

"that none of the Bishops take another province, which has not been formerly and from the beginning subject to him," and the canon goes on to decree that if any have done so he shall restore it, that the Canons of the Fathers and the liberty of the clergy be not infringed."—(Perceval on Apostolic Succession).—And yet the Romanists, who charge us with schism for throwing off the usurpations of the Pope, pretend to acknowledge the authority and to obey the canons of this Council!

Mr. Brown.—I now clearly see that the Church of England had the same right to be independent of Rome, that Rome had to be independent of the Church of Jerusalem, or that the Church of the United States has to be uncontrolled by that of England. But then was there not great confusion at the Reformation, especially when Queen Elizabeth came to the throne? Indeed, did not the Church of England then lose its regular succession of Apostolic Bishops? And I ask this question seriously, for I will confess to you that from some things I have been reading lately, I am almost convinced that this is necessary;—Bishop Onderdonk's Tract on the Scriptural proofs of Episcopacy, though a little book, is, I think, unanswerable.

Mr. Secker.—I am exceedingly happy to hear you speak thus; I think the "general necessity" of Episcopacy is every day clearer to my own mind. But with respect to your question, the truth is that the Reformation caused nothing like the confusion in our Ecclesiastical Polity which the Romanists falsely assert, and which it is generally believed, that it did. The purifying of the English Church, usually called the Reformation, was mainly accomplished in the reign of Henry VIII. and his son Edward VI., at which time those who did not conform were exceedingly few, only two, I believe, out of all the Bishops, Gardiner and Bonner, refusing to do so. "All the consecrations of Bishops in the reign of Queen Mary were uncanonical, having been made by the authority of the Bishop of Rome," whose usurped authority the English Church had formally renounced nineteen years before; and this decision the Church never repealed, not even under Queen Mary. When Queen Elizabeth therefore came to the throne, she of course restored such of the true Bishops, which her sister had deposed, as were yet living, and by the singular Providence of God the See of Canterbury became vacant almost immediately after Queen Elizabeth's accession, by the death of Cardinal Pole, who was its Archbishop, and thus the church was saved from the agitating question of whether he was its legal possessor, and Matthew Parker, a clergyman favourable to that purification of the English church which had taken place, was duly consecrated, to this the first and most important Bishopric of the Empire, by four Bishops, like-minded with himself, respecting whose previous consecrations

there can be no reasonable doubting, the documents which prove them still existing. Thus, Mr. Brown, as "we do not say that the Church of England was no church before she was reformed; neither can the Romanists ever prove, that she ceased to be a church, when God in mercy granted her, her reformation. She did not cease to be the ancient and Catholic Church of England, or sever her connexion with the church of the Apostles, because she cast off the usurpations of Rome. Oh! no, not even Romanists themselves being judges. For twelve years after the Accession of Queen Elizabeth, the Church of England was recognized by them as catholic; at all events there was then but one church, nay, but one religious communion, in England, and of it those Papists, who afterwards formed a separate sect, were members." Nor was it until the Bishop of Rome (the Pope) had arrogantly ex-communicated Elizabeth, who was the Queen of a kingdom with which he had no connexion, and a member of a branch of the catholic church over which he had no lawful authority, that that miserable Romish schism began, which, insignificant as it was at first, so many are now set upon upholding; out of upwards of seven thousand clergymen, I believe there were not two hundred* who dissented in favor of Popery, and even that little schism did not take place till about thirty-six years after the church first renounced the supremacy of the Pope, and twelve after the completion of the Reformation by Queen Elizabeth. "Indeed until the year 1685, that is for more than one hundred and twenty years after the death of Mary, the Romanists had no Bishops in England, if I except the space of six years, during which one titular schismatical Bishop was sent by the Pope. You see then, my dear Mr. Brown, that it is the Romanists in the British Empire, who are dissenters from our Reformed English branch of the catholic church. The Romish churches (it is the name they give themselves, because they still wish to be under the Bishop of Rome) of Germany, France, Spain, or Rome, we admit are, in their own countries, branches, though, alas, sadly corrupt, of the ancient catholic church of Christ; but we say that when they obtrude themselves into the British Empire they cease to be catholic, they become dissenters and schismatics;" just as much as the Church of England would be schismatical, and her members dissenters, if she attempted to send Bishops and to establish a Church in opposition to the Protestant and Catholic Episcopal Church of the United States. All such doings are offences

* Southey (Book of the Church, p. 390) states, on the authority of Strype, that "of 9400 beneficed Clergy, only 177 resigned their preferment, rather than acknowledge the Queen's supremacy," and worship after the Reformed manner. In England, all the Romish Bishops were recusants, save one; but in Ireland, only two of the Bishops rejected the Reformation.