

ticle of evidence to prove that it was ever considered right to grant the right of succession to Co-Adjutors elected in any form.

The authorities I have referred to give numerous instances of Co-Adjutor Bishops, some elected by the Bishop alone, and others in a great variety of ways, in many of which elections the people also took a part. Yet knowing all this we find the article on "Bishops" in Dr. Smith's Dictionary winding up with this unmistakable impression: "*Co-Adjutors with right of succession were forbidden*;" and further on in the same book the article on "Coadjutor Bishops" commences in this manner: "*Co-Adjutor Bishops with a right of succession was distinctly against Canon*;" and I maintain that the whole sense of the legislation in the early Church was against allowing the Bishops any rights in connection with the appointment of their successors. Dr. Smith is evidently of this opinion when he refers (page 220) to Conc. Rom. A.D. 606, which he says "in order to prevent Bishops nominating their own successors forbids election until the third day after the last Bishop's death." And on page 228 we find the following to the same effect: "And Pope Boniface III. in a Roman Council A.D. 606, forbade any formal discussion about a successor to a deceased Bishop until the third day after his decease, the clergy being assembled and the sons of the Church, then the election should be made."

In regard to what your correspondent says about the nomination of Diocesan Bishops, I would suggest to him that he had better read the whole article to which he refers in Smith's Dictionary, extending from page 213 to page 219, and he will find that the practice he refers to was not universal, and only pertained for a certain length of time. And if he wants a still more reliable guide as to what is the right course to adopt in such elections let him refer to his Bible, and he will there find (Acts i. 15-26) that when the election of an Apostle became necessary in the place of Judas the nomination was not claimed by the other Apostles nor by their leader, St. Peter, but was conceded to "the disciples," who nominated two persons, of whom they themselves elected one, viz., Matthias, and he was numbered with the Apostles, and became one of them. Surely if the right of nomination was not claimed by or for St. Peter in the case referred to, it is not necessary to grant it now to the Bishop of Fredericton in the election of his Co-Adjutor. Let us rather follow the scriptural plan and leave the nomination with the people.

In regard to the pamphlet, as I was one of the number of Churchmen in this city who drew it up, it is not for me to pass any opinion upon it. I may say, however, that the object kept constantly in view by its framers was to state fully and fairly the whole case, giving the arguments *pro and con*, and entirely free from personalities or party expressions. As to whether they succeeded in this I leave its readers to judge. If the statements contained therein were "exparte and grossly at variance with the facts" as asserted by "Canon," I think it would have been promptly answered, and "Canon" would have been one of the first to attack it. But, on the contrary, up to this time no attempt has been made to refute its arguments, and the inference, to my mind, is plain that it is practically unanswerable. The coming debate in the Synod will, I suppose, show us anything further that can be said on the other side of the question, and we can then judge for ourselves. As to the discussion of the matter outside of the Synod, I entirely repudiate "Canon's" idea, which apparently is that because in New Brunswick we have a Diocesan Synod to which each Parish sends delegates, therefore Churchmen generally are to be debarred from discussing, either in meetings or print, such important questions in relation to the Church as the present. And I trust the day is far distant when such "Synodical tyranny" will prevail in this

Diocese. Evidently St. John people do not think as "Canon" does, for there have been numerous meetings both of clergy and laity, here on the subject during the past three months. At the last meeting of the clergy in the Deanery of the County of St. John this was the subject fixed for discussion by them, and only yesterday the Rector of St. Paul's gave public notice in the Church that in compliance with a written request handed to him by the Parishioners, a meeting would be held in the School House on Thursday evening next to discuss the subject. It is highly gratifying to find laymen particularly taking such a lively interest in the affairs of the Church, and it is to be hoped that the action of the Synod in this important matter will be such as to *increase* and not *decrease* that interest.

One word more, and I have done for the present. "Canon" boldly states that 63 out of 70 of the clergy are in favor of the Canon as proposed by the Bishop. Whoever has been "prospecting" for him has made a sad mistake in the figures. Why in this Deanery alone the clergy are in the proportions of 3 to 1 against it!!! And the lay delegates are similar in number. I notice "Canon" speaks more cautiously about the lay delegates throughout the Province. He well may, for he will find, when the voting takes place in the Synod, that an immense majority of them will vote against the Canon.

CHURCHMAN.

P. S.—I must not neglect to call "Canon's" attention to the fact that he entirely forgot (!) his intention, as announced in the opening sentence of his letter, of proving that I was incorrect in asserting "that the proposed Canon would interfere with the present rights of the clergy and laity." Perhaps "Canon" has changed his opinion on this point.

A CO-ADJUTOR BISHOP.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—One would imagine from the zealous and untiring manner in which the opponents of the proposed Canon for the election of a Co-Adjutor Bishop have utilized every means of building up the cause, that they were conscious of its weakness. We were, in the first place, favoured with Mr. Jarvis' letter, which was circulated very extensively, only to be followed by the "Pamphlet," to which your correspondent "Churchman" refers as "embodying the arguments that exist against the terms of the proposed Canon." The anxiety, too, which the opponents of the Canon have shown, to delay the time of its consideration, as exemplified by Mr. Jarvis' motion to refer it to a committee, said committee to report at next annual meeting; and also exemplified by the satisfaction with which they welcomed the fact that the Synod had not been legally summoned in July last, seems also to point to conscious weakness of their cause, everything to be gained, and nothing lost by delay.

Your correspondent "Churchman" kindly states that "the pamphlet" embodies the arguments that exist against the terms of the proposed Canon," so that, apparently, it will only be necessary to show the fallacy of some of these arguments, and the weakness of others, in order to render the purpose of the publication of this wonderful pamphlet futile, and this will be pretty effectually done at the coming session of the Synod, or your correspondent is much mistaken. It is greatly to be hoped that the publication of this pamphlet may not have the effect of causing any member of the Synod to commit himself as a supporter of either side of the question, until he shall have heard the discussion that is to ensue at the approaching Synod meeting in Fredericton.

A few general remarks with regard to this pamphlet may not be out of place, seeing that your space for correspondence will not admit of going into details,

In the first place, it is wanting in the calm, dispassionate statements that ought to be characteristic of a question of this nature. No lawyer, in making up his case, could have been more assiduous in making use of every little thing that could be in any way made to support his cause, than have the originators of this pamphlet. As a natural consequence, it is in places inconsistent with the statements formerly made in Mr. Jarvis' letter; many of its arguments are fallacious; and its facts are so highly coloured and distorted as scarcely to be recognizable. In a word, if this illogical summary "of the arguments that exist against the terms of the proposed Canon" is all that our opponents can bring forward, the vital principles of the Canon are in no danger of being overthrown.

And now, to consider the question from a common-sense standpoint. Your correspondent "Churchman" says that every delegate ought "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." With that sentiment, I cordially agree; only adding, that in the opinion of several members of the Synod, the proposed Canon is neither "uncanonical" nor "contrary to the best interests of the Church."

The position of the Church in this Diocese of late years has been characterised by a striking amount of harmony, and in the various addresses lately presented to our good Bishop, we have expressed our gratitude that such has been the case; and we have also professed our confidence, not only in his wisdom and experience, but in the way he has avoided everything that tended to engender party strife. For my own part, I should be willing, in the event of a Co-Adjutor Bishop becoming a necessity in this Diocese, to leave the appointment entirely in the hands of the Bishop, believing him to be a better judge than myself, after his thirty-four years experience, both of the wants of the Diocese, and also of the qualifications of the person appointed to the post. But this is not the power the Bishop asks. All that his Lordship asks, is to be allowed the privilege of nomination, leaving the question of election to the Synod. I am fully aware that there are those who would scout the idea of leaving the appointment entirely in the hands of the Bishop; and I am also fully aware that there are men in the world whose actions savour of *personal* (not Papal) *infallibility*. Your correspondent lays no particular claim to the grace of humility, and yet he is not ashamed to say that he believes his Bishop to be a better judge than himself in this matter.

It will not be difficult to show, when the time comes, that the question of nomination resolves itself into one of expediency, and that there is no cast-iron rule about the matter. This Canon is not a desirable one, perhaps, for every Synod to adopt, but in the case of a Diocese in which the utmost confidence has been repeatedly expressed in its Bishop, time and again, and in which harmony has reigned supreme for some years past, we contend that this Canon is that best suited for the present exigency; and as such, it is to be hoped we will adopt it. Its supporters do not pretend to say that there can be no amendment in its details; and no one would more gladly welcome a suggestion that would tend to advance the welfare of the Diocese, than his Lordship the Metropolitan of Canada, whose last wish would be to destroy the work of his lifetime by any hasty action. The cases of the Dioceses of Montreal and Toronto are not analogous to ours, and even if they were, I very much doubt if the history and result of those elections is such as to excite the envy of our own Synod. Certainly, if a desire for a similar result is the hidden mainspring that animates the opponents of the proposed Canon for a Co-Adjutor, the sooner our friends show themselves under their true colours, the better.

One thing is certain with regard to the proposed Canon, its rejection will be a direct expression of "want of confidence" in our Bishop, and as such, his Lordship will receive it.

Trusting that the ensuing meeting of the Synod may happily dispose of the question which has aroused such a wide spread interest,

I remain yours truly,

J. R.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

St. John, Sept. 29th, 1879.

Sirs,—Several clergymen deeply interested in the work of Church of England Temperance Societies, met at my house in May, and, after conference on the subject, agreed that it would be desirable as soon as possible to form a union of Church of England Temperance Societies of the Diocese of Fredericton, and agreed on rules of such Society, to be proposed for the consideration of those who would aid in such Society.

Will you kindly insert a notice of meeting of Delegates of Synod who may be willing to aid us in forming a united society, and promoting Church of England Temperance work in Diocese of Fredericton.

Yours truly,

F. H. ALMON.

SIGN OF THE GOLDEN KETTLE

RENT'S
STOVE & KITCHEN FURNISHING
DEPOT,
31 Barrington St., Halifax, N. S.

Full Stock complete of all the leading
BASE BURNER STOVES,
such as the CROWN JEWEL, SULTANA
GOLD COIN, SILVER MOON, and QUEEN;
also a nice assortment of
Portable Cook Ranges, and Cook, Parlor,
and Bedroom Stoves,

All of which, having been purchased for
Cash, at a very low figure, are offered at prices
that defy competition. Also a full Stock of

TINWARE AND KITCHEN FURNISHING HARDWARE,

In Dish Covers, Toilet Ware, Bird Cages, Jelly
and Pudding Moulds, COAL VASES and
FIRE IRONS, Hearth Brushes, Door Mats,
Clothes Wringers, and everything required for
House Furnishing, Wholesale and Retail.

EXTRA DISCOUNT allowed to clergymen
purchasing at this establishment.

GEORGE RENT, - - PROPRIETOR.

JACOBS' PATENT LITHOGRAM.

Patented in Canada, July 16th, 1879.
Patent applied for in the United States

WONDERFUL SAVING OF TIME,
LABOR AND MONEY.

A New, Simple, Perfect and Wonderful Method of
PRODUCING OVER FIFTY COPIES of
any Writing, Documents, Plans, &c.,
FROM ONE WRITING. No Press, Roller,
Pad or Prepared Paper required. This apparatus is
so simple a child can operate it.

TEN IMPRESSIONS PER MINUTE.

An Invaluable Article to Official Assignees,
Lawyers, Architects, Surveyors, Bankers,
Merchants, Tradesmen, Schools and
others.

Send all orders to

T. P. CONNOLLY,
Sole Agent for Nova Scotia.
Corner of George & Granville Streets

25-3m

I. MATHESON & CO., ENGINEERS

AND

Boiler Makers,
NEW GLASGOW,
NOVA SCOTIA.

1-7