

refers to is "the coercive jurisdiction" connected with such an institution.

Now this we conceive to be really no great loss, or no loss at all. An intelligent episcopalian who believes that that system of church government is based on scripture, and that his church has been founded by Christ and his apostles, and owes its origin to no earthly government, need care but little whether the office and jurisdiction of its ministers be recognized by act of parliament or Queen's letters, or not. He knows that the church long existed without any recognition from the state except occasional persecutions, and its office-bearers were as much and as truly office-bearers of the church then as ever they were since the church was established by Constantine, and it need not disturb his equanimity what civil courts may decide as to the status of their ministry. So at least we feel as presbyterians. Believing in the scripturalness of the presbyterian polity, we would not care a straw though all the lord chancellors and civil courts in Europe were to decide that our ministers were not ministers at all. Such a decision from any civil court any sound-hearted presbyterian would laugh to scorn. Believing that the church owes its existence and constitution to Christ, he would regard his ministers as holding the same position after such a decision as before. It is true that this would place the church of England in the colonies, in the eye of the law, in the position of voluntary associations, as other religious bodies are regarded. But whether this is liked or not, it is the position to which the members of that body must make up their minds. The present decision plainly implies that churches in the colonies will just have the position which the legislatures of these colonies choose to give them. And in our own, and most other colonies, it is very certain what that will be. The policy will be to place all denominations on a footing of equality, with entire liberty to manage their affairs according to their own views, so long as they keep within bounds of the law. The fact that certain bodies are established in England or Scotland, will not give the slightest pre-eminence to members

of bodies affiliated with them in this province. Our friends of the Kirk, we may note in passing, may as well make up their minds to this fact. It is simply ridiculous to hear ministers of that body in this province, talking of their status as ministers of an established church, and the Queen being bound to do so and so for them on account of their holding that position. She may be so bound in Scotland, because by the law of Scotland there is a presbyterian church established there; but, in governing Nova Scotia, she is just as much bound by the law of Nova Scotia as she is by the law of Scotland, in Scotland, and, if in the latter, she is bound by the law to recognize one body as established, she is equally bound in Nova Scotia, by the law of Nova Scotia, to recognize none as established, and all as on an equality.

It might appear on a first reading of the lord chancellor's decision, as if the church of England in the colonies had not the power, by voluntary association, to establish the jurisdiction of bishops, metropolitan or suffragan. But he distinctly refers to their position as part of an established church. There would be no difficulty were they merely claiming the position of other bodies and simply wishing to establish among themselves all the parts of the episcopalian system of church government, as what they believed to be most in accordance with scripture. In this case their bishops would hold a position to their flocks analogous to that of the bishops of the Romish church in protestant countries, or of the episcopal church in the United States. When the power and jurisdiction claimed by ecclesiastics is dependent on the consent of their own adherents, and the only means of carrying out decisions is by influencing the conscience by spiritual means, no protestant government will interfere with them. And we have no hesitation in saying that this is all the power the ministry should have. The union of the spiritual powers with the civil has always been found subversive of liberty, and has probably, in the past history of the world, been the occasion of more strife than any single cause, apart from the general one of human depravity, and we are jealous even of its shadow.