

the Bishop disapproved of the manner of appointment, yet at the time he was appointed to the charge, there were 42 candidates. But the question of great importance to the Society was whether or not its interest would be advanced if the lay element were now introduced, and if members of the Church being communicants had a vote in the appointment; he thought increased interest would arise if the laity were more consulted, and had more opportunity of expressing their opinions, and it would be more satisfactory to the Church at large. He was not desirous of taking the patronage out of the hands of the Diocesan, but he thought it would be more satisfactory to deliberate between this and June upon it, and at that season many would be induced to attend who at this season cannot come, and a fuller and fairer expression of opinion would be then obtained if the Chief Justice would consent to defer his resolution.

Dr. MACKELCAN said, many had travelled from a distance to attend this meeting, and if it were incompetent to it to pass a By-law, it would be better to defer the question to another time. He differed widely from some of the speakers on the subject of excluding the laity. He thought the time was come when they must more or less have a voice in the selection of their Clergy; and while he laments the danger of losing the endowments, yet if they were examined into it would be found they were clearly inadequate to their present wants, and still more so to the future. In Canada the voluntary principle was beyond doubt in operation. The Clergy were thrown to a great extent on the affection and liberality of their flock, and he would like some plan which might ensure them an adequate support; and though opposed to the democratic principle of election, yet he thought some opportunity might be given to the laity to express an opinion, they might suggest whom to appoint without interfering with the patronage. He saw there was a strong feeling evinced in the meeting as to the necessity of continuing the patronage in the Bishop and his successors, but this would not be satisfactory to the laity. As one of that body spoke plainly, and he would say it was difficult to arouse in them feelings such as ought to prevail, but would effectually by giving them a voice in the nomination. In England the principle works favourably, in many places the congregations alone choose their pastor, and the support was derived from the pew rents and such funds. The Rev. Hugh McNeill, of Liverpool, and other eminent divines received their stipends from such sources, and so it will be in this and other Canadian Dioceses. Everything is now in favour of giving the laity a voice in the nomination, and if they had it they would come forward and support the church more effectually. He did intend to suggest that whenever a vacancy arose the District Branch should select a clergyman and the pewholders another, and submit their names to the Bishop, but he saw it would be of no use, as a bye-law can not now be passed if he understood rightly, and under these circumstances he thought that it was as well to adjourn the final decision upon the matter until June.

The Rev. C. C. BROUGH thought by the plan proposed no infringement upon the prerogative of the Diocesan was intended, but it occurred to him that whilst desirous by our acts to preserve that prerogative, we might endanger it by tempting parties to get up independent chapels, and if we altogether repudiated the lay element parties might be found who from unworthy motives would do so.

THE LORD BISHOP said, as the non-attendance at this meeting of many had been observed upon, he wished to call the attention of the meeting to the fact that to every Clergyman in the Diocese had been sent copies of the Act they were now discussing, not only for their own use, but also sufficient for their people, and if they did not now attend, that was no reason why they should keep the Diocese longer agitated upon the subject.

The Rev. Dr. BEAVAN rose to a point of order. There were two resolutions under consideration. He would suggest that the first should be put, and then they could discuss the second.

GEORGE DUOGAN, JR., Esq., thought there was much feeling amongst the Laity, and a desire to have lay influence introduced. It would have the effect of uniting the Clergyman and his flock. He had conversed with many on the subject, and thought it would not be an undesirable mode to name a Committee, who would frame bye-laws accordingly, and report them at the next monthly meeting, in order to their being adopted at the following monthly meeting or in June. People were to blame for not availing themselves of the present opportunity for discussing it. It was said that the Laity were not sufficiently aware of it, and were this so, it would be well to afford them more opportunity. There was at this meeting no opinion of the Laity. It was said they were unanimous in their approval of the course proposed. This was not so. There were many who he knew would not desire to transfer the patronage beyond the present Diocesan, in whom they would place it not for the reason in the preamble alone but because doing so was also best calculated to promote the interests of the Church.

Hon. J. HILYARD CAMERON said that the observations of Mr. Duggan arose from suggestions made by himself; and as this meeting was not competent to go further than a resolution, it was as well people should know the deep responsibility thrown upon them in framing any bye-law which would give the Laity influence in the election, and as a bye-law cannot be passed now,

he thought it would be no harm to name a committee to prepare one, and report at the next meeting. In the meantime means might be taken to make these proceedings known through the length and breadth of the land. He did not think the principle of lay nomination was against the principles of the Church. At home, both in England and Ireland, Collegiate and corporate bodies exercised that power. With them they did so as a governing body; and though with us the power would be in the body the principle was the same. If his opinion as to the exercise of this power were to be expressed, he would vest the power in His Lordship so long as his life was spared, and he prayed God his span might be extended to the longest limit assigned to man. (Hear, hear.) The reason he urged this strongly was, that he felt His Lordship enjoyed the favour of his people, and he as strongly felt that the patronage during His Lordship's life should not be out of his hands; but he was not prepared to say he would submit to have it in the Diocesan at all times, nor was he prepared to say he would not; but he must reserve his decision to a future period. If the Laity had not more largely availed themselves of this opportunity for discussion on the subject, they had only themselves to blame. Yet he as one was not prepared to say what his ultimate decision would be, or what it would not. He considered the Act fortunate. He was himself an humble instrument in promoting the passing of it, based on a little Bill which had been introduced, and which would have swept away the Rectories as they became vacant (hear, hear.) When the suggestion to refer it to a Committee was adopted, an amendment was introduced to take that vital action upon the Rectory question in the Court of Equity, in furtherance of which they might not be aware a Bill had been filed to abolish them all. At that critical moment there was no time for deliberation, and when he considered the actual constitution of the House, deficient as it was of influential members of the church of England able to do justice to the church, he secured the patronage being vested in the Church Society as the best governing body that offered, having the Bishop to consult with. In fact, he felt that when the time came for its removal from the hands of Government, where it was placed with men nominally Churchmen, who left it with His Lordship, yet the time might come when the Government would not take the re-commendation of the Bishop. (Hear, hear.) He felt, he repeated, that in doing as he did he was taking from them the means of doing the Church an injury; and, therefore, he was desirous of taking it out of their power, and placing it in other and more friendly hands. That being the case, every means and opportunity should be given to the whole Church, Lay as well as Clerical, to pronounce an opinion upon the question of its ultimate disposal. There should be no error, no mistake, in what we do, and he would suggest the appointment of a Committee to prepare a bye-law, and submit it to the consideration of the next general meeting, and to be published one, two, or three months beforehand, so that all might know what was being done, and all express an opinion upon the question.

THE LORD BISHOP rose to say he considered the course pursued by Mr. Cameron a very right one.

The Hon. JUDGE DWARKE said he had prepared a resolution which he thought would meet the views of all; and the several proposers and seconders had some conversation as to alterations and amalgamations so as to embody them.

The Hon. the CHIEF JUSTICE said he considered that ample notice had been given of this meeting. He had seen it in remote parts of the Province, and he thought the sense of the meeting seemed to be to vest the patronage, not only in the present but future incumbents of the See. He saw no necessity for a delay until June. This act cannot be said to have become law until the Proclamation of last September, which gave it effect, so that no time had been lost in convening this meeting. If the decision of the Society on the question now before them, were postponed until June, and that in the interim a vacancy arose, there could be no legal institution of a pastor by any but the Church Society or some one intrusted by it, with the patronage. Legal questions also might arise, questions of title and right of ejection, for instance. If a vacancy were now filled by His Lordship, the question might arise, how was the incumbent appointed, whether by the Church Society or its nominee? The answer must be—No. For any inconvenience and delay, they would therefore be responsible as well as for any division which might be created. As to the interference of the laity, it was said they were not represented here. Were that whose fault was it? but he saw many here, and there was nothing to prevent their intending as well as the Clergy, many of whom had come from a distance. Some talk of not interfering with the rights of the Bishop, but they were not free from being charged with inconsistency. (Hear, hear.) They would nominate three or four and let the Bishop choose therefrom. Now he would like to know was not this an interference, yet if it would have the effect of creating among them a warmer interest, that might be a necessary reason for adopting it, but, for his part, he thought the great bulk of the people by whom the appointment might be thus made, would much more steadily support the pastor named and appointed by the Bishop, than one named by a majority of the laity against their individual wish. (Hear, hear.) He had seen some strong examples of the inefficiency of the voluntary system in Canada. Look to the Roman Catholics, to

the Methodists.—Do they consult the laity in nominating a pastor? No. If any one desecration in Canada, more than another, exercises that power it is the Church of Scotland. It was an undesirable state of things, and as to the sufficiency of the voluntary system, we had only to turn to the neighbouring States, where he had seen it stated on good authority that, in the State of Pennsylvania the laity of the Presbyterian body, who were consulted in the appointment, did not contribute an average of more than \$150 to the support of their clergy. (Hear, hear.)

Dr. MACKELCAN said that in latter years the income of the Church Society diminished, instead of increasing with the wealth and population of the province, and contended that if the laity had confidence in the Church Society, a larger income would fall in to it. Now one means of effecting this was to continue the patronage in the laity as they must have a voice. He was no friend to the voluntary system, but he would not say we may yet come to it, and he thought if an arrangement were entered into, to give them a voice in the nomination they would take a greater interest in the Society, see more of its practical benefits than now, and attend more regularly the ministrations of the Church. With these views he would suggest that the District Branches of the Church Society should have the nomination of candidates to the Bishop. This would give the laity a voice in the nomination, and check the election of clergy contrary to the spirit of the church. Thus would all be brought in harmony, and it must tend to extend the church more widely. But as this meeting was not competent to adopt any bye-law upon the subject, there was no use in pressing it now.

The Rev. J. G. GEDDES said, it had been lately observed to him that the Church Society was losing the confidence of the people, but he at once denied that such was the case, and to sustain this denial he opened the reports and shewed therefrom that although at the close of the year report the Society was labouring under the shock given to it by the painful irregularities of a confidential servant, still the report shewed, in many instances, a larger amount of subscriptions; a brother clergyman had made the same remarks. This statement had been made here, and he thought this ought to be corrected; and when it is said the time named by the notice was not sufficient, he certainly differed in opinion for he did think ample time had been given to all. The subject had been much discussed, there had been writer upon writer upon the subject in the columns of the press. He came there prepared to act in the matter, but he was not previously aware that this was no time to pass a bye-law.—His belief, however, was that even if it were known we were competent to do so, no larger meeting of the clergy and laity than the present was likely to be got together. It was contended that it would increase interest in the Society if it had this patronage, but he would like to see the subscriptions of the laity flow from some purer and holier motive—(hear)—from a desire to propagate religion; to send missionaries to relieve the spiritual destitution of the distant settlers, and not from a desire to grasp the patronage of the Church or exercise its power—(hear, hear.)

The Rev. Mr. CHOWN said he dissented from the resolution as framed partly for the reasons already explained and partly because it was competent to them to pass any bye-law they saw fit "from time to time." If we finally disposed of it now we would be anticipating the wishes of the Society at a future day when there might be good grounds for changing our opinion. The Rev. Mr. Geddes had said that the Society was not in any languishing state. Now if the population increased in any great ratio so ought the congregation and the funds; but he believed the funds were at a stand, and this was not a satisfactory state of things. It was said this was essentially different from the exercise of lay patronage at home. The Colleges in Ireland had endowments bestowed upon them, the University had its endowments and great patronage. In this instance the Government had handed those endowments to us, and that being the case he did not think it inconsistent to exercise the patronage with which the Government had thus endowed us. He did not see in what lay patronage differed from these cases he had cited, and saw no argument against the Church Society retaining in its hands the patronage confided to it. It was time now to introduce the lay element into the Church. They must in secular matters work together; and over spiritual matters might their Bishop long preside. (Hear, hear.) Endowments were the secular matters. These Government had provided for the Church and with them he would maintain the laity had a right to interfere, and the time was coming when they would. We should not therefore pass what would be a vain resolution. The Roman Catholic Church did not allow lay interference in nominations, but if they had reason to be dissatisfied they could constrain their Bishop to remove the minister and he did so. Thus we behold the lay element recognized in that iron bound church, but he would rather see it recognized in the appointment than in the removal of a minister. (hear.) How do the Methodists act? The Conference appoints and that Conference was largely composed of their laity. He was not prepared to say how it would work with us. The sooner we introduce it into our secular affairs in aid of the Lord's work the better would we be able to devote ourselves to spiritual affairs.

The Rev. Dr. LOWNY made some observations which we did not catch, his back being turned to us.

The Rev. Dr. LERR said the only question now was whether the appointments should be hereafter in the Church Society or in the Bishop.

In all meetings such as this opportunity was desirable. To a certain extent it now existed, namely, so far that all agreed in confiding to his Lordship the exercise of the patronage during his time, and with one voice rose to show their respect to him. But its after disposal was the knotty point. As to this he would appeal to the meeting, and ask them would it not be better to let the further discussion of the matter drop now, and he sincerely hoped that for many a year it might not be necessary to revive the question. Let us when we go from this meeting be able to say that there were no dissentient voices raised, and that we were unanimous in our decision. If this course were approved of, let this disputed point drop with the consent of the proposer and seconder, and a bye-law embodying the spirit of the resolutions be prepared giving the patronage to the Bishop for life which could be submitted at the next monthly meeting, and in due time formally adopted. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. T. B. FULLAN said it would afford him much pleasure to vote for the first resolution, but he confessed he should like to see the question finally disposed of, as he thought any postponement on that point might hereafter be deemed invidious to his Lordship's successor. In his opinion the present was the time to settle it. According to the constitution of the Society no By-law could have effect, without the consent of the Bishop, and he did not think his Lordship's successor would be likely to consent to a By-law which would take it from him. (Hear, hear.) He could not vote for Mr. DeBlaquiere's resolution, for he thought the time was come when we must call in the assistance of the laity. We do not hold the position that we ought. When parishes became vacant there were no clergy to fill them. Look to our Divinity Students, are they in number as they ought?—No; and why is this, but because the leading families in the country do not encourage their sons to study for the Clerical Profession. This was not a proper state of things, and to remedy it we must call in the assistance of the laity. Let us look to the condition of the Church in the United States, under God, its existence and present prosperity is to be attributed to the laity, and there so well had it been working that one half its present members had been born in other Protestant denominations. Their laity have a legitimate voice in the Church, and when we see it there, growing from a small beginning we have no reason to be disappointed. As evidence of the feeling of the laity in the adjacent States, he instanced a Church in Buffalo, the incumbency of which was lately vacant, and a debt lay upon it amounting to \$3,000. A member of the congregation said to another that it would be desirable that the new incumbent should not enter with such a debt upon it, and he proposed to pay one half if his friend would pay the other. The proposal was seconded and the debt paid. There was evidence of the beneficial working of the lay element in the adjacent State, and he could not help thinking that if the laity were not allowed to use their legitimate influence here the consequences might be disastrous.

Hon. Mr. DE BLAQUIERE said that nothing had been he hoped dropped by him calculated to create disunion. There was a great principle involved in the resolution, and any deviation from that he thought was to be avoided. He would now observe on one point: It was said that the lay element would, by having a voice in the nomination be stimulated to exertion; there was no one more anxious than himself that the lay element should be legitimately drawn forward. Its proper place was in the government of temporal affairs, and that would be best attained by keeping from them the power to appoint in spiritual affairs. He would, however, for unanimity withdraw his resolution, but his opinion was not the less confirmed of its propriety.

The Rev. C. C. BROUGH said that if the resolution could go forth with the explanation given it would be satisfactory, but otherwise it might be supposed we would repudiate the lay element. If any real good could be effected by passing it thus, he would say go on.

J. H. HAGARTY, Esq. said, he would record his emphatic protest against this principle.—What has the lay element to do with the appointment? Why introduce *ad captandum* argument—if withdrawn it would be against his emphatic protest against the patronage being in any hands but the Bishops; but for unanimity he would withdraw it, at the same time he asserted that the parishioners should in no way interfere in the nomination.

The Rev. Mr. CHOWN said that if the patronage was given to this Society, Laymen would have a voice, being incorporated members to whom the Government had given the patronage, and it was these, not the Parishioners, would have a voice. The Bishop, the Clergy, and the Lay element elected in, constituted the Corporation.

The Rev. ADAM TOWNLEY said he came here at great inconvenience in order to support a principle, and if they were to adjourn their decision to to-morrow, be it so, and no farther.

The Rev. Mr. CHOWN suggested that the proposer of the original resolution should withdraw it, and if the seconder were equally willing to do so, and take up the resolution as proposed to be altered, unanimity might be obtained. He was not prepared to support it as it now stood; but must vote against it; in fact, there was so many propositions before them, that no one could well tell what they were called on to consider.

(The resolutions were published in our last.)