

tion of his Clerical Guide in 1879, that is to say, four years after Diocesan organization, and at that date the working staff of the Diocese consisted of 49 clergymen, including one Dean and one Archdeacon. Our present Synodical Report almost doubles that, for we have 77 clergy on the active list, and about 11 on the Otium-cum dignitate shelf; but where the otium merges into the dignitate or vice versa, it is not easy to discover. Instead of one Archdeacon, as in the early days of the Diocese, we have now four, good men and true, every one of them, and valuable in carrying on the work of the Diocese. I remember once congratulating a friend of mine on his appointment to an Archdeaconry, but to my great surprise, he didn't enthuse in the least, and when I asked the cause, he told me that a very great authority had decided that the ultimate salvation of an archdeacon was one of the most doubtful questions in ecclesiastical literature. With such a serious handicap, upon the oculus episcopi, the great body of the clergy may congratulate themselves that, as touching salvation, they are not in the precarious condition of an archdeacon. As the Canons are like the cones, a feeble folk, I hope the salvation of Canons is upon a surer foundation.

In this reminiscent mood, I recall the warm personal letter I received from my old friend, Bishop Hamilton, bearing upon my entrance into this Diocese. At one time we were co-Presbyters in the city of Quebec, where the status of an Anglican clergyman differs considerably from that which obtains in the more western sections of the Dominion. It was a matter of much personal satisfaction to find myself once again associated in the work of the Church with a Bishop so profoundly and genuinely sympathetic as Archbishop Hamilton. He was to his clergy a real "Father in God," and as far removed from the historic type of step-father as light from darkness. Confidences reposed in Bishop Hamilton were held as inviolable as they were sacred. Such reticence often demanded great personal self-repression and restraint; but in the end it was amply justified, and the episcopal office was magnified in the person of the Bishop. During almost the whole of Bishop Ham-