

revolved. The feature of the American Church which most strikes a looker-on, is, notwithstanding its high episcopal pretensions, the real practical congregationalism which percolates through all American institutions. Against this the episcopate presents only a personal idea. It is a perambulatory thing, lacking the charm which gathers round "a local habitation and a name." It is not in harmony with the catholic rule. The Canadian church has already made two false steps in establishing a bishopric of Huron and of Ontario; but in both of these instances the See has a cathedral church in the chief city, whose name the See should have taken. It is not desirable to follow any later exceptional instances, but to adhere to the long established universal rule.

And this brings us to the real difficulty of the case. Montreal is a Metropolitan See in ecclesiastical rank. "*Episcopus et Metropolitanus*" is inscribed on the back of the *Cathedra* in Christ Church, Montreal; remove one, remove both. We have here a cathedral city and a cathedral church; but the latter is nothing more than a fashionable proprietary church, having a foundation (so far as it is one) which may at any moment bring on a serious collision between the cathedral and parochial parts. It may be found impossible to have the Rector and Dean in one person, or the Clergy, who are really only stipendary curates of the vestry, to be appointed Canons. Or the Canons of the Cathedral, which are Diocesan offices, may be got rid of by the vestry. There is a great deal of unreality about the whole arrangement. But there is no unreality about the possible scandals that may arise; those are real enough. I myself have watched the Cathedral with an affectionate interest, until the recent scandals have made it impossible to do so. I can see no further room for hope that it can ever possess the confidence of the Diocese under its present foundation. Still I have hoped that things would settle down at least into quietness and peace. But when I find that a proposal to revolutionize our ecclesiastical system is now emanating from Christ Church vestry, it seems to me that it would only be a just retribution if the Cathedral were removed entirely to another foundation. Churchmen who would be willing to yield all due respect to a *bona fide* Cathedral foundation, would yet be most unwilling to yield the same deference to a proprietary vestry, the real ruling power in Christ Church, Montreal. The Cathedral of the Diocese should be a Diocesan, not a parochial, church, least of all a proprietary one. Many of our recent troubles have proceeded from that church. If a new trouble is to be brought in, and a change proposed in regard to the Metropolitan See, would not the best change be that Christ Church should cease to be, not only Metropolitan, but Cathedral; that the Bishop (in whose power it is) should remove his Cathedral to another foundation, more satisfactory to the Diocese at large, and non-proprietary?

And in order to put a stop to these agitations for change, and to attach the Metropolitan office by a permanent title to Montreal, I would venture to