

leading layman. "That a little Bishop went a great deal further than a great deal of commission." The history of the early Church gives us a clear record of small dioceses, with the chief city of the part as its centre, and always bearing such name, and not as with us, after some large tract of country, such as Ontario, Huron and many others. In areas such as these the early Church would have had at least its six or eight Bishops. Our Episcopate must be extended if we are to progress or even hold our own. No one I think can deny this is the great want of the Church in Canada to-day, and must be agitated for and that persistently, until something is done to remedy this great want. While all would desire to know that our Bishops were amply endowed, and placed beyond the care of providing for their daily necessities, yet we cannot but ask how our House of Bishops have considered it an essential requisite for a Bishop in Canada to have \$40,000 invested for his support. Such was certainly not the case in the early Church. Has it come to this, that a monetary consideration is to weigh in the balance against the extension of the Church of Christ? I must not trespass further now, but may at some future day trouble you again on this vital question.

"ANOTHER EPISCOPALIAN."

#### Synods.

SIR,—June is the month of Synods. There will be a good attendance of priests and laymen, the visit to the city will be enjoyed by all, and — ? Will there be the usual amount of "talk," "resolutions," "committees"? Will "aggressive Church work" be shelved? Will "Church literature" be ignored? Will the Rural Deans' reports" be dismissed with a simple resolution? Will Diocesan temperance work be a mere name? Will the city rectors make no provision for a daily early celebration during the session? In short, will the delegates return to their parishes simply from a great Church business meeting, where one or two men did all the talking? or will they return fired with love and zeal for our dear old Church, and with a renewed spiritual life? Will the clergy ask the prayers of their people during the session of the Synod? Will the Protestant Indians be on the war path hunting for scalps from the great sacerdotal tribe? or will they, for the good of the Church, ignore "party" matters?

UNITY, FORWARD, ALL.

#### More Bishops.

SIR,—Some time ago you invited correspondents to discuss this question in your columns, and a correspondent over the signature "An Episcopalian," is the first, as far as I am aware, to respond to your invitation. His letter in your issue of the 10th inst. will be recognized by any one acquainted with country parishes as a plain statement of facts, as far as it goes, but it does not mention the abandoned churches and vanished congregations that were organized and flourished for many years when there were even fewer Bishops than there are now. Evidently "Episcopalian" is under the delusion that our Bishops have the power to make their influence felt, for he says: "If we had enough of Bishops to go round the whole country and properly oversee all our parishes, I am quite certain that we should hear of a far less number of those troubles between pastors and people which are a scandal and a disgrace to the Church. The clergy and laity would come directly under episcopal discipline, and both clergy and laity would experience the beneficent influence of the apostolic presence." Now as we have no "Clergy Discipline Act" like as they have in England, it is folly to expect better results from more Bishops, as the clergy are not responsible to their Bishops any more than they are to the civil authorities or their own congregations. Hence "every parson uses what is right in his own eyes," as your correspondent states. Hence also the Bishops do not act in "parish troubles," but our Bishops do "go round" to the parishes when the incumbents require them for confirmation or consecration rites, and I think that "Episcopalian" will admit that there are enough of bishops for this very limited service. In this Diocese of Toronto, the appointing power is in the Bishop's hands, subject to a consultation with the wardens and lay delegates of the parish, but he (the Bishop) invariably refrains from exercising that power for obvious reasons, but leaves it to the parish to choose its own minister, for all appointments (except to missions) are for life or during the pleasure of the appointee. The Bishop cannot cancel the appointment, be the choice his own or that of the parish, no matter how injurious to the progress of the Church such an appointment may turn out to be. So I think it would be advisable to postpone the question of more Bishops and take up the question of clothing our Bishops with sufficient authority to exercise an efficient supervision over the parishes. "I am in a bank, and I can picture to myself how like country parishes our branches would be if the inspector did

not make his annual visit and general overhauling." The above quotation from "Episcopalian's" letter implies the necessity of authoritative supervision for good results, which our Church with her Bishops is powerless to enforce, and no increase of the episcopate will confer it.

ANGLICAN.

#### House of Laymen.

SIR,—The history of two important bills relating to "Church Patronage" and "Clergy Discipline" introduced into the House of Lords by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1885-6, has recently become a subject of great and increasing interest to the laity of the Church of England throughout the empire, but especially of course in this Dominion of Canada, from the fact that one of these bills, the Clergy Discipline Bill, very greatly through the influence of the House of Laymen, was passed and became law in 1892, thus placing the laity after centuries of ignorance and subjection, in their true position as independent Churchmen, capable of expressing their united opinion on all Church affairs, which up to this time has been studiously denied them.

The efforts which His Grace made in these years to effect legislation on the above subjects failed, and nothing was heard of them for several years. In 1891, however, he again made the attempt, but again failed. The House of Laymen, established by the Archbishop a few years previously, at once recognized the critical and important position of affairs. They had several deliberations upon them, and then passed the following resolution, moved by Mr. L. T. Dibdin, London, and seconded by Mr. W. A. Heygate, Peterborough, "That this House, while regretting the failure of the efforts which were made in the Parliament of 1885-86 and the early sessions of the present Parliament to effect legislation on the subjects of Church Patronage and Clergy Discipline, respectfully presses upon His Grace the Archbishop the importance of these subjects not being allowed to drop, and hopes that bills dealing with them will be introduced into Parliament during the present session." The Archbishop was greatly encouraged and immediately reintroduced the bills, and had the great satisfaction in 1892 of seeing the royal assent given to the "Clergy Discipline" Act, and it is hoped the Church Patronage bill will become law this year, 1894.

There is scarcely a member in the House of Lords who has not some pecuniary or other interest in advowsons and next presentations. For one layman or one clergyman, even though he be the highest and noblest in the Church, as was the case in this instance, to present a bill advocating the reform needed, was proved as we have seen to be useless. It was at once set down by Bishops and lay Lords as a presumptuous interference with their vested rights. But when it was seen that behind that bill there were upwards of one hundred sober, solid, thoughtful laymen united as one man in support of it, the position of the noble Lords was changed. A little hesitation soon gave way to earnest consultation and enquiry, till ultimately their better judgment was superior and gained the day for the Church's welfare.

The foundation for His Grace's remarks on moving the third reading of the Church Discipline Bill, would seem to have been the provision in the endowment system which we shall often have occasion very reluctantly to refer to; for it has dominated, moulded and influenced the spiritual and temporal character of the clergy from almost the dawn of Christianity down to the present day—a provision which gives to a presentee of a living, or as we should say, the rector, a life interest therein; which has been part of the education of the clergy and which has made them through all the ages to a large extent independent of their Bishops and independent of their congregations. On a recent occasion His Grace said significantly, "Again I entreat the clergy to reflect that there is no Church in the world in which parish priests or ministers have anything like the same independence in or out of the Church as our parochial clergy have." In his opening remarks on the occasion above mentioned, he told the Lords wisely, temperately and firmly what the Church demanded of them, namely, power to prevent further injury to the Church by certain of the clergy so frequently abusing the independence thus unwisely given them. "If," he said, "the clergyman was a drunken man and a profligate his influence was most mischievous. He was bound by law to be a guide and a teacher, to visit the sick and dying, and the poor. How was he to discharge such duties if he was a drunken man or a profligate? There was the visible sign of an empty church, but the visible signs were more terrible than the emptiness of the church. The sick were unwilling to send for him. The parsonage house was suspected and shunned and pointed at, and yet there were no means of getting rid of the evil priest. Only last year the Court of Arches punished a drunken clergyman by suspending him for six months. The first sermon on his return was a lively description of the holiday he had had abroad!"

For the moment the narrative of the man's assurance causes a smile, but the very next it is one at which angels might weep. What! is it come to this, that the head, the Spiritual head, of the great Church of England should have put upon him the indignity, should suffer the humility of being obliged to acknowledge to the nobles and the people of England and of the whole world that there were no means available of getting rid of the "evil priest"? What an admission to make in this nineteenth century, and especially, as history tells us, the vile blot in our ecclesiastical system which has shielded the evil priest of to-day has existed and demoralized and shielded the evil priests of the Church and their people throughout nearly all the long centuries of the Church's existence. Thanks to the noble action and courageous perseverance of the Archbishop of Canterbury, aided by the watchfulness, advice, common sense and influence of a House of Laymen, this too long and most damaging blot on our Church Constitution has now been erased for ever.

We have just given a modern instance of the injurious working of the endowment system. Let us look at its working in ancient or comparatively ancient times, to a noticeable instance which occurred five hundred years ago, in Henry VII.'s reign.

The Church of England at that time was suffering as it had suffered for ages before, from the inroads of the Papal usurpation. Her national character was well nigh extinct. She was ruled against her will by Popes and Bishops who led most dissolute lives, and it was not to be wondered at that the clergy, with such examples before them, were not distinguished for integrity and virtue. Their moral tone and intelligence will not in fact bear examination. Still at this dark period, there were a few earnest and good men who had time and again protested, as the English statute book shows, against the Papacy's meddling with their English Church, who now tried to reform the abuses which such meddling had created and fostered, and to curb the dissipated lives of the clergy. Cardinal Moreton and his successor Archbishop Warham both desired to curb their scandalous irregularities and reform ecclesiastical abuses, but they were powerless, even though they were backed in their efforts by the full sanction of the Pope and the loudly expressed demands of the people. Why were these dignitaries of the Church powerless, and why were the clergy so contumacious? We may well in wonder ask, how dared they set at defiance the reasonably expressed wishes of their superiors whom they had sworn to obey, whose efforts were sincerely intended to rectify abuses and restore the Church to something like its pristine purity? Such efforts, had they been successful and continued, might even have rendered the subsequent Reformation unnecessary. The true and simple answer is, they were an endowed clergy, independent of cardinals, archbishops and popes. The Church was their freehold for life. They could do as they liked. If they had only known that at the end of a certain term they would be called on to give an account of their stewardship and might possibly be removed, depend upon it their conduct would have been very different, and it would have shown itself in many ways to the advantage of a more intelligent and progressive Christianity. But they were like the "evil priest" whom the Archbishop of Canterbury could not get rid of. We are safe to say that but for the moral influence of this London House of Laymen, this most important and salutary Clergy Discipline Bill would never have been passed. And does it not show the value to the Church of laymen, a no inconsiderable part of that Church, being a recognized consultative and united body, and not a mere rope of sand, as they are now.

But we pursue the subject a little further to show the influence which the pernicious principle in the endowment system, abstractedly an excellent system and which should be in every way encouraged, has had in the long past centuries, and still has, though in a milder form, owing to changed times and circumstances, on the clergy of the present day, and also to show the necessity there is for the laity to be permitted to express under some recognized authority their collective opinion on this and kindred subjects, having always before them an earnest and sincere regard for the best interests of the Church both spiritual and temporal.

In England there are between twelve and fifteen thousand endowed churches. They were built and endowed by the kings, earls, barons and other great men, under a sense of religious duty and for the benefit of the localities in which they were especially interested. In later times the great manufacturers and mill owners built and endowed churches for the special benefit of their work people, and in this way a very large portion of England was covered with endowed churches.

\* In the Parliament held at Carlisle, 1307, statutes were published prohibiting the taxation of English monasteries by their foreign superiors (English Church in the Middle Ages, by Wm. Hunt, edited by Professor Creighton, page 181). Resistance to Papal exactions was renewed in a Parliament held at Stamford in 1309 (ib. page 182).

As was liberalit laity, be they an stowing patrona they the approva his asse!

It was Church, to the re But it w to be a fostered round t and we ful it m traceabl the givin interest he soor Bishop what h Church, Bishop, dead, y laymen.

A few in advoc able sale reproach dition to pluraliti educatio standard clergy ( Church

One o end of preachir the dut; all in at the end till they indiscri main.

which g high in; graduall taining they or man (th "We ha the Div not den

Another M.A., P his Bam incredib around ( responsi fess our verily g century tional th them an her custat ion th her Four

Once i history ( castes, I of their were the people; they res ignoranc the tyra dotal d Christian

It may of ancier let rest. were an augurate ent Ang livings o fluenced was pre no doubt but unfc evil, wh were, of the long the bad surround but also than foll land, ha through effect do surely as