

of England," in the preceding, and it will be correctly worded, according to Mr. Darling's real meaning. But only examine his method of proving his assertion. A few words taken from this, and a few words from that, and a few words from somewhere else, put these together according to the writer's views, and, my friends, the prayer book, or any other book, even the bible, can be made to say any thing or nothing, just as a man pleases; couple with this the most painful mis-statements, and false or garbled quotations; and you have at one view the way the Church of England is made responsible for Mr. Darling's church principles.

But let me not fall into that gentleman's error of asserting without proving; let us examine how he endeavours to prove the assertion quoted in the preceding paragraph. After adducing the nineteenth article, he says: "Now, according to Christ's ordinance, his sacraments must be ministered by lawful bishops, priests, and deacons." Let me ask, where in the bible is it related that Christ made such pretended ordinance. Where does the Church of England say any such thing. Christ, my friends, made no such ordinance. He says, "Do this in remembrance of me;" and "Go ye, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost." But, more than this, Christ makes no mention of bishops, priests, and deacons. Search the word of God, my friends, and see if these things be so. Mr. Darling, continuing his argument, says: "But the Church of England says, no man is a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon, unless ordained by a bishop." The Church of England says no such thing; how can any man assert she does? She says, in the preface to the ordination service, that "No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon, *in the United Church of England and Ireland*, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined and admitted thereunto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly episcopal consecration or ordination" in other words. And can any thing be plainer? The ministers of the Church of England must be episcopally ordained; but no opinion is given or doctrine taught respecting the invalidity of the orders of non-episcopal churches. (See the twenty-third article of our church.) Mr. D. goes on to say: "and therefore those denominations whose ministers are not ordained by bishops cannot have the sacraments ministered according to Christ's ordinance, and consequently are not—according to the articles of the Church of England—visible churches of Christ." Turn to Mr. Darling's letter and read this tissue of nonsense carefully, for which, by the bye, if done by a boy over twelve years old at any public school, he would run the risk of a severe flogging; then read, my friends, the nineteenth, twenty-third, thirty-fourth and thirty-sixth Articles; and then pass an honest and unbiassed judgment, whether such unchristian opinions are the doctrines of the Church of England. She says, at the conclusion of the thirty-fourth article, "Every particular or national church hath authority to ordain, change and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the church, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying." Mr. Darling will not surely now tell us, with this article before our eyes, that episcopacy, however desirable and in accordance with primitive and universal custom, is essential to the validity of a church.