

stitute for election by the Bishop's clergy and lay delegates representing the Diocese at large. And thus, because the Bishop knows best, carry his doctrine a little further; adopt the autocratic principle in its entirety; and the Synod may cease to meet. Its functions, except as a body to register whatever the Bishop knows best, are at end.

In effect, then, what is proposed, is to take from the clergy and lay delegates the choice of their future Bishops and to rest the appointment in the Bishop for the time being.

Let us understand this clearly.

And now, will "Canon" look a little to his facts. Why will he assert positively so much that is quite untrue.

1.—"Eirenicon" and "Loyalty" are not the same as you can easily attest. "Eirenicon" does not even know who "Loyalty" may be. "Canon" must have strange views of editorial management, if he supposes that the editors of a respectable paper would allow a correspondent thus to double himself.

2.—Is "Canon" quite sure that about 63 out of 70 of the clergy, and 3 out of four of the laity see just as he does in the matter?

3.—"Canon" alleges that in 1865 Diocesan Election was "so new and untried a thing" that "doubt and misgiving as to how it would work" led to the peculiar form of the canon under which Bishop Oxenden was appointed.

In point of fact Bishops Cronyn of Huron, Lewis of Ontario, and Williams of Quebec, had then been elected by the Synods of their respective Dioceses, and sat in the very Provincial Synod of 1865 which framed the canon in question.

What really led to the peculiar canon of 1865 was the desire to confine the Metropolitanate to Montreal. The Synod of Montreal desired that it should continue the Metropolitan See. Their right to elect their own Bishop was already conceded.

The House of Bishops claimed, however, the choice of their Metropolitan.

A joint committee of the House of Bishops and the Synod of Montreal proposed to compromise the difficulty by allowing the Bishops to present a name to the Synod for approval, and on rejection, another *ad infinitum*.

The Synod, on receiving their report, altered this so that the Bishops were required to present two or more names for approval or rejection.

In this form the canon passed.

A like canon was proposed for the election of a Co-Adjutor Bishop of Montreal, with right of succession, but rejected by the House of Bishops.

Until Bishop Fulford's death in 1868 the canon adopted remained imperative.

Meantime Bishops Bethune of Toronto, and Hellmuth of Huron, were chosen by their Synods under the system of free election.

But on Bishop Fulford's death an election on the really "new and untried principle" of choice and negative, now again proposed, for the first time took place. Let us hope also for the last.

Results:—1. A protracted struggle without result, and an adjournment. 2. Another struggle, and the choice and approval of a comparative stranger, Bishop Oxenden. 3. The repeal of the canon, now tried and found wanting, at the next session of the Provincial Synod.

The principle of free election contained in the canon already enacted by the Synod of Fredericton has been tried in the elections of the present Bishops of Quebec, Montreal, Ontario, Huron, and Niagara, and, in some instances, of their predecessors.

The principle of nomination and rejection contained in the proposed canon has been tried but once, and then only to be found wanting and condemned.

4.—The Bishop of Fredericton will scarcely thank "Canon" for putting in his mouth such words as these, "In other Dioceses . . . in nearly every case . . . a man whose qualifications and person have been unknown to all but

a very few in the Synod, has been elected by the strongest partizanship, or the most glaring ignorance." Well done, "Canon."

Curiously enough, Bishops Cronyn, Lewis, Williams, Bethune, Hellmuth, Fuller, and Bond have all been chosen from their own Dioceses, and Bishop Sweatman will scarcely be spoken of as one whose qualifications and person were unknown.

The only "unknown" person elected a Bishop in Canada has been Oxenden, taken from England in 1865 similar to that now proposed.

5.—I must not further trespass on your space except to point out that, although Bishop Oxenden's election was undoubtedly to a vacant diocese, the clause in the proposed canon which gives an absolute right of succession to the Co-Adjutor Bishop makes the present case a very similar one. In Montreal the Bishops, (not one but four), chose, and the clergy and lay delegates first negatived and at last reluctantly approved, to a diocese already vacant. In Fredericton it is proposed that the Bishop shall choose and the clergy and lay delegates approve a person to succeed to the see immediately on its becoming so.

EIRENICON.

CANON FOR A CO-ADJUTOR.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—I trust you will allow me sufficient space to answer "Churchman's" letter, published in your issue of the 11th inst., in order that I may show how very far from correct is his assertion that the proposed Canon interferes with rights possessed by Clergy and Laity; and that a Co-Adjutor Bishop, with the right of succession, is uncanonical, and was unknown to the Early Church.

I am quite willing, and I am very sure all who favor the adoption of the Canon will be willing to discuss the question from the standpoint suggested by "Churchman", in the following sentence:—"The proper course to pursue, in such matters, is to consider well every measure that is submitted to the Synod, and to vote against the passage of anything that is either uncanonical or contrary to the interests of the Church."

We are quite prepared, I say, to accept this position, and it has been because those favoring the Canon wished the question discussed—not in the newspapers, nor in highly coloured and inflammatory pamphlets, containing *ex parte* statements, grossly at variance with the facts, but—calmly and dispassionately, on the floor of the Synod, there to be judged on its merits, that they have for so long a time preserved silence, until, at last, silence ceased to be a virtue; and inspired solely with the desire to place themselves right before the Church at large, they have been compelled, though reluctantly, to enter the arena of newspaper controversy.

Such a sentence as that just quoted from "Churchman's" letter, comes, therefore, with very bad grace from a party which has not been too particular with regard to the means employed in prejudicing the minds of the Clergy and Laity against the Bishop and the proposed Canon, and so in having the case prejudged before it could come up regularly and constitutionally for discussion in the Synod.

But now, to a consideration of "Churchman's" serious charges. How dare "Churchman" make assertions of so damaging a character, if true, without being able to sustain them with substantial proof? The bald assertion he has boldly made, but when we come to look for the proof, what do we find? A quotation from "Dr. Smith's Dictionary of Antiquities," advanced presumably in good faith, and, therefore, made in ignorance of the fact that the passage has reference to a case altogether different, in certain impor-

tant particulars, from the one now before the Church in this Diocese. "Churchman" should have known that, as a rule, Co-Adjutor Bishops were neither nominated nor elected by the people in the Early Church; indeed, as a matter of fact, that the people knew nothing whatever of the affair until it was all over; and that they were simply appointments of the Bishops themselves, who made the selection, and consecrated by the imposition of their own individual hands. (See Dr. Smith's Dictionary, page 227.) It may surprise "Churchman" still further to learn, that this same Dictionary of Dr. Smith, upon which he builds his case, says, under "Bishop" "Election," page 213:—"The election of Bishops pertained from the beginning to the neighbouring Bishops and to the Clergy and Laity of the particular Church. But the relative rights of each class of electors were apparently determined, not only by express enactment, but by Apostolic practice, defended in the first instance by Jewish precedent. The judgment, commonly the choice, and the ratification naturally inclined to the Bishops, so that for the first 500 years such elections were ordinarily ruled by them. The approval and the testimony to character, were the more proper office of the Clergy and Laity of the diocese itself. While the formal appointment, which included the ordination, belonged exclusively as to the Apostles at the first, so to them who succeeded to that office, viz., the Bishops."

So that, as it is here plainly proven, even Diocesan Bishops were not nominated by the Laity, or by the Clergy of the vacant Diocese, but by the Bishops of the Ecclesiastical Province; and it was under this precedent that the nomination to the vacant See of Montreal, to which "Eirenicon" alluded, was placed in the House of Bishops.

It was because the people had no voice whatever in the choice of a Co-Adjutor Bishop, either as regards selection or approval, that, in the Early Church, in the cases referred to by Dr. Smith, and quoted by "Churchman," it was held, and very justly and rightly so, too, no doubt, that such Co-Adjutors could not properly succeed to the Bishopric. But how entirely different is it with the Canon now before the people and Synod of Fredericton. In the present case, the Bishop nominates, and the name is to be voted upon by the Clerical and Lay Delegates, whose votes elect him, thus keeping closely to the very best form of primitive practice in the case of an ordinary election to the Episcopate.

But if this explanation places "Churchman" in a false and ridiculous position, what will be thought of his unguarded and reckless statement that, "if there is one point upon which the ancient history of our Church is clearer than another, it is that such appointments (*i. e.*, Co-Adjutor Bishops with the right of succession) were uncanonical and forbidden?"

Enough has already been said to show what was the ordinary practice with reference to Co-Adjutor Bishops in the Primitive Church, and why it was that Dr. Smith's Dictionary of Antiquities very properly declares that the general sense of the Church was against such men becoming successors of the Bishops after their death. This is the class which "Churchman" has been making so much ado about; but, as I have already shown, these cases are not at all analogous to the present one, seeing that, according to the proposed Canon, the Bishop of the Diocese nominates, while the Clerical and Lay Delegates elect; which action represents another class of Co-Adjutors to which I wish now to refer.

That such a course as this now proposed in Fredericton was sometimes practiced in the Early Church, and that certain Co-Adjutors, whose names had been formally endorsed by the people, were consecrated to assist the Bishops while living, and, when they should die, to be their successors, can easily be sustained by the following extract from

"Bingham," an authority no student of Ecclesiastical history will question.

He says, chap. 13, section 4—"To these" (*i. e.*, certain exceptions to the common rule of having but one Bishop in a city) "we may add a third exception in a case that is more plain, which was that of the Co-Adjutors. These were such Bishops as were ordained to assist some other Bishops, in case of infirmity or old age, and were to be subordinate to them as long as they lived, and succeed them when they died." And after citing seven such cases, he adds:—"These instances are evident proof that it was not thought contrary to the true sense of the Canon (*i. e.*, the Nicene,) in case of infirmity or old age; to have Co-adjutors in the Church."

I should like to say a great deal more, and quote a great deal more from both Dr. Smith and Bingham, in support of our Bishop's position, but my letter is already far too long, and so I must reserve what further I have to say for another occasion, should opportunity offer.

CANON.

A CO-ADJUTOR BISHOP.

To the Editors of the Church Guardian.

SIRS,—Churchmen of the Diocese of Nova Scotia are not so directly interested in the proposed Canon, shortly to be submitted to the New Brunswick Synod, as our fellow-Churchmen in the latter Province, but the election of one who may occupy a seat in the House of Bishops, is a matter of great moment to all Canadian Churchmen.

I do not think a better plan could have been conceived for avoiding the grave scandals which have distressed and alarmed so many of us.

I allude particularly to the elections of the late Metropolitan, and the present Bishops of Toronto and Montreal.

I was present at the election of Dean Bond, and I trust, never again to witness such a scene. All the machinery of a political contest was in full running order. Caucuses, personal canvassing, inflammatory appeals, and the most uncharitable attacks upon those who differed from Dean Bond, were all unsparingly used.

I was mistaken for a member of the Synod, and at the door of the Synod Hall, I was handed a fly-sheet, stating that if the Dean were not elected, the Diocesan funds for Missionary purposes would be lessened; and it was pointed out to me that the members of St. George's congregation alone could, by withholding their subscriptions, cause such a deficit as would necessitate a great reduction in the salaries of many of the clergy.

The disgraceful scenes at Toronto are too fresh in our recollection to be forgotten—a repetition of them will place a great strain upon those who desire to remain loyal to the Church of England in Canada.

For thirty four years, the Bishop of Fredericton has administered the affairs of his diocese, and now, when age is coming upon him, and he finds his strength unequal to his work, he desires assistance.

As a highminded English gentleman, and a Divine, whose acquaintance with Ecclesiastical history is not second to that of any other in his Diocese, he shrinks from being a partaker in such scenes as those of Toronto and Montreal; and so he has proposed a Canon, which, if adopted, will give peace to the Church, and protect the rights of every Priest and Layman in his Diocese.

I cannot think that his Synod will abandon their Bishop, and leave him in his old age to struggle under a load of work too heavy for him to bear.

And there is another consideration, I trust, will not be forgotten. The same people who forced Dean Bond upon the Diocese of Montreal, threaten legal proceedings against Bishop Medley to com-