

neither understand nor commend. Indeed I know no surer way to bring Episcopacy into contempt, than to give a minister of Christ an English diocese as it now is, and then expect him to do the duty of an Apostolical Bishop. Of all classes of men in the present day, there are none so truly pitiable as conscientious English Bishops. They have an enormous amount of work expected from them, and have neither brains, nor bodies, nor time to do it. To suppose they can find leisure for reading deeply on any subject, for investigating new heresies, for reasoning with refractory ministers, for delicately handling difficult cases, and for "giving themselves to the Word of God and to prayer," is simply absurd. If they had as many eyes as Argus, as many arms as the fabled Briareus, and as many feet as a centipede, they could never do their work thoroughly, so long as they have each only one mind. They are completely overworked; and, consequently, they are obliged to let alone many things which they do not like, but cannot prevent.

(2) I submit, in the second place, that no English Diocese should ever exceed a county, and that the larger counties, such as Yorkshire, Lancashire, and Middlesex, should each form at least three or four dioceses. Such subdivision seems absolutely necessary, if the office of an English Bishop is to be discharged efficiently. Every county likes to have its own Lord-Lieutenant, its own Sheriff, and its own Bench of Magistrates; and every county ought to have its own Bishop or Bishops. It is nonsense to talk of diocesan synods and diocesan organization, until such huge dioceses as London, Winchester, Exeter, Chester, Manchester, Lichfield, Lincoln, and Norwich are broken up. At present in such unwieldy dioceses there is practically very little real "episcopacy." To all intents and purposes, in a large English diocese the Church of England consist of a scattered body of Independent ministers ministering to Independent congregations. And this we complacently call Episcopacy! This is the system which we expect Presbyterians to admire! So long as our dioceses remain undivided, there can be no real practical "oversight." There will always be a great gulf between the Bishop and his clergy, which no quantity of archdeacons and rural deans can possibly bridge over.

(3) I submit, in the third place, that our Bishops would be far more useful if, as a body, they had no seats in the House of Lords. Let four or five of them be elected to sit there by representation, but let the rest be allowed to reside always in their respective dioceses. Such an arrangement would save a good deal of expense, and enable Bishops to devote themselves entirely to their own proper work. It would keep them from intermeddling in politics, and take away all excuse for selecting them for office on account of their political opinions. The notion that English Christianity would suffer damage, if the Bishops were withdrawn from the House of Lords, appears to me entirely devoid of foundation. I have read the debates in Parliament with considerable attention for twenty-five years, and I am unable to see that the Church of England derives much benefit from its Bishops being temporal peers. On the contrary, the complaint has been made,—and with no little show of reason,—that in the debates and divisions of the Upper House the Bishops are often present when they ought to be absent, and absent when they ought to be present! The little good that they do in the House of Lords certainly does not outweigh the harm that is done by absence from their dioceses, and by an expensive sojourn in London. At any rate there seems no necessity for more than five Bishops, at most, being in Parliament.

(4) I submit, in the fourth place, that the power of our Bishops, is at present far too autocratic. They would be happier and more useful if, like constitutional monarchs, they could do nothing without the advice of a Council. Such a Council might consist partly of laymen, some to be nominated by the Bishop himself, and some to be elected by the Churchmen of the diocese. As things are now, I know no one hardly, except a Roman Dictator or a Russian, Czar, who is such a thoroughly irresponsible autocrat as an English Bishop! No one has such absolute official power as he has, and no one is so entirely non-accountable to anybody but himself! I believe that no mortal man is fit to have

such power. The result is that bold and rash Bishops often do too much in some special direction, and make immense mistakes, while timid and cautious Bishops do nothing at all, from the very fear of doing wrong. A Council such as I have described would immensely lessen the anxiety of too much responsibility, and immensely increase the firmness with which episcopal action would be taken in a great emergency. If any one fancies there is anything peculiarly novel in this suggestion, he is mistaken. In the year 1641, a Committee of the House of Commons, of which Hyde was chairman, proposed a scheme of Church Reform, in which this idea of "a Council" was a leading element. Those who wish to examine this scheme will find it in Stoughton's *Church of the Civil Wars* (vol. II., p. 526).

(5) I submit, in the fifth place, that if English dioceses were properly diminished in size, a salary of £2,000 a-year, with a residence, would be sufficient for each Bishop. An additional £1,000 ought undoubtedly to be assigned to those prelates who are elected to represent the Church of England in Parliament. For the other Bishops, excepting the two Archbishops, an income of £2,000 with house (not a palace) would surely be sufficient. Give a Bishop a million of souls in his diocese, 800 or 1,000 clergymen to look after, and a seat in the House of Lords, and he is not one bit overpaid with £5,000 a-year. Give him, on the other hand, 200 of 25,000 clergymen at most a single county at the utmost to superintend, and no other work but that of his diocese to take up his time, and I firmly believe that he would be quite as well off with £2,000 a-year as he is now with a much larger income. The true measure of a man's income is the extent of the demands made upon it. Double the number of English Bishops, and halve their dioceses, and there is no difficulty in halving their incomes, especially if you take them away from the House of Lords.

(6) I submit, in the last place, that the present mode of appointing a Bishop to an English diocese is thoroughly bad and unsatisfactory. The plan of allowing a Prime Minister to select any one he pleases, too often from mere political reasons, and to thrust him upon the Churchmen of two or three counties as their chief pastor for life, whether fit or unfit, without allowing them voice, or choice, or expression of opinion, has been tried too long. It is high time to lay it aside for ever. However suitable to the days of the Tudors and Stuart, it is out of date in 1870. The subject, I know, is a delicate and difficult one. I have not the least desire to see each diocese electing its own Bishop, and the Churchmen of each diocese divided into two sharply-cut parties at every vacancy. I would far rather see some such system as that of the diocese presenting three names to the Crown, and leaving to the Crown the final selection. In such cases a fair representation of opinion might always be secured to a minority by allowing the cumulative vote, and permitting each Churchman to cumulate his three votes upon one name only. The plan I venture to suggest is rather like that which the House of Commons Committee of 1641 recommended, in the following words:—"Upon every death, or other avoidance of a bishopric, the King to grant a *congé d'élire* to all the clergy of the whole diocese, they to present three of the presbytery, and the King to choose and nominate whom he chooseth of them."

Such are the suggestions which I venture to throw out for the complete reform of our episcopal system. To many, I have no doubt, they will appear absurd, chimerical, revolutionary, impracticable, impossible, unnecessary. Be it so. I only ask all thinking Churchmen to read, mark, consider, and inwardly digest them.

Of the necessity of some such reforms as I have indicated, I feel no doubt whatever. Even Henry VIII. proposed at one time to have twenty-five additional Suffragan Bishops, at Bedford, Berwick, Bridgewater, Bristol, Cambridge, Colchester, Dover, St. Germain, Guildford, Gloucester, Grantham, Hull, Huntingdon, Isle of Wight, Ipswich, Leicester, Marlborough, Molton, Nottingham, Penrith, Southampton, Shaftesbury, Shrewsbury, Taunton, and Thetford. What would he and his farsighted advisers have thought if they had foreseen our present senseless position? The mere fact that our population has increased fivefold since the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and that we

have only two more Bishops now than we had then, is a fact that alone speaks volumes! To go on as we do now is to bring Episcopacy into contempt in the eyes of all Presbyterians and Independents throughout the world. It is as good as saying that Episcopacy is only a name, a sham, a mockery, a delusion, and an unreality. Railways and telegraphs and penny post no doubt enable a Bishop to do things that he could not do in 1570. But they do not counterbalance the enormous increase in our population.

Of the usefulness of diminishing dioceses and multiplying Bishops I feel no doubt whatever. Things cannot go on worse than they do now, and they might, by God's blessing go on infinitely better. Anything is better than sleep, torpor, and stagnation. A flood of Episcopal Hildebrands in every part of England might of course do much harm and cause many collisions. But I would rather see a lively struggle for God's truth commenced and fought out within our pale, than see the Church fall to pieces from the dry rot of disorganization, torpidity, and inaction.

Of the practicableness of such reforms as I have indicated I feel no doubt. If public opinion will only take the matter up, and the public voice will speak out, the thing may be done. A few wise, bold, and persevering Churchmen in the House of Commons might do wonders. There are no financial difficulties. We want no grant of public money. We only want a redistribution of funds which the Church already possesses. Once let the country be convinced that the operation is necessary and useful, and, in spite of the patient's reluctance and desire to be let alone, the operation will be performed. The Irish Church at this moment is a great lesson to the world. Driven into a corner by hard treatment, and obliged to organize, whether they like it or not, Irish Churchmen are working out their great problem with a steadiness and energy which deserve our admiration. If they had only taken up self-reform as energetically ten years ago, the Irish Establishment might have stood to this day.

"Trojaque nunc staret, Priamique arx alta maneres."

English Churchmen would do well to remember this. Let us not put off Church Reform till it is too late.

In conclusion, I wish it to be distinctly understood that in making the suggestions of this paper, I disclaim all idea of casting reflections on our present Bishops. Nothing is further from my intention. Many living English prelates are zealous, hard-working, conscientious men. Some of them, in the matter of gifts and graces, would do honour to any Church. Considering their enormous difficulties, I marvel that they do as well as they do. But all of them are occupying positions in which they can neither do justice to themselves, their dioceses, nor the Church of England. It is their misfortune much more than their fault. They are running a race in which they are completely overweighed. They have duties devolved on them which they can only discharge in the most hurried and perfunctory way. To expect the Bishop of such a diocese as Chester, Manchester, Exeter, Lichfield, Lincoln, or Norwich, to oversee his charge thoroughly, efficiently, and completely, and to be the mainspring of Church work in every parish, is simply expecting impossibilities. It is expecting what a man with only one body cannot do, or if he tries to do it he kills himself. It is from a strong desire to increase the usefulness and happiness of our Bishops that I advocate a wholesale diminution of the size of our dioceses.

From the Episcopate, I propose to pass on to the consideration of Convocation, the Cathedral bodies, the Public Worship of the Church of England, the Ministry, and the position of the Laity. In all these points I see sources of much present weakness, and in all I see great room for useful reforms. About each and all of them I hope to make practical suggestions in future papers.

That "the only wise God" may give to all Churchmen wisdom and boldness in this dark day, and may make us "men of understanding" to know what should be done, and men of action to do it, is my daily prayer. In that prayer, I humbly entreat my readers to join.

"Time tries all things," and has proved that *Dr. Wistar's Balsam of Wild Cherry* is the remedy *par excellence* for

the cure of coughs, colds, croup, whooping-cough, bronchitis, asthma, phthisis, sore throat, and influenza. It cures coughs and colds *instantly*! It soothes the irritated parts; it heals the inflammation; and even consumption itself yields to its magic influence.

Commercial.

STOCK AND SHARE LIST.

BANKS.	Am't of Shares.	Paid up.	Dividend last 6 m's.	Closing Price.
Bank of Montreal	\$200	All.	6 p.c.	107 1/2 a 108 1/2
Bank of N. A.	£500	do.	3 p.c.	105 a 106
City Bank	\$100	do.	3 p.c.	87 1/2 a 90
Bank of the People	50	do.	4 p.c.	102 1/2 a 103
Molson's Bank	50	do.	3 p.c.	104 a 105 1/2
Ontario Bank	40	do.	4 p.c.	105 1/2 a 106 1/2
Bank of Toronto	100	do.	4 p.c.	102 1/2 a 104
Quebec Bank	100	do.	3 1/2 p.c.	108 a 108
Bank Nationale	50	do.	4 p.c.	106 a 108
Bank J. Galtier	50	do.	4 p.c.	113 a 114
E. Townshend's Bank	50	do.	4 p.c.	104 a 106
Merc. Bk of Canada	100	do.	4 p.c.	116 1/2 a 117 1/2
Union Bank	100	do.	4 p.c.	106 a 107 1/2
Mechanics' Bank	50	do.	4 p.c.	89 a 90
Royal Canadian Bk.	50	do.	None.	96 a 97 1/2
Can. Bk of Commerce	50	do.	4 p.c.	121 1/2 a 122 1/2
RAILWAYS.				
G. T. of Canada	£100	stg.	All.	None.
L. & St. Lawrence	100	do.	1 1/2 p.c.	12 1/2 a 13
G. W. of Canada	22	do.	1 1/2 p.c.	13 a 14
Montreal & Cham.	200	do.	None.	16 a 21
Do., preferential.	\$200	do.	5 p.c.	100 a 101
MINES, &c.				
Montreal Consols.	0	\$15.10		\$3.75 a \$4.30
Canada Mining Co.	4	90 p.c.		
Huron Copper Bay	4	12 cts.	20 p.c.	25 a 32 1/2
Lake Huron S. & C.	5	102 c.		
Quebec and Lake S.	8	\$4.10		
Montreal Tel. Co.	40	All.	5 p.c.	185 a 186 1/2
Peoples' do.	100	do.	5 p.c.	95 a 97 1/2
Montreal C. Gas Co.	40	do.	4 p.c.	bks closed
Montreal City F. R.	50	do.	6 p.c.	130 a 130
Richelleu Co.	100	do.	5 p.c.	156 a 156
Can. Navigation Co.	100	do.	3-12 m.	105 a 105
Mont. Elevating Co.	100	do.	5 p.c.	112 1/2 a 113
Montreal F. B. Society	50	do.	4 p.c.	109 a 110
Canada F. B. Society	50	do.	5 p.c.	124 a 135
Canada Roll'g Stk Co	100	do.		104 a 105

BONDS.	Clos'g Price's
Government 5 per cents, stg.	94 1/2 a 96 1/2
Government 5 per cents, cy	95 a 97
Government 6 per cents, stg.	102 a 105
Government 6 per cents, cy	108 a 109
Dominion 6 per cent stock	108 a 109
Montreal Water Works 6 per cents, due 1885	99 1/2 a 100
Montreal Corporation Bonds, 6 per cents.	99 1/2 a 100
Corporation 7 per cent stock	114 a 114 1/2
Montreal Harbor Bonds 6 1/2 per cents, due 1883	103 1/2 a 105 1/2
Quebec City 6 per cents	85 a 90
Quebec City Bonds, 6 per cent, 1882	90 a 92
Kingston City Bonds, 6 per cents, 1872	92 1/2 a 95
Ottawa City Bonds, 6 per cents, 1880	95 a 97
Champlain R. R., 6 per cents	87 a 90
County Debentures	90 a 90

EXCHANGE.	
Bank on London, 60 days sight, or 75 days date	109 1/2 a 109 1/2
Do. do. 3 m. and 6 m.	110 a 110 1/2
Private do.	108 1/2 a 109
Private, with documents	108 1/2 a 109
Bank on New York	12 a 12 1/2
Private do.	12 1/2 a 13
Gold Drafts do.	1/4 dis
Silver do.	6 a 6 1/2
Gold in New York	113 1/2 a 00

ROBERT MOAT, BROKER,
North British Chambers, Hospital Street

MONTREAL WHOLESALE PRODUCE MARKET

Sept. 13, 1870.

FLOUR—Per barrel of 196 lbs.	
Superior Extra	\$ 6 25 @ 6 50
Extra Superfine	5 80 " 6 00
Fancy Superfine	5 60 " 5 75
Superfine from Canada Wheat	4 95 " 5 00
Stroh Super from Canada Wheat	4 20 " 4 30
City Brands of Superfine	4 90 " 5 00
Superfine No. 2	4 50 " 4 60
Western States No. 2	4 35 " 4 50
Fine	4 20 " 4 30
Middlings	3 75 " 4 00
Pollards	3 25 " 0 00
Choice U. C. Bag-flour, per 100 lbs.	2 50 " 2 60
City Bags, do.	2 65 " 2 70
Oatmeal, per 200 lbs.	2 50 " 2 60
GRAIN—Per bushel	
Wheat, U. C. Spring	1 00 " 0 00
U. C. Red Winter	2 25 " 0 00
Rye Flour	0 00 " 0 00
Corn Meal	0 85 " 0 95
Peas, white, per 60 lbs.	0 83 " 0 85
Oats, per 52 lbs.	0 36 " 0 38
Barley, per 45 lbs.	0 70 " 0 70
Corn	0 75 " 0 77 1/2
Rye, per 56 lbs.	0 00 " 0 00
PORK—In barrels	
Mess, per 200 lbs.	28 50 " 29 00
Thin Mess, per 200 lbs.	26 00 " 26 00
Prime Mess,	24 00 " 24 50
Prime	22 00 " 22 00
LARD—per lb	
	0 13 " 0 14
CHEESE	
Canada Factory, per lb	0 11 1/2 " 0 12
BUTTER	
Choice, per lb	0 21 " 0 22
EGGS	
	0 15 " 0 16
ASHES	
Pots, Firsts	5 80 " 5 85
Pots, Seconds	5 20 " 0 00
Pots, Thirds	4 35 " 0 00
Pearls, Firsts	4 40 " 7 40
" Seconds	0 00

INDIA WAREHOUSE.

CHARLES REAY,
Family Grocer & Wine Merchant
46 BEAVER HALL,
Corner of Dorchester Street,
MONTREAL.

A. J. PELL,
GALLERY OF ART,
345 NOTRE-DAME STREET, MONTREAL.
Silvered Plate-Glass, and manufacturer of Mirrors,
Picture Frames, Gilt Mouldings, &c.
OLD FRAMES RE-GILT.
Picture Gallery always open Free to the Public.

G. R. W. KITSON, B.C.L.,
NOTARY PUBLIC,
44 LITTLE ST. JAMES STREET, MONTREAL.