

proceedings of a meeting of the Church Society of the Diocese of Huron, held on the 13th inst., as taken from the *London Prototype*, is about to make its appearance in the *Ecclesiastical Gazette*. I therefore beg of you to give no room in the *Gazette* to say that, inasmuch as the report reflects unfavourably upon myself, and as I abstained, as an act of grace, from entering into the reasons in detail which induced me to write to Mr. Marsh at all; I shall at the next quarterly meeting, with the permission of the Society, enter fully into the subjects included in my communication of the 20th Dec. last; and I doubt not but that the whole will receive its proper, and a very different colouring from that which it is now made to present.

I am, dear Sir,  
Your obedient servant.  
E. R. STIMSON.

### DIOCESE OF MONTREAL.

THE RIGHT REV. FRANCIS FULFORD, D.D., METROPOLITAN BISHOP OF CANADA.—This distinguished and learned prelate, so justly celebrated for his goodness and piety of heart, holds the high position of head of the Anglican Church of Canada. Dr. Fulford is the second son of the late Baldwin Fulford, Esquire, of Great Fulford, Devon, by the eldest daughter of the late William Adams, Esq., M.P., of Bowdon, near Totness. The family is descended from William de Fulford, who held Fulford temp. Richard I. The right reverend prelate was born at Sidmouth, 1803, married in 1830, the eldest daughter of Andrew Berkeley Drummond, Esquire, of Cadlands, Hants, grand-daughter of the second Earl of Egmont. He was educated at Tiverton grammar school, and subsequently entered Exeter college, Oxford, where he graduated B.A., in 1824, he was elected a fellow, in June 1825; he received the degree of D.D. in 1850; was rector of Trowbridge, Wilts, from 1832 to 1842; rector of Croydon, Cambridgeshire, from 1842 to 1845; was minister of Curzon chapel, in the parish of St. George's, Hanover square, London, from 1845 till his consecration in 1850; he was also chaplain to the Duchess of Gloucester, and has published sermons, and a work, "*The Progress of the Reformation*."

In 1859 he was appointed by the royal letters patent "metropolitan bishop of this province," and as such, is at the head of the church in Canada. His lordship is regarded as a bright ornament of the church, and an eloquent preacher. His language is elegant, and his reasoning logical, without any affectation or pedantry. Since he has been connected with this country, he has done much to promote the advancement and peace of the church, is popular with all denominations, and has endeared himself to all with whom he has come in contact. His services towards science and art have been extremely valuable, and are held in high estimation; so much so indeed that he has been elected on several occasions to high offices in some of our best institutions—*Cel. Canadians*.

### Foreign Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

#### CONVOCAION OF THE PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY.

UPPER HOUSE—WEDNESDAY, FEB. 12.

The house met at one o'clock. The members present were the Archbishop, the Bishops of London, Winchester, St. David's Oxford, Chiches-

ter, Lincoln, Landaff, St. Asaph, Bath and Wells, and Salisbury.

#### THE SCOTCH CHURCH.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON.—It was my intention to have moved that a committee of this house be appointed to take into consideration and report upon the desirableness of applying to the Legislature for some relaxation of those disabilities whereby certain persons episcopally ordained to the office of priests and deacons, who are ready to subscribe to the formularies of the Church of England, and make all the declarations required by the law, are prevented from officiating in England and Ireland. But circumstances have occurred which make me hesitate in moving the appointment of such a committee. I may, however, take the opportunity of making a few remarks on the subject. Various representations have been made of late years, of more or less urgency, from our brethren of the Scottish Episcopal Church, respecting the hardship which it is thought the persons ordained by the bishops of that church suffer in consequence of the present state of the law. It does appear to me to be a very great hardship that whilst any other subject of her Majesty, who is episcopally ordained, can be received as a priest or deacon of the Church of England, those who are so ordained by the Bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church are for ever excluded from officiating in England except for two Sundays, or by obtaining, at great expense and inconvenience, a private Act of Parliament to enable them so to officiate. At first sight it seems to be a very great hardship that, whilst a person in the position of a Dissenting minister finds no insuperable difficulty in his way of becoming a clergyman of the Church of England—that whilst a person ordained by a Roman Catholic Bishop, even if that bishop be officiating in England, and the individual be ordained in England, finds no difficulty in officiating in the Church of England—our brethren of the Church of England in the northern parts of the kingdom should be subject to this disability, which can only be removed by an Act of the Legislature. This relief has from time to time been sought by the Bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church. When we consider the matter carefully, however, the question becomes a great deal more complicated; for although it is stated that persons ordained by the Scottish Bishops are the only persons labouring under this disability, an examination of the actual provisions of the law will show that that is by no means the case, and that the question is a somewhat larger one than in its simple bearing on the Scottish Episcopal Church. In drawing up my resolution I have therefore adopted words somewhat wide; for besides those persons who are ordained by the Scottish Bishops, there are others who suffer from the same disability. There are, for instance, our brethren of the Church in the United States. Their case is undoubtedly somewhat different from that of our Scottish brethren, in so far as they are not subjects of her Majesty the Queen; but, according to ecclesiastical principles, their orders being perfectly valid, it seems undesirable, unless from some great necessity, that an insuperable barrier should be presented to their officiating, except in a very limited way, within this realm. The necessity for a relaxation of this bar has from time to time been acknowledged by the Legislature, who have passed acts for the purpose of enabling the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States to officiate and hold livings in England. But besides the persons ordained by the bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church, and by the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, there is another set of persons whose cases

certainly seem to require some consideration. Your lordships are aware that in the reign of King George III. an act was passed for the purpose of enabling the Archbishops and Bishops of England to consecrate certain persons, not subjects of her Majesty, to officiate as bishops without her Majesty's dominions; and that under the provisions of that act two bishops were consecrated at Lambeth for the Church of the United States. During the reign of her present Majesty it has been thought desirable to extend the power of consecration to the office of bishop beyond the provisions of the Act of George III. That act had provided that no one should be consecrated to the office of a bishop or exercise the functions of a bishop without her Majesty's dominions, unless he were not a subject of her Majesty; but it was thought desirable to widen the power, so as to enable the Archbishop of Canterbury for the time being, and the other bishops, to consecrate to the office of a bishop persons who were subjects of her Majesty, as well as persons who were not in that position, to exercise their functions beyond her Majesty's dominions. Under these acts two individuals have been consecrated Bishops of Jerusalem, one of them being a subject and the other not being a subject of her Majesty. But the latter act contained a clause providing that the same restrictions should be placed upon deacons and priests ordained by the bishop of Jerusalem as are placed upon the clergy of the Scottish Episcopal Church and the clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. Now, with regard to these cases, the argument in favour of restriction is partly this—that if the bishop be not a subject of the Queen, it does not seem desirable to give to those who are ordained by him exactly the same rights as are possessed by those who are ordained by bishops who are subjects of the Queen. But that that can hardly hold good as a general rule is proved by the fact that Roman Catholic priests, ordained by bishops who are not subjects of the Queen, are in many instances admitted into the Church of England, receive orders, officiate, and even hold benefices in the church. Then, on the other hand, it is said that if persons are not bishops of the Established Church, it seems right to put some restriction on the powers of those whom they ordain, so as to prevent the persons so ordained from being exactly in the same position as those who are ordained by the Bishops of the English Church. Of course the Scottish Bishops are subjects of her Majesty, and although there was a time when they were supposed to be disaffected, the state of affairs is now so altered that every ground for such suspicion is gone, and the simple distinction is, that they are bishops of a church that is not established. The question raised is this—whether, on account of their not being bishops of an established church, it is reasonable that the persons ordained by them should be excluded from the exercise of their functions in her Majesty's dominions? But there remains a harder case than that of the clergy who are ordained by the bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church, by the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, or by the Bishop of Jerusalem—there remains the case of those who are likely to be ordained by bishops consecrated under the same act as the bishop of Jerusalem, but in really totally different circumstances. That act is a general act. It contemplates this state of things—that from time to time the Sovereigns of foreign countries may desire that a bishop of the English Church should be sent to minister amongst them, and it points out the way in which the Archbishop of Canterbury, with the full consent of the civil power, may proceed to consecrate missionary bishops who shall go forth bearing the Church of