

and therefore he had endeavored to get the advice of clergy and laity, that together they might consider what was necessary to place the Church of England in the same position as the Presbyterians and other bodies: otherwise everything must, as now, be carried on by the Bishop *ex mero motu*. There were other reasons why the Church should be represented by a constituted body: for example, the Clergy Reserves Act allowed clergymen to commute, with the sanction of the religious bodies to which they belonged; but at present, as there was no other representative of the body, the Bishop's will was alone capable of being consulted.

His Lordship then read a letter, of which he had received a copy, from the late Sir W. Molesworth, as Secretary for the Colonies, to the Governor-General, in answer to an application from the Canadian Legislature, asking for legal authority to be granted to the Church of England in Canada to hold Synods, and also to elect her own Bishops. It was stated in the letter, on the authority of the law officers of the Crown, that there were difficulties in the way of passing any imperial act for those purposes, and constitutional objections to granting the right of electing Bishops; but with reference to the electing of Bishops, in practice the difficulty might be got over, as he Sir W. Molesworth was willing to receive any nomination which the Governor-General might send home after consultation with the authorities of the Church in Canada, and he would lay the same before the Queen. Now if we had a regular representative body like a Synod on such occasions, the mind of the Church might be authoritatively arrived at; otherwise to attempt to get at it by petitions, or such like declarations of opinion, there might be so many contradictory ones that no definite result could ensue.

The Church acting in Synod would have a position and a voice which would be positively and substantively heard. Nor will it infringe any law. The decision of the Crown law officers of England, while it seems to raise great objections to giving a legal status to any synodical action here by any imperial statute, does not touch the question of their meeting and framing rules for the guidance of their own body, subject to all existing canons. He would be glad to hear the opinions of others on the subject. He was sure it would do much to disabuse the minds of many respecting the formation of the Synod. It had been stated that this measure would give the Bishop an unlimited power. This was not the case; for it was most apparent that it would rather limit that power and authority. This action had been taken by him honestly and in good faith. He hoped the proceedings of the meeting would be carried on in such a manner as would not cause a single regret for the way in which they had been conducted. He had issued the notices calling this meeting before he received Sir William Molesworth's despatch; but had he not done so, he should still have probably thought it his duty to issue them, as he had promised them to do it, and had been called on repeatedly to know when he would do so, and by no one more frequently than by the Rector of St. John's (Mr Bancroft). Had he declined doing so, it would have been said that he wished to prevent the expression of opinion. He had considered it his duty to give them an opportunity for discussion, and he hoped they would give free expression to their opinions. He had no object but the good of the Church.

A discussion here arose relative to the mode of the appointment of some of the lay delegates, and a petition was presented from members of St. George's Church, complaining that its dele-

gates had been chosen by a vestry of proprietors instead of pewholders.

His Lordship said he had had an explanation of the matter, and that it was simply that the delegates had been appointed by the vestry; the latter body, however, had been authorized to do so by a majority of the pewholders present at the meeting called for the election of the delegates.

The petition having been read, a motion was made that a committee be appointed to investigate the case, which was negatived.

Mr. Justice McCord then rose to move the following resolution: "That there is a necessity for the establishment of a Diocesan Synod within this Diocese; that the Bishop, Clergy, and Laity here assembled be the Synod of this Diocese, and do now proceed to consider the report of the sub-committee on the declaration and constitution."

The Rev. Canon Townsend briefly seconded the motion.

Subsequently, the Hon. Judge McCord withdrew his original motion, and moved to resolve simply—"That there is a necessity for the establishment of a Diocesan Synod within this Diocese."

Rev. A. D. Campbell moved in amendment, "That the Clergy and Lay delegates now assembled, not recognizing a Diocesan Synod apart from the Crown as lawful and constitutional, decline to proceed to such organization."

Mr. Bowman seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at  $\frac{1}{2}$  past 6, till Thursday.

THURSDAY.—After Morning Prayers at the Cathedral, the Bishop proceeded to the National School, and having taken the chair at 12 o'clock, called on the Rev. Mr. McLeod to resume the debate.

The amendment proposed by the Rev. A. D. Campbell was then put to the meeting, and lost on the following division:

CLERGY—*Ayes*: Rev. Messrs. McLeod, Forest, Flanagan, Cornwall, Bond, Campbell, Brethour, and Canon Bancroft.—8.

*Nays*:—Rev. Messrs. Robinson, Johnston, Lindsay, (R.) Canon Townsend, Sykes, Davidson, Mountain, Scott, Sutton, Jones, Lindsay, (D.) Machin, Mussen, Neve, Du Vernet, Lonsdell, O'Grady, Slack, Dean Bethune, Archdeacon Lower, Canon Leach, Burrage, Canon Gilson, Lockhart, Rollet, Fulton, Abbott, Whetherall, Whitwell, Young, Pyke, Rogers and Godden.—35.

LAITY—*Ayes*: Messrs. John Bostwick, Wm. McGinnis, Hon. R. Jones, Col. Wilgress, W. Newman, Wm. Bowman, Col. Hoyle, John Campbell, George Maerne, A. H. Campbell, A. N. Rennie, E. L. Montzambert, Isaac Coute, and Dr. Smallwood.—14.

*Nays*:—Messrs. J. Drake, G. J. Marston, J. Armstrong, L. M. Knowlton, H. S. Foster, Major Campbell, Colonel Austin, Amos H. Vaughan, David Derrick, A. Perry, Stevens Baker, George Adams, Asa Foster, John Morrison, Henry Martin, Hon. J. Pnuguan, Edward Rauson, Charles Gillespie, Hon. Geo. Moffatt, John Crawford, I. J. Gibb, W. J. Knox, — Gough, Henry Schneider, John Wainwright, D. Westover, Wm. Robert, G. H. Monk, R. A. Ellis, and R. Sheppard.—30.

The Bishop then said he supposed the vote just taken might be considered as expressing the opinions of the meeting with respect to the necessity for the formation of a Synod.\* He

\* Judge McCord the mover of the original resolution was unable to attend on the second day, being obliged to be present in Court.

Hon. Mr. Justice Aylwin also, who would have voted with the majority, was also detained by judicial business at Quebec.

desired at that stage of the proceedings to make a few remarks. He felt a deep responsibility rested on himself in this matter, but his first wish had been to have it so brought before the clergy and laity of his diocese as to enable them to understand fully the real state of the question. They had had something substantive before them which had awakened feelings of interest and called forth the opinions of both clergy and laity. But he did not desire to have the constitution and rules for the government of a Synod hastily adopted. He wished them to be duly considered and intelligently discussed. It is not likely they could retain all the delegates here a sufficient time to discuss them as they should be now, and he therefore thought best, not on account of any threats of withdrawal, but to give full time and opportunity to all to consider them, not to proceed further than to affirm the necessity for a Synod on the present occasion. He had never wished to force Synods upon his people. They had been demanded from him repeatedly by both clergy and laymen, and he saw there was a need of some such organization. Rev. Mr. Campbell said he had his cathedral chapter as a council. But he (the Bishop) asked if it was not notorious, that the greatest jealousy and ill-feeling would prevail if that body, of his own appointment, were given the government of the Diocese. He had had but one wish in this proceeding, as in the remodelling of the Church Society, to call in to aid and counsel him in the government of his diocese, the clergy and representatives of the laity. Those who had acted with him in that society knew that he had sought to place the representation of the laity upon the broadest basis, and when the rectories had been given up to that society to manage, he had himself suggested their being handed over to the vestries as most interested in their proper management. In all his proceedings, since he came into the diocese, this had been the principle on which he had acted. In taking steps for assembling a Synod he was not of opinion he had shown himself disloyal to his Queen. He felt no one could justly lay that to his charge. He was bound by his consecration oath and trusted he should always feel the full force of that obligation. He recognized the supremacy of the Queen and of the law, here as in England: here as there, all writs run in the Queen's name. But other bodies met under the authority of the Queen and of the law, why should not they? He did not feel that in meeting thus they would be contravening any law. With regard to the objection raised to our Synodical meetings here, that it would give rise to unseemly contentions, because such had been the case at the meetings of Convocation in England in former years, the argument did not apply. There the disputes were about doctrinal questions. Such questions could not come before their Synod. There too it might be, and was urged, he would not say how justly, that they had no need of Convocation or Synod, for Parliament gave them the necessary legislation, and through the Ecclesiastical Courts discipline was maintained. But here the Church was not represented or recognised in Parliament, nor had we Ecclesiastical Courts. In this country the practical good sense of every other religious body have given them such organization as this, and enabled them to work its machinery to their benefit. He did not believe the practical good sense of the members of the Church of England was any less, or that it would fail them in any effort to carry on the affairs of their church. With regard to the remarks of Sir Geo. Stephens (who was recognised as a great authority in Colonial affairs), contained in a letter addressed, he be-