

power are widely different. The Senate of the United States can veto an appointment made by the President, yet they cannot be said to elect Ambassadors. A Bishop has a veto in a Diocesan Synod, but it would be an abuse of language to say that he elects its officers. King John, in his Charter of freedom of Episcopal elections, *ut liberæ sint electiones*, provides that after an election has been performed, his assent should be required, *post celebratam electionem noster requiratur assensus*, yet neither he nor his successors can be said to have elected Bishops under the Charter*. A veto power may be used unfairly by a man or a body of men resolving to veto every name submitted for approval till his or their candidate be reached, and of this we had something very like an instance in the case of the election of a Metropolitan, when the Synod of Montreal vetoed name after name; but such an abuse of a veto power could not by possibility occur under a Canon of Confirmation. Perhaps some members of the Provincial Synod may have been prejudiced against the Canon by Mr. Dawson's way of putting the matter: "A new election in the House of Bishops, over the Diocesan Synod." I thought that in case a new election was made necessary by a veto of the House of Bishops, the new election would be held in the Diocesan Synod, and not in the House of Bishops. Indeed there seems to be a *primâ facie* ground for giving the House of Bishops this veto. If by our Diocesan Legislation, one Bishop may veto a resolution of a Diocesan Synod, why may not a majority of the House of Bishops veto a resolution of that same Synod on an Episcopal election, a resolution carried too at a time when the Synod is without one of its constituent parts—the Bishop, and when the composition of the House of Bishops itself is greatly concerned. Common sense suggests that a case may arise when a revising power external to a Diocesan Synod might be most desirable. Suppose the case of a Priest elected a Bishop by a majority of one vote. Suppose again that the one vote is his own, (this case has really occurred). Add to this the supposition that the Bishop elect has been under grave suspicion of holding heretical doctrine, though nothing has been proved by direct evidence against him. Further suppose that on

* Stubbs, Select Charters, p. 289.