

Mr. R. B. Denison asked if it was right to go on with the discussion, when the understanding arrived at in the forenoon was that it would not come up till to-morrow.

Mr. Henniker thought the discussion should be postponed, at the same time he was in favour of the amendment proposed.

Prof. Wilson said the discussion might go on, and be taken up also to-morrow. They could not finish it that day.

The Prolocutor announced that he had appointed Archdeacon Palmer as his deputy. He would now ask him to take his place while he expressed his opinion on the subject before the House. (Cheers.)

Archdeacon Palmer having taken the chair,

The Prolocutor said he simply wished to express his opinion, which was that they should accept the amendment of Canon Loosemore, and defer the consideration of the subject for the present. (No, no.)

The Prolocutor then resumed his seat.

Rev. C. P. Reid thought it was a want of courtesy to the Committee on Ritualism to take up the discussion of this subject before their report came up.

Rev. Dr. Balch said, as it was near the hour of adjournment, he would move that the House do adjourn, and then this question would come up the first thing in the morning. Lost.

Hon. Mr. Huntingdon moved that, when the House adjourn, the debate stand adjourned, to be taken up on the first order of the day to-morrow. Carried.

The Synod then adjourned.

FIFTH DAY.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

The debate on the amendment to Canon No. 2 was resumed.

Rev. Canon Loosemore thought they should accept the recommendation of the Committee on Ritualism.

Dean Hellmuth said that the Committee consisted of ten delegates, and four of them dissented from that portion of the report which recommended delay of action in reference to those points referred to in the memorial from Toronto. He proceeded to state his reasons why they should legislate without any loss of time on a question of so much moment to the harmony and peace of the Church. There was no instrumentality better calculated to gather people into the fold of Christ than the Church of England. But she must hold her principles as firmly as those did who, in former