

in which there has not been, in the course of a few years, a large increase in the number of clergy and parishes. And I firmly believe, if only we have faith in ourselves and in our principles, and if we are *led on* by our natural leaders as we ought to be, that what has been done in the past would be done again. Let us in our work have a "free hand," and not be crippled by any useless traditions of comparatively modern days.

(5) We need not fear that the decrease in the size and income of a bishopric would lessen the dignity and respect due to the episcopal office. The great bishop of New Zealand was never more highly thought of throughout England than when his stipend was stopped by the government of the day, which left him literally, as he said, "in the apostolic succession of poverty, but yet a Christian bishop with his face to his duty." When men are devoted to their work, when they are examples of zeal and self-denial, even if they are poor, we need not fear that they will be despised. On the contrary, "they will be very highly esteemed in love for their work's sake." It is by personal self-denial that the greatest triumphs of the cross have been won.

In advocating the wider extension of the episcopate, I am but advocating the policy of one who had a statesman's eye for the future, and who laid down a programme. The highly respected honorary lay secretary of our synod has informed me that "soon after the first organization of the diocese of Toronto, Bishop Strachan planned its subdivision into the Eastern District (Ontario), the Central District (Toronto), the Western District (Huron), and the Northern District (St. Mary's); most of which was carried out in the bishop's lifetime. The synod of this diocese moved further in this matter in 1873, and by a unanimous vote recommended the division of the then existing but reduced diocese of Toronto into four, viz., the Western District (Niagara), the Central District (Peterborough), and the Northern District (St. Mary's or Algoma), all of which has been accomplished except in the case of Peterborough; and this part of the programme was not carried out owing to the fact that a conference was ordered with a committee of the diocese of Ontario with a view to including several counties in the western portion of that diocese in the proposed new see of Peterborough—which conference has never taken place." In the meantime, the diocese of Toronto has not decreased in the number of its clergy and parishes, while more than one of its daughter dioceses has surpassed the mother diocese in numerical strength and power. But, with our past experience, why have we stood still in this matter for the last twenty years?

There is a widespread feeling that it is now full time to take another step forward and

move for the creation of several new centres of diocesan work, and a consequent extension of our ecclesiastical work. We wish our bishops to give the word of command, *and march with us, at our head*. We want to follow in the steps of those who have preceded us in the faith. In our generation, we wish to do what famous men before us have done, so that those who come after us may see that the men of 1893 have the same purpose as the men of 1873 and 1853, and mean to carry it out in the wider extension of the Church in her full organization. "The recent census returns," says *The Evangelical Churchman*, "reveal the fact that there are many thousands of people who profess and call themselves churchmen who, as far as the pastors of the Church are concerned, are lost sheep of the Church of England. This fact is a reproach to our whole parochial system. It calls for instant remedy. The bishops, clergy, and laity must rise to the occasion, and, like the Great Shepherd, go forth to the sheep scattered abroad and without a shepherd. . . .

. . . We dare not say that they are to be left without the privileges of the Gospel because of apparent lack of men and means when God has laid the burden upon us. When God gives the work, He is ready to provide both men and means."

(6) Now, what is "the lion in the way" which seems to block all progress for a while? It appears to be the difficulty of raising what is thought by some to be a sufficient endowment. In an adjoining diocese where, since its erection, the clergy have increased in number from 45 to 132, and where the churches have increased from 50 to 300, and where for fifteen years the bishop has favored a subdivision, the matter has hung fire for the last ten years; and *all for want of an endowment*. At a public meeting held a short time ago that bishop is reported to have said "that the necessary ecclesiastical legislation had passed, and that all that is wanted is to raise the endowment of \$40,000, and when that was raised he would call a meeting of the synod to elect a bishop for the eight eastern counties of the present diocese." But I am not aware of the existence of any canon of the Provincial Synod which makes an endowment of a new diocese a necessity; and I am unable to recognize the right of the bishops in their private capacity virtually to block the extension of the Church by insisting upon the creation of a large endowment of \$40,000 before they will agree to the erection of a new see, or consent to the consecration of an additional bishop. We do not read that St. Paul stipulated that a similar sum should be invested before he consecrated Timothy for the see of Ephesus, or Titus for the diocese of Crete. We do not insist on an endowment before extending our *parochial* organization. In this matter the clergy of the second order