

clergy. I utterly repudiate the idea that any such superiority is sought by the clergy, or that they desire anything but the best interests of that Church of which they are the ordained ministers. Still it cannot be denied that it would give them an appearance of superior power, an appearance which is by all means to be avoided. The second proposition is equally objectionable, and that mainly on account of the practical effects which would follow its adoption, a topic which was hardly touched upon during the late discussion, and to which I must therefore at some length be permitted to revert.

1. First the possibility, nay, the strong probability of a conflict between the two houses. If one candidate should be elected by the clergy, and another by the laity, I do not see upon what principle of justice either is to give way to the other. And I can imagine nothing more disastrous than the position of a Bishop, who feels that the votes of a majority either of the clergy or of the people have been recorded against him. I cannot imagine that any Christian minister would venture, under such circumstances, to take upon himself the burden and high responsibilities of so high and sacred an office.

2. A conflict between the two houses, in the event of different candidates being chosen, could only be terminated by the clergy giving way to the laity. This, on account of the vast numerical disproportion between the two orders, would be the only possible, indeed the only just solution, when the principle of equality of rights has once been admitted. And thus the clergy, instead of really having equal rights in this matter, would be placed in a position of marked inferiority. The choice practically would rest entirely with the laity.

3. From this it will follow that the limits within which our choice can be made, would be unduly narrowed. I feel a just pride in being a humble member of a body of men, who are so highly and so deservedly esteemed by their parishioners, that there are many among them who are thought worthy of the dignity of the Episcopate. But we have adopted the Catholic principle that our choice shall not be limited to the clergy of our own diocese; but shall be co-extensive with the United Church of Great Britain and Ireland, including all her

colonial branches. And I cannot doubt the fact that circumstances may arise, under which it may be expedient that we should select one from among the many thousands of able and devoted men in our Mother Church, rather than from among our own small number. While, if the choice rests practically with the laity, the election of any but a Canadian Clergyman would be well-nigh impossible.

4. A greater objection is to be found in the fact that it would lead to canvassing and party strife. Indeed this objection applies, though in a less degree, to the proposal of the Reverend Mr. Denroche. Not only when the actual election is to take place would this occur, but every vestry meeting at which Lay Delegates are to be chosen would become a scene of discord and confusion. We are wisely striving to rouse the laity to some energetic interest in the affairs of the church; but are we willing to see that interest develop itself in the form of election placards stating the controversial merits of the respective candidates, or in banners of Broad Church blue, Tractarian red, and Evangelical yellow? Are we willing to see "High Church for ever" or "Down with Tractarianism" chalked upon the walls of our streets, as has lately been seen in England? Would it be possible under such circumstances, to make a wise, a dispassionate choice? Would it not inevitably follow that some leader of a party, some bold and generally rash asserter of extreme views, would be chosen to fill that office, which above all others requires moderation, discretion and impartiality?

5. The last and the gravest objection to which I shall advert is, that it would place a great and dangerous temptation in the way of the clergy. Gentlemen of the Laity, we are but weak and frail men, like yourselves; and one of the subtlest temptations to which our office renders us liable, is that of seeking the applause of men, rather than the approval of that God, whose servants we are. I will not dwell upon this painful topic, but only solemnly appeal to you not to place this temptation in our path. Do not, — as you love your Church, — do not tempt us to become a time-serving and popularity-hunting clergy, the greatest curse which an offended God could inflict upon a self-willed people.

I have explained the insuperable objections to which I conceive both the proposals lately discussed in the Synod to be liable. And I will