

nature of the dress which Bishops may wear, it would appear they may still use the scarlet robe, which was discarded as an Episcopal habit, by order of Council, but is this the case? The robe the Bishop speaks of is the University robe of a D.D., and not the Episcopal habit, and the Bishops sit as Doctors in Convocation just as they vote in their Doctor's gown, the proctors refusing to accept their votes in Episcopal robes, black and lawn.

The Archbishop's train is part of his Episcopal habit, in fact the habit prolonged, the rubric not troubling to define the cut, or length, or fashion of the habit or gown.

The Bishop brings forward the practice of the Bishops of Fredericton and Newfoundland—as well as that of some of the Bishops at home, within the last few years, and in the Colonies, in support of his use of the staff. But the example of some contemporary Bishops, either at home or abroad, cannot be quoted as an authority; their act forms no precedent of usage, and the legality is yet to be discovered. For, like all ministers of the Church, the Bishops are bound by the declared law of the Church and realm, and can no more revive suppressed observances or ceremonial at their own will or judgment of expediency, than their clergy can revive vestments, banners, processions, or practices long since annulled, and recently declared illegal.

The Bishop tells us that “a great principle is at stake,” but what it is for which he seeks to force his staff upon us, he has not condescended to explain. It is better to wait for this information, for the staff in itself is the emblem of jurisdictions that have carried with them to many churches of old, and very many lowly members of Christ, sorrow and tribulation in this world. It remains to be seen whether it had not been better for the sake of truth and peace, that the Bishops had rebuked rather than accepted these unaccustomed, and, as it now appears, suppressed, forbidden, and confiscated emblems.

Our refusal to admit the staff is not unwarranted nor without sufficient grounds. The use leads to superstitious ideas, for the plea of “The Ritual Touch” is already put forward as attaching to these staves, as if the hand of the Bishop, or at least his Chaplain, a magic were attached, and a virtue passed by them from the Bishop's hand, so that without this magic wand his ceremonial act was incomplete; whereas, our Church has made the investiture of a Bishop complete in his habit and his chair, and has excluded all other emblems what-