

gly, are  
a whole,  
Before,  
tient, it  
nature  
whether  
ren now  
acter,  
t. The  
s would  
of the  
e treat-  
case is  
or two,  
reasing.  
nearly  
licate a  
roof, in  
remedy  
opposite  
le have  
edented  
s been  
unpro-  
rinous  
charit/  
27, and  
should  
r cent.,  
g, but a  
ing the  
ur sub-  
in their  
credit,  
verthe-  
se by a  
e level  
to be  
s of last  
er and  
ive sec-  
whether  
ements  
be ad-  
cies of  
se very  
taken.  
! But  
tely, of  
The  
cted to  
as yet,  
is con-  
robabi-  
ficulty  
us, yet  
emand  
l from  
perity  
a pos-  
data of  
ly, the  
is. It  
nstitu-  
his ex-  
to ex-  
"root  
But  
y yield  
They  
ey re-  
vorked  
ect no  
on the  
hange  
Some  
ay be  
care-  
ly cal-  
cisting  
at we  
vise or  
mend-  
enue  
ionar-  
easing  
us the  
u can  
tly in-  
ised us

the most. It seems never to have occurred to Mr. C. that if, before calculating on increase, and as a means to that increase, you make the clergy independent, the necessity for the increase, as to those clergy, is done away with altogether. Nor does he seem to have realized the difficulty that might arise out of an attempt to pay special additional grants out of an exchequer whose capacity was barely equal to meet (meagre) ordinary outlay. No influence, moreover, is indicated whereby any increase is to be attained, unless it be couched in these words, "the clergy being free, would be more interested in making collections"—a view of the case, perhaps, less complimentary to the clergy than the writer intended it to be. Your correspondent "G," who is altogether more practical and to the point, would throw the whole burden of collecting funds on the clergy, imposing upon them a duty which would, we fear, very seriously militate against everything like proper spiritual influence. The clergyman, who in addition to immediate parochial obligations in this direction, undertook the task assigned him by G. would very speedily be regarded as a dun; and, in that character, repelled. A clergyman should never, if it can be avoided, expose himself to a refusal, for it involves a loss of influence which is rarely, if ever, regained. He may, and perhaps should, take the oversight of this business; should order and control the machinery by which the work is to be done; but, beyond this, his intervention would be of very doubtful value. As to the clergy being the "principal collectors," or—when on deputation—acting as "sides-men," the thing is so utterly contrary to the ideal of their office that the laity would protest against the practice. The proposal of W. that we should have a special mission envelope which, distributed among the congregation at the close of the missionary meeting, should afterwards be returned, with its enclosed gift, as a religious act of worship, and after the offertory, be duly forwarded to head-quarters as the contribution of the parish, would be very satisfactory were it not that the worldliness of the age, left to itself, unreasoned with, unchecked, is not apt to be over-mindful or over-liberal in the direction of Christian charity. Much counsel and persuasion, much comparison of expenditure secular and religious, is sometimes required in order to induce men to think seriously of the duty of giving. With some, the plan would answer admirably; with others, perhaps the majority, the reception of the envelope would be an idle ceremony . . . needing to be supplemented by some other more telling agency. As part of a system it would, doubtless, be of value . . . by itself alone it must needs prove a failure. The plan suggested by Archdeacon Parnell, some months ago, and improved by the suggestion of machinery by the Rev. E. W. Beaven, in your issue of January 24th, seems to be the only one which, as yet, promises to be effective. It is this: Let every parish be carefully canvassed, and every individual above confirmation age be solicited to subscribe so much per week, (be the sum ever so small,) say, anything from one cent to ten or twenty cents per week. Make this money payable quarterly, half-yearly, or yearly, provided only it be in before the 30th of April in each year. Have an organization in each parish, with its branches, if necessary, for out-stations, whose business it shall be to collect and pay over to the clergyman and churchwardens the money thus pledged. And, from time to time, hold special missionary meetings, at available points—not to collect monies but to convey information and to stimulate to greater effort. Let all this be done by direction and order of the Synod. The result could not be other than beneficial.

The advantage of this plan is that it is not revolutionary. It interferes very little with the present system. It allows place for the Whitsunday and Advent sermons; and for the action of deputations. It merely take the place of the unreliable, oftentimes most injurious method, now in vogue, i. e. of collecting by cards. It systematizes the whole work, assures increased certainty to the revenue, places 'giving' on its right basis, as a duty—not a caprice, escape from importunity, or premium or flirtation, as in many cases it has been found to be. Something further, however, (in our opinion) is needed for the protection even of these organizations. "Quis custodiet ipsos

custodes?" Without some bond of union, some supervision whereby the interest might be sustained and the action quickened, these organizations (like parishes themselves) would lapse into mere formal work, without eye or heart for the general object in view.

To obviate this, let the Bishop be requested to divide the Diocese into (say) eight districts. And, over each of these districts, let him appoint some priest, of suitable discretion, to take the oversight, and—in conjunction with his brethren in the district—to hold meetings, to stir up the people, and to look closely after the interests of the Mission Fund. But little expense, and small loss of time, need be incurred by such an arrangement; while, on the other hand, it would serve to ensure co-operation among the clergy, and a wholesome emulation in the parishes, which could not but prove of advantage to the church. As a final, yet most important point, it may be added—that it is expedient, nay, necessary, for the satisfying of the Diocese, that the *Sustentation Fund* be placed, at once, at the disposal of the Synod. The Synod is the legally appointed Trustee of all the monetary interests of the Diocese, and to its custody this Fund should be committed. There are few men in the Diocese who do not realize the anomaly of the existing state of things as to this money. It is devoutly to be hoped that the anomaly will be rubbed out, by the introduction of proper legislation, in this behalf, at our next Synod.

CHARLES FOREST.  
A member of the M. Board.  
Morrisburg, Feb. 14th, 1878.

IS IT A CANON FOR THE ELECTION OF A BISHOP, OR IS IT RATHER "HOW NOT TO DO IT?"

DEAR SIR: The question, which forms the heading of this communication, should surely have but one answer; but late proceedings seem to throw doubt upon it. If not assuming too much, suppose we admit that the canon was really meant to regulate the election of a bishop. This being granted, we may also concede that the canon was meant to bring out the best expression of opinion in a full house, and to remove objections to action in the case of a thin one. Now let us keep these two conditions in mind, and keep them as distinct as the canon intended. The first part, which is in fact the "canon" or rule, provides that in a full house—that is at least two thirds of each order—a majority of votes shall carry the election. Now, presumably, the object being to elect a bishop, if anything is added to the main rule, it must be something to aid the operation of that main rule, and not to interfere with, much less destroy its object. And in so very important a matter as the choice of a bishop, it being presumable that all entitled to vote would feel such interest and such sense of responsibility as would ensure their presence and their voting—this is surely the rule which carries the leading idea, and one which should prevail wherever possible—given a two-thirds presence, there follows a majority vote of each (that is either) order. Against this main rule the contingency, which is afterwards provided for can only (I maintain) operate *quoad hoc*. The word "otherwise" introduces an alternative rule which is meant to remove objections and facilitate action in the event of a deficiency in number in either order; for if meant to be applied as it was applied in the 5th ballot it is simply obstructive and destructive; it gives a minority the power of destroying the vote of a true majority; it violates the intention of the canon which was to show how to elect a bishop; and it introduces clearly that other principle, "How not to do it."

Let us now consider the actual wording of the subordinate clause, under which the 5th ballot was (as I think) wrongly annulled: "Otherwise, two-thirds of the vote of each order shall be necessary to determine the choice." Now, first, the word "otherwise" reflects back on the precise wording of the main canon, which speaks of each order, and of contingencies which may affect, therefore, one order and not the other, either (1) insufficient numbers, or (2) sufficient numbers and not all voting. These contingencies likewise are plainly meant to be considered distinctively and separately, either or both being possible to either order.

Now, the recurrence of the words *each order* in the subsidiary part of the canon—where, if the appeal were well founded, we should have expected the words *both orders*—is to my mind conclusive that the framers of the canon worded *advisedly*, though I admit not clearly. They were not then so obtuse, but really meant to add a clause which should facilitate the election of a bishop, by removing from either order the obstacle to having its votes recorded which the main canon places in the way; and thus should enable it to vote, though on a different principle from the order which still came under the main rule. The framers did not then mean to show "How not to do it."

W. STENNETT.  
Cobourg, Feb. 16th, 1878.

P. S.—There are graver aspects of this question connected with voting or not voting, but I refrain from presenting them at all, as they would need a separate communication.

THE FAILURE TO ELECT A COADJUTOR.

SIR,—Will you allow me space in the present number of your journal to name a few of the circumstances which, although known in Toronto, will be acceptable I am sure to readers elsewhere in explanation of the failure to elect as our coadjutor Bishop the great and good man, whose name is in all the churches, and whose high attainments and holy life have long pointed him out here and elsewhere as pre-eminently fitted to be a chief pastor in the church he has for a long period served so faithfully and defended so nobly.

What then are these circumstances which have resulted in disappointment universally felt, and which have taught us a lesson it is hoped we shall never forget. They may be named as the want, firstly, of combination of purpose, and, secondly, of appreciation of the sacredness of the franchise committed to us, and to which every other possible consideration, which interfered with its unfailing exercise should have been made subordinate. With regard to the first, none will deny that while, with those who in the first two or three ballots cast their votes scattering, and without combination, doubtless the most earnest and conscientious motives prevailed, yet simply from want of reflection of the utter hopelessness of electing any of the candidates thus, I may say, promiscuously named, strength was frittered away, and when the necessity of combination became apparent, the mischief had been in great measure accomplished, the lost ground was difficult to be regained, and above all, the combined minority had gathered strength and hope from want of combination so plainly and lamentably manifested in the ranks of an undoubted majority, this was the first circumstance. The second was more sad, the failure of appreciation of the sacredness of the franchise we were called on to exercise, and which in the fourth ballot voided an election from the want of one solitary vote, several voters happening to be absent, all good churchmen, thoroughly earnest in the matter, except in feeling that no consideration should have allowed them thus to risk the result, by even a casual absence.

The fifth ballot was rendered void from a combination of circumstances which are almost too humiliating to narrate. The minority seeing that combination at length prevailed with the majority and that success must attend them in this ballot fell on a device, which on so sacred an occasion it is hard to believe could have been either suggested or followed, namely, a call on the clerical minority not to vote, and thereby destroy the voting presence of two-thirds of each order which the canon required, and the device succeeded but too well, as will be found set forth in the successful protest against this otherwise successful ballot. On this it is not necessary to enlarge here, the object was accomplished, the doctrine of the heathen poet prevailed "Rem recte si possis, si non quocumque modo rem," and I think it need not be doubted, which side will gain in the end from such a result. Had it been the result of accident in numbers present, not a word of criticism unkind or otherwise would have been uttered, but if deliberately to pass the word round that opposition which must fail by fair means must be accomplished by stratagem; if tactics such as these, are, I say, the result of so-called evangelical teaching, such a result calmly considered