

Whilst we should be willing to adopt the constitution of the Episcopal Church in America, we are opposed to the introduction of any changes into the diocese at present, until we are first made fully acquainted with the principles of the proposed new constitution.

We are also of opinion that many other parishes in the diocese coincide with us on these points, and would rather that things should remain as they are at present in the diocese; and if any legislative interference be required, we would rather that it should be instituted here in our Colonial Parliament, upon the joint representation of the Church.

We therefore hope that your Lordship will defer the consideration of the Colonial Church Bill now before Parliament, and allow the enclosed resolutions from the second parish in importance in the diocese to have some weight.

We have, &c.

(signed) *Robert Fitzgerald Uniacke, A. M.,*
Rector of St. George's.

(signed) *John T. Walford,*
J. W. Merket, } Churchwardens.

Encl. 2, in No. 1.

Enclosure 2, in No. 1.

Parish of Saint George's, Halifax, Nova Scotia,
9 April 1855.

EXTRACT from the Minutes of a Meeting of the Church Wardens, Vestry and Parishioners,
held this day at the Parish School House.

ON motion of J. W. Merket, Esq., seconded by F. W. Morris, Esq., the following Resolutions were submitted:

Whereas, at the parish meeting, held in St. George's parish, in the City of Halifax, on the 18th September 1854, it was unanimously resolved,

"That this meeting is of opinion that the establishment of periodical Church assemblies in this diocese, at the present time, is both inexpedient and unadvisable."

"That the Bill passed last year by the House of Lords, referred to in the recent circular of his Lordship the Bishop to the clergy, and by which Bill he states the assembly is to be governed, is inadequate to a full and free synodical action, and would not sufficiently enlarge the privileges of churchmen, inasmuch as by the provisions of that Bill no voice is allowed to clergy or laity in the future nomination or appointment of their bishop, and, further, that no regulations for the management of Church affairs are valid without the consent of the Bishop; that while we respect the office of a Bishop, we do not approve of a Bishop possessing the power to nullify the deliberate action of so large and influential a body as the clergy and laity." And at which meeting Napean Clark and Thos. B. Aiken, Esquires, were appointed delegates to represent the congregation of St. George's, with instructions to oppose the formation of a Church Synod.

And whereas our said delegates have this day reported their proceedings to this meeting,

Resolved, "That this meeting approve of the course pursued by the said delegates, in voting against the establishment of a Diocesan Synod or Convention in Nova Scotia."

Resolved, "That in consequence of it being the intention of the Bishop to construct the Synod, in conformity with the terms of a certain Act, introduced into the House of Lords in 1853, which places an unconditional veto in the Diocesan on all the proceedings of colonial synods, it is the opinion of this meeting that such a constitution would not be acceptable to the laity, because a direct unqualified veto in the Bishop, in his capacity of a separate branch of the synod, would in a great measure deprive the clergy and laity of that independent position which would render it worth the while of laymen to take an interest in Church legislation; that such a constitution would give to the opinion of one person a greater weight than the collective opinions of the whole body of the clergy and laity of the diocese, and they are confirmed in this opinion by the working of the system in the American diocese of Vermont, where the convention is in fact reduced to a cipher, as is shown by the words of Bishop Hopkins, of that diocese, in his pamphlet lately published, who says, "If the proposition under debate be so obnoxious to the Bishop's judgment that he cannot accede to it, he says so, and there is no vote taken at all."

That this meeting is strengthened in their opinion by the fact, that out of above 32 dioceses in the United States of America, but one has adopted the veto; all the other bishops having relinquished any claim to such an authority in the various conventions, though in some of the dioceses where the Bishop disagrees to the measure passed by the Convention, the question is sent back for further discussion, when two-thirds of both clergy and laity must affirm it before it can pass in opposition to the opinion of the Bishop.

That by placing an unqualified veto on the Bishop, he becomes clothed with a power beyond that of the Sovereign under the British constitution, who, though a separate branch of the Legislature, yet exercises no direct veto in opposition to the other two branches. In the case of the Sovereign, there is a council selected from the other two branches, who advise the Crown, so that no important measure is introduced by Govern-
ment