

their opinions thereon, to be evidenced in writing with the signatures of the Members in each congregation approving and disapproving of the same."

Hon. Robert Jones objected that the Laity of the Diocese were not sufficiently represented to warrant the meeting taking action upon a matter of such vital importance, and wished to know how many delegates were present, and how many absent. This having been explained, the Lord Bishop stated that he knew of no better way of securing a full representation than the plan he had taken. He could not compel delegates to come, and it was never expected that all the members of a representative assembly would be in attendance, and as to the importance of the matter, the present question was simply as to whether it was desirable that the Church in the Colony should be allowed to make rules for its guidance, subject always to certain restrictions. After a lengthy and somewhat irregular discussion, the amendment was put and lost. The following persons only voting in the affirmative: Rev. W. Bond, Rev. J. Irwin, Rev. C. Bancroft, Hon. Robert Jones, W. Bowman, Esq., W. Leggett, Esq., J. Coote, Esq., and C. Jones, Esquire.

The original motion was then put and carried. The Bill with the amendments of the Committee and certain other amendments was then, after consideration and some discussion adopted, clause by clause. The Bill as thus amended will be found below, the amendments, proposed in Convocation, being printed in Italics.

It was then moved by W. BOWMAN, Esq., seconded by the Rev. C. BANCROFT, that the Bill with its proposed amendments, be printed and referred to the Parishes. The mover again addressed the meeting at some length. The scope of the observations of the opponents of the measure (which want of space compels us to omit) seemed to us to consist in this, that a Bill coming from Mr. Gladstone, an avowed leader of the Tractarian party, should be looked upon with suspicion, as likely to give a despotic authority to the clergy, and remove the Colonial Church from the salutary influence of the legislative supervision; that in the first clause of the Bill the Bishop was given authority to negative any of the proceedings of the Convention, which would be giving an unworthy prelate, if ever they should be so unfortunate as to have one, too great a power. These objections had been urged at Cape Town, in New South Wales, and in New Brunswick.

On the other hand, it was urged that it did not matter from whence the Bill came so that its provisions were good; that it had been the desire of the members of the Church of England here to be allowed to hold Conventions similar to those held in the neighboring States, in which would be vested the authority over the clergy and members of the Church in matters of discipline, an authority which seems to be vested in nobody, and impossible to be exercised. Therefore it was well to accept a Bill which defined their position, and gave them the desired authority, if they could get such amendments made in it as were then proposed.

As for the power of veto given to the Bishop, it was held by the Bishops in the United States, and had given no occasion for complaint there. It was farther objected in support of Mr. Bowman's motion, that sufficient time had not been given for the mature consideration of the Bill, and that the Laity being imperfectly represented it would be well it should be referred back to the parishes.

In reply, it was said that that meeting was about as large or perhaps a larger meeting of Delegates, than could be got together again; that if the Bill were referred to the parishes, some would take no action upon it, and nearly all the rest would find it impossible to give it mature consideration, and would adopt the views of leading members of the congregations—probably of the very delegates sent to the convention. Further, that it was of importance that the matter should be decided now, as the Imperial Parliament would likely take action on it during its present session, and the Bishop was to proceed to Great Britain ere long, where he should be empowered to express the opinions of this Diocese on the subject

The Rev. Mr. Bancroft desired to make an explanation of what might appear inconsistent in his conduct as a member of the Convocation Committee who prepared and presented the report, voting against its immediate adoption. At the time the Bill came before the Committee he had recently returned from England, and had not seen or considered it at all. It seemed to him all right, and he had voted for its adoption. Further reflection had convinced him that under the circumstances they required to proceed with deliberation and caution, and he desired therefore, that further delay should be granted, for a full consideration of the subject by all the congregations in the Diocese. This was his reason for voting against its adoption then.

The Rev. Mr. NEVE, seconded by the Rev. W. ABBOTT, moved in amendment, that the final consideration of the question be now proceeded with, which was carried.

It was farther resolved, on motion of Major CAMPBELL, seconded by the Rev. Dr. LEACH, that this meeting are decidedly of opinion, that unless the amendments now proposed are faithfully adopted in the Bill, it will not be satisfactory to the Church in this Diocese.

It was finally moved by Col. AUSTIN, seconded by the Rev. Dr. BETHUNE, and *Resolved*, That the Bill with its amendments be adopted, and that his Lordship the Bishop of the Diocese be respectfully requested to forward the same to the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with such observations or remarks as to his Lordship may seem appropriate. His Lordship remarked that the only observations he should send would be a succinct statement of facts; and that if any congregation should feel aggrieved and desire to send in a remonstrance against the Bill, he would see it faithfully forwarded to the proper authorities.

The meeting was then closed with prayer.

*REPORT of the Convocation Committee, appointed at the General Meeting of the Clergy and Laity, on the 22nd January, 1851.*

"The Colonial Church Bill" having been considered, the adoption of the general principles of the Bill was recommended with the following suggestions:—

1. With reference to the first clause; That the Imperial Statute, 25 Henry VIII., c. 19, so far as the same may affect churches in the Colonies, now included in the Schedule A, should be repealed.

2. With reference to the same clause; and in order more clearly to define what shall constitute Lay Membership; and that all persons having received Christian Baptism, and made a written declaration that they are *bona fide* members of the Church of England to the Clergymen of their Parish or District, or are communicants of the said Church, shall be considered for the purposes of the said Act.

3. With reference to the same clause: That in order to produce, as far as possible, uniformity of action in the Dioceses in the North American Colonies, it is desirable that the senior Bishop for the time being, should be appointed *Provincial* Metropolitan, and that there should be a General Convention of all the Dioceses convened under his presidency, that no Canon, Rule, or Regulations should be in force as the act of such General Convention until it shall be allowed by the Archbishop of Canterbury as Metropolitan, and that the Diocesan Conventions, meeting under each particular Bishop, should be restricted from passing any Canons contrary to the Laws and Canons of the General Conventions; also, that in framing any new Canons, or adapting those of 1603 to the present state of the Church in these Colonies, it should not be lawful for any Synod or Convention, so assembled, to make any alterations in the authorised version of the Holy Scriptures, in the Book of Common Prayer, or in the Thirty-nine Articles now in use, or do anything which shall affect any matters of doctrine, or interfere with the supremacy of the Crown, or the authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury, as Metropolitan.