

It must be clearly understood that the proposal before the Synod was not the appointment of a Coadjutor Bishop, but the sanctioning of certain *rules of procedure*, to be put in force in the event of the appointment of a Coadjutor being thought expedient *by the Synod*, (see clause vi above) at some future time.

THE VOTE.

It was decided that the proposed addition to the Canon should first be voted upon clause by clause, and then as a whole, as the opposition was thought to be to the details, rather than to the principle.

On clause vi the vote was ayes, 22 : nays, 10. On a vote by orders being called for, the numbers were : Clergy—ayes, 14 : nays, 5 ; Laity—ayes, 10 ; nays, 9, and the clause was declared carried.

Clause vii was negatived by a substantial majority, the vote being : ayes, 11 ; nays, 25.

On clause viii, the vote was again taken by orders, and was declared lost on the Lay vote. The numbers were : Clergy—ayes, 14 : nays, 4 ; Laity—ayes, 9 ; nays, 10.

But after the vote had been taken, it was pointed out that a bare majority of each order was not sufficient, but that a two-thirds majority of those present of each order was necessary for the adoption or confirmation of a Canon.

This being so, clause vi had really been defeated, but the point was not raised until the next day, when clause vi (all that remained of the Canon) had again to be voted on as a whole. It would probably have been better had the chairman on the second day ruled that the clause had not been properly carried, but he did not do so, and a division took place resulting in the defeat of the clause by a considerable majority. Most of the supporters of the clause on Tuesday voted against it on Wednesday, feeling that as the other clauses (and particularly clause viii, which was essentially) had been struck out, the one by itself would be inoperative, and was therefore valueless.

The full strength of the Synod is : Clergy, 24 : Laity 58—total 82. Of the 24 Clergy, only 4 voted against any of the clauses : of the Laity, only 10 out of 58 : yet under our Canons the opposition of these 10 dissentients was able to thwart the almost unanimous wish of the Clergy, and to defeat resolutions that would most probably have been carried by large majorities had there been a fuller attendance of the Lay members of the Synod.

THE CONSEQUENCE.

Did the persons so voting, realise the position into which they have forced his Lordship? We imagine that some at least of them did not. By refusing to confirm the Canon, they were rendering the appointment of a Coadjutor impossible for 2 years at least. Few persons of his Lordship's years would care to face the work of the Diocese, knowing that no assistance could be had until such a period had elapsed.