

Meeting, that fountain of refreshment, is no part of the system. It is an extra, an unauthorised addition; and we have heard of a Canadian Bishop calling a clergyman to account for venturing to hold one! Will the beauties of any liturgy compensate for this practical exclusion of public Free Prayer?

The *exclusiveness* of the system is a very grave objection against it. Though it may not be expressly asserted in the Prayer-book, it is tacitly assumed, and the attitude of the Church towards all other than its own clergy, is based on the assumption, that in its "orders" alone is to be found the title to be a true minister of Christ. Though a man may have consecrated his early youth to the Gospel, have diligently prepared himself for the work, have been set apart to it by the most wise and godly men, and have had the Master's seal upon him in the fruits of his ministry, all this avail-eth nothing, is not taken into the account; he must begin again in a lower order, just like the beardless novice who kneels beside him to have Episcopal hands laid upon his head. When once he has undergone that ceremony, he is cut off for ever from his old associates, and from multitudes of God's most honoured servants, in all recognition of them in the Church as ministers of Christ. If Robert Vaughan, or Thomas Binney, or Newman Hall, or Alexander Raleigh, or George Smith, or Baptist Noel, or Morley Punshon, should pass by that way, he may acknowledge them as the excellent of the earth in private, but he dares not ask them to preach for him! How many of us are willing to shut ourselves up in that position? A man born in it may remain there, bemoaning his captivity; but to offer ourselves for imprisonment, when we have been free born, is another matter.

While we should be thus shut out from so much that is holiest and wisest among men, who would be our new companions? One party is going on toward Rome. Another halts on the same road. Another pitches an "Evangelical" camp. Another, rejoicing in his liberty, makes off in the direction of Rationalism. Yet all these are to be recognised as duly authorised ministers of our Apostolic Church; perhaps, by turns, as our Right Reverend Fathers in God!

The whole Anglican system, in so far as it is a system, is built upon the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. The Baptismal Office, that for Confirmation, the Catechism, the terms of admission to the Lord's Supper, the Sunday Services, the Order for the Visitation of the Sick, and for the Burial of the Dead, all agree most harmoniously with that doctrine; nowhere contradict it. One believing it, has no difficulty in using all the services in their plain sense. But one who holds the views known as "Evangelical," as opposed to the "Sacramentarian," has to supplement and explain, and resort to non-natural meanings, and what not? The words are there, plainly declaring spiritual regeneration in and by means of the sacrament—how can he get around them? We have never seen an explanation that met the case.

If any one *believes* in apostolical succession, with its episcopal authority