

The first paragraph is a mere assumption of a fact for the existence of which there is not a shadow of likelihood. Then we have a list of objections, which the writer answers (to himself) most satisfactorily in the last paragraph. Re-organize the whole Synod—extend its sittings—abolish the “opening service” and the “missionary meeting,” and then everything might be discussed with advantage in Synod.

Our object is not to pull down but to build up. If only the Laity were required to meet, and we are satisfied they would willingly do so, on the Monday from two to five and from eight to eleven, the objects of the House of Laymen would be fully answered, and without in the least interfering with the present composition and arrangements of the Synod.

23. “Replying to your favor, etc., I am quite in favor of the establishment of House of Laymen, although I have had no opportunity of discussing this proposal with my colleagues or other laity. I would venture the opinion, that it would meet with the approval of the laity as a whole.”

24. “I have considered the matter you ask my opinion about. I think it is a step in the right direction. The delegates from country parishes could bring up matters connected with the Church, and debate among themselves, better than they can if they are sitting with the clergy. Many are afraid to speak before men so highly educated, and yet our objects and meaning may be as good.”

25. “I beg to say that I am favorable to the establishment of a House of Laymen for the Diocese of Toronto, and believe that it would meet with the approval of a majority of the country laity.”

26. “If our constitution was changed, and instead of the present election of delegates, a House of Laymen should be formed to confer, etc., the Bishop could have no difficulty in giving his support to the movement.”