

cated, *de novo*, at the will of this or that self-constituted authority, to provide for the demands of the church? Now, look in this very point of view, as well as in others, upon Zion, the city of our solemnities. She is a tabernacle that shall not be taken down; not one of the stakes thereof shall ever be removed, neither shall any of the cords thereof be broken. Never, I trust, will the peculiar Anglican stamp, the genuine Anglican character and spirit, (with whatever necessity for some partial adaptation to local circumstances,) be obliterated from our Colonial institutions. They are dear and most justly dear to our hearts; and fervently may we hope, and fully may we trust, that the establishment of a Metropolitan Jurisdiction, in compliance with our petitions, and in conformity with the Anglican system at home and abroad, will tend to conform and perpetuate our close identity with the honoured institutions which have been passed to us from our fathers."

This is plain language, for which we are thankful. But does not the name sound most oddly? Suppose we transfer the formula to New Testament times, "the United Church of Egypt and Crete in Greece!" Will not the least inspection shew any man that in so far as the church is a church of Christ it is for *all nations*, and that so far as it is Anglican, it is fit only for the few islands that are Anglican? To prosper in the United States it must be American, and now must be either Federal or Confederate; and to prosper here it must be Canadian, and Anglican only so far as Canada is English.

But what is in a name? A great deal sometimes, and so the reverend metropolitan goes on to shew us. It is part of the Established Church and that disguisedly gives it a position in a country which has by legislative enactment declared the separation of Church and State. The Queen is the Head of the Church, and she sends forth Her Metropolitan under the seal of the Empire, giving thus to him and the Church over which he presides that legal existence and jurisdiction which is now denied in Scotland to the Free or any other non-established Church. The Church is *quasi* independent,—no longer of the See of Canterbury, but still part of the Established Church, subject to the laws which regulate her affairs, and partakes so far of her privileges.

The distinctive principle of the church is clearly enunciated—"Prelacy by Apostolic succession." This is unquestionably anti-Protestant. To claim the rite of confirmation by prelatic hands as essential to the validity of baptism, and the ministerial gift from prelatic hands as essential to holy orders, is tantamount to making the existence of the church, both members and office-bearers, depend on the existence and actions of a set of mere prelates not mentioned in Scripture, and whose claim is confessedly based on the traditional usage of the early church. If this be the strength of the Anglican Church, it will, like every other human device, come to nought. But we do not believe it. We would rather take the opinion of the Bishop of Victoria, who stated, that *in none of the authoritative documents of the Church of England is it taught that Prelacy is essential to the Church of God*; or the opinion of the early Reformers of England, who fraternised and consulted with the continental Reformers and Divines, and submitted as a matter of necessity imposed upon them, to a half reformed prelatic organization; or the opinion of "men among ourselves," who can see the church of God in other places than in the Church of England and her apostate sister of Rome.

Other things which took place savour so strongly of anti-Christ that they offend us, such as Canons of the Church of the fourth century; embers, vest-