

position. Why either the synod of the diocese of Montreal would feel itself obliged to accept any of those two names, or it would feel at liberty to reject them. If the diocese selected one, Montreal lost the right of electing its bishop; and if it rejected them the consequence would be an unseemly conflict between the diocesan synod and the House of Bishops. The Rev. Canon Bancroft had said that the choosing of three clergymen would nullify the rights of Montreal. But how could this be when we would secure a choice of three to the synod of Montreal. The Rev. Mr. Bancroft had also said that it might not be desirable to fix upon Montreal as the metropolitan see for ever, because it might not be the best place for it twenty years from this on account of the corrupting influence of Romanism. But he begged to differ with the Rev. gentleman upon this particular point. They should place themselves face to face with Romanism, and he thought they were all ready as one apostolical church to contend with Romanism upon the ground that the truth which they believed was the truth always held by the church of Christ. They could show a bold front, and were ready to prove the fallacies of the doctrines of Romanism.

Rev. Mr. PALMER's amendment was then put and lost, ayes being, we believe, 24.

The following amendment to Mr. Carter's amendment was then moved by Rev. Mr. Hollan, and seconded by the Rev. Dr. Lauder,

"That on a vacancy occurring in this Metropolitan See, the senior surviving bishop shall summon a meeting of the other bishops at the same time and place as the Synod of Montreal meet to hold its election. That the House of Bishops shall propose to the Diocesan Synod names for election.

"That on their rejection of all the names, others shall be proposed, and so on, until the election be arrived at.

"That, provided the Diocese of Montreal elect as the bishop of that see any one of the names so proposed by the House of Bishops, he shall be nominated to Her Majesty the Queen, for confirmation as Bishop of Montreal, and Metropolitan, and his patent shall issue accordingly. But if the Diocese of Montreal shall not elect as their bishop one of the names so proposed then the clergyman so elected be nominated to Her Majesty for confirmation as Bishop of Montreal only, and the election to the office of Metropolitan shall be vested in the House of Bishops."

The mover stated that he would add to this the canon originally submitted by the committee.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON would take this opportunity of saying a few words. He thought that the original canon contained some of the same provisions as this amendment. What had been said by a gentleman on the previous day was very true. None of the amendments that had been made were practicable. The only choice was either to have the Metropolitan elected by the House of Bishops, or to say that Montreal shall always be the Metropolitan See. Was it likely that the bishops would ever send down the names of members of their own House, and then submit to the indignity of having those names rejected. There had been a great deal said about the primitive usage of the church, and the sixty of the Metropolitan see. But by the original canon they would have one of the primitive customs, in the manner in which it was provided that the Metropolitan should be elected. He then read an extract from a work on the Antiquities, by which it appeared that Primacy in Africa had always been conferred on the senior bishop. With regard to the see being fixed at Montreal, because it was a large commercial city, that was no reason. Small cities

had frequently been the seats of Bishoprics. It all came in the end to the original canon, and the election must either be left to the bishops, or the see fixed at Montreal. He objected to a matter which concerned all the Dioceses being left to the Diocese of Montreal.

Rev. PROVOST WHITAKER agreed with Mr. Cameron that it would be a delicate matter for the Bishops to present the name of one of their number to the House; but it would only be in accordance with ancient usage, for then the people had a voice in the election of a president.

Rev. Mr. HOLLAND's amendment was then put, and it also was lost.

It was then moved by Rev. J. A. MULLOCK, seconded by Rev. E. DUVENNE, that on the Metropolitan See of Montreal becoming vacant, the Synod of Montreal be requested to fill the vacancy by electing their Bishop from any of the Colonial Bishops.

This motion was put to the House without discussion, and lost, only the mover and seconder voting for it.

It being now one o'clock, the House rose.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Synod having re-assembled at half-past two o'clock,

The Rev. PROLOCUTOR called the meeting to order, when,

Mr. STEELE moved in amendment to Mr. Carter's amendment :-

"That the report of the committee be not now adopted, but that a committee be appointed to prepare a petition to the Provincial Parliament, praying it to declare Montreal to be the Metropolitan See, and to grant to the Synod the exclusive right of regulating the succession to that See, and to prepare a short bill to that effect, and to invite the co-operation of the diocesan synod of Montreal in taking the requisite measures to secure its passage."

He thought the only way to settle the difficulty would be to go to the Legislature. No injustice would be done to the Diocesan Synod of Montreal by adopting this course. That Diocese had, with the other Synods, requested the Queen to settle the succession. They had thereby assented to the principle. And besides they would not be deprived by any legislative action from a voice in the ultimate regulation of the question. There could be no doubt but that the Metropolitan should be elected by the voice of the whole church. If, unfortunately, the Diocesan Synod of Montreal refused to give way, the Provincial Synod, at its next sitting, would have to request the Queen to withdraw the present patent, and issue another, which would be more likely to settle the question. Some gentlemen thought it would not be advisable to go to the legislature. He saw no difficulty in that step. The act incorporating the diocesan synod of Ontario instead of the church society of the diocese, passed without any difficulty.

The motion was seconded by the Rev. Mr. HEMMING, and being put to the meeting was lost, only three members voting for it.

The Rev. Mr. FOTHERGILL moved, seconded by Mr. SCOTT, -

"That the report of the committee be not an exception, but that it be vetoed that this Synod do determine that the Metropolitan See shall be fixed in the city of Montreal."

The Rev. Mr. SLACK asked if the amendment now put were lost could the same principle be again put to the synod embodied in a different form?

After some discussion, and appeal to the rules of the Synod,

The PROLOCUTOR decided that the principle could again be introduced this session if put in another form.

This amendment was also lost.

The Rev. Mr. ROE now moved, seconded by the Rev. Dr. BLEASDELL,

"That it is the desire of this House that the Metropolitan See ought to be fixed to one city, and that the decision of Her Majesty the Queen in selecting Montreal as the Metropolitan See ought, if possible, to be maintained; that, therefore, a committee be appointed to devise some measure, in connection with the Diocesan Synod of Montreal, for the solution of the difficulties in the way of the election of a Metropolitan, and to report to the next meeting of this Provincial Synod; and that in the meantime the election of a Metropolitan be vested provisionally in the House of Bishops."

Hon. J. H. CAMERON said that the amendment was very ingeniously worded, but the first part of it reaffirmed a motion which had just been negatived—alluding to the Rev. Mr. Fothergill's amendment.

The Rev. Mr. SLACK said that the Rev. Mr. Roe's amendment was written in the morning, and could have no connection with the Rev. Mr. Fothergill's.

Objections having been made to the amendment on the ground that it contained a preamble which many of the Synod could not affirm, having previously voted adversely to it,

The Rev. Mr. ROE reminded the Prolocutor and the House that the former had decided but a moment ago that they could re-introduce the principle embodied in it.

The PROLOCUTOR said he was of the same opinion still. The same principle could again be affirmed.

After some further discussion, the motion was put to the vote, and carried by 35 to 23.

The Hon. J. H. CAMERON called for the ayes and nays. These were taken thereupon.

The Rev. Mr. HOLLAND asked what further steps would now have to be taken in the matter. He thought that it would be necessary that the canon or some portion of it would have to be adopted, in order to give effect to the vote. He would consequently suggest that the canon adopted by the committee be adopted by the Synod.

The Rev. Mr. ROE, seconded by Rev. Mr. BLEASDELL, moved—That the committee mentioned in his former amendment consist of the Dean of Montreal and Mr. Carter, the Archdeacon of Ontario and Mr. Steele, the Provost of Trinity College and Mr. Campbell, Archdeacon Brough and Mr. Lawrason, and the Revs. Mr. Roe and Mr. Irvine. Carried.

The Rev. Mr. ROE again moved, seconded by the Provost of TRINITY COLLEGE, that the resolution respecting the Metropolitan See be transmitted to the House of Bishops, and that they be requested to concur in it, and add one or more members of their body to the committee. Carried unanimously.

(To be Continued.)

SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED TO END OF VOL. 9.

Dr. G., Toronto; G. P., Thornhill; W. P., Thornhill; W. R., Newmarket; W. G. P., Collingwood.

THE Canadian Ecclesiastical Gazette

IS PUBLISHED TWICE A MONTH,
BY HENRY ROWSELL, TORONTO.

ROWSSELL & ELLIS, PRINTERS, TORONTO.