

who asserts that St. Paul received the rich rewards of faith after he had "taught righteousness to the whole world, and gone to the utmost bounds of the west."

In the age immediately succeeding that of the Apostles, we find a host of writers bearing witness to the fact that the Gospel had taken deep root among the Britons; and Tertullian, after remarking that districts inaccessible to Roman arms had been subdued by Christ, adds that the fame of their Christianity had extended to Africa and the east. Between the years 170 and 176, King Lucius, the grandson of Caractacus, having embraced the Christian faith, caused an increased number of bishops to be consecrated, in order to make the diffusion of the Gospel co-extensive with his dominions. This was the first bowing of a crowned head to the sovereignty of the Cross, so that besides the honour of having given to Rome her first Christian Bishop, (for Linus, the first occupant of that See, who was consecrated in the year 67, was the son of Caractacus), and at a later period her greatest monarch and first Christian Emperor, (for Constantine the Great was born in Britain, and his mother Helena, was a British lady); England claims the yet higher honour of having been the first nation in the world that was governed by a Christian King, and the foremost to fulfil the prophecy which predicts of the Church of Christ, that "Kings shall be her nursing fathers." To the days of Lucius, then, may be referred the origin of the union of Church and State.

C

COLONIAL ANGLICANISM.

[From the *Toronto Globe*].

The Episcopal Church in the Colonies has been declared to have no more connection with the Crown than any other Church. The Queen is not, out of England, in any sense, the head of any Church. The Colonial Church is, consequently, not trammelled in its action as the English branch from its connection with the State must be. Such being the case, why should it not, so far as it is free, regulate its own concerns in doctrine and discipline like other Churches? We can see no reason why, and why especially should not some effort be made to have a recognized system of doctrine held and taught by all the clergymen within its pale? Its present position is in the last degree anomalous. Apparently a man may believe everything or nothing, and still be a clergyman in good standing. The *London Times* objects to such proposals as paving the way for clerical tyranny, but there is no reason for its complaints. A voluntary association as every Church independent of State support is, can make its own terms of membership, if these do not conflict with the law of the land; and if they do, the association itself would be unlawful. Nobody is forced to join such a society, or to continue in it. What hardship is there in any one who does, promising to conform to its regulations or go out of it. The Colenso scandal is sufficiently notable to induce every one who wishes well to the Anglican Church to seek some way by which it might be removed. * * * To complete the Pan-Anglican idea, as shadowed forth in the reports referred to—all which seems necessary is to agitate for all the severance of the connection with the State in England and Ireland, and the absolute surrender of all endowments from public funds. Let the bishops and their friends do that and succeed; and then, notwithstanding all the "thunders" of the *Times*, every lover of fair play and freedom would be glad to see them managing their own Church in their own way, and having as many Courts of Appeal, or as few as they choose. These are matters with which outsiders would then have nothing to do.