

hop, priest, or deacon of the United Church of England and Ireland, or of any of her Majesty's foreign possessions, to officiate in any church or chapel of which he is incumbent or curate, shall for the first offence be liable to be called to appear."

Then follow the penalties. These words, it has of late been argued, do in their plain grammatical sense include persons ordained by Roman Catholic Bishops as well as others. But if the matter were investigated, it might turn out that that is not the true interpretation to be put upon the clause.

**THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN**—I think that the difficulties which are felt with respect to the admission of the Scottish ordained clergy to full privileges in the Church of England have been understated by both the Bishops of London and Oxford; and with regard to the difficulty arising from their possibly defective education, some words which fell from the Bishop of London might be taken to mean that in the Church of England restrictions have been removed of late years, and that the qualifications required in candidates for holy orders are less strict than formerly. The very reverse is, I believe, the case. Some years ago there were many more literates, persons without any University degrees, than at the present time. I have received a letter from a Bishop presiding over a populous diocese, in which he states that in his last ordination there was a number of graduates from Cambridge and Oxford, and but one literate, which he says is exactly the reverse of what it used to be formerly. The reason why there would be more danger or difficulty in receiving clergymen from the Episcopal Church of Scotland than colonially ordained clergymen, arises from the proximity of the two churches; the probability being that many of the persons so ordained had found some difficulty in getting ordained in this country, and had gone to Scotland for the purpose of being ordained, and then coming back to England. There are in Scotland a number of churches requiring to be served, the endowments of which are so small that it appears disgraceful to the liberality of the Episcopalians in Scotland. Served, however, those churches must be, and thus the choice of the Scotch Bishop is reduced to a very narrow limit indeed. The consequence is, that persons who would not think of going to Scotland to reside and minister in that church, might go there and get ordained, and then come back with a view of bettering their position in the Church of England; and the difficulty in rejecting clergymen when appointed to a benefice is very great. With respect to the difference of the Scotch Communion Office, the grounds of the feeling which exists in that respect have been scarcely fully stated, nor is the strength of that feeling distinctly understood. It is quite true, as has been stated by the Bishop of Llandaff, that Bishop Laud strongly recommended the Scottish Bishops of his day to accept the Communion Service of the Church of England as then established; and it is quite true that when they declined to do so—on the ground principally that they wished to have an independent existence—he unwillingly drew up an Office for them, which was adopted at that time; but as the present Scotch Service is neither that of Edward VI. nor that which was drawn up for them by Laud, but an entirely different one, altered in many important points, and drawn up by some who dissented from our Church, Nonjurors, in that precise form and manner, because they wished to embody therein their opinion as to the defects—or, as they termed them, the errors—of the English Communion Service; it has, therefore, been regarded as a standing protest against the

Communion Service of the Church of England. Looking at it in this light, it can be no great matter of surprise that there is an unwillingness on the part of many members of the Church of England to receive at once into equal communion those who not merely entertain a different opinion with reference to the most solemn service of the church, but are also bound to hold it of primary authority by a Canon passed as recently as 1838. The explanation, indeed, given of this enactment is, that whereas the Office had fallen into disuse in a great many of the congregations of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, and it was not desirable to enforce it upon every occasion, the bishops were content to pass a canon declaring its primary authority, and then to allow each congregation in ordinary worship to use the service it thought fit. Still, there it stands upon the statute-book, a solemn ordinance of the Church of Scotland, although an Office which history teaches us was drawn up as a protest against our own, which is thought to contain passages altered most injuriously for doctrinal purposes, and in order to make a distinct difference between the two services. The ground of dislike or distrust may be also stronger, because in the Church of Scotland there is not the same difficulty with respect to altering its canons as we labour under; and if there is any disposition to remove an obstacle to the hearty and cordial union of the two churches, they have it in their power to do it at any time they please. It is said, indeed, that the Scotch Communion Office is never used at all in three of the dioceses, and used regularly in a comparatively small number of churches in the others, and, if so, it would seem that the Office is retained rather as a symbol than an office—rather to express an article of faith than because it is available for practice. I feel strongly what the Bishop of Oxford urged, that there would be an inconvenience in requiring as a condition of removing the existing disability that the service should be given up; but I think we ought to suggest to our brethren of the Scottish Episcopal Church, or rather we ought to entreat them of their own free will, carefully and deliberately to inquire into the matter, and to repeal that canon before they come to the legislature and ask it to remove the disabilities under which they labour.

**THE BISHOP OF OXFORD**—The Bishop of Lincoln has said that he thought I had undervalued the difficulties of the question. I am most anxious that nothing should go forth which would seem to imply that I undervalue what I consider as the great evil of the existence of that Office, which is a point upon which I entertain feelings quite as strong, if not stronger, than my right rev. brother.

**THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN**—Your expressions with respect to the Office were as strong as could be. I was speaking of the difficulties arising from want of education. Both points were mixed up together.

**THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY**—The discussion has been diverted from the one point which alone was, I think, raised by the Bishop of London with regard to the Church in Scotland. In a great portion of that speech I entirely concur, and it is in my opinion very unfortunate that we have diverged from the line of argument which he took. The Bishop of London prudently avoided the discussion of the differences between our Liturgy and that of the Scotch Church. That is a matter with which, to my mind, we have nothing to do in determining the question whether we should help our brethren in Scotland to obtain a removal of their present disabilities. We are able to apply to the solution of it a precedent. The right line of conduct seems to be clearly marked out for us by the way in which we receive the clergy of the

Greek or the Roman Catholic Church. We require them to give us certain pledges that they agree with us in doctrine. And if we obtain the same securities from the clergy of the Scotch Church, what can we want more? Unless, therefore, we are prepared to say that we act improperly with regard to the clergy of the Greek or Roman Churches—and I am sure that this is far from being the opinion of my right rev. brother—it would be inexcusable in us to wish to maintain the present harsh line of exclusion with regard to the clergy of the Scotch Church. There is also another reason why I am most anxious that these questions with regard to the Scotch Office should not be discussed by us. If we import into any proposals we may make to help them to obtain a removal of their disabilities, such a condition as the giving up of their office, we should possibly raise up feelings in Scotland which would only aggravate our difficulties, and increase any differences which may exist between us. I am sure that your Grace must feel that the difficulty of making any such change would, under any circumstances, without any pressure from us, or irritating interference on our part, be very great, and that even if all the Bishops of the Church of Scotland agreed to give up this office, there would be still an exceeding difficulty arising out of the affectionate attachment of many members of the Scottish Church to it. With regard to the danger which might, it has been said, arise to our church from the alleged imperfection in the education of the clergy of the Church of Scotland, I have two things to urge. The one is, that the remedy must ever be in our own hands. Our duty in all cases of great ignorance is plain, and we should not shrink from the discharge of it, nor seem to seek protection against it in the disabilities created by an act of parliament. I should be very sorry that it should go forth to the world that we, the Bishops of the Church of England, feel ourselves incompetent without the aid of the state to make provision against such an evil. The other point is this. If it be true that the candidates for ordination in Scotland are oftentimes in gross ignorance, and so very inferior to those who seek ordination at our hands, freedom of communion between the two churches would tend to lessen this difference. The difference, if it exists, arises, I should suppose, mainly from the exclusion of clergymen of Scotch ordination from ministrations in our more highly favoured Church of England. I will only add that I am persuaded that when this matter is fairly considered, you will find it impossible to withstand the force of the argument of the Bishop of London, that it is unreasonable to place the clergy of the Church of Scotland under greater disabilities than those which are laid upon the clergy of the Greek and Roman Churches.

**THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN**—I don't think that any one has spoken of the Scotch Episcopal Church as containing persons of gross ignorance, or used any thing like such strong terms. It must be borne in mind that the evil that is feared has not arisen, and there is not at present any temptation for incompetent persons to go there and offer themselves.

(To be Continued.)

SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED TO END OF VOLUME 9.

Rev. A. M. Toronto; Rev. J. P., Vaudreuil; Rev. W. M. M., Orillia, (to No. 6, Vol. 10); Rev. J. S., St. Mary's.

ROWSELL & ELLIS, PRINTERS, KING ST. TORONTO.