

Another inaccurate quotation, so inaccurate as entirely to alter its original meaning, is in the upper part of the third page of the Pastoral Letter, where Mr. Darling asks, "Again, how did it happen that, 250 years ago, such a canon as this was passed by the synod or convocation of the Church of England? "Whosoever shall hereafter affirm or maintain that there are within this realm other meetings, assemblies, or congregations of the king's born subjects, that may rightly challenge to themselves the name of true and lawful churches, let him be excommunicated; and not restored but by the archbishop, after his repentance and public revocation of such his wicked errors." Now, my friends, Mr. Darling asserts this to be the eleventh canon of 1603, and urges you to examine and judge for yourselves. I entreat you to do this. Respond to that gentleman's invitation. For, remember, this is not any mere doctrinal argument between Mr. Darling and myself, it is much more; it is between truth and falsehood, between the bible and the deceitful crafty system of Ignatius Loyola, between the commandments of God and the traditions of men, between Protestantism and Popery. Now, let us read this eleventh canon (having obtained the churchwarden's permission, which seems first of all to be necessary by the Pastoral Letter), and we shall find it runs thus: "Whosoever shall hereafter affirm or maintain that there are within this realm other meetings, assemblies, or congregations of the king's born subjects, *than such as by the laws of this land are held and allowed*, which may rightly challenge to themselves the name of true and lawful churches; let him be excommunicated, and not restored but by the archbishop, after his repentance and public revocation of such his wicked errors." Notice well the words Mr. Darling has omitted; for, as you see, they entirely alter the meaning intended to be given you. The laws of England hold and allow the Roman Catholic to be a lawful church, by the annual grant to Maynooth alone; The laws of England hold and allow the Presbyterians, Baptists, and Independents, to be true and lawful churches, by the *regium donum*, and the annual grant of ministers' money, as it is called. Consequently, I am fully borne out by this canon of the Church of England in recognizing my Protestant brethren as belonging to this or that church.

"Another church (Popish) principle is, that there are three different orders of ministers in the church, and that they must be ordained by bishops deriving their authority by unbroken succession from the apostles." (Pastoral Letter, page 3.) Now, except the declaration that the Church of England recognizes bishops, priests, and deacons; Mr. Darling has not in his letter adduced, neither can he adduce (as he well knows) one single proof from the articles, or liturgy, much less from the bible, to support the doctrine of individual apostolical succession.

"But," says Mr. Norris, "the apostolical succession is a mere figment." Mr. Norris says no such thing; he says, in page 22 of his letter, "*individual* apostolical succession is a figment." But he holds and maintains the doctrine of the apostolical succession of the christian ministry *generally*, as a truth in accordance with scripture, and likewise acknowledged by the Church of England. But let us beware, my friends, of "setting the church and her ministers in the