

was overruled by the bishops of the province? As we have stated before, the validity of all acts done in the Anglican Church since the Reformation rests upon the canonicity of Archbishop Parker's consecration. If his appointment is invalid the clergy and bishops of the Church of England are laymen. Now Parker was ordained in spite of the refusal* of all the bishops of England to take part in the ceremony. He was ordained by four bishops who had been exiled by Queen Mary, one of whom was a suffragan, without jurisdiction, and the other three were bishops then without sees, two of whom were afterwards confirmed by the archbishop. They were all bishops, duly consecrated as to orders, and the consecration of Parker was perfectly valid, even by the canon law of Rome at that time, but under the present interpretation of the fourth canon of Nicæa it was irregular. If this interpretation is to be held it will be difficult to meet the objections of Roman Catholics who may take us upon our own ground. In this manner Palmer was driven by Cardinal Wiseman to fall back on the Apostolic Canons which decree that ordination by two bishops is sufficient. These considerations are put forward not to impugn the validity of Archbishop Parker's consecration, but to show that the change proposed in Canada is a novelty which tends to weaken the whole basis of the reasoning by which only Anglican orders can be defended.

In every synod report, diocesan or provincial, will be found the statutes we refer to. The second Act refers to Diocesan lay Delegates, and has no bearing on the point at issue. The first Act has two clauses only. The first clause refers to diocesan synods, and the second to the Provincial Synod. The powers granted are defined clearly, and each body derives them separately from the same source. It is a parallel case to the British North

Palmer—Episcopacy Vindicated.

Bp. Short—History of the Church of England, p. 195.