

5. That when required by two clerical and two lay delegates, the vote of the house upon any question may be taken by orders, voting separately, and in that case, a majority of both orders shall be necessary to an affirmative vote.

6. No member, save the mover of a resolution—who, as mover, is entitled to reply—shall speak more than once, except by permission of the House.

7. When a question is finally put by the Prolocutor, either on an original motion or amendment, no further debate shall be allowed, the Prolocutor first declaring that the question is finally put.

8. A member may (if not interrupting a speaker, require any motion under discussion to be read for his information, at any time during the debate.

9. A member called to order while speaking shall sit down, unless permitted to explain.

10. When a question is under debate, no motion shall be received by the chair unless to amend it, or postpone it, or to lay it on the table, or for adjournment, and no more than one amendment to a proposed amendment of a motion shall be in order.

11. No motion or amendment shall be considered as before the House unless seconded and reduced to writing.

12. Motions to adjourn or to lay on the table shall be decided without debate.

13. When a motion has been read to the House by the Prolocutor, it cannot be withdrawn by the mover without the consent of the House.

14. A question being once determined shall not again be drawn into discussion in the same session without the unanimous consent of the House.

15. A motion to adjourn will always be in order.

16. No motion shall be received without notice, except with the permission of the House.

17. On a division, the names of those who voted for or against a question shall be recorded in the minutes, if required by three members.

18. The reports of committees shall be in writing, signed by the chairman, and to be received in course, unless a motion be made for re-committal.

19. No rule of order shall be suspended except upon a two-thirds vote of the members present.

20. That it shall be the duty of the Secretaries to arrange a list of all unfinished business and all motions of members sent to them to be brought before the Provincial Synod according to the order in which they are received, and, under the direction of the Metropolitan, to cause a printed copy of the same to be sent to every member of the Synod 21 days before the meeting of the Synod, which business and motions shall stand first on orders of the day.

THE TREASURER

On motion of the Rev. Dr. PATTON, the Hon. George Moffatt was unanimously elected Treasurer of the Synod.

ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY.

The Hon. Mr. CAMERON then moved that the message from the House of Bishops be read, and referred to a select committee of five, to be appointed by the Prolocutor to report forthwith to this House.

Mr. FARRELL moved in amendment, seconded by the Rev. Mr. MARSH, that such committee should consist of one lay and one clerical delegate in the resolution as named from each diocese.

A LAY DELEGATE expressed a hope that the address would be adopted without discussion or division. Addresses to Her Majesty ought to be so adopted.

Mr. SIMPSON said they needed no reference to a committee, and proposed that the House should at once concur in the address sent down from the House of Bishops.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON had no objection. He merely proposed the reference to a committee as following the Parliamentary custom.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON thought there was no need of a committee, that it was not the established usage in Parliament.

Mr. IRVINE felt as many others there did, that the adoption of that address, thanking Her Majesty for the appointment of a Metropolitan, was adopting or approving of the patent as it stood, and the extraordinary powers conferred on the Metropolitan Bishop, which they objected to. He thought it would be the wisest course to take up the address and consider it at the same time as the report of the committee appointed to consider the Patent. He would move a resolution to that effect, seconded by the Rev. Mr. ROE.

The Rev. PROLOCUTOR said they had already had two amendments before them. Mr. IRVINE's would not be in order till one of them is disposed of.

Mr. IRVINE had not understood Mr. SIMPSON to have moved a resolution.

The PROLOCUTOR said they were only waiting for him to write it—a courtesy always extended to a member wishing to move. He might add at the same time that the custom in England was always to amend an address sent down from the Upper to the Lower House, if only in some trivial point, to assert their right to do so.

Rev. Mr. CAULFIELD thought it strange any one should be disposed to force the matter through that house with such haste. It looked as if some special object were to be gained by it.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN said he was very sorry to hear such language made use of. He did not think there were any members there to whom the terms employed by the last speaker could be properly applied. He thought it was the general desire to expedite the business before them and not to promote any special or concealed object, that prompted members to urge this on.

Hon. Judge MCCORD thought that if any body took the pains to examine the address, to mark the care with which it was drawn up, they would see that it in no wise committed that House to any approval of what was contained in the Patent. It simply thanked Her Majesty for having been graciously pleased to accede to the wishes of three of the Dioceses in this Province. Its adoption could not possibly compromise any body.

Archdeacon BROUEN said the address clearly defined that they only thanked the Queen for appointing a Metropolitan to preside over the Synod, not for any other purpose. No one surely could object to that.

Mr. SCOTT said that if the Queen had been asked to give them one thing, and she had given them very much more, and a very different thing from that they desired, they surely ought not to express their thanks simply, without some explanation.

Dr. BOVELL, Colonel O'BRIEN, and Mr. ARMSTRONG spoke in favour of immediate concurrence, holding that nobody was bound to support any objectionable features in the Patent by the adoption of the address.

Archdeacon HELLMUTH, on the other side, argued that as so many felt doubts about the matter, and were very anxious not to commit themselves prematurely in so grave a case, it were better to defer the adoption of the address till they had the report of the committee appointed to consider of the powers to be granted under the Patent before them.

Rev. Mr. MANSU said that they would perceive from the terms of the address itself that one diocese had declined to join in the demand for the appointment of a Metropolitan, and he and others from that diocese might be pardoned for expressing a feeling of dissatisfaction with an appointment which they had never desired, if they declined to acquiesce in an address of thanks for that which they did not wish. They held, and had stated so in a representation to high authority (when asked for their reasons of non-concurrence in the petitions of the other dioceses,) that the Synod act of the Provincial Legislature conferred on the members of the church here all the powers necessary to organize a Provincial Synod.

Mr. GAMBLE said that the gentlemen from that diocese should come into court with clean hands. Who was it, he asked who, after the Provincial Act had so effectually severed the connexion between Church and State, declined to rest content with the action of their own Synod and the Canadian ecclesiastical authorities, but sent over their Bishop elect for a patent from the Crown and consecration in the mother country?

Rev. Mr. MANSU—They had elected their Bishop, and had nothing more to do with it. The next they knew Dr. Cronyn had been in England and came back to them a Bishop.

Archdeacon HELLMUTH urged again that as so many held the Patent incompatible with the act and desired to adhere to the act, they should be allowed to have the opinion of the committee on their compatibility before committing themselves, even so far as this address would commit them.

The Very Rev. DEAN OF MONTREAL said he very much feared the committee could not report on Thursday. They required, before deciding upon the matter, to have the patents of the other Bishops before them, and they could not as yet procure them. Indeed it was uncertain if they could procure them in time to report at all this session.

Mr. CARTER thought the least they could do was to thank Her Majesty for recording their request by granting the necessary powers to call together this general assembly of the Church. If Her Majesty had accorded more than they asked, so much the greater reason for gratitude. (Laughter.) If the diocese of Huron had got what they had not even asked for, why they were under the deeper obligation. (Laughter.)

The Rev. Mr. BLSADWELL thought there had been a great deal of useless discussion on this subject, and a great deal of needless distrust evinced. If they would turn to the address of his Lordship, the Metropolitan, delivered on the previous day, as published in the paper they had in their hands—the Gazette—they would see there how distinctly His Lordship had assured them that he had reserved the Patent for their consideration and advice. (The rev. gentleman here read the passage in His Lordship's address.) That surely ought to divest any gentleman's mind of any apprehension that it was attempted by this address to commit them to an approval of the Patent as it stands.

Rev. Mr. ROE said that he felt that it was a great pity to divide the House upon the vote of an address to Her Majesty, and that could only be avoided by giving members some time. Many there felt—they could not rid themselves of the feeling—that the adoption of this address would commit them to an approval of the Patent issued, that if they adopted the address they precluded themselves from afterwards representing to Her Majesty how objectionable portions of it were. They had just heard from the chairman of the committee that it was likely it would not report