

home, recently made by the ministry of the day, makes us devoutly thankful that we are freed from the incubus of government nominations, and that the election of our Bishops rests for the future practically with ourselves.

We should be among the last to consent, for any consideration, to divest ourselves of this power, which has been most justly conceded to us. We should be unwilling to consent even to its temporary suspension. We are, therefore, disposed to think that the writer who commenced the discussion referred to, used ill-advised and unguarded language, when he spoke of "divesting ourselves of the power of election," for whatever may be the disadvantage of what he terms "popular election," and the almost intolerable evils of ecclesiastical "canvassing," they are, nevertheless, ills of smaller magnitude than those arising from the appointments of worldly-minded and crass statesmen.

As regards the question whether it would be wiser to fill the see on its next avoidance by getting a Bishop from home, or by electing one of the present clergy of the Diocese, we are free to confess (without in the remotest degree wishing to disparage our brethren) that, to our mind, the former course appears the better one.

The revival which has taken place in the Spiritual life of the Church at home, is a matter of devout thanksgiving, and her great heart is there throbbing with an earnestness to which she has long been a stranger. We, however, form one of her remoter extremities, and though the tide of her renovated life is beginning to flow into us and to exert over us a warming and benignant influence, yet we must acknowledge that comparatively speaking the pulses of our spiritual life beat low and feebly.

Looked at theologically, ecclesiastically and ritualistically, the level on which we stand is unquestionably a low one, if we regard the Diocese as a whole. It cannot well be otherwise, indeed, remembering our circumstances and position, and we should unquestionably be thankful that the principles of the church should be as fully comprehended as they are; and that the course of action to which they ought to lead should be as clearly recognized.

Thankfulness for such progress as we have made, ought not, however, to pass into contentment with results so manifestly inadequate, and so far beneath what our principles should produce, and yet the tendency of the human mind to become habituated to, and contented with the order of things by which it may happen to be surrounded, is very likely to reconcile the mind of any Canadian clergyman elected to the Episcopate to our present condition, and make him shrink from any changes which might seem necessary to give vigor, effectiveness and expansion to the ministrations of the church.

Again, the number of clergymen in the Diocese is really so insignificant, that in truth it affords very little room for choice. It is said to be an indignity to suppose that out of a hundred and seventy Canadian clergymen no one can be found fit to exercise the office of a Bishop. We, for our own part, make no such assertion, but we have no hesitation in saying that we have in reality no such number from whom to choose, and that to affirm such to be the case is a pure sophism, calculated merely to throw dust in the popular eyes. In the course of a short time the eastern portion of the Province will be erected into a separate Diocese, and then the number of clergymen left in the Diocese of Toronto proper, will be as nearly as may be, one hundred, and when from this number those are eliminated who from their youth and other causes have never been mentioned or even thought of as possible occupants of the See, we have a residuum of about half a dozen names which in reality afford the only scope for choice which a strictly local selection would afford us.

Again, of these half dozen clergymen whose names are probably all who would or could with any chance of success be

brought forward, there is not one who stands out so prominently before the minds of the churchmen of this Diocese, as to make his election by any means certain. This in itself seems to show that in none of them is there recognized any peculiar fitness for the office, and surely, therefore, it cannot be regarded as any undue disparagement of their claims, if we think and say that we could make a better choice from among the many eminently qualified clergymen whom we could find in England. The subject is a very large one, and for the present we have contented ourselves with adverting briefly to a few of the drawbacks which appear to us to be inseparable from the choice of any clergyman among ourselves. We shall very speedily return to the subject, and seek to indicate the advantages that would result from adopting the course we advocate. We shall endeavor to meet the arguments which are brought against it, and shall discuss the mode of proceeding by which it has been suggested to carry out the project.

DR. RYERSON'S "REPLY."

DR. RYERSON has thought fit to publish his reply to Dr. Wilson and Mr. Langton. In doing so he has acted advisedly. Before its appearance, all that the public could glean of the doings before the Parliamentary Committee was just what the *Leader*, with its sceptical tendencies, or the *Clear-Grit* organ, chose should appear in their columns. After Dr. Wilson's speech, as reported by them, we had a grand flourish of trumpets; the whole question, we were told, had resulted in the total discomfiture of the petitioners; and, above all, in the utter annihilation of the Superintendent of Education. It was even doubted whether he would again make his appearance in Toronto. After this came an ominous silence, and we heard no more. By the publication, however, of the "Reply," the aspect of matters has been entirely reversed; and the holding back of the truth, as usual, has recoiled with twofold force upon its suppressors. The defenders of the College, instead of directly meeting the charges brought against their system, sought to bring the matter to a side issue, by a concentrated attack upon an individual: they spared neither his public acts, his motives, or private character. What all this had to do with the question, or why it was permitted by the Committee of grave Legislators appointed to take evidence, we know not. On these points Dr. Wilson will, no doubt, be able to give a satisfactory explanation to those whom he was representing on the occasion. To the general public, all that is patent is, that, having made a violent and abusive personal assault, he met with severe and well-merited punishment. Our space is too limited for many references to the admirable and telling points in the "Reply." We believe it, however, to be a direct and complete refutation of the charges, whether personal, or directed against an enlightened movement for a National University, which would combine all the Colleges, and whose funds, instead of being misappropriated to the building up of one, would meet and foster voluntary effort in all. We would call attention, however, to the manner in which the charge of the want of a University education and consequent incapacity for grappling with the subject is met, by showing that Dr. Wilson himself never matriculated, and never received a Degree at the University at which he professed to have been educated. (Page 8.) Next we find him cleverly placed on the horns of a dilemma by the production of his own opinions on the subject of options, especially in modern languages, published not very long ago, but in direct contradiction to those expressed before the Committee, showing either a fickleness of judgment, or that he was, to suit the occasion, arguing against his own convictions. "O that mine enemy would write a book," never met with a happier illustration. (Page 10.) The non-practical nature of Oxford education is very summarily disposed of, by shewing that the Finance