

We look up from our low place to the splendours of our friend's "third heaven," and feel that between him and us there is a "great gulf" fixed. Episcopal views would not particularly disturb fraternal feeling, but apostolic succession does indeed interpose a gulf over which we, for our part, have no means of putting a bridge.

It is, after all, only a rueful and ghastly kind of pleasantry that can be excited over this case. The great issues involved *will* loom up. "Sir," said a venerable and distinguished Presbyterian minister to us the other day, in reference to the step taken by our friend: "Sir, it's a species of apostacy." So it is. The farce of confirmation (and what else was it in such a case) had to be gone through, and the piety of a veteran Christian must begin *de novo*! "Being now come to years of discretion," (!!) he was asked if he would "ratify, confirm, and acknowledge all these things," which his God-father and God-mother "then undertook" for him? And he answered "I do," when, in fact, he never had God-father or God-mother! A stout Non-conformist in days not long past, he swears "unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything in the Prayer-book." Declared by Divine seals to his ministry to have been long ago a minister of Christ, he abjures his first ordination by submitting to a second. "Pray sir," said a bishop to John Howe, "what hurt is there in being twice ordained?" "Hurt, my lord," rejoined Howe, "it hurts my understanding; the thought is shocking; it is an absurdity, since nothing can have two beginnings. \* \* I cannot begin again to be a minister." After enjoying the liberty and manifesting the catholicity of non-conformity, "what a falling off was there" in espousing a system of ecclesiastical exclusiveness! The great and good man just quoted made this a prime objection to conformity, "that when that flourishing state of religion should arrive which he thought he had sufficient warrant from the Word of God to expect, a constitution which rested on such an exclusive basis must fall; that, believing this to be the case, *he was no more willing to exercise his ministry under such a system than he would be to dwell in a house with an insecure foundation.*" Our friend was once a zealous opponent of state-churchism, and we well remember a time when he took a lecturing tour through Canada to stir up the people against the Clergy Reserves and Rectories, and to create a public sentiment in favour of ecclesiastical independence and the voluntary principle. "How art thou fallen, O Lucifer, son of the morning!" By what mental process have these revolutions of opinion been brought about? We are curious to know. It is easy to account for a clinging to "the church of our fathers" on the part of those born and brought up Episcopalians, and we ought to have a large amount of charity for such, but how an enlightened, independent, conscientious mind can bring itself or be brought by others to turn tail so completely on all the convictions and positions of other days, is a mystery we cannot solve. For the justification of his own course, and the enlightenment of his benighted brethren, whom he has left so far behind and beneath him, our friend ought to narrate "The wanderings of a pilgrim from the first to the third ecclesiastical heaven," and we hereby request him to do so.

It is a favourite idea among Congregationalists, that Presbyterianism, from its recognition of human authority in matters of religion, has in it the germ of Popery. Is it by this hierarchical road our friend has been journeying to his present position? Did he get into a labyrinth of perplexity as to church-power, transferring it from the brotherhood to a Session, from the Session to Presbytery and Synod, until at last he has centralized it in a bishop? If