

Church. I have reason for saying that their Lordships have considered the subject of sufficient importance to obtain special counsel in the matter. Their Lordships were advised that grave caution was necessary, and otherwise they might become involved in serious ecclesiastical difficulties, inasmuch as my orders, as well as those of Bishop Toke, are most unquestionably as legal as those of their Lordships. The legal advisers even went so far as to state to the Archbishop of Canterbury the orders conferred by Bishops Gregg and Toke were as undoubtedly valid as any conferred by His Grace."

Will Bishop Gregg be a little more explicit, and tell us plainly what he means? What is the nature of the "serious ecclesiastical difficulties" which may arise? Does the "Bishop" contemplate taking possession of Canterbury Cathedral or Westminster Abbey some day, in the name of the Reformed Episcopal Church of Great Britain and Canada? Or does he intend to claim the right of sitting in the House of Lords among his brethren of the lawn? The truth is that the Reformed Episcopal Church is just as "valid" as any of the different denominations, and no more. The Bishops Gregg and Toke can "confer orders" in precisely the same way, and to precisely the same extent, as the Methodists and Congregationalists, and in no other way. In the Established Church Dr. Gregg was simply a Rector, and had not the slightest legal authority to "confer orders" upon anybody, while "their Lordships" do that by law and in the name of the Crown. Dr. Gregg is now a clergyman of the Established Church of England, without a charge; by the permission of the Bishop of any diocese he could officiate in any Episcopal Church as preacher, or he could perform the ceremony of marriage or burial, but he could not ordain a priest.

But Bishop Gregg cannot confer those same orders on the clergy of the R. E. Church. In the eyes of the law they are simply Non-conformists. They cannot marry a couple except the Registrar is there to attend to the legal part of it—and in fact can do nothing more than any of those called Dissenting Ministers. If Dr. Gregg said these things to the *Witness* reporter, he most certainly misunderstands the nature of his own position as an ecclesiastic. If he has any desire to test the matter, he can easily do so on his return by claiming tithes—or getting one of those on whom he has conferred orders to perform a marriage ceremony when the Registrar is not in attendance—or to bury in the parish graveyard—or to do anything which a Dissenter may not do.

SIR,—In answer to an article in the last issue of your paper, respecting the Saint *Bartholomew's Church* in this city, permit me to hand you herewith a copy of Col. Aycrigg's pamphlet, which will tend somewhat to enlighten you on the subject. The facts are as follows:—

The church was established under the jurisdiction and canons of the R. E. C. in the United States, as founded by the late Bishop Cummings.

Bishop Gregg, seceded from the church, starting a church of his own under the jurisdiction of the United Kingdom, quite distinct from the old R. E. C.

The Rev. B. B. Ussher, with a majority of the congregation, withdrew from the church and united with Bishop Gregg under a different jurisdiction, which they had a perfect right to do, but not to hold possession of the Church property, which legally belong to the minority continuing loyal to the church as established.

Hence the two St. Bartholomew's Churches. The congregation of the original church having (in the meantime) to worship in the Alexandra Rooms, contenting themselves with having served the usual protest in order to preserve their rights until such time as they may think proper to bring the case into Court in order to get possession of their property.

I remain, Sir, yours respectfully,

Geo. Horne, Warden St. B. C.

A PUZZLE.

I have received the following communication from a friend at a distance, and have pondered and puzzled over it to no purpose. Will somebody help me? There is meaning in it, I am sure, for my friend is a sensible man; but it is too much for me—I cannot grasp the thought.

Let the ideas of the *SPECTATOR* and its correspondents be as good and able as they may, those ideas will have to get themselves clothed with the

material and physical and visible element before the work that is wanted for the present time will be accomplished. No objection can be taken to an analysis of *principles*—either "first" or "second." Without such we might all be struggling in the dark. But if the population of the land we inhabit—our real fellow-citizens—are to be benefitted in this generation, we need a synthesis of social facts, and synthetical teaching leading up to those facts. An effeminate christianity will no longer serve; and any journals that come short of this requirement will hardly continue to keep a leading place. Surely no people have grander opportunities than we, to-day.

Loud and reasonable complaints have been, and are being made, against the enormous expenses of towage to the Port of Montreal. This is caused to a very large extent by the force of the St. Mary's current. It is strange that in this age of invention and scientific improvement no effort has been made to break this current. Will not some of our young and ambitious Civil Engineers exercise their ingenuity on this matter?

I see that Mr. Rolland, one of the Harbour Commissioners, has suggested that the Ile Ronde be used as a lumber yard. The idea is brilliant, but hardly original, as the Hon. John Young propounded the same theory some twenty years ago.

CETEWAYO'S JOKE.

Cetewayo is a born cynic, and his late experiences of the manner in which England, with its advanced civilization and State Church, endeavours to make converts are not likely to fill his heart with a tender love. "I never should have fought against such good men as the English," he said, "who intended to take away my country. They shot us to make us Christians, and I am sorry for shooting back at them." The astute Zulu comprehends the situation perfectly, and poked grim fun at his captors. He knows that the word "christian" was only used to cover a hypocritical ambition. He knows that the English shot down his men that they might take his country from him. He knows that this division into small principalities under the rule of several chiefs is only the next move in the old English game of "heads, I win—tails, you lose." Cetewayo is King no more. The missionary zeal of Sir Bartle Frere has achieved wonderful success over the heathens, who have no rights and privileges until they have yielded to the appeals of several regiments of British soldiers. Cetewayo is to be well treated by his conquerors. Magnificent charity! What can the heathen find to complain of? Of course he is "sorry for shooting back at them"—they have only taken his country from him.

The Zulu people will soon find that they have privileges they never dreamed of under the barbarous rule of Cetewayo; and their new friends will advise them to demand them in full of their rulers. Those rulers will at times and again refuse to accede to all the requests of their people; there will be frequent uprisings of the discontented; an occasional slaughter; and then—British interference will be required; and then, a Christian regard for the badly governed people will compel the assumption of direct and complete control over the whole of Zululand. That is the way we transform heathendom into a place of light.

THE EARL ON CANADA.

There is reason for considerable discussion as to whom the Earl of Beaconsfield meant when he claimed a high American authority for the blundering statements in his bucolic speech at Aylesbury, but it is incontrovertible that a more ridiculous confusion of facts and fancies was never put into words by an English statesman. And yet, we ought not to be too hard on the ever hopeful and imaginative Earl—for this is but the inevitable result of the kind of puffing the late Governor-General has done for Canada. For nearly a century the Colony had scarcely been thought of in England. Englishmen considered that Canada was, or soon would be in the United States—for years the talk has been of emigration to America—but Canada was rarely mentioned. Now, all at once it is talked of in an absurdly exaggerated way. Perhaps we shall be able to impress the truth upon them by and by that Canada is a good field for the farmer who has some capital and a great deal of industry.

EDITOR.