

terians, outside its pale. This did not prevent it at the Revolution being constituted the National Church, as, upon the whole, the Church most "suitable to the inclinations of the people." Through all its history, and even what our United Presbyterian friends would call its unfaithfulness at certain periods of its history, it has remained, we contend, the Church most "suitable to the inclinations of the people of Scotland." We believe that with all its faults (we have no wish to hide any of its faults, but would gladly see them all amended, if our friends would only assist us) it is so still. And it is this *national suitability*—the fact that with all which has occurred to injure and weaken it the Church of Scotland is still the Church of the people of Scotland, to which they are more inclined than to any other.—it is this which makes it a National Church and not a "sect." It remains in the national position in which it was established, if even considerable portions of the national life have "cut" themselves off from it. This cannot destroy its old national character. It is the original trunk from which these branches have been severed. The cuttings or "sects" are made by the severance. However they may increase, this does not make the old tree from which they have been separated a cutting like themselves. "Sects" in short, are made and only made by separation. It is a mere abuse of language, to call the Church of Scotland, so long as it exists at all in its original legal position, a "sect." It is the Church of the country, and nothing but its disestablishment can destroy its claim to be such.

It is a still greater abuse of language and of history to speak of its position as being unjust to other Churches around it, merely because they have separated from it and refuse it privileges. If they have done so, it is because they suppose themselves to obtain privileges which they value more highly than State con-

nection. To call, in such circumstances, the historical position of the Church a cause of irritation to Dissenters, is simply to talk nonsense of the most arrant kind—nonsense only worthy of fledgling Radical candidates who know nothing either of Scotland or of its Church. It is to be hoped that we have heard the last of this sort of nonsense. The privileges of the Church of Scotland, pecuniary or otherwise, are inherited privileges of the people of Scotland. That certain persons who choose to avail themselves of them should enjoy these privileges, while others for the sake of advantages which they prize more highly should keep aloof from them, is surely no reason, political or Christian, why the privileges should be destroyed. Man cannot have anything in this world. They cannot, according to the common saying, have their cake and eat it too. The Scottish Dissenter cannot enjoy the pride of religious independence, and at the same time destroy the very institution which enables him to assert his independence. If the members of the Church of Scotland do not wish independence after his fashion, what right has he to thrust it upon them. If I rejoice in my bonds as a State Churchman (which I most heartily do), what right has any one to strike them off? I have inherited them; I prefer them. With the great mass of my countrymen, I not only do not find them bonds, but the dear symbols of the transmitted freedom; and I am to be made "free" against my will? It is the old story of the fox which lost his tail. It is surely enough for him that he is allowed to run about without a tail—that he is not arrested and compelled to adapt himself to the prevailing fashion. It is merely insanity that he should not be content with this, but should insist on every other fox who wears all the inherited honour of a full tail, and is proud to do so, being made tail-less like himself.

Scottish ecclesiasticism has been in-