

The Bishop was not asking for a Coadjutor to be appointed *now*, but the vote of the Synod amounted practically to a refusal to allow him such a helper at *any future time*, a decision which could hardly lead to anything but his Lordship's early and unconditional resignation of his See.

We do not think that this was the end that the opponents of the Canon desired to bring about. We cannot think that Churchmen, who have most of them been associated with his Lordship for so long a period, could deliberately have wished either to compel his resignation, or to see him (to use his own expression) crushed into the grave under a burden of work which must soon, in the course of nature, have become more than he could support.

We believe that the votes were given without the issue being understood, and an examination of the arguments used by the various speakers seems to bear out this view.

THE ARGUMENTS.

For first most of the speakers seemed to think that the Bishop was at the very moment applying for a Coadjutor, and this in spite of his Lordship's distinct declaration from the chair, that even if the Canon was confirmed, he had no intention whatever of so applying for some time to come.

And secondly, others opposed the clauses on the ground that by adopting them, they would in some way be legislating away their rights, or would be allowing the Bishop a principal share (which they preferred he should not have) in the appointment of his successor. But there is nothing in the proposed Canon that would give the Bishop any such powers. The Coadjutor is to be elected "by the same rule and under the same conditions as those laid down for the election of a Diocesan Bishop," and that (see clause ii of present Canon) without the Bishop being even present in the electing Synod.

And thirdly, others argued that any appointment of a successor to the See, while our present Bishop is amongst us, would be influenced by him, and a Bishop unacceptable to the bulk of the people would be perhaps selected. But we fail to see how these objectors propose to mend matters by sending our Bishop into retirement. We imagine that the influence he exercises will not be entirely lost the moment he ceases to be our Bishop. We think that there are many members of the Synod who feel more confidence in the ability of Dr. Hills to suggest a suitable successor to the See he has administered so ably and for so long a time, and the needs of which he understands so thoroughly, than they do in their own judgment, and who will therefore most certainly be guided in their actions by his advice, whether he be here or in England.

And fourthly, it was said that one Synod had no right, by appointing a Coadjutor with right of succession (and a Coadjutor without right of succession could not be had) to anticipate what should be the privilege of a future Synod. But this could never be the case. The alternative