er think on the The Times t of Sir John the Standard. ged themselves resford. It is ry hot; and of sappearance of the two prota-

attempt to give the two great ord, naturally, other; having a member of almost ridicunatural impres--especially if h birth. There n the imageof the Tar as and as he preinations. The ne complexion at of the typieason, namely, he frame is rolined to stoutndy-legged, as man has had on the rolling -also suggesthally the voice ious as a fogcharacteristics r of an Irishsense of the friendly with good idea of esford makes east the inaripposed to be; volubly on any whenever the the House of ford was certareer to make spoke in such ailor to speak, there was alin his eye and with that foghigh note that ne Terrace and wards of St.

family is Marf innumerable of them is enlace of the See ays before the a seat in the Protestant uncle of Lord of Armagh the Convention itution of the A courtlier or ed-looking man line features of -which, as in have ever seen, clear and huid, although he eventy when I I dress seemed orm which got eatures and the He intervened always pertincious combinacommand, and in an assembly y delegates at cals—were no Presbyterian in like the stout garded as sav-

a wild stock; generations al-

ne Anglo-Irish

Beresford, who wild, irresponthe sober midbranks and the when George exploits made e kind of man to have a caght sitting in n St. James's n which Byron negar, and took mber as a boy this mad Marran the same ng an Irishman -as the Marled by the loss s Hermit; and ke the English

o my own days, louse of Lords. s. One of my hen the newsitous announceth the wife of member of the eed, an underhe ministry of ell. The career spiciously than the young lover who had given oes not always t Curraghmore, and the new

Lady Waterford proved so charitable, so devoted, and so Christian a woman that when she died she was deplored as a tragic loss by the whole countryside, and especially by the poor, all of another race and of another creed though, I believe, she became a Catholic in later years. Lord Waterford ended sadly. He was always, like his family, a great man after the hounds; kept the famous pack of his county-Waterford has always been a great hunting county-got a bad fall, and never entirely recovered. He used to speak often in the House of Lords, when the Land War was at its height. I remember the weird feeling had when, one evening, on entering the House of Lords, I heard a voice, clear, penetrating and rapid, and could not see whence the voice proceeded. I discovered soon the reason of my perplexity; it was Lord Waterford speaking, but speaking from his seat, and not standing; he was allowed to do so in consequence of his infirmity. In the end the

Tuesday, August 11, 1908

much; and he shot himself in his own palatial

Hot blood, then, runs in Lord Charles Beresford's veins; in his case mitigated by long years of active service, by the hard discipline of the Navy, by great emergencies, out of which he came glorious, in battles by sea and battles by land. In recent years he has been even more alert than ever, and even younger than ever, all because, as he himself puts it, he has had the courage to become an absolute abstainer. And, barring his hot Irish and hereditary temperament, I cannot understand his doing anything very rash or very stupid.

Though he is not Irish, there is a good deal of quicksilver-at least, to judge from his appearance—in Sir John Fisher, too. . I had an opportunity of studying him for three weeks some years ago when he was taking the cure at Marienbad—he was almost as great a lover of that delightful health resort as poor C.-B.; and was a devotee of it long before the

the typical sailor in appearance and manner. A round, bullet-shaped head, a robust, taut, alert body, eyes dark and somewhat protruding, a sallow skin, a compressed mouth, a ready laugh, a quick manner, such is my recollection of his appearance. He is what his looks suggest, I believe, a dynamic man, all motion, activity and power-ready to get up and be at his desk at five in the morning; masterful, clear-sighted, impatient of opposition, and frightened from no purpose by its difficulty or its unpopularity. I know too little about the Navy to pass any opinion on the changes he has introduced; but I gather that they are of a revolutionary character; that steamships have been "scrapped" and thrown away as old iron, with something of the splendid recklessness a great American manufacturer or a newspaper proprietor shows when he throws out £100,000 worth of machinery from a mill or a printing-office two years after installing it, as soon as he has heard of something faster agonics which his malady created proved too King ever set his foot there. Here, again, was and better. In all the old ideas of the places

where attack might come and defence should es at variance on such an issue, are fighting I also gather from the papers and speeches, has been quite as revolutionary—filling up with vessels spots which were left bare and tion under the old regime. This policy finds, of course, its crux in the regions in and about our own Isles; for there it is that if there were to be an attempted descent on the United Kingdom the Navy would have to fight and win or die, and therefore the number of ships to be placed in this point or that is one of the vital problems of national security. It is no wonder that there should be hot differences of opinion on problems so supreme; and that as men differ on points so cardinal,

fers fundamentally on this point from Sir John Fisher; that he regards himself as deprived of the safety of the positions he has to defend; response, "she's the Creator's handiwork, but and that two masterful men, finding themselv- I canna' say she's His masterpiece."

therefore be always ready, Sir John Fisher, their battle with something like personal ferocity. How will it all end? A little date perhaps will supply the key. Early next year the command of Lord Charles Beresford comes leaving bare places where there was conges- automatically to an end; and it is obviously the desire of Mr. Asquith and Mr. McKenna to look to that date as relieving them from the painful necessity of going to extremes; and thus the dispute will for the moment be ended. But Lord Charles Beresford is an old electioneerer, and an old member of Parliament, and it is possible that we shall hear the next chapter unfolded at Westminster. May I be there to see!

A Scotch laboring man, who had married a I gather that Lord Charles Beresford dif- rich widow, exceptional for her plainenss, was accosted by his employer: "Well, Thomas," he said, "I hear you are married. What sort the number of ships which are necessary for of a wife have you got?" "Well, sir," was the

THE POLICY OF SPEND, SPEND, SPEND

livered by Mr. Foster in the closing days of the session, in which he reviewed the financial record of the Government: Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into committee of supply, I want to make a few remarks with reference to the financial condition, as it appears, and the outlook on the basis of that condition. It has been usual of late years for the Opposition to make a summing up of the matter, presenting the figures and, to a certain extent, embodying their own position with regard to it, which custom will not be departed from on the present occasion. It seems to me that it particularly timely at this period to review some the more recent events and transactions in relation

to Canadian finances and to present in concise form the conditions of things as it appears at the present time. The Government has been in power now for about twelve years. It is an old story to make mention of the principles they professed and the politics they propounded before they came into power. That has been gone over in successive years until I think there remains not very much more necessity for men-tioning it in a review of this kind.

The three principal points in connection with the finances of Canada are: the taxation collected from the country, the expenditures which are made, and the increase or otherwise of the public debt resulting therefrom. The House knows that the Liberal party before 1896 professed to be in favor of low taxation, declared that the taxation at that time imposed was declared that the taxation at that time imposed was excessive, and promised that when they got into power it would be their privilege and duty to reduce it. Today the matter stands something like this; that the per capita taxation of 1896, \$5.46 per head, was in 1908 raised to \$11.70 per head. The total taxation of 1896, amounting to \$27,700,000, was raised in the last year to \$73,000,000, an increase of \$45,200,000, or 163 per cent increase in volume of taxation. The student of the history of taxation would find that \$252,000,000 in taxes has been paid during the administration of these gentlemen more than if the level of the taxation exacted in 1896 had been maintained, and that in the eleven years and three-quarters of the administration under review \$544,000,000 have been taken from the people in taxation, an average of about tration under review \$544,000,000 have been taken from the people in taxation, an average of about \$48,000.000 yearly, and that each day there is collected in Canada a little over \$200,000 as against a daily collection of \$76,000 in 1896. There are not many more than six millions of tax payers in 1898, as compared with about five millions in 1896; so that the increase in rate, in volume, and in yearly amount of taxation has been increased far away and above the increase of population.

increase of population. Coming next to expenditures, we find that party which when in opposition was opposed to the expenditure of that time as being alarmingly exexpenditure of that time as being alarmingly ex-cessive, have raised the per capita expenditure of the country from \$8.14 in 1896 to \$18 in 1908, and the amount of the expenditure from \$41,700,000 in 1896 to \$112,000,000 in 1808, an increase of 70½ millions in that period, being an increase of 165 per cent. It is interesting to know that in that period of eleven years and three-quarters \$533,000,000 have been expended by this government of economy, which amounts to \$71,000,000 yearly, and that the average daily expenditures of the country are \$303,571, as against \$114,000 in 1896. Although this has been the history of the ordinary expenditure of the country during that period, when we approach the period of 1908-1909 we and that the expenditure authorized and contem plated is far and away the greatest of any year in the history of Canada. The following table shows the es-timates of 1907-1908 and the estimates of 1908-1909,

Supplementary	\$ 5,329,638 119,237,091 10,665,657 2,850,000 2,850,000
Total	\$140,957,381 \$ 19,544,152
Subsidies— 15,000 Bridges 5,000,000 Rallways 5,000,000	800,000 22,566,300
Loans— \$ 5,015,000	\$ 23,366,800
Quebec bridge 6,678,200 Mont. harbor 3,000,000 C. N. R. Guaranteed Bonds	11,067,000
Total\$136,106,429	\$174,586,681

This is extremely illustrative when we take into account the condition of financial affairs in Canada and throughout the world at the present time as compared with the condition in 1907-1908. Where you would naturally look for prudence and economy and if anything a curtailment of expenditures, you and a very large and significant increase. There is no ndication in this of any appreciation by either the Finance Minister or the Government of the condition of the country or the financial conditions prevailing the world. If they have any appreciation of those onditions they have not met them as most prudent in business, banking, commercial or other posions always are ready and think it prudent to do. ut the expenditure as outlined for the present year as a feature in it which is somewhat different from e feature of last year, as I find by looking over the ms of estimates, particularly of the supplementaries, nese are what you might call pregnant estimates. very large portion of them are for the beginning of orks which in the very hurried and altogether in-equate examination that could be given as the esates were passing the House, promised to run into y large figures before the works for which these the initiative votes shall have been carried to

There is also this year the item of railway subsiamounting to some twenty-three or 'wenty-five ons of dollars, which of course ex-s over a period of years and calls for large sums, take for granted that these are bona fide enter-s and will be carried out. Looking over these ditures, and indeed over the expenditures of this ernment for the last five or six years, there seems in o species of expenditure which is barred from the help; to expend seems to be the great object a department and there seems to be no dis-ating sense as to what are proper objects for enditure of Dominion moneys and what should be avoided. The limited examination which was made in the Marine and Fisheries Department, and which I believe if made in almost any other department of

the Government would be equally indicative of the general tenor of the expenditures, has shown I think to the satisfaction of everybody who has read that report that the evidence, that there was, according to the commissioners, an utter lack of care and prudence and business foresight, and in fact of directive power and business foresight, and in fact of directive power and of, conscience in the expenditures which were made. During the second commission we have had the fact brought out that over \$200,000 were actually thrown away within the last two or three years in the Marine and Fisheries Department alone on account of the patronage list, purchases within the knowledge of the deputy and the officers which were larger than they should have been, had the patronage list not ruled and had business foresight and discrimination been exercised.

One of the most reprehensible troubles that we find in the passing of votes and initiating expenditures and undertaking works in this country is what I hope I am not too strongly naming as the absolutely false misrepresentation of the expenditure made, either through carelessness or worse, by the department or the minister in charge of the programs. misrepresentation of the expenditure made, either through carelessness or worse, by the department or the minister in charge of the measure. It is getting to be almost the invariable rule that you cannot place any reasonable reliance upon the estimate which a minister will give you with reference to the completion of a work undertaken by a vote of Parliament and the granting of money for the initial proceedings. I shall mention only two instances of this, one on a small scale and the other upon a very large scale. First, we have the Royal Mint. The statement made was that the mint would cost us an outside figure of \$350,000. And, although there was some opposition, the House concluded that if a mint could be had for that amount it would pass the vote; and it did pass it on these statements. The mint, when it is finished, will have cost very close to \$650,000, which is \$300,000, or nearly that, above the estimate. That is an example which might be multiplied hundreds and hundreds of times, showing inder-estimates of the same extent; or at least a great extent in what may be called the smaller transactions. But what I wish to take up now is the largest transaction of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. That was a very large undertaking for the people of this country, an important undertaking. And in presenting the scheme the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance were on their honor and on the responsibility of their high offices which have the power of authoritative recommendations and explanation of the measures which are brought before the House. The Prime Minister studied the question gathered his information and placed a statement of the financial cost to the country, as well as other statements, before the House. the financial cost to the country, as well as other statements, before the House.

Now, I do not wish to misinterpret anyone, so I ote from 'Hansard' of 1903 where the speech of the Prime Minister is reported,

where the speech of the Prime Minister is reported, the statements he then made.

The sum total of the money to be paid by the government for the construction of that line of railway from Moncton to the Pacific ocean will be in the neighborhood of \$12,000,000 or \$13,000,000, and not a cent more Well, Sir, the Finance Minister takes up the mat-

In order to be absolutely certain, he says that al-In order to be absolutely certain, he says that although he finds that he has made a proper calculation as to the cost of the road, he adds 25 per cent. to the cost, making the \$25,000 eastern section cost \$31,250 per mile, and the \$28,000 for the other, to cost \$35,000 per mile. Then he carries out the same actual calculation, and says that to provide for that advance, if ever that advance is required, the actuarial sum required would be \$31,725,706. And if that were placed at 3 per cent, interest compounded half yearly in 1903, it would meet every cent of the obligation the govquired would be \$31,725,706. And if that were placed at 3 per cent. interest compounded half yearly in 1903, it would meet every cent of the obligation the government would be under, on the increased estimate of cost that he gave in order to save himself.

Now, Sir, I do not think there is any misrepresentation in that statement of the position taken by my hon, friend. And how does it pan out? I have

placed here in parallel columns, which I have given to the 'Hansard,' Mr. Fielding's estimate of 1903, and the facts as established in 1908, and they make very teresting reading.

Cost of Grand Trunk Pacific to Government.

As declared by Mr. Fielding 1903 Quebec to Moncton	
Total	\$114,393,765 10,009,454
Total when constructe d 54,609,676 Interest for seven years thereafter	\$124,403,219 26,124,676 4,591,250
Total cost seven years after construction	\$155,119,145 - 11,304,300 \$166,423,445 14,422,238

Total cash cost Grand Trunk Pacific and bridge \$73,691,706 \$180,845,683 that there was no need of it. This side of the House was laughed at when it made that request. They had mountains of information, and they read these mountains of information and placed them upon "Hansard." They knew all that it was necessary to know, and, as time would not wait, this matter was pushed through, and here is the instructive result. Are we, with the estimate which I have just read to the House of \$180,845,683, yet up to the actual cost of the work? No, sir. This is only again an estimate passed partly on actual contracts and partly on more gathered information, but yet an estimate, and I do not doubt at all but that the estimate will be very materially exall but that the estimate will be very materially ex-

It is now interesting to find out where this amount of \$13,725,706, put at interest in 1908 at 3 per cent. compounded half yearly, would be in this year 1908. It would be added to by \$2,300,000, and at this date you would have in the hands of your insurance man or trust company exactly \$16,000,000 in order to pay \$26,124,676 on the eastern section, and \$11,304,300 on the mountain section, or a total of \$39,400,000 in round numbers. If you add to that \$14,422,238 for the

Quebec bridge cost, you have, to meet that, the vaunted \$13,725,706, which, with its accumulations of interest, makes now \$16,000,000. I think, a more silly, as well as a more unfounded

country. They are these:	e and tina
Cash Obligations Incurred	75 S. F.
For Grand Trunk Pacific—	
Construction, Winnipeg to Moncton !	\$114.393.765
Interest on cost of same whilst building Seven years' interest on total cost to be	10,009,454
paid by Government without recourse	26,124,676
Cost of terminals, Government's share Interest to be paid by Government without	4,591,250
recourse on mountain section	11,304,300
For Quebec bridge—	166,423,445
Total shim out to accept and	

ount required \$ 14,422,238 Total cash obligations \$180,845,683 Bond Obligations Canadian Northern Railway bonds guaran-anteed in 1903 58,048,000 Total obligations 67,433,639 Contingent Cash Liability

Grand Trunk Pacific-For three years' additional interest on cost of construction, eastern division...... 11,196,290 Grand total of cash and bond obligations \$259,475,612

About these figures there is not a shadow of disagreement between either side of the House. greement between either side of the House.

Now, sir, with all that bond and cash indebtedness facing the government, what else is there? With the present scale of expenditure and the multiplicity of objects which are continually claiming expenditure and which the government is meeting, and the falling of receipts which are marked both in customs and in the railways of the country; we must not buoy ourselves up for a moment with the hope that those cash obligations can be met in any other way than by borrowing upon the money markets; London in particular. So that if you take these certain cash obligations—leaving out the contingent obligations of \$180,845,683, which is now lessened by \$26,000,000 paid on that account up to March 31, 1908—and meet them by loans, what happens? It happens that your public debt which in 1896 was \$258,500,000, and on March 31, 1908 was \$278,000,000, has to be increased to the alarming total of \$423,845,683. And if that contingent lability of \$11,000,000 comes to us and we have to provide the of \$11,000,000 comes to us and we have to provide the money from borrowings the total debt will amount to \$444,041,973, when all of these liabilities in cash shall have been covered. The most of that must be covered before the end of 1911, and all of it within a few years

But that is not all of it. There are in the current temporary loans running at rates from 3½ to 4½ per cent., amounting to \$17,800,000 in different banks here and there, wherever accommodation can be got. They cannot always run; no country can allow that. They cannot always run, no country can allow that. They must be taken up. Then again if you go to the Public Accounts you will find that before 1910 ends, \$57,000,000 of public debt not provided for by sinking funds will fall due and these two items together will render necessary additional new loans amounting to \$74,800,000 or a total of \$240,841,973, of which \$192,216,-

thereafter, so that new loans on this account will

necessary to the amount of \$166.041.973.

797 must be raised within three years. Now, it seems to me that that gives any sensible man room for thought, and necessitates great anxiety and the most serious consideration. And yet, notwithstanding all these facts which I have recited, this appailing load of cash and other obligations that are to be met a much at the desired. be met as much as the fates are to be met in their decrees or natural laws in their working out.

estimate, was never presented to any parliament by a man having the responsibilities of the head of the Exchequer of a nation.

What are the cash obligations which today are straight in front of the Minister of Finance and this country. They are these:

Cash Obligations Incurred

For Grand Trunk Pacific—

no amount of 'Oh, we don't care' will get rid of them; no waving of the hand puts them out from fronting you; no optimism based upon insufficient grounds of consideration or knowledge of facts will ever remove them from your path. They are there, and there to be met, and this country must meet them. And yet, sir, in the face of these appalling facts, this government starts out in the year 190s on an expenditure and an increasing of obligations unprecedented in the ment starts out in the year 1908 on an expenditure and an increasing of obligations unprecedented in the former history of this country, involving in estimates alone \$138,078,381, and in bountles, which the Finance Minister himself has estimated for me and which are to be paid \$2.875,000, being a total of \$140,983,381. alone \$138,078,381, and in bounties, which the Finance Minister himself has estimated for me and which are to be paid, \$2,875,000; being a total of \$140,953,381. These are the expenditures authorized. But beyond that you have bridge subsidies and railway subsidies amounting to \$23,366,300; you have guaranteed loans to the Canadian Railway in the shape of 3½ per cent. bonds, and so have added to your financial burdens \$11,067,000. Thus you have in this present authorization a total of obligations and expenditures of \$175,386,681. I have read to you the obligations which before were staring this country in the face, amounting to \$250,000,000 and more. Add that to the \$175,000,000, and you have a total of \$484,000,000 of cash and bond obligations, most of them cash, which are today staring this country in the face and to be undertaken as soon as this Supply Bill shall have been passed. You may deduct \$26,000,000 of that as having been already paid out of the obligations upon the Transcontinental Railway up to March 31, 1908, which leaves you a debt of over \$408,000,000. And yet, sir, I fail to see in any member of the government, any utterance of the government, the least appreciation of the condition of things which is set forth in that presentation of what I believe to be the bare and naked facts.

Now, sir, let me very briefly ask a question or two with reference to this. What is the accompaniment of this condition of things? Are the revenues buoyant? Is trade prosperous?

Is trade prosperous?

This government has been kind to the wrongdoer and eminently kind to the middleman. When has the right hon, gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) ever stood and eminently kind to the middleman. When has the right hon gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) ever stood between the treasury of this country and the man who wanted to loot it? Will any one out of his own experience tell of one single case in which it has been done? But when Merwin looted the treasury, when Lødge looted the treasury, when Pierson, Dodge and hundreds of others have looted the treasury, though the Prime Minister knew it, though it was proven and put up to him, not once has the Prime Minister risen and by even a word condemned such proceedings: And today the middleman and the patronage list are in all their glory. Yesterday as a finale of the land transactions for the present session, displayed before this House one of the most malodorous deals that have ever been exposed here to our humiliation—a trust for the Indians sacrificed by the men who held that trust; Indian property sold for \$9,000, and turned over almost before the bill was paid for \$100,000. And yesterday the Minister of the Interior slept during nearly the whole of the presentation of that subject. And when he got up, the first thing he did was to call the hone gentleman (Mr. Boyce) a scandal monger. And the next thing was to give his plea. And his plea was: The land belonged to the Indians; Indians cannot eat land; they have to sell it and get money or they cannot get the good of it; we sold it—and that is the whole story.

whole story.

Franchises are given everywhere. I brought one case to the attention of the House not long ago. Here were four members of Parliament in good standing—Duncan Fraser, of Guysborough; Mr. McIsaac, of Antigonish; Mr. Maxwell, of a British Columbia constituency, and Mr. McInnes, also of British Columbia. And these four members of Parliament were standing up like little men fighting for every proposal that the government tried to put through this House. And they got the townsite of Whitehorse divided amongst themselves at \$10 an acre, a townsite in which lots—and an an acre makes several lots—I have been informed sell at from \$500 to \$1,500 per lot. That is a part of the system of doping. The Prime Minister dopes the country in several ways. For instance, he gives a contract of printing to Mr. Pierson, who owns the St. John Sun, who has no job office. And Mr. Plerson receives the contract and thanks the Prime Minister. Then he turns it over to a gentleman by the name of Armstrong, telling him: You do this printing and I will keep 25 per cent. and you can have the other 75 per cent. That is done, and the Prime Minister knows it. Why should not the country have that 25 per cent., and Mr. Armstrong do the printing and get just as much for it as he gets now? And the same gentleman. The right hon, gentleman himself carries on the doping process. How? By writing out a promise of a judgeship or a governorship and giving it to a man who supports him as a member of this House.

The Prime Minister knows he did it, knows the letter was read, knows that the gentleman had it in his trousers pocket, and voted for him. Since they have come into power in 1896 they have appointed seventy-five members of Parliament to positions of emolument, involving an annual salary of \$350,000; and these men, until they got the office, would of course have supported the government; and they would he heathens if, after they got the office, they did not say a good word for the government. And so it goes on, and tomorrow we will be asked to swallow another measure, the infamous Quebec Bridge matter, which we will have something to say about tomorrow. I believe that the proposition which is put before the House in that respect will not stand fair investigation. It was a political thing; the gentlemen who has been the soul of it for these years back, is the close political friend of the Prime Minister; and had it not been for that political influence I do not believe the Finance Minister would have done what he did with reference to these bonds. Now, after it has gone to pieces through lack of Government supervision, we are to shoulder the whole loss, then we are to rebuild the whole bridge, and then do what we can, little or more, te get any revenue from it afterwards. These and many other methods of the transaction of public business, alongside with what is to my mind, the utterly reckless extravagance of the government, are making themselves felt in this country, are making themselves felt outside this country, are affecting us here and affecting our country abroad, and I think it is high time that a halt were cailed. The Prime Minister knows he did it, knows the us here and affecting our country abroad, and I think it is high time that a halt were called.

The Dean of Westminster's Sermon

HE following is the conclusion of the ser-mon preached before the Bishops of the Lambeth Conference at Westminster Abbey:
"I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision."—Acts xxvi, 19.

Fathers of the Church of God, it has Fathers of the Church of God, it has seemed to me becoming that, in venturing as a presbyter to address you. I should invite your floughts to the central teachings of the New Testament, and dwell on the Apostolic doctrine of the Church, rather than attempt a survey of our present position and of the various problems which it offers for your consideration. But I ask you to let me make one practical application of the truth which I have tried to expound. I have chosen the subject of Christian Unity because it is, to my thinking, by far the most important that presents itself at the moment of history at which we have now arrived.

The Episcopate was developed in its monarchical form in the course of the second century out of the growing necessities of Christian unity. If we believe that evolution is a Divine law of progress we are no more troubled at not finding a formal Episcopate in New Testament times than at not seeing the oak in the acorn. It came by a Divinely natural necessity; it came when it was wanted, and it remains because it is wanted today. The function of the early Episcopate was the safeguarding of the faith and the preservation of the unity of the Church. These are the two primary elements of the function of the Episcopate today; only to the second we must penitently add the restoration of the unity where it has been lost. It is of happy omen that the two topics of Faith and Unity stand first on the programme of your deliberations. The Episcopate was developed in its monarchic

The reunion of Christendom has sometimes been taken to signify primarily our re-entry into communion with the Churches which still remain subject to Rome and with the Orthodox Churches of the East. These we may not for a moment forget, even though our first duty, as I believe, lies nearer home, and amongst our own kith and kin. We must always be on our guard lest by word or act we give needless offence, and thereby postpone yet further the day of our reconciliation with these ancient branches of Christ's Church. But by almost universal agreement the time of that reconciliation is not now.

I asked a distinguished French ecclesiastic what he thought I might wisely say on this point in presence of the assembled Bishops of the Anglican Communion. He replied, "Do you know the beautiful prayer of our Litany, Oremus pro fratribus nostris absentibus." (Let us pray for our brethren who are absent from us.)"

But our first responsibility unquestionably lies, as I have said, in the direction of our own kith and kin, amongst those who speak the same language and read the same English Bible. The Congress which has recently met has rightly emphasised this side of our responsibility, and wise and large thoughts have found utterance with regard to it. It has shown an unexampled recognition of the work of the Divine Spirit in the Communions which are separated from us, an unexampled desire to learn what they have to us, an unexampled desire to learn what they have to teach us, an unexampled readiness to inquire how reunion might be accomplished on conditions honorable to both sides.

It is plain that we cannot abandon what we have hitherto declared to be the four essential characteristics of our own position—the Holy Scriptures, the two great Creeds, the two great Sacraments, and the historic Episcopate. But we can and ought to recognize that where the first three are found, and where there is also an ordered ministry, guarded by the solemn imposition of hands there our differences are not so much matters of faith as matters of discipline and imposition of hands, there our differences are not so much matters of faith as matters of discipline, and ought with humility and patience to be capable of adjustment. A fuller recognition on the one side of a charismatic ministry, which God has plainly owned and blessed; a fuller recognition on the other side of the permanent value of an episcopacy which has long since ceased to be "a prelacy;" a readiness on both sides to arrive at some temporary agreement which might ultimately issue in a common ministry, regular in the historic sense, though admitting the possibility of separate organizations and exempt jurisdictions—given such recognitions and such readiness, and what a prospect of reconciliation are not what we want. We want apostles of reconciliation—men who have seen "the heavenly vision," and can be content with no lower ideal than the one Body of the Christ. And where have we the right to look for them if not in the Episcopate, the very raison d'eire

of which is the preservation and the restoration of unity? There is danger here in England today lest the ideal of the Episcopate be lowered till it mean no more than the careful shepherding of "a denomination," lest our Bishops exhaust themselves in a multiplicity of beneficient activities which might appropriately be left to their Archdeacons and parish priests. It is indeed all to the good that the whole level of our spiritual life should be raised, as it has been raised in many Dioceses, by the example of this fervent zeal. But oh! bear with me if I say that a larger task awaits you—the task of restoring in each Diocese the broken unity of the Body of Christ. England, America, the Colonies, the Misston-fields—and land, America, the Colonies, the Mission-fields—and the last most pathetically of all—plead with you to rise to the height of your calling as the apostles of reconciliation.

I know that it is urged that if we desire unity, I know that it is urged that it we desire unity, there is no corresponding desire in any of the Communions to which I have referred; that they are well contented to be separate from us, and that they have made no movement towards a corporate reunion. What if it be so? Brethren and Fathers, we have the Vision, if they have it not as yet. We have the Vision, and we have hear set by Providence in the Vision, if they have it not as yet. We have the Vision; and we have been set by Providence in the middle place, between the old and the new, for the very purpose of reconciliation. It is a heavenly, God-sent vision; let us take heed that we be not disobedi-ent to it. It is the will of God; through us, or through others if we prove unworthy, it is destined to be re-alized. "For the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak, and not lie; though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will

And so, Fathers in God, we humbly commend you to the Divine keeping as you enter upon your solemn deliberations, and we turn again to prayer and to the Blessed Sacrament of our unity in the Body of the

A man once asked Thackeray to lend him five shillings, which he would convert into £20,000. Asked how, he explained that he knew a young woman with £20,000 who he knew would marry him if he asked her, but he had pawned his teeth, and wanted five shillings to redeem them, in order to propose effectively.

Teacher (to new pupil): "What's your name?"
New Pupil: "T-t-tommy T-t-thinker."
Teacher: "And do you stutter all the time, Tom-New Pupil: "N-n-no, m-ma'am; o-only when I