

keeping up the connexion with the mother church, and this could only be done by following the precedents of that church.—If the episcopate here is given a different position from that accorded to it there, a barrier would be set up between the church in the mother country and here.

The METROPOLITAN BISHOP said that as this was a subject which very nearly concerned himself and his right reverend brethren, he might be expected to give expression to his own opinion on the subject. An attempt had been made to compare their position there with that occupied by them in the Diocesan Synods, but he thought the parallel did not hold good. When he presided over his own diocesan synod, he met men with the most of whom he was personally acquainted, with whose opinion he was familiar. But here, where other bishops were present, where many were gathered from various parts of the province, where there were greater diversities of interest and of opinion, the case was very different, and the position of the presiding bishop not at all similar. It was neither fair to the bishops nor to the representatives of the several dioceses, that they should thus be sitting as one body. The example of England and the United States Convention, supported by a long experience there, was one which it might be advisable to follow. What had they on the other side? He thought there was a broad general principle lying on the very surface of their investigations into the best method of organization, which need not be referred to any committee, nor give rise to any long discussion. It was not an interference with the duties of the proposed committee. It was surely competent for the Synod to give any instructions it thought fit to its committees. He thought it would be for the good of the church and tend to promote the harmony and freedom of their deliberations, if they met as separate branches of the Synod.

The LORD BISHOP OF TORONTO said he had given the matter long and careful consideration, and he heartily concurred in all that had fallen from his Lordship the Metropolitan Bishop.

After some remarks from the Rev. Mr. Roe, the motion was put and carried.

In rising to leave the chair the Metropolitan Bishop said he could not separate from the delegates without an expression of thanks to Almighty God for bringing them so far on in the business about which they were met, in so harmonious and satisfactory a manner, nor without saying to those present how grateful he felt for the courtesy and kindness towards himself, which they had evinced while presiding over their deliberations. He had looked forward to that meeting with some anxiety. He could rejoice now that the beginning of their work had been made in such good temper, and so excellent a spirit. They had an important work to do. He could hardly express his satisfaction at the manner in which they had set about it. He hoped it would be carried forward in the same harmonious spirit, with the same good feelings for the good of the church, and the extension of Christ's kingdom here on earth. It only remained for him to announce that the bishops would meet on Wednesday morning after prayers in the Cathedral, in the room above, and that the lower house would re-assemble at the same hour in the room where they were then sitting. Their first business would be to elect a prolocutor. Till that were done, he would name the Very Rev. the Dean of Montreal as temporary chairman.

His Lordship then pronounced the apostolic benediction, after which the Bishops left the hall, the members of Synod standing.

The Very Rev. the Dean of Montreal having taken the chair, and called the meeting to order, The Rev. Dr. FULLER said that at the instance of a number of his brethren he arose to name for the office of prolocutor one who, next to the Dean of Montreal, was best entitled to it, and the Dean, being in the diocese, where the Metropolitan resided would, perhaps, be willing to waive his claims. He, therefore, would propose to that house, the name of a clergyman, a neighbour of his own, a learned Canonist, a gentleman possessing great patience, great courtesy and firmness of purpose. I therefore propose the name of the Rev. Dr. BEAVEN, of the Diocese of Toronto.

The motion being seconded, was carried, and Dr. Beaven proceeded to take the chair. He said—Gentlemen of the clergy and laity, it is with feelings of no ordinary gratification, as well as with feelings of great difficulty, that I find myself placed in the position you have accorded to me. I look upon it as the greatest honour you could have conferred upon a clergyman of this Province. I will simply content myself with saying that I hope, by the blessing of God, to make some approach to carrying out the character which Dr Fuller had said he considered necessary for the person that would fill this chair. I hope I may have the assistance of all my friends in this meeting in attaining this object;—It may be a difficult one, but with this assistance I hope all difficulties may be smoothed down; and I pray God that he may bring all things unto peace and harmony, and cause us to proceed with the same harmony and unanimity of purpose with which we have hitherto proceeded.

The Prolocutor announced that His Lordship the Metropolitan Bishop had appointed the following Committees to form rules and orders:—Archdeacon Helmuth and Col. Rhodes of the Diocese of Quebec. Rev. Mr. Kennedy and Dr. Bovell of the Diocese of Toronto. Rev. Canon Bancroft and Hon. George Moffatt of the Diocese of Montreal. Ven. Archdeacon Brough and Watson, Esq., of the Diocese of Huron. Rev. Mr. Forest and Hon. J. Hamilton of the Diocese of Ontario.

A committee was then named to accompany the Prolocutor to the House of Bishops and announce the choice of the Lower House to have fallen upon him; after a discussion about the use of the term Prolocutor, which Rev. Mr. Marsh, Rev. Mr. Canfield, and some others, said they did not like, the Synod then adjourned.

#### LOWER HOUSE.

SECOND DAY.

The Synod met at 10 o'clock on Wednesday morning, the Prolocutor, Dr. BEAVEN, in the Chair.

The proceedings were opened by prayer offered up by the Prolocutor, after which the names of the delegates were called by Rev. Canon Bancroft, Clerical Secretary to the Synod.

The minutes of the previous day were then read by the Secretary. A short discussion arose as to what was considered, by a few members, informalities in the minutes, but the Clerical Secretary having given an explanation, the matter dropped.

The Prolocutor here left the room for the purpose of being presented to the Upper House, sitting up stairs, and proceedings were temporarily interrupted. On his return, the Prolocutor said that the first business was to receive—

#### THE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

The committee of twenty submitted a report under a Draft Constitution.

The Committee of ten submitted a Report of Rules and Orders of Proceedings, which being read,

Hon. GEORGE MOFFATT moved, seconded by the DEAN OF MONTREAL, that the several clauses of the report be taken up *seriatim*—Carried.

The preamble and sections 1, 2, & 3 were read and carried. Sect. 4 was then read.

It was moved by Hon. Mr. CAMERON, seconded by Rev. Mr. BRASSELL, that sect. 4 be amended to read, "That the election of clerical and lay delegates shall be received under the hand and seal of the bishop of the diocese which they represent, or in the absence of the bishop, by the chairman of the Synod, and such certificate shall be final and conclusive."

Col. O'BRIEN moved, seconded by Rev. Mr. Davidson, that the words, "That on the election by Diocesan Synod of members for the Provincial Synod, a list of the same by the secretary of each Diocesan Synod, shall be forwarded to the secretaries of the Provincial Synod, certified by the bishop of each such diocese, which certified lists shall be taken as authority for such members to take their places," be substituted for Mr. Cameron's amendment.

Much discussion took place as to whether the Provincial Synod, under the statute, had the right to interfere with the action of the Diocesan Synods in the election of delegates to the Provincial Synod, Col. O'Brien contending that the statute gave that right. Hon. Mr. Cameron and others taking a contrary view.

Rev. Mr. BOND did not think they should come to too hasty a conclusion on so important a subject; there should be free discussion. This house should not divest itself by its own act of the privilege it had of enquiring into the right to be there of those who came as delegates to meet us. There were some there who would not dare to have that question thoroughly sifted, and he would not agree to the house giving up its right to make such enquiry.

Mr. L. S. FARRELL wished to know who the rev. gentleman meant by "us." They were all there elected by the several diocesan synods under a certificate of their respective bishops. And the gentlemen representing the Diocese of Montreal were, he presumed, elected exactly in the same way. Therefore they were all "us;" and he considered it a direct affront to the bishops to have the matter of election of delegates taken out of their hands by this house.

Mr. DENISON wished to know if the rule would take effect immediately, or not until the next synod, in the latter case he would vote against the amendment, but he considered it his duty to prevent any appearance of fraud in the election of delegates.

A clerical delegate said that it had been emphatically asked by Mr. Bond if they should divest themselves of the privilege in question. He was not at all sure if they had ever been invested with it, and they could not act contrary to Act of Parliament, and if they did have the power, he was very much in favor of their surrendering it. It would be a direct insult to the bishops to question any act of the Diocesan Synod unless the chairman of this house were himself a bishop, which could never take place.

The amendment was then put and lost.

Hon. GEORGE MOFFATT then moved, seconded by Rev. Mr. BOND, that the words in Mr. Cameron's amendment, "and such certificate shall be final and conclusive," be struck out.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON was opposed to this amendment, as he thought the certificate of the Bishop should be final and conclusive.

Col. O'BRIEN, while acknowledging that there would be some inconvenience in the investigation by the Provincial Synod of any case which might come up, and that without doubt ill feeling would be engendered, still remained of opinion