

that, having reference to ordination by dissenters. "Ignatius" is kind enough to say, "Do they not rather send for two or three pastors who have been already ordained *in their way* to do what they want?"

It is to be presumed from the words *in their way* being in italics, that "Ignatius" has not much faith in it, and does not recognize them as successors to the Apostles, still a much greater man, I take it, than "Ignatius" does recognize them as "Fellow laborers and fellow servants in the Gospel," and opens his pulpit to them and invites them in, viz:—The Archbishop of Canterbury—what, therefore, becomes of all your logic learned, Ignatius?

And it must not be forgotten, "Most Learned Pundit," that Bishop Cummins is what you would call a successor to the Apostles with all the necessary power—so our minds may be quite easy on that score, if we had any scruples. "I will write thee again from Philippi."

LUTHER II.

OTTAWA, 25th March, 1874.

### THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

To the Editor of THE CITIZEN:

DEAR SIR,—In your issue of last evening, a writer under the signature "True" tried very hard to make it appear that the statement made by Mr. Gallagher (as he is polite enough to call the Rev. Gentleman), to the effect that the Archbishop of Canterbury had declared himself a "fellow laborer and fellow servant in the Gospel" with non-conformist clergymen and thrown the pulpits of the Episcopal Church open to them, as a "hoax," and calls on us to believe it as such on his simple *ipse dixit*. As he says he has seen it referred to as such in an English paper he occasionally reads, but he does not state what that paper is, no doubt the "wish is the father of the thought" with the writer. Perhaps he has read it in some "High Church" organ which does not approve of such good news being promulgated for the benefit of low churchmen or nonconformists.

The writer states he is a diligent reader of English newspapers and has not come across the statement made by the Rev. Mr. Gallagher, except in the manner he has told it—as a hoax. Well, I can produce half a dozen gentlemen who read it in a Scotch paper, copied from an English one as no hoax, but a reality, and none of us were "startled by the statement," but looked upon it that Dr. Tait was simply making the world aware that he was a good Christian and no bigot.

And we must have some more substantial proof of it being a hoax before we or the public can be expected to swallow "True's" wonderful discovery, and from the narrow minded style evinced in his production, we would require proof beyond him to convince us, at all events, that it is a hoax.