

That this House is of opinion that the See of Montreal being in the most important city in Canada and most central in position, should be appointed to be the Metropolitan See.

That with a view of offering a solution of the difficulties which surround this subject, arising from the right of the Diocese of Montreal to elect its own bishops, this House proposes to the House of Bishops the adoption of a canon to the effect that whenever a vacancy shall occur in the office of Metropolitan, the names of three clergymen shall be presented to their Lordships House by the Synod of the Diocese of Montreal, and from such three clergymen so presented one shall be selected by their Lordships, who shall upon his appointment as Bishop of Montreal succeed to the office of Metropolitan.

Rev. Mr. BOND said he had no objection to record the amendment.—He was prepared to say, and it might as well be said out boldly at once, that the Diocese of Montreal would never give up the right to elect its own Bishop, and they ought to be ashamed of themselves if they did give up that right. He thought this proposition was one which would meet with general concurrence, and he would like to see it pass.

Hon Mr. BOUTON would say, as a member of the Church of England, that there was no one more desirous of having the matter settled in the best manner possible; but all the schemes proposed were impracticable. How was it possible to carry out the proposition just read. He had no objection that the See should be fixed at Montreal, and he saw no other plan of settling the matter than by adopting the original motion. The diocese of Montreal could not be compelled to give up the right to elect their own bishop. Even if the whole bench of bishops were excluded from whence could they get a better man. He was inclined to think that Montreal was the best place for the See: but the matter should be settled without delay. If put off, the present Metropolitan might possibly not live the three years intervening before it could be brought up again, and if anything happened him what position would they then be in for a Metropolitan. He could not conceive how any member of that Synod could object to leave the election of the Metropolitan in the hands of the Bench of Bishops. He regretted exceedingly that the matter had been delayed so much, and that they had lost so much time. They knew what the delay of a committee was, and it had already been referred to as good a committee as they could find. They should act without delay, and he trusted they all had in view the welfare of the Church.

It being now six o'clock, the Rev. PROLOCUTOR pronounced the benediction, and the meeting adjourned.

SIXTH DAY.

The Lower House of the Synod met at ten o'clock in the morning, and after the proceedings had been opened with prayer by the Rev. Prolocutor, Rev. Canon Bancroft, D. D. read the minutes of the previous day's Synod, which were corrected and approved.

ORDER OF PROCEEDINGS.

Moved by the Rev. H. HOLLAND, seconded by Dr. BOVELL, that a committee be appointed to revise the order of proceedings and rules of order with a view to the incorporation of any standing orders of the House of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, or any other rules that may appear desirable, and to report to the Synod as early as possible.—Carried.

The following was the committee then appointed:—Dr. Beaven, Rev. Mr. Marsh, Rev. Mr. Forrest, Rev. Canon Leach, Rev. Mr. Wool-

ryche; Messrs. Harman, Rowe, Simpson, II. Taylor, and Irvine.

SUCCESSION TO THE METROPOLITAN.

The debate on the motion and several amendments relative to the canon on the above subject, submitted the day before, was now resumed.

Rev. Mr. SLACK wished to ask a question.—How far did the concurrence in any motion that might be passed in this House affect the succession to the Metropolitan See as regards the Diocese of Montreal? It would be useless for them to concur in any thing before the House if they could then be told their action did not bind the above dioceses.

The PROLOCUTOR stated that the debate would be continued on Rev. Mr. Palmer's amendment (printed yesterday.)

Rev. Dr. NICOLL said a plan of the nature he was going to submit might help to meet the difficulty. If when a vacancy occurred in the See of Montreal, the diocese submitted three names to the other bishops, sending in at the same time criticisms and judgments on those names, and if their Lordships did not think any of those proposed were fit and proper persons to be appointed Metropolitan, then the action might come back to the Synod, to name as representing the bishops, and on their own part, a Metropolitan. He could not vote for any thing before the House except the original motion. But if this could be added thereto—that in case of the failure of the Diocese of Montreal to submit three names, or in case of the persons whose names were submitted not being such as the bishops should think proper for the office, the bishops should send the matter to this Synod for settlement—he would like it better still.

Rev. Mr. HOLLAND said the above scheme would in fact leave the election of the Bishop of Montreal in the hands of the House of Bishops, and he did not believe it was proper or competent for any power to take this election out of the hands of the Diocese of Montreal. This plan would involve a legal difficulty. Mr. Holland proceeded to urge the following arguments in favour of the principle of a fixed Metropolitan See: First—The ancient and universal custom of the Catholic Church, which was that of fixed Sees. Second—The practice of the Church of England both in Great Britain and the colonies. Third—The Queen's letters patent. Fourth—The propriety and evident expediency of the measure. He contended, in conclusion, that as Montreal was the head quarters of Romanism in this province, if there was a city in Canada in which the Church of England ought to exhibit her ecclesiastical system in all its integrity and establish it against the Church of Rome, this was the place. This point had weighed with him a good deal in forming his opinions, and was manifestly a point of expediency which should not be disregarded. Against his view of the matter it had been urged that the Diocese of Montreal might elect a young and inexperienced bishop, whom it would not be judicious to have elected Metropolitan. Now, according to the patent, no Metropolitan could exercise any irrevocable power, and he must be bound by the law of the church in all his acts; that would be a sufficient protection against any attempted stretch of power. He admitted the strength of the argument against the Bishop of Montreal being for all time the Metropolitan—namely, that the Diocese of Montreal would thus have the power of electing the Metropolitan; and he would go so far as to say that if the Diocese of Montreal should insist on electing their bishop without reference to the views of this Synod, he and all would succumb to the necessity for an-

other course than that he now advocated. But he could not think that that diocese would be so unreasonable, and was satisfied they would accede to such reasonable terms as the House might propose on the subject. It might be well to have a provisional canon drawn up after considering the form in which it would be right to give this House a voice in the election of the Bishop of Montreal. The terms might be discussed with the delegates of the diocese of Montreal present, and such terms as should be accepted might be embodied in an enactment. (The speaker here read his scheme, which contained the views set forth in his remarks.) If the system they should now adopt was not found to answer, it would be competent for future Synods to reverse their legislation, but if they departed from conservative measures now it would be impossible for future Synods to repair the injury.

Archdeacon BROUGH said that as regards the legal question, forming his opinions from the legal gentlemen who had addressed the House, he should say it was perfectly competent for this Synod to take such steps as they may think fit in the matter under consideration. As regards the principle involved, he agreed with Rev. Mr. Dewar that the office of Metropolitan was not one of divine institution, and hence it was competent for the church or synod to take action in the matter just as it had been for Constantine the Great or Justinian in the church of old. It was as competent for the church in this day to act in a matter not of divine institution, as it was for the church of any former period, and moreover considered they had at this day as erudite and eminent divines as any that belonged to the church at any former period. As regards antiquity, he considered we had a claim beyond that of those who existed when the office of Metropolitan was instituted, because the church was older now than 1500 years ago. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) He agreed with the Archdeacon of Toronto in his view as regards the practical utility of an ambulatory Metropolitan See. The very grounds upon which Rev. Mr. Holland had urged that Montreal should be the Metropolitan See were those which he would cite why it should not be the place. If prestige and impressions were of any value, they owed them to the protestant portion of the country, which could appreciate, and would not look down upon them. They might as well expect to make an impression on adamant as upon the class previously mentioned.

Rev. Canon BANCROFT said that after listening to the many arguments used in this debate, and having devoted an evening to the consideration of the amendment and canon, he was of opinion that the remark of the Hon. Mr. Boulton came nearer the truth than any thing he heard—standing in reference to the amendment, that it was impracticable, and they would be obliged to let it drop. He was here guarding the interests of Montreal and yet legislating for the province generally, and for all time, and he believed the amendment would be injurious to this diocese and province. If he took his own diocese he found that by obliging it to present three names for a selection of a Metropolitan, their rights were curtailed, and the election was almost absolutely nullified. How were they to agree on three men whom they were equally happy and anxious to receive into their pulpits and houses, and call them reverend fathers in God! It was always a serious matter for the dioceses to decide on one man much less than on three. It would be against the interests of Montreal also to have to send in three names, one of whom was to be bishop, because the bishops would be obliged to