

orders, and instituted him to his living." Well, that was something, even if the doing of the latter was not a mere voluntary act. In the American Church a Bishop cannot even ordain a deacon without the consent of the Standing Committee of his diocese. We are not quite sure whether he can reject a candidate, but we suppose he can. Then, as regards instituting, there is no such ceremony; and further, a curate or assistant is engaged by the congregation just as any other servant is engaged, and the Bishop has nothing to say to the matter, except to see that the clergyman came regularly into his diocese, and probably to enter him on the clergy roll. Here, at least, rightly or wrongly, the English Bishop has some power! he may refuse to license, and he can withdraw a license. Here in Canada things are still better in respect to the powers of the Bishop, since he has a veto over the appointment of every incumbent. In some few cases, it is true, there is private patronage, in some dioceses the bishops have waived their rights; but in most cases the ultimate decision remains with the diocesan. "Once in possession of his living," the writer goes on, "the incumbent is as independent of his Bishop as a citizen of London is of the nearest Stipendiary." Just so. The law is not made for the obedient, but for the disobedient. Still, the writer admits, the Bishop, if he has not much power, has a great deal of influence. In the first place, it is useful to have a dignified person as a referee in case of any disturbance in the parish. Again, the Bishop carries weight with the Laity and especially with the upper class Laity. Moreover, the Bishop is commonly a man of ability, a good deal above the average, and as his feelings are generally less enlisted than those of either party to a dispute, he has a certain superiority in dealing with troubles. There is, says the writer, a notion current in the newspapers that Bishops are generally fools, but the notion is a very silly one, deriving the very slight foundation it has from a passed-away state of affairs, when Bishops were of all dignitaries most likely to be selected by favour. Now-a-days it may be taken as a rule that nobody rises to the top of a profession without qualifications of some sort of a pretty strong kind, and as Bishops are chosen by lay persons who have to study their public repute, and are greatly afraid of making blunders, very few persons without special claims mount episcopal thrones. The Bishop, therefore, is pretty sure of deference; and deference in England, in peaceful times, involves something of actual power. Almost equally true of Canada, where the Bishops are elected by clergy and laity, although it must be admitted that these elective bodies seldom show the same sure instincts which are ordinarily displayed by Prime Ministers. A somewhat strenuous cry has arisen in England asking that more power be given to the Bishops. It will be curious to watch and see whether the Public Worship Regulation Act will be quickened. No doubt that was a very blundering piece of legislation, but the blunders were chiefly of a technical and unimportant character, and at least it contains a provision which, at the

same time, confers power on the Bishop and affords protection to the clergy, by providing that no prosecution shall be undertaken under the Act without the permission of the Bishop. It is very curious that the Diocese of Toronto should be the first to extend the power of the Bishop, so that in time an incumbent may be removed not merely for offences against the law, but because he has ruined his parish.

ARE WOMEN IMPROVING?

What a very impertinent question. Would it not be as much to the point—perhaps more—to ask whether men are improving? No doubt such a question seriously considered might be of good consequence; yet it is hardly the question which seems at the present moment to demand immediate attention. As far as we know, very little is at the present time pretended as to the improvement of men. We hear of the amelioration of society, by some affirmed, by others denied, but of men as such we hear very little, except that they are gradually, and perhaps with some difficulty, being taught their proper place in the world, and learning to recognize the rights and privileges of those who used to be called the weaker vessel. Now, with regard to women, we do hear continually or, at least, very frequently, that they are making great and rapid strides towards perfection; and we partly believe it. There may be certain particulars which are to be put on the negative side, in making up the sum total; but on the whole, we think the positive side has the advantage. Certainly women are now much better educated than they were, and, on the whole, more rationally. Whether a little too much may not be attempted in the way of assimilating the education of women to that of men may be a question. Still, on the whole, it is undeniable that women are now doing a great many things which formerly they could not do or were not allowed to do. Employments are now open to them which were previously closed; and, although some offer objections to the change, the general verdict is in favour of it. As a matter of course, there are those who put forth the darker side of the subject—as there is a darker side to every subject. Cases of female peculation, forgery, etc., are pushed into prominence, as if they were illustrations of ordinary feminine life and character, instead of exceptions. The fact is that everything is now much better known than it was in former days, and people are much more outspoken, whatever their opinions may be. "The decay of religious belief," says an English Contemporary, "so far as it has affected women at all, has immensely increased their audacity, while the growth of self-consciousness, which follows inevitably upon improved education, has made those among them who were inclined to hardness distinctly harder. They make fewer excuses for themselves, see more clearly that they are bad, and decide that badness is their proper role, and a 'way' of life like another, a decision made all the more definitely because of their clear impression that without money there is no enjoyment. Nothing struck us

so much in the pearl-stealing case, which excited such attention a few years ago, as the statement of the guilty lady, reported in the course of the trial, that she would commit any crime to get some cash—'oof' she called it, killing thereby that particular bit of slang. She had evidently thought the matter out, decided that she could not get the money she wanted honestly, and therefore decided also to take the first opportunity of committing a profitable crime." It is this hardness, this brazening out of evil doing, which is new, and which impresses the ordinary observer and makes him dash to the conclusion that women are worse, which is not true. For the case is not merely exceptional, but there have always been such cases—of theft, forgery, poisoning—only that they have not been flaunted in the same manner. How much is to be said on the other side? "Was there ever a time," the same writer goes on, "when the well-placed woman cared so much to improve the world, did so much to assuage its misery, spent such time and energy and money in the effort to make it more intelligent or more kindly or more pure in conduct? In numbers which are to the numbers of the audacious or the ill-conducted as the numbers of London to the numbers of Bristol, they devote themselves with a sort of passion to good works, preach, teach, distribute, nurse and comfort all who are in need of their ministrations." It is allowed that some may be injudicious, some of them even "screamy." But there are dozens and hundreds and thousands of women doing enthusiastically and self-denyingly work in the cause of suffering humanity; and most of them with as good taste as with humane intention. Here the change is all for the better. The race of languid and indifferent women is almost gone, and in their place has come a race of workers even of martyrs and sufferers. It is said that they are sometimes too tolerant of evil; but we cannot consider this subject now.

DEATH OF MRS. CHARLES BETHUNE.

We are but giving expression to the universal sentiment of English Churchmen and of multitudes outside our own communion when we offer our deep and respectful sympathy to the Rev. Dr. Bethune on occasion of the sudden and terrible calamity which he has sustained in the loss of his noble-minded and devoted wife. The name of Bethune is deservedly had in honour in Canada and specially in the Diocese of Toronto, and Dr. Bethune, by his personal qualities and his official achievements, has not only sustained the honour of the name, but has added to its distinction. He may be assured of all that human sympathy can bring in such a case. "Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth."

REVIEWS.

Books for Young People. Price \$1 each. Philadelphia: Vir Publishing Co.; Toronto: Publishers' Syndicate 1898.

It is perfectly well-known that many young girls and boys, chiefly through ignorance, foster habits which it is very difficult for