

It cannot be that your Lordship dreads lest your Clergy or Laity should make an improper nomination. Surely your Lordship cannot thus distrust us. And even were such a nomination possible, the person nominated could not, under the present, as well as the proposed Canon, be chosen except by a two-thirds majority of each order—Clerical and Lay—and even if chosen, he could not be consecrated until the choice was confirmed by the Bishops of the Ecclesiastical Province under the Canon of the Provincial Synod. Why, then, exclude Clergy or Laity from the right of nomination? We may well believe that your Lordship would endeavour to act impartially in the exercise of the right. But we cannot predicate this always of your Lordship's successors—we know not who they may be. True, under the proposed Canon we may reject. But is it right or fair that the powers of the Clergy and Laity in this Diocese, alone, I believe, of all others, should be so limited? Might it not occur at some future day, that name upon name was sent down until a weary Synod, dissatisfied with those names and yearning for some other—yet unable to propose it—submitted, hesitatingly it might be, yet irretrievably, to a choice, if such it could be called, the result of which might be to involve your Lordship's once happy Diocese in party struggles, jealousies and dissensions for years to come.

My Lord Bishop, trust us, and ask us not to give up the right of nomination, and thus limit our privileges, until we have shown that we are unworthy to possess them.

3. But it is proposed that the Bishop may nominate one or more persons, at his discretion. And why should the Synod be limited, at the discretion of the presiding Bishop, to vote upon a single name, or upon two only? How often, in other Dioceses, has a name which at first commanded but a small vote, proved eventually to be that as to which the Synod were almost or quite unanimous in approval. Are men of one school of thought only to be nominated? Are all, not of his own, at the discretion of any Bishop, to be excluded. If not, why again limit the right of nomination to him? Surely the effort should be to secure a Bishop who will be most acceptable to the Diocese at large. And surely this will be best attained by the utmost freedom of nomination and election, and not by placing it in the power of the presiding Bishop to confine or control the vote.

4. And again, is it safe, as is now proposed, that the election should be left open to be made, not of necessity at a special meeting of the Synod upon full notice and consideration; but, even at the very meeting at which a resolution declaring the election advisable, may be passed?