

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We must beg our friends to write the names of persons and places as distinctly as possible. This will save much annoyance. Communications received later than Wednesday morning must stand over till our next issue. We cannot undertake to return rejected manuscripts. Back numbers will be sent only on application. Subscribers are especially requested to make complaint at once to the office of any irregularity in mailing or delivery of their papers.

VISIT A. J. PELL'S GALLERY OF ART, 345 NOTRE DAME STREET, In rear of Post Office, MONTREAL.

Church Observer.

"THIS PROTESTANT KINGDOM."—Bill of Rights, 1868.

MONTREAL, 5TH NOVEMBER, 1868.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF A BISHOP.

If to a properly regulated mind the care of one church is an object of deep and prayerful anxiety, what must be the care of many churches? If the charge of the souls of a single parish has taxed the energies of our best and ablest men, what must it be to feel in a measure responsible for the care of the souls of a diocese? We read of a bishop of the early church who when he was first nominated secreted himself lest he should be compelled to undertake the office. And to descend to our own times, those who knew the sainted Bishop Mountain will remember what nights of prayer and conflict he passed in view of his labours and responsibilities. His successor, Dr. Williams, in speaking of our late venerated Diocesan, said that few knew the extent of his self-denial, and how he had given up many of his most cherished plans that he might meet the necessities of the diocese. The position of a Bishop in this Dominion is not an enviable one; and we cannot believe that any but the sternest sense of duty would prompt a right-minded man to accept of it. Well do we remember an aged country clergyman, now with his bishop in a better world, state his conviction that he and some of his brethren were far better provided for in temporal things than their diocesan. He is expected to maintain the dignity of the office and the Metropolitan with less of a salary in gold than is given to many a worldly bishop. He must be hospitable and generous, and his diocese may to all the dioceses—on half the sum expended annually by the moderately wealthy of his laity. He has not even the Communion fund to fall back upon, or those private donations which the faithful in their congregations are wont to place in the hands of their pastors; and lives in the most expensive city in the Dominion. When we now soberly recall the past, we feel that our late Metropolitan, with his moderate income, must have suffered no little inconvenience, and that in addition to the tablet or bust to his memory, a purse of five hundred or a thousand pounds given to Mrs. Fulford, would be but a simple act of justice. The bishop of a Canadian diocese finds himself notwithstanding, the mark for the shafts of envy and dissatisfaction. His theological views are not the views of all of his clergy; let him attempt to be ever so impartial, ever so considerate of the feelings of others, cold and uncharitable remarks will be made of him, and many who know nothing of the burden under which he is tottering will push him down, instead of extending a helping hand, and throwing the mantle of brotherly love over his imperfections. Alas! what one of the clergy, on witnessing the severance of a connection which has lasted 18 years, does not feel humbled at his own sins in this particular. Then if we look at the special work of the church in this diocese, how few we are among those of another faith—of what elements we are composed—the peculiarities of the people and missions.—Why, it is the work of a life time to get acquainted with the field; and therefore it is that we express our conviction that the proposal to secure a bishop from England would not be generally acceptable. It is not that we doubt that there are in England men of high culture and commanding abilities, but that they lack the experience on the soil, which can only be gained after years of toil and self-denial. We cannot afford to make the experiment of bringing out one totally unacquainted with the country, who must unlearn much that he has learned in the old world before he can begin to be useful in the new. The reflections made on the education and ability of the bishops and clergy on this side the Atlantic do not call for an answer. If they have had the best training the country can give, and have successfully worked their parishes and dioceses—if they have won the confidence of their countrymen generally within and without the church—if they are men of God, charitable and forbearing—if they have the spirit of Christ and the qualifications laid down by St. Paul in his Epistles to Timothy and Titus, or in the Ordination service—we

shall not stop to inquire at what University they were educated, or whether they are so far intellectually or by education elevated above their fellows as to dwell in a different atmosphere—in a word to be unapproachable. We have not forgotten that true worth is modest and unassuming, accessible to the humblest. Nor do we forget that among our bishops and clergy are men of high attainments and sound education; and we are not willing to admit their inferiority to others whose failings and deficiencies are less apparent because farther removed from us.

Some few, we are aware, may carp at these remarks; but the great body of the Canadian clergy and laity will, we are persuaded, endorse them. Therefore we shall wait with quiet confidence the action of the House of Bishops, persuaded that in the very anomalous position in which they are placed they will, with the help of God, faithfully discharge their task, and that the result will be satisfactory to the church at large. We venture further to hope that whoever may be the choice of the bishops and diocese, he will have the sympathy and co-operation of the diocese. Though we are within a week of the election, there is no information respecting the intention of the bishops, nor have any canvasses, that we are aware of, been held in favour of one over another.

No one can at this moment tell who will be the future bishop. It is unwise to make calculations respecting individuals, when it is not even known whether their names will be submitted to the diocese. To abide the day, now near at hand, and to do their duty as in the sight of God, seeking the best man who can be obtained without reference to personal friendships or any selfish motive, is clearly the duty of every faithful churchman,—and may God speed the right.

THE POPE'S INVITATION.

It has often been stated, and experience proves the truth of the assertion, that whenever the Papacy becomes weak at its centre, it grows strong at its extremities. Never was Roman Catholicism more feeble than it is to-day in Rome and Italy, and never was it stronger than it is at present in England and the United States. Encouraged by the number of its converts and sympathizers in these latter countries, it ignores the fact that its own people are in spiritual revolt; and at a time when it is unable to reclaim those at its doors, it rises in its ambition, and seeks by one grand effort to entrap within its fold all the communions of the Christian world. We have observed in the various Protestant churches to his bar; they are to go up to him, in order that he may exhort them to faith and obedience. Now we will begin by asking, who gave the Bishop of Rome the grand convening authority by virtue of which he is at liberty to summon all Christians to his tribunal? The Eastern church may claim with truth a higher antiquity than that of Rome, and therefore may have a precedence, if there be any, over other churches in calling all Christian communions to a general assembly. The first Ecumenical Council held after the time of the Apostles, was not summoned by the authority or even at the instigation of the Bishop of Rome, but by the command of Constantine the Great. The Council of Nice, to which we have reference, was not held at the city of Rome, nor have we any record that the bishop of that city presided over its deliberations or influenced in any particular way the votes of its members. The Council of Constantinople was summoned by the Emperor Theodosius A. D. 381; Ephesus by the younger Theodosius, A. D. 431; Chalcedon by Marianus A. D. 451; and the second Constantinople by Justinian, A. D. 553. Now if the authority of the Pope of Rome was not considered supreme in these early days, we know of no earthly reason why it should be now. That this was the idea of the fathers of the Church of England is plain; for the bishops shortly after they had thrown off the Romish power, made the following declaration: "We think that neither the bishop of Rome nor any other prince of what estate, degree or pre-eminence soever he be, may, by his own authority, call, indict or summon any general council without the express consent, assent, and agreement of the residue of Christian princes." The days were when the Popes laid claim to depose monarchs, absolve subjects from their allegiance, lay kingdoms under interdict, and in fact do a thousand things that would not be tolerated now; and it was only when their extravagance became insupportable, and rulers could no longer brook their interference, that they at last broke the yoke ambition had so long imposed, and ignorant credulity so patiently worn. And to-day, when the Pseudo-Tudore Decretals are exploded, and the lofty pretensions of Pope Innocent III. laughed at as chimerical and absurd, it is amusing, if it be not edifying, to see the Pope trying to exercise a power he does not really possess, and to summon to his bar with an ex-cathedra voice, all the recalcitrant members of the Protestant communion.

That Protestantism, with ashes on its head and sackcloth on its loins, will not go up, is certain; but admitting for argument sake that it did, it could only do so as a poor lorn penitent to receive pardon for the past and advice for the future. As for argument, that is impossible; for when one's adversary judiciously ignores all reasoning as being utterly unworthy of his position, and claims perfect infallibility for himself, however delightful it may be to him, it places us in rather an awkward predicament from which it is discretion to retire. Of course it is too much to expect that the successor of the Apostles will lower himself to prove to Protestants the infallibility and piety of all those who have preceded him in the bishopric of Rome, or that he will try to show his exact likeness to the lowly fisherman of Galilee; but really when the Pope does take it upon himself to summon us all before him, he ought, for decency's sake, to waive a few of his high prescriptive rights, and condescend to argue, rather than aspire to command. Should, however, he admit argument into his council, an inquisitive Protestantism might so far forget itself as to enquire the reason why those countries most immediately under the sway of the Pope were the most vicious as regards morality; might ask how it comes to pass that the percentage of crime is infinitely larger in Roman Catholic Italy than in Protestant England; and above all, how it can be explained, that in the city and environs of Rome, where the pope and his cardinals regulate every thing spiritual and secular, from the highest mysteries of faith down to the sale of bread, the most enormous amount of crime exists, and the most terrible recklessness with regard to life and morality. We do not know of course what answer his holiness might give to this question; but we know the intelligent observer will draw his own conclusions, and regard with the highest affection that religion which most exalts human nature, and saves it from the pollution of vice.

We understand that on Wednesday next, at eleven o'clock, the Diocesan Synod of Montreal will assemble in the Cathedral for divine service. The sermon will be preached by the Rev. Dr. Balch, at the request of the Dean, after which the Holy Communion will be administered. At 3 o'clock the Synod will meet to receive the nomination of the House of Bishops. The election will be by ballot. The clergy will each have a vote, and the laity will vote by parishes for cures. If two-thirds of both orders are present, a simple majority of both orders are not present, then a two-third majority of each order will be necessary. As considerable time will be taken up in examining the lists of voters, it is uncertain whether the balloting will commence before Wednesday morning. There will be an interval allowed of not less than one half hour between receiving the names and balloting. On Sunday last the first of a series of services and sermons, to the Sunday-Schools of Trinity Church, were commenced. The service, consisting of the Litany with a sermon, is to be held the first Sunday afternoon in each month, at a quarter past three o'clock. This is in addition to the usual morning and evening services.

THE FULFORD MEMORIAL.—We are happy to learn that it is intended to hold a general meeting of all those favourable to the erection of some memorial of the late Metropolitan, during the approaching session of the Diocesan Synod, on the evening of Wednesday, the 11th November.

PERSONAL.—The Rev. Mr. Innes of Quebec, preached his farewell sermon at the English Cathedral in that city, on Sunday evening last, to a very large congregation. He left Quebec on Monday, en route for London, Ont., having received a call as assistant minister to the Cathedral in that city.

Correspondence.

We are not responsible for any opinions expressed by our correspondents.

GENERAL CONVENTION.

NEW YORK, October 29th, 1868. [To the Editor of the Church Observer.] DEAR SIR,—Having been enabled during a temporary residence in this city to attend the National Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, now in the 27th and last day of its session, I have thought it possible that a slight account of my impressions and experience might be acceptable. The Convention met at first in Trinity Chapel, a beautiful building connected with the more beautiful church of the same name, on Broadway; but it was found so difficult to hear the proceedings, that an early adjournment was made to the quaint, though much more suitable church of the Annunciation. In this it was very easy to hear every thing that occurred, and the peculiar structure of the interior seemed to be in direct contradiction to architectural rules, for it is low and long, with an arched ceiling running the whole length resembling somewhat a demi tunnel. Divine service was performed here each morning, which I had often the privilege of attending. The church has the reputation of a strong leaning to ultra views. It is true that what is in fact the Lord's table assumes here the form of an altar and super altar, with a huge cross and candlesticks upon it, and a

credence table at the side; and that at the celebration of the Holy Communion the candles were lighted in broad sun-shine; but several peculiarities which in Canada are looked for in churches seemed extreme here wanting. The preacher preached from a pulpit; the minister did not turn his back to the congregation, and the word amen was not pronounced aloud. I noticed a few of the congregation to bow reverently when pronouncing the adjective "holy" and at the word "glory," but they did not form a title of the congregation. So, the standing up when the clergy entered the church and at the offertory was even less practiced. The place of worship in the city most noticed for ritualistic practices is St. Alban's, where, I understand, lighted candles and incense are in daily use, and the officiating ministers wear a species of cocked hat, though it is reported that these extreme things were much moderated during the sitting of the Convention.

The proceedings in the Convention were particularly decorous and orderly. I saw no violence either in manner or language on the part of either clergy or laity—no unseemly interruptions or contradictions—all was respectful and genteel. Would that the same could be said of the Synod lately sitting in Montreal in every particular. There was often a very pleasing reference made to the Church of England, and to the English Universities. The rules, the precedents, the discipline of those bodies, were quoted as authority, and accepted as such. The death of our own beloved Diocesan was feelingly mentioned, and the sad news reaching us this morning of the death of the Archbishop of Canterbury was received with becoming expressions of regret, and a telegraphic message of condolence by Atlantic cable, was forthwith despatched.

The amount of business done in the Convention is not great in proportion to the time spent. Canons innumerable have been passed on indifferent matters; precious time lost, and many lengthy discussions have ended in postponement. The tender point of ritualism, too, has been shirked, by having it by resolution passed yesterday, when the House was poorly attended, to the House of Bishops to form and recommend a code upon the subject, for consideration three years hence. The state of parties resembles somewhat that of Canada, a majority, not very large, of the clergy, having a ritualistic leaning, and the mass of the laity being the other way. And I can scarcely think that the majority of the House of Bishops (44 in number were in attendance) goes with the majority of the clergy, although they have been too lax in restraining practices savouring of Rome. I have heard several of the Bishops preach, a highly cultivated, enlightened set of men,—and some have spoken freely in censure of ritualism and vestments, while those among them of different opinions have been discreetly moderate in their expressions. A SUBSCRIBER.

GAMBLING AT BAZAARS.

[To the Editor of the Church Observer.] DEAR SIR,—I would respectfully beg to call your attention to the systematic gambling carried on at nearly every Bazaar held here. A large amount of money produced at bazaars comes in by the dice table. On asking the person in charge of the table, and the reach of most purses, the answer is we intend raffling it. Ladies and gentlemen are sent round to every house to solicit you to throw dice on this or that thing. One lady I met going from Bazaar to Bazaar, for the excitement of raffling and not to purchase, she said she was fortunate with dice and thought to win something valuable.

At a Bazaar held in a village close to this city it reached the climax, nearly everything being disposed of by dice. Children of tender years, whose parents are carefully endeavouring to train them up in the way they should go, might be seen dice box in hand, with the full sanction of their parish minister, whom I regret to say belongs to the Church of England. I ask any Christian to answer this question honestly (without justifying it by the vain argument that being for the Church it is all right, God will never admit this Jesuitical plea at the Judgment day,) whether there is not as much sin in throwing dice for a chair, value fifty dollars, as for fifty dollars in money, yet church officers will throw for the first and call the man who does likewise for the second, a publican.

These corruptions are rapidly spreading, and if not arrested we may ere long see amateur theatricals or a fancy ball given to pay off the debt of some church, as was done by the Roman Catholics at Etchemin this summer, who gave theatricals and a concert in connection with their Bazaar. Many Protestants assisted them and were large purchasers; and in return some of the Roman Catholics came down to help the Protestant Bazaar. Would it strain much for those who are so linked in with Papists and assisting at their theatricals to have the same for themselves? The first time I was tempted and threw dice was at a church bazaar, and thanks to an over-riding Providence the last time, though others may not be so preserved and date a deal of suffering to those who should have guided but led their steps astray. Surely to meet in an upper room would be more in accordance with God's revealed wishes than in a spacious building raised by the means just mentioned.

Praying that believers in Christ may greatly increase and become daily more like unto Him, I remain, As INQUIRER AFTER TRUTH. Quebec, Nov. 2nd, 1868.

CLERGYMEN'S STATUS.

[To the Editor of the Church Observer.] DEAR SIR,—A recent number of your paper stated that the General Convention of the church in the United States had refused to give the same privileges to the Canadian clergy which the church in Canada grants to clergy from the States. I wrote to the Rev. Dr. Potter, Rector of Grace Church, N.Y., and Secretary of the House of Bishops, for the official record; and with his permission, send his reply for publication. All who desire to promote comity and brotherly feeling between the two churches will, I am sure, be pleased to read Dr. Potter's letter:— (over.)

"New York, Oct. 31st, 1868. DEAR DR. BALCH,—The facts of the case in regard to the status of Canadian clergymen in the States, are as follows: The House of Bishops received a very handsome letter from the Presiding Bishop of the Provincial Synod of Canada, informing of the removal of restrictions upon American clergymen going to reside in Canada. In consequence

of this, the House of Bishops repealed the proviso at the close of Table I. Canon 10, § 1, (see p. 37 of Digest) beginning 'Provided also.' But, unfortunately, their action till just at the close of the Convention, and then without the letter of the Presiding Bishop of Canada, which would have interpreted it.

In consequence it failed in the Lower House, undoubtedly, as I am persuaded, because of the Bishop's omission to make their action intelligible by communicating the kind letter of the Bishop of Huron, which was the occasion of it.

Another Convention will, I am confident, see this incomplete legislation (for it really was no more a perfected law.)

With cordial respect, Faithfully yours, H. C. POTTER, Secretary, &c."

Permit me to add that the canon in question is, and has always been, practically a dead letter. Still it is a blot on the otherwise admirable statute-book of the American church.

From the Secretary's letter you perceive that it was repealed by the House of Bishops; but, owing to accident or inadvertence, the Lower House non-concurred. In such cases, the uniform practice of the two Houses is, to appoint a joint committee of conference, whom the disagreement is reconciled. Owing probably to the hurry incident to the close of the session when this legislation occurred, the Committee of Conference was not appointed; but undoubtedly, the House of Bishops will; for their own sake, as well as that of the Church, see the matter properly adjusted early in the next session.

It may not be without interest to your readers if in this connection I state a fact: During the last three years, four clergymen of this Diocese have removed to the States, and have been most cordially and affectionately welcomed and are liberally supported—their salaries are \$1,500, \$3,550 and \$6,000 per annum—notwithstanding the obnoxious canon. And, during the same three years only, one clergyman from the States has removed to Canada, although no such canon is in force in Canada.

For the honor and unity of the church it is desirable that the church in the United States should repeal the canon in question; but no other reason seems to render it necessary.

Very respectfully yours, LEWIS P. W. BALCH.

November 4th, 1868.

NOTES ON THE CONVENTION.

A special correspondent of the New York Episcopalian, writing to that journal from the assembled Convention, says:—

"The proceedings of the past week have been of such a character as should admonish our evangelical friends not to expect too much at the hands of the General Convention. It would seem to be quite clear that the body is under the control of men too deeply imbued with High Church principles, to yield anything worth speaking of, either as regards the interpretation of iron-bound canons, or that larger liberty of preaching which the exigencies of the times, and the necessities of our country, imperatively demand. Accordingly, they have so ingeniously managed things as to rear almost every resolution and proposition looking in a way that must be fatal to the cause, and yet too prudent always to act in accordance with the precepts of Trinity Church, the untoward influences of which, we are sorry to say, are almost supreme, over a majority of the Convention itself. Nevertheless, the evangelical party are making vital substantial progress,—that is to say, such progress as abundantly warrants the expectation that if it can accomplish but little, on this occasion, at the Church of the Transfiguration, it will be able to make itself felt as a power, speaking in the imperative mood, at the next Triennial Convention. Without understanding the value of what has already been accomplished, and looking forward hopefully to the future, then let our friends thank God and take courage.

The social aspects of the Convention are, as they ought to be, pleasant in the extreme. For the first time, it may be said, since the close of the late civil strife, northern and southern brethren have been permitted to come face to face, and to take each other by the hand. The agreeable friendships of the older time have been renewed, and with the renewal men have gotten out of the grooves of selfishness, with which the most of us often unconsciously run in our every day life. Diverse views, concerning the various subjects agitating the Church and the State, are not allowed to run into personal dislikes; so that on the whole, perhaps, we are warranted in saying, that the Convention, take it all in all, approaches about as near to what a great body of Christian men assembled for the purpose of advancing Christ Church on earth, as one can expect, considering the infirmities and short-comings of our human nature. There have been many sharp things said occasionally in the course of debate, but rarely a sentence or a syllable savouring of personal unkindness, or ill-feeling of any kind. For these things let us be thankful. A different picture is so often presented in the conventions and synods of other religious bodies, that the contrast cannot well be passed without notice, and that too, let us hope, in no spirit of self-righteousness, nor self-exaltation.

DEFECTIVE RITUAL.

There is a great hue and cry made by the sacramentalists over what they call "defective ritual," meaning instances where the surplice may not be used, or where some other minor customs of the ceremonials of worship are departed from by those whose idea it is that the great aim is to worship the Lord in the "beauty of holiness" and not in the "holiness of beauty." Now, it is strange that it should be so, but it is the case that many fail to see that this is merely a dexterous measure to confuse the issue and to create the impression that the Romanists only aim at propriety and reverence in their innovations, which are, say they, violated by many of their opponents. Evangelical men consequently allow themselves often to be silenced by such a retort as: "why complain of us, and not of those who drop the surplice and use no credence table?" and they go away from the discussion, leaving the field to the enemy, but yet feeling that it is a victory not fairly won, and that there must be some way of meeting the argument.

The way to meet it is to deny in limine that there is any analogy or any pertinence in the argument.

What we oppose and detest in ritualism is not the mere assumption of unusual garments and the attendant gaudiness and theatricals of such displays. We dislike, of course, the formalism and irreverence of such scenes in the congregation of Christ's people, in God's House; but this is not the greatest evil. The evil is that