

Rev. J. JONES, *Montreal Diocese*.—"That while we regret to learn from last year's report, that a deficiency existed in the income of the Parent Society—yet we express our hopes that there will be an increase during the present year commensurate with the increased prosperity of the country, and that this parish will do its duty in endeavouring to increase the funds of the Society this year."

6. Moved by Rev. CHARLES FORREST, seconded by Rev. J. GODFREY.—"That the position in which the Church is at present placed in this Diocese, more than ever demands the energetic and well-sustained efforts of her children, to obtain for her performance and stability in the land, and that every member of our communion—rich and poor, young and old—should feel himself imperatively called upon to support her in all her endeavours (and particularly through the medium of the Church Society) to spread herself far and wide throughout this great country."

6. Moved by Dr. HILL, seconded by Rev. E. LOCKER.—"That the thanks of this Parochial Branch are due and hereby tendered to Mrs. T. M. Blasdell, Mrs. Fitzgibbon, Mrs. H. Freleigh, and Miss Foster, for their kindness in acting as collectors for the past year, and for the satisfactory manner in which they completed their good work."

[We insert the following letters upon an interesting subject, without any further note than that the Committee have not yet reported to the Synod.]

ELECTION OF BISHOPS.

To the Editor of the Colonist and Atlas.

Sir,—In the total want of any ecclesiastical organ connected with the Church of England, I trust you will do me the favour of inserting in your journal the following remarks and suggestions upon a subject of great interest and importance to those of your subscribers who belong to that communion.

It is said that a committee, appointed at the last meeting of Synod, to consider and report upon the propriety of altering the canon relating to the election of Bishops, have recently had a meeting upon the subject, and that, impressed with the great evils resulting from the system of canvassing, which seems almost inseparable from the process of popular election, they have agreed to recommend that henceforth on the avoidance of the See, the Bishops of Canada shall be respectfully requested to submit to the Synod of this Diocese the names of three clergymen, whom they shall deem fit and proper persons to fill the vacancy, and that the Synod shall proceed forthwith to the election of that individual out of the three who shall be deemed most eligible.

Heartily agreeing as I do with the members of the committee on the evils of popular election, and conceding the fact that nomination by the Bishops of the ecclesiastical province in which a vacancy in the Episcopate may occur, has the sanction of primitive practice, I nevertheless beg leave, with all deference, to doubt whether the step, which it is said they have agreed to recommend, is that mode of supplying any vacancy which may hereafter occur which would be most efficient and likely to prove most generally satisfactory.

The Bishops of Quebec and Montreal have, I may say, no knowledge of the clergy of this Diocese, and would, therefore, be in a very indifferent position for forming any well grounded opinion of the fitness of any of our present priesthood for the episcopal office. The Bishop of Huron, to whose greater knowledge on the subject his brethren of Quebec and Montreal might be disposed to defer, would, if he followed

his well known theological bias, name those whom in this Diocese it would be confessedly impossible to elect.

It is not, however, necessary that they should name any clergyman of this Diocese, and I, for one, do not think it desirable that they should do so: but where else are they to look? We are not aware of above one or two out of their own Diocese whom they could possibly bring forward with any hope of success; and as for the Church at home, the Bishops of Canada are not in the best position for choosing men from that wide and fruitful field. The Bishops of Quebec and Huron have spent the greater part of their lives in these colonies, and even the Bishop of Montreal has now for some years been much separated from the Church at home, and, consequently, their knowledge of the clergy in England must be very vague. These seem very serious drawbacks to the recommendation of the committee, and much more might be said on the subject, but that I am unwilling to extend the limits of this letter.

What, then, are we to do? This is a question of deep and almost painful interest to the clergy, and all the more zealous members of the Church. It is self-evident that almost every thing, humanly speaking, depends upon the character and qualifications of the man who is destined to succeed an incumbent who has brought to the discharge of his duties no ordinary powers. It is a fact, which is in the mouths of the vast majority of the clergy, that there is no one in the Diocese to whom the minds of men naturally point, who, were he called to the Episcopate, would be the right man in the right place. We may each have our private predilections, but the first person to whom we mention our idea is sure to suggest difficulties and objections which are fatal to any hope of carrying it out.

In talking over the recommendation of the committee the other day with a friend, he made a suggestion which I find has been present to more minds than his, and which, if the Synod would adopt it, would be certain to secure us (whenever the sad day for its necessity shall arrive) a Bishop of the highest character. It was simply this,—that the Synod should consent to accept the nomination of the Bishop of Oxford, who—his very enemies being the judges—is, for earnest-hearted work for God and the souls of men, the model Bishop of the day. Notwithstanding the triumphant manner, however, in which Mr. Golithly's most scandalous charges of Romanizing, brought against him and his Diocese have been refuted, there are those who, for want of information, are disposed to regard the Bishop of Oxford as an extreme man, and I suggested this to my friend as a probable reason for the rejection of his suggestion; but we mutually agreed that by placing the nomination in the hands of the Bishops of Oxford and London, it would be more likely to please all parties. No one doubts that both these men are thoroughly in earnest—that both of them are indefatigable in their labours, and deeply sensible of the need which exists for the entire consecration of man's highest powers to the carrying out of the church's work. Hence, as a general rule, they are heartily supported in their Dioceses by almost all earnest men, even though differing from them theologically;—this I can state from my own personal knowledge, and nothing in these days of division is more delightful than to see how men who work together learn to know and love, and (to a far greater extent than they once thought possible) agree together. From the intimate knowledge of the clergy which these two Bishops possess—in one case from many years of Episcopal experience and the attraction of his character, which has brought round him some of the most devoted men of the day, and in the other from his high position

as Bishop of the Metropolis—we might be absolutely certain of getting a Bishop of the very brightest character and attainments. Their opportunities of selection from *eighteen or twenty thousand* clergy, the most prominent of whom must be known to them, would place this beyond a doubt, and such a combination as the two Bishops named ought to disarm suspicion, for if low churchmen think the Bishop of Oxford, with all his excellences, somewhat too high, high churchmen perhaps regard the Bishop of London, notwithstanding his undoubted devotion, as rather too low.

The advantages of such a selection are so manifest that it is very difficult to understand how any one could object to such a proposition. It has all, and more than all the advantages which would result from adopting the suggestion of the committee as relates to the prevention of canvassing, while it would secure us a Bishop of the highest class, which their recommendation would, I fear, fail to do. If we are to divest ourselves of the power of election by agreeing to accept the nomination of others, surely it would be better to place that nomination in the hands of two Bishops of our Ecclesiastical Province, who, from their character and position, have both the ability and opportunity to make the best possible selection, than in the hands of three others of the same province whose position is such that, notwithstanding their best endeavours, they are unlikely to make a satisfactory choice either from the Colonial or Imperial portions of the Church.

I remain yours, &c,
A CHURCHMAN.

ELECTION OF BISHOPS.

To the Editor of the Colonist and Atlas.

Sir,—Pray oblige me with space for the following remarks upon the letter of your correspondent, a "Churchman," on the above named subject, which appeared in your evening issue of the 16th inst.

I dissent in *totu*, and I trust that the whole Diocese, without exception, will dissent from any proposition which involves the surrender of the privilege of electing our Bishops. As the Crown has conceded its right in our favour, to resign it after a single trial would be such a humiliating confession of inability to exercise it, as I trust our Diocese will never consent to make.

If, in the first instance of election under the newly acquired power, some things occurred which ought not to have occurred, surely there may be an amendment in the next, and probably improvement in each succeeding one, as we acquire experience. I think we learnt a lesson in the first which we are not likely to forget. We learned, at least, what would have to be avoided in all subsequent elections. We saw what should not have been, and what I am sure left upon every one's mind, the determination that the same shall not take place again.

Your correspondent speaks of the great evils of canvassing which seem almost inseparable from the process of popular election. Ours is not a popular election; the suffrage is very limited, being confined to the clergy and lay delegates who compose the Synod of the Diocese; and though on the former occasion, some, with more zeal than discretion, rushed into a newspaper controversy on the merits of their respective candidates, it does not follow that the same must occur again, or that there will be any canvassing of an unseemly character. It would be most unjust that the whole Diocese should be punished, and so to speak, disfranchised, for the indiscretion of a few. It is an imputation to be indignantly repelled, to suppose that there is not in such a