Besides the election of a Bishop, other important questions will have to be decided by the assembled clergy and lay-delegates. It is to be presumed that no subject will be discussed except those which bear upon the organization of the diocese, and that all others will be deferred until a regular Diocesan Synod can be summoned. But there are some such questions which must engage the attention of the meeting, and it is of much importance that they should be fully and fairly considered.

The first of these is that question which so unprofitably occupied much valuable time at the last meeting of the Synod of the Diocese of Toronto; namely, the relative rights of clergy and laity in the election of a Bishop. We say, unprofitably; for we cannot see what advantage would accrue to the clergy from confining to them the right of election, and giving to the laity merely a negative or affirmative vote. If there is any advantage we ought not to ask it; for the two houses, the clerical and the lay, ought to meet in Synod on a footing of perfect equality; and if there is no advantage, why raise a question which is sure to excite feelings of jealousy and ill-will. To us indeed it seems that a better mode of proceeding might be adopted; that the Bishops of all Canadian Dioceses should elect the Bishop of any diocese that becomes vacant, and that upon the confirmation of their choice by the clergy and laity of the diocese, lie should be declared elected. Upon the present occasion such a mode of proceeding is, we fear, out of the question; but we still hope, that when the Diocese of Kingston has been organized, and Canada thus obtains a house of five bishops, some such method, which undbubtedly would be the nearest approach to the primitive n.odel, will be adopted.

The next question that will come up, is that of the majority to be required for the successful candidate. The general impression seems to be that in order to a choice, it should be necessary that one of the candidates should obtain a majority of two-thirds of each house. Much may dbubtless be said in favour of this proposition; but it would, generally, be found impossible to elect the most distinguished men among our clergy; and where the number is so small, this is, we conceive, a fatal objection.

It is a fact which we cannot alter, even if we should desire it, that there are, and always have

been, two different schools of theology,—for we will not call them parties,—in the Church. And it is a fact that the ablest, the most devoted, the most zealous men, are found among the foremost champions of one or the other of these schools. The men who hover in vague uncertainty between the two, are generally men of no fixed principles, no energy, activity, or usefulness. We say generally, for there may, of course, be exceptions.

Now if the two-thirds rule be adopted, it will, in practice, be found impossible to elect any one of these able, devoted, and zealous men; and we shall have to compromise by uniting upon a man who is unobjectionable, simply because he has no marked character or opinions. No; let us have for our Bishop the best man of whichever school has the numerical majority. The simple majority is, we take it, the ancient and natural rule by which all electoral assemblies, except the college of cardinals, have been ever guided.

There is a third question to be settled; namely, the persons among the clergy to whom the right of voting is to be extended. With regard to those who have a distinct parochial charge, there is of course no question. But it is uncertain whether this right should be given to those who are superannuated, and to assistant ministers. We would withhold it from the one and grant it to the other; and that upon the same broad principle. We would withhold it from superannuated clergymen, because they have really no longer any interest (except such interest as every member of the Church has) in the character of their Bishop; they do not necessarily come into contact with him, or have any intercourse with him. We would give it to assistant ministers because they, on the other hand, liave perhaps the strongest interest of all in the character of their Bishop; they are most dependent upon him; and their comfort, success, and happiness in their ministerial career will be very much influenced by his character.

We have briefly touched upon the subjects which must necessarily come up for discussion on the 13th of May, in order that such of our readers as will bear a part in that discussion may have time for mature and calm reflection, which in the heat of a debate is not always possible. And we would be permitted to give one necessary caution. Let them not be de-