

having been lighted, ought not to be put under a bushel measure, but on a candlestick, not only to give light to all that are in the house, but that other candles may be lighted from it, so, that through them "the true light of the world" may be widely diffused. This principle of extension seems to have been that upon which the Church has always proceeded; and I am quite unable to understand why our right reverend fathers in God, acting in their corporate capacity in the upper house of the Provincial Synod, should have shown so little interest in the extension of their own office—in which, of course, they believe as firmly as we do—as on two occasions, in 1889 and 1892, to relegate this important matter of the extension of the episcopate to a committee, when it had been formally and unanimously brought before them after grave and serious deliberation by the lower house, which is composed of some of the most earnest and able members of the Church in the Dominion.

(3) The true definition of a bishop (*episcopos*), as it may be gathered from the New Testament, is an *overseer*—one who overlooks the work of those to whom he has delegated a portion of the ministerial office originally given to the apostolic order only. A bishop's commission is to "go forth and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever Christ has commanded them," and our Lord has promised to be with His ministers "always, even to the end of the world." A bishop is to feed the Church of God, which He hath "purchased with his own blood." He is to "show himself an example of good works unto others." He "is to be a shepherd to the flock of Christ, and to hold up the weak, heal the sick, bind up the broken, bring again the outcasts, and seek the lost."

These words from the scriptures and from the ordinal at least mean that a bishop is to set an example of personal devotion, and self-denial, and self-sacrifice. He should ever be in the front in all matters affecting the Church and its welfare. He should be so known by the force of his character that even politicians, when dealing with matters affecting the Church, would stop to enquire, "What are the bishop's views upon this question?" In a country like this, the bishop of a diocese should always be on the watch for openings where the Church could be extended in the towns and in the backwoods, and should continually encourage by his presence and kind words his delegates and representatives in the ministry. It would be a blessing if this were the case!

Of course, we have no right to expect impossibilities. But I am persuaded that if the episcopate were at once increased fourfold, and if the bishop were the chief missionary in his

diocese the greatest results for good would be attained. There can be no doubt that if the episcopate were more widely extended, so that it would be possible for bishops to *know* the circumstances and the people of each parish by visiting them periodically and regularly, in the true ecclesiastical sense of the word "visiting," a great deal of unhappiness would be prevented in parishes by kindly advice and Christian guidance, founded upon personal knowledge of men, and their work, and their shortcomings. Men, clerical and lay, are but human after all, and are grateful for a little sympathy and a little encouragement.

Take such a matter as the "patronage question," about which one of our religious newspapers has been instructing us and stirring us up from time to time. For one, I believe that it is solely within the province of the bishop to fill up every ecclesiastical appointment, after an earnest and wise consultation with the representatives of the parish as provided by the canon; but then there must be a personal knowledge based upon personal contact with clergymen and parishes; otherwise there would be a continual "putting of the round peg in the square hole," which is always a thing to be deprecated. If our dioceses were of a workable size, so that there would be a possibility of the bishop knowing everything he ought to know about priest and people, then when vacancies occurred the actual *knowledge* of the bishop would be such that difficulties would not arise, for he would *know* what was best to be done and would do it, and all sensible people would thankfully acquiesce, because they would be aware that the bishop's action was based upon knowledge obtained, not by hearsay, but by personal contact with the parish in question and with every individual clergyman in his jurisdiction. But then, to make this possible, our dioceses must be of much smaller size; in fact, there must be a wider increase of the episcopate; and our conception of the episcopal office and duty must rather be connected with the idea of a "father in God" than with the idea of an "ecclesiastical baron."

(4) The Church to which we belong, the ancient catholic and apostolic Church of England, has a constitution which was given to it eighteen hundred years ago; and if we wish to be true to our principles, we must work according to that constitution. The plan marked out of old was for the bishop, who was the depositary of the ministerial office, to ordain his deacons and priests, set them in their respective spheres of duty, and continually overlook them at their work. He did not ordain them and leave them to their own devices, to sink or swim, as the case might be; but he exercised an efficient oversight, so that their mistakes, if they made any, as most probably at first they would, might be pointed out and quickly corrected, and