

the existence of 'union and communion' between the Church of England and the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. They imply that the Church of England, in the person of her Primate, repudiates fellowship with the ground of the Scottish nation solely on the ground of a difference in Church government, and gives all her sympathy, for no better reason, to the Church of a small minority. 'The Episcopal Church,' says the Archbishop, 'is the only true representative of the Church of England in Scotland.' In the first place, what business has the Church of England in Scotland at all? Can the Archbishop be infected with the delusion of the Stuarts, and imagine that it is the mission of the Church of England to reduce all the parts of the United Kingdom to a religious uniformity? But, moreover, we cannot but protest against the assertion that the only true representative of the Church of England in Scotland is a small dissenting sect. The true representative of the English Establishment is the Scottish Establishment, and the true representative of the Church of the English nation is the Church of the Scottish nation. They are one in the great protest out of which they arose, one in their object and in the main principles upon which they are founded, and their sole difference relates to the form of Church government. We are well aware, indeed, that a certain class of theologians deny the name of a Church to any community not enjoying Episcopal government. Such an extravagance will never receive much respect from the English people: and, even among divines, so staunch an advocate for Episcopacy as Hooker never seems to have dreamt of this narrow fancy of ecclesiastical bigotry. But, at all events, so far as the Archbishop is concerned, it is sufficient to observe that English law knows no such refinement. The Presbyterian Church of Scotland receives precisely the same recognition as the Archbishop of Canterbury himself, and whatever may be his private opinion, it is certainly improper that in his public capacity he should set himself flatly against the judgment of the very law to which he owes his own position. His next remark is not more fortunate:—'I think it well that it should be understood that the prelates of the English Church pretend to exercise no jurisdiction over clergymen in Scotland. It is entirely contrary to the diocesan system that such a course should be pursued.' Undoubtedly. This is the very principle we have been urging, but it applies equally to Presbyterian as to Episcopal dioceses, and the Presbyterian Church should have been treated by the Archbishop with as much respect as the diocese of the Bishop of Moray and Ross. But the climax in this extraordinary scene was reached by the Bishop of Argyll and the Isles. It may, perhaps, have occurred to our readers that the Archbishop is not wholly without precedent in employing his high office in the task of spreading the principles of the Church of England in Scotland. Archbishop Laud gained an unenviable notoriety for similarly injudi-

icious proceedings, but we should hardly have thought that any one would have had the audacity to quote the precedent. The Bishop of Argyll, however, rejoiced at the presence of one who was the representative, among others, of 'à Becket, who contended for the principles of ecclesiastical freedom, and of Laud, who saw in Monarchy,' and, we may add, in Episcopacy, 'a divine right.' After this ebullition, nothing further, we think, can be needed to condemn the course taken by the Archbishop. Tell me those you consort with, and I will tell you what you are. Thomas à Becket is not exactly a model for a modern archbishop, but if there is one ecclesiastic whom it would have been desirable to forget on such an occasion it would have been the man who, above all others is identified with a policy of the most deadly antagonism to the Scotch Presbyterian system. To have laid the foundation of a cathedral at Inverness, and, after repudiating fellowship with the Scotch National Church, to have been greeted as the representative of Laud is a position in which we should have thought no archbishop of the present day could possibly have placed himself. Could not the Archbishop find sufficient to occupy him in the state of the Church at home, that he must needs indulge in this gratuitous interference in the ecclesiastical affairs of the sister kingdom? The occurrence, it was said at the banquet, was a thing unprecedented in the history of Scotland. We have no doubt of it, and we trust it will remain so."

Just as we are going to press, we observe a paragraph in the *Witness* announcing that the Rev. Mr. Smith, of Melbourne, has accepted a call to Fond du Lac, in Wisconsin. Should this be correct, the Church here will lose one of her most energetic ministers, who has done much good in the Eastern Townships, and who, it was hoped, would for years have laboured here successfully and acceptably.

There will be found in this number, among "Articles Communicated," an address by the Rev. Robert Dobie, which we commend to our readers, as it discusses some questions which are now exciting lively discussion throughout the Church. Of course we must by no means be considered as responsible for the opinions expressed on all the points taken up by the author of the communication.

The Presbytery of Toronto will meet in the Church at Chinguacousy on Tuesday, the 10th December, at 10 o'clock a. m., for the induction of a minister, and the transaction of general business.