

tionships? And we whose office it is to adjust the activities of the Church to the living situation—yes, remember, that is your calling and mine—what are we doing to make the Church adequately a voice of warning, of authority, of instruction to a perverse and evil generation? There must be an order of preachers and prophets, there must be a centre of operations, there must be a directing mind, there must be adequate training—in one word there must be that which nothing else but the cathedral, not merely as a building, but supremely as an institution (an infinitely more august and important aspect of the whole question let me say) can adequately supply.

(d) And that brings me finally to remind you that we want the cathedral as the home and centre of the work of the bishop. There is a tone with reference to the episcopate which one often hears in our generation concerning which it is difficult to say whether it is more grotesque as an anachronism or as an imbecility. It is the tone which is fond of depicting the modern bishop as an ecclesiastical tyrant—self-willed, overbearing and imperious. Dear brethren, this ogre is a creature simply and purely of the imagination. He does not exist, simply because he cannot exist. The days of a "paternal" government, in the technical sense of that term, are, in the history of bishops, forever ended. We have come to the days of a constitutional episcopate. I do not need, I think, to explain that phrase to those to whom I speak this morning. In the capital of this great commonwealth it is eminently appropriate and suggestive. A constitutional episcopacy is an episcopacy "tempered" if you choose, not by congregationalism, or parochialism, but by constitutional law. Such law we have (a) in the constitution and canons of the several dioceses, and (b) in the constitution and canons of the General Convention. To these the bishop is subject in precisely the same way, and certainly in as large measure as the youngest deacon. And if these are not sufficient to restrain him, it is competent to invoke, in matters that touch the material interests of them over whom the bishop is set, the common law.

In a word, whatever may be anybody's theory of the inherent powers of the episcopate, they are limited and hedged in at every hand by the prescriptions and restrictions of law. To these, in the administration of his office, the bishop must have perpetual reference, and in construing and applying them lies a large part of his responsibility. But, plainly enough, he needs in so doing counsel and co-operation. Indeed, when a bishop enjoins anything of a dubious character unsupported by the voice of his clergy, he acts on lines unknown to the primitive Church, even as the maxim of St. Jerome plainly indicates when it says: "Let the bishop do nothing without his presbyters." How, now, is such counsel to be had? Do you answer through the diocesan convention, or the Standing Committee? The one body is too large and too unwieldy; the other is too small and too remote. The former statement requires no proof; the truth of the latter becomes obvious when you remember that the Standing Committee is made up usually of members from all parts of the diocese rarely convened, and that its members are largely engrossed with local and parochial interests which are, to most of them, not unnaturally, supreme. What we wait for, especially in the due administration of our young dioceses, is the cathedral chapter to be the cabinet of the bishop, to be made up of preachers, missionaries, rectors, canons and scholars, each one of whom shall have a double tie, first to the cathedral, and then to some mission field, to some outlying cure, to some organized parish, to some college, or school, or seminary, to and fro between which they shall go upon a service regulated by rule (canons), and in all of which the bishop shall preside as a guiding, restraining, inspiring mind. This I maintain is the restoration of the lost ideal of the episcopate, whereby his office and his seat become of paramount importance to the whole diocese, as expressing and impressing his influence, as binding together the active life of the diocese not only in one polity, but in one policy, as the centre of institutions which surround the cathedral and grow out of it, even as in this instance, thank God, they preceded the building of this cathedral church.

And does any one apprehend that this will issue in the undue enlargement of the bishop's prerogatives and powers? On the contrary I maintain that it is at once the wisest and the safest way to limit them. No diocese will readily consent that the cathedral chapter shall be other than equitably representative. No convention will be apt to put itself in the power of a body which does not reflect more than one aspect of thought or one type of policy. And no bishop, unless he be more than obtuse to those inexorable facts which confront one in this era of Christendom, will care to attempt to surround himself with a college of advisers which shall be pledged simply to register his own decrees. The day for that has passed, never to return. And yet, for lack of points of contact with his diocese, a bishop may so drift out of touch with its living interests and aims, as to be

merely an isolated functionary, impotent as a ruler, and more than impotent as a leader. I wish I had time here to show how in our mother Church of England this could be demonstrated from the usurpations of the monastic order, where the abbot thrust himself into the place of the bishop, and where to-day the dean, who has inherited the abbot's place and powers, has neutralized the office of the bishop in his own seat, and stultified the purpose of the cathedral chapter.

But we are hampered by no such traditions. Ours it is, if we will consent to see the need of that more adequate organization of the episcopate which the growth of the Church demands, to create such centres of administration in cathedral foundations, that in addressing ourselves to those new tasks which every day loom up before us in such vast proportions, there shall be the due recognition and utilization of the episcopate as the organic centre of the Church's aggressive life.

And so I thank God for what has been accomplished here. Noble as is this fabric both in what has been completed, and what is projected, it is but a small part of the whole. The great idea which lies behind it—an idea which rescues the episcopate from isolation, from the errors of individualism, and so from comparative impotence, this is the thing of supreme consequence and of pre-eminent promise.

And I congratulate you, my brother, that in the good providence of God it has been permitted to you, and to the loyal and loving flock that have prayed and striven and given with you, to achieve so much. I do not find it easy to put into words my hearty admiration for a faith which has never faltered, for endeavors that have never tired, for a patience that, as I have watched, I may not be denied the privilege of saying, even in this presence, has seemed to ennoble your whole nature. No one knows better than I do, the difficulties you have had to encounter. I was born and reared in what is now the Diocese of Albany, and was intimate with its traditions long before you came to it. Some of my most intimate and cherished personal friends are among those who, in this whole undertaking, have been most remote from sympathy with you. But they must suffer me to say—what I think they would some of them be glad to have me say—that your meekness and gentleness, in the face of much criticism and often opposition, your generous magnanimity under circumstances of discouragement and alienation, have, as it seems to me, only made you more and more worthy of our common love and respect. You have held to your own opinions and have advocated them with a courage which is worthy of all praise; and if you have differed with some of your brethren whose sympathies, like those of your preacher, you have deemed so large that they were in danger of becoming loose, you have not suffered either the odium *theologicum* or the *amor cathedralis* to embitter your speech or your temper. Above all, you have striven here, as we rejoice to believe, not for yourself, but for God and the honor of His Church, and so we bless God to-day that you have not striven in vain.

May God make this sacred shrine of your own and your people's hopes and affections, the place of His abiding! May you be spared to finish what, to His glory, you have so worthily begun! To this House of the Lord may the tribes go up, even the tribes of your Israel. Here is the seat of judgment, even the seat of the House of David. May God long spare you to fill it. And hither, also, may there never cease to come the burdened hearts that hunger for the bread of life, and rest, and peace, and may they never fail to find them.

Home & Foreign Church News.

From our own Correspondents.

DOMINION.

MONTREAL.

MONTREAL.—His Lordship has been pleased to appoint the Rev. Wm. Ross Brown, L.S.T., Incumbent of Masonville, Rural Dean of Brome, in succession to the late Rev. John Smith. Mr. Brown has been a faithful and hardworking priest of this diocese, remaining in it although having had offers of parishes in Ontario several times. The appointment gives general satisfaction to the deanery, as it is considered a due and just recognition of his services on the part of the Bishop.

Church Censures.—The Rev. Dr. Norton, rector of Christ Church Cathedral, last Sunday morning preached on "Party Spirit in the Diocese of Montreal," taking for a text 1 Timothy iii. 15: "How thou oughtest to behave thyself in the Church of the

living God." In the course of his remarks he said: "As members of the Divine and Apostolic Society," called in my text "the Church of the living God," we have special duties and responsibilities towards the Church and towards her members. The faithful preacher, in expounding God's word, must sometimes advert to these subjects. The recent meeting of our Diocesan Synod, and the approaching session of the Provincial Synod in September, naturally turn our thoughts in this direction.

Of course I am aware that some of you are thinking of the narrow-minded and foolish boycotts which exclude the representatives of this Cathedral Church from the Provincial Synod. But in this exclusion we are not alone. Clergymen and laymen of marked ability, who have grown gray in the service of this diocese, have shared the same fate. It is an honor to be their companions. But some of you ask what you are to do. I answer calmly: Possess your souls and do your duty liberally and lovingly for Christ's sake to the Diocesan Mission Fund and all other branches of church work just as if nothing had occurred. Do not despair of or judge too harshly the rank and file of those who have done this wrong. Remember that Montreal is changing as fast as it can. Many of those who are now against us will in a few years be on our side. The old crude, uncharitable principles, which in truth are not church principles at all, but remnants of a tyrannical and now almost defunct Puritanism, are rapidly disappearing. The majority of those who profess them seem to have become half ashamed of them, and the far more truly Evangelical and Catholic principles of the church herself are taking their place. The change is widespread and unmistakable. During the past five years notable events have occurred in four parishes in this city, proclaiming with no uncertain sound the direction in which intelligent lay opinion in Montreal is moving. This boycott, by disgusting hundreds of right-minded persons, is effectively spreading more liberal and kindly principles. Therefore, be patient and watch hopefully the good which God is bringing out of evil. But above all things imitating the tactics which you condemn. If we ourselves do right we can exercise a good personal influence on many others. This leads me to my next point: There must be no party spirit amongst us. Conscientious differences of opinion and of method there always must be in a church like ours, which wisely allows wide liberty of thought and action in matters not essential to salvation, but such differences are not party spirit. Again, I do not commend extreme views of any kind; nevertheless, you may, and you ought to, zealously advance your own views; you may prefer the society and co-operation of men like-minded with yourself and may often act in concert with them, and yet you may be totally free from party spirit. For you may recognize that those loyal churchmen who differ from you are entitled to brotherly consideration and even-handed justice. As every child in a family is entitled to justice, nurture and love in the parental home, so every churchman has a right to receive similar treatment in his spiritual home "the Church of the Living God." The harsh maxims and doubtful expedients of worldly politics should have no place amongst us. He is not a good son who intrigues against and bullies his younger brothers, and endeavours to drive them from their father's house. But this is very much what the party man does in the Church. God's work recognizes and condemns the moral turpitude of party spirit in the plainest and most solemn language. On the night of his betrayal Our Lord prayed against this sin: that "all" his disciples might be "one" in visible unity and love; that the world might believe in his divine mission. The Holy Ghost severely censured the Corinthians for having party "divisions," "contentions," and "factions" in the church. Such things are a breach of that divine "charity" or "love," without which the most eloquent and gifted churchman is no better than a "sounding brass or clanging cymbal." In Galatians v. 20, we learn that "factions," "divisions," "parties," in the church are among those "works of the flesh," of which the Holy Ghost forewarns us "that they which practice such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Of course unspiritual and unloving men have quite a host of carnal and prudential reasons for persisting in this sin, as they have for persisting in other sins, but their worldly reasons will not save their souls from guilt and condemnation. I understand that for many years previous to 1886, party spirit was repressed, or at least kept in check in our Diocesan Synod. The different schools of thought within the diocese allowed to each other a representation in proportion to their number in the Provincial Synod and in other branches of church work and responsibility. At the Diocesan Synod in that year—1886—a notable incident occurred. The late Hon. Thos. White, holding a caucus ticket above his head, denounced in strong and indignant language the framers of the ticket, as guilty of an act of injustice and violating the good understanding which had existed for many years between the different sections