

claims of the Church are based upon parliamentary enactments. This error is held even by some of our own people, and it is your duty to beware of countenancing it in any way, and always make it clearly understood that our position is entirely independent of any human authority or recognition; that whether we be prescribed and persecuted, or kings be our nursing fathers and queens our nursing mothers, we equally claim to be the true representatives of the Church constituted by the Apostles,—under commission from her head—from whom we trace our descent in unbroken succession."

I know not by what arguments his Lordship sustains and defends his opinion. Perhaps he takes the position which has been assumed by some members of his Church—that the Apostle Paul first preached the gospel in Britain, and ordained ministers there, from whom the succession has proceeded in the regular order; that in the middle ages, it is true, the Church came under the power of Rome, and was so far contaminated; but that at the Reformation its freedom was regained, and the true succession restored.

It sounds well. One thing only is lacking—TRUTH. No man can prove that the Apostle Paul ever saw Britain. A great deal of ink and paper has been wasted in the attempt. The early Christian writers make no mention of it. Nothing more than a weak probability can be arrived at, and that will not serve the purpose. The fact must be *proved*, which cannot be done.

But even if it *were* proved, the claim would not be established. For though Archbishop Sumner can show that he has been regularly ordained, and that the bishops by whom he was ordained were admitted to the holy office with equal regularity; is he able to prove that all preceding bishops, up to the Apostle Paul—all through the disturbed middle ages, were free from taint of irregularity in ordination? Is he able to prove that all the bishops by whom they were ordained priests were also free from taint? Is he able to prove that every bishop