

“reached, that I have even seen a squib quite unworthy of so sacred a subject, but published in highly respectable journals, in which the different candidates for the Bishopric were described as race-horses, in a series of articles entitled ‘The Race for the Mitre;’ and in another election I read in a Canadian newspaper : ‘The issue of the election goes to show that the system is not adapted to our institutions. One and all agree that the power to choose our Bishops is an unmitigated evil on this side of the Atlantic. It is most demoralizing in its tendencies.’”

In the same address our late Bishop expressed his own opinion on our present Canon in the following decided manner : “As to our own Diocese, we are already in a different position from the rest, in consequence of the office of Metropolitan being attached to it. Our Synod does not claim the full power of election ; but the House of Bishops nominates, and the Synod assents or dissents. I own that, as far as my own feelings go, I cannot but wish that we may see other Dioceses follow this example, as I think it would tend to augment the dignity, respectability, and efficiency of the Church, and to do away with what certainly are the evils of a popular election for the holder of so high and so holy an office.”

These are the traditions of our mother Church which endowed this See, and which yet contributes large sums to the support of our clergy. Great deference is due to these traditions, for every link which binds us to our mother Church should be carefully guarded, and, in the words of the patent, our See is subordinate to the Archbishop of Canterbury. But it is a mistake to suppose that in the sister Church of the United States even a Diocesan election is quite untrammelled. The following Canon shows that no one can become a Bishop even there without the consent of a majority of their General Convention and their House of Bishops :—