

England in its ministrations to foreign lands. As your lordships are aware, a bishop was lately consecrated under that act, and if the law should be allowed to remain in its present state, while his *status* is recognised as a Bishop of the Church of England—while he is at the time of his appointment a subject of her Majesty—while, in fact, every condition has been fulfilled which will place him on a par with other bishops, the clergy consecrated by him will labour under all the disabilities which apply to the clergy of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Missionary bishops have within the last few years been consecrated in two ways—first, under the act, by the Archbishop of Canterbury; and secondly, in the colonies, not under the act, but under what is regarded as the inherent right of the Episcopacy where unrestrained, and by the law of England running, as in the case of the diocese of Capetown. Missionary bishops have been consecrated by the bishops of South African province, and the question must soon arise—is there any reason in restricting the authority of the bishop who was consecrated at Lambeth with the full consent of the civil power, and placing all those who are ordained by him under a disability which does not exist in the case of the clergy ordained by other missionary bishops who were consecrated at a great distance, without any reference to the civil power? I think I have stated sufficient to show that it is very difficult to dissociate the case of the Scottish Episcopal Church from several other cases, and, that the question is of a somewhat complicated nature. At the same time, I am ready to admit that these parties labour under a real grievance, and I cannot but hope that in the course of time, with a due regard to the interests of the Established Church on the one hand, and with due regard to the necessary maintenance of the laws of the church, irrespective of its being established, on the other, some mode will be devised of greatly relaxing, if not altogether removing, the disabilities which now exist. When the case of the clergy ordained by the bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church is brought forward by itself, of course the hardship is quite apparent; but it is necessary for us to consider in a straightforward way all the difficulties that stand in the way of the settlement of the question. Considering the great political influence exercised by many of the members of the Scottish Episcopacy in both Houses of Parliament, and the reverence with which many of the divines of that church have been regarded in England, I cannot believe that this disability would have so long existed had it not been for two practical difficulties which stand in the way. And I think it most desirable that they should be clearly understood. One of these difficulties is, that we have amongst ourselves a regular system for the instruction and training of our own clergy. As a rule—although the rule has of late years been very much relaxed—we require education at one or other of the great Universities, or at some seminary which is under the control of the Church of England. We have found it necessary of late to relax these rules, because, considering the pressing wants of the country, we felt that we must occasionally take persons who did not rise to the exact standard of intellectual training which was formerly required under the University system. I am only expressing the unanimous feeling of your lordships when I say that we did not depart from the old usage without great unwillingness. We believe that the clergy of the Church of England do their work better upon the whole when they have had that wholesome training which they receive at our ancient Universities: and my own opinion is that the persons who have had that advantage are the most efficient men even in the poor destitute

districts of London and in remote country places; and therefore I have always been very unwilling to do anything calculated to lower the standard of the clergy. When we consider the case of persons educated in England, although they may not have been at the Universities, we feel that they have more or less been under our control, and when we admit the admirable men who come from King's College and similar places, where a good opportunity is afforded for theological study, we know exactly what we are doing. But when we go beyond this we sometimes get into difficulties. It may be said, "But you admit the clergy who are ordained by the Colonial Bishops, and, of course, considering the state of society with which they have to deal, they cannot be considered so efficient in point of intellectual training as your clergy at home." We certainly do admit them, but that admission is subject to the check imposed by the Legislature. Although that check does not amount to much, its very existence shows that this feeling has always been recognised—that we ought to be careful as to the training of the persons whom we admit into our respective dioceses. Our brethren of the Scottish Episcopal Church, in making their wants known, have not put forth any very distinct statement as to the sort of training which they in all cases would require in the event of their clergy being admitted to the rights for which they ask. That is a deficiency in their case. They are bound to satisfy us that, although the necessities of their very poor church may stand in the way of a very expensive training, they will take care a man shall have a thoroughly good education before he is brought to the bishop. Nothing can be further from my intention than to express the slightest disrespect of the persons who have been ordained by the Scottish Bishops; but the fact that they have no system that we can rely upon stands in the way of their claims being granted, and before they can put forward a perfectly good case, they must let us understand more clearly than we do at present that we have no ground for entertaining such a feeling in our minds. The next point to which I wish to call your lordships' attention is that there is a certain amount of difference between the authorised services of the Episcopal Church of Scotland and the authorised services of our own church. There is a similar difference with respect to the American Church and in the case of persons ordained by the Bishop of Jerusalem, because they have the option of signing either the Articles of the Church of England or the Augsburg Confession. There is a widespread opinion throughout England that the clergy of the Scottish Episcopal Church differ from us in some respects in point of doctrine. I know a good deal about Scotland, but I could never make out any great difference between them and ourselves. Some of the best men in England have officiated in the Scottish Church—men of all parties—men holding evangelical sentiments—men most respected and revered have officiated for years in the Scottish Episcopal Church. It is quite true that there are men of extreme opinions on the other side in the Scottish Episcopal Church, but they do not represent that body generally. As to their representing the laity, the idea is perfectly ridiculous. Of course there are persons of extreme opinions in the Scottish Episcopal Church, as there are in all other churches where liberty of opinion is allowed; but it would be most unfair to look upon the Scottish Episcopal Church as consisting merely of one extreme section. Then comes the question, why is it that this difference in the services of the two churches exist? I confess myself somewhat at a loss to know why the difference in the services was ever introduced into Scotland. It does not

appear to possess any very great amount of antiquity, or to have any great hold on the affections of the people. I believe I may say for the great body of educated men in Scotland, that they were never present when the service was used. I was in Scotland for eighteen years, and never heard the service used but once. I believe that it really is a weight upon the necks of the clergy of the Scottish Episcopal Church. I should be glad to see them take the step which has been recommended by the wisest of them, and quietly withdraw from the position which is an obstacle to their perfect union with ourselves. I believe that if they were all assembled in Synod, the majority would at once vote for its removal. They might be somewhat restrained by the feeling that a few of their number are tenderly attached to it; but I believe that feeling is wearing off, and I cannot help hoping that some overture may be made for assimilating the two churches more completely by the removal of that particular service. There remains a difficulty in the way which it is useless for us and for them to shut their eyes to—namely, that they might be opposed by the members of the Established Church of Scotland. But I am disposed to think that that opposition would not be very strong.

The BISHOP OF LLANFAFF—Do you mean in Parliament?

The BISHOP OF LONDON—Yes. The obvious hardship of a man being put in a worse condition than a Roman Catholic priest so recommends itself to our common sense, that I cannot think any fair-dealing persons would desire to keep the Scottish Episcopal Church in such a condition. A feeling of justice would induce them to say, it is most desirable that some door should be opened whereby these persons may be freed from their disability. The particular mode might be objected to by the Established Church of Scotland and some other bodies, but I do not think the general principle would be opposed. With regard to the Church of England, there is one question of very considerable importance which must not be lost sight of, and which it would be well for those who cry out loudly against the relaxation of this disability to lay to heart. Under our present system, Roman Catholic priests are admitted on their profession that they are ready to make a certain subscription. Why in the world are we to hold out the right hand of fellowship to the Roman Catholic body, when we refuse to offer it to those churches which are the most like ourselves of any which exist in the whole world? The position in which we place ourselves is perfectly untenable. As much of the opposition to the relaxation of the disability arises from the fear of our church becoming too much assimilated to the views of our Roman Catholic brethren, it would be well to consider whether the present system which unites us to them should not be so relaxed as to enable us to hold out the right hand of fellowship to those who are Protestants, and who are governed by bishops. As I have already intimated, it is not my intention to propose the appointment of a committee, because I am apprehensive that such a course of proceeding would impede rather than advance my object, seeing that the whole matter must come under the cognisance of Parliament.

(To be Continued.)

SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED TO APRIL 1

Rev E. R. D., Font Hill, (to No. 8, vol. 8.)
To No. 9, vol. 9.—J. S., Richmond Hill; Mrs. J. D., Clayton; Rev. J. S., Clifford; Rev. Dr. F., Melbourne; H. R. O'R., Waterdown.