

enter upon a refutation of this theory would be only trifling with time. It has not the least shadow of support from the word of God, and sectarians all tell us they believe the Bible, and the Bible only. The second supposes such a call to the ministry from God himself as supersedes the necessity of any additional act of the public authorities of the Church. But if an individual should pretend to such a call and be asked for his credentials, how is he able to furnish them? He may refer us to certain impressions upon his own mind which he supposes to be made by the Spirit of God, but whilst these may satisfy himself, so long as he is of that opinion, are they calculated to give such satisfaction to any one else so as to induce him to submit to his authority? The fact is, God never called any man to contravene the injunctions of his own word, or to break the unity of his Church, (a crime, of which all such pretenders are most glaringly guilty,) when he did call any person to minister in his name, by a commission held immediately from himself, as the Prophets and Apostles, he invariably furnished them with those miraculous credentials without which no such pretensions can be sustained, so as to satisfy the mind of any man that has given the slightest consideration to the subject.

The third theory is that which may be justly termed Catholic, as it has been held and acted upon in all parts of the Christian

Church, and in all ages since the days of the Apostles. It is simply, that in order to receive a legitimate commission to exercise the office of an Ambassador of God, it is necessary that it should be conveyed through the ministry of the regular and established authorities which he has appointed in his Church. Now if a man is to be put into the office of the Ministry by those who were in office before him, this necessity implies a succession of some kind, and leads us up along the various links of a chain till we arrive at the commencement of the Christian Ministry, or to the immediate appointment of the Apostles themselves. But we desire to call the attention of our readers to the Episcopal succession as always held by the Catholic Church of Christ to which our adversaries object, not excepting a dignitary of the "No Church" party in Toronto. This they are all free to class as undisguised ritualism, as a popish innovation of the Oxford School. Let us examine the opinions of the Reformers upon this subject, as also those entertained by the early Church.

When the English Reformers renounced the usurped power of the papacy, and reclaimed their own native independence, the succession of their Bishops, it is well known, was carefully preserved. This is rendered peculiarly obvious, as a matter of fact, by the celebrated controversy which was subsequently carried on with the Jesuits, about the "Nag's Head Ordination." Now,