

On the third point the Synod on a division decided in the following terms: The Synod having read the memorial of Mr. Sharp find that the action of the Presbytery of Ontario was unconstitutional in so far as they refused to Mr. Sharp certain rights and privileges due to him as a member of that court without any process of discipline, but at the same time sustain the action of the Presbytery in reference to the certificate granted to Mr. Mitchell.

On the subject of the reference to the Synod by the Presbytery of Ontario of the whole case of Ashburn three motions were submitted. The first was by Mr. Gillespie to the effect that the Synod appoint a Commission to proceed to Ashburn with full powers to inquire into all the circumstances of the case and finally dispose of it. The second was by Mr. T. McPherson recommending that Mr. Sharp and his congregation be placed under the supervision of the Presbytery of Toronto, and that the members of the congregation who could not conscientiously remain under Mr. Sharp's ministry might unite themselves with any of the neighbouring congregations. The third motion, which was carried on a division, was by Principal Willis. It was in the following terms:

"That the Synod receive the reference, approve the Presbytery's procedure so far as they have given supply to the dissentients, and considering from the case now so fully before them that there seems little prospect of agreement between the divided parties, the Synod appoint Commissioners to visit the locality, not to reopen the general question, (unless in the case of new circumstances having emerged fitted to arrest the Commissioners' procedure) but to deal finally with the minority on the question, —should reunion be impracticable —of their separate congregational organization on the spot, empowering the Commissioners to sanction such organization, and to di-join dissentient elders and members from the existing congregation of Ashburn, or to direct them (this failing) to apply for certificates of di-junction to the session or Presbytery with the view of annexing themselves to other congregations."

*The Cartwright Case* —This case, like that of Ashburn, embraced several distinct dissents and complaints, &c.

1. Appeal by Mr. Windell from decision of Presbytery of Ontario, to rebuke him for contumacy.
2. Dissent and complaint of Mr. Windell in regard to the sustaining of a minute of Presbytery.
3. Dissent and complaint of Mr. Windell against Presbytery for resolving to grant certificates to certain parties.

The papers in these cases were read, and parties were fully heard. Four different motions were proposed to the Synod for the settlement of this case. We do not consider it necessary to give all the motions. We may observe that all of them were in favour of dismissing the two dissents and complaints, while two were in favour of sustaining the appeal. The motion which carried was proposed by Mr. J. Mitchell and was as follows:

"The Synod having heard the papers and the parties in the case, dismiss the dissents and appeals of Mr. Windell, and sustain the action of the Presbytery of Ontario"

*The Southampton Case* —This case arose out of the resolution of the Presbytery of Grey to grant a moderation in a call to a minister in the vacant congregation at Southampton in connexion with West Arran. Against this resolution of Presbytery, Mr. Dewar, Mr. Stevenson and others dissented, and complained to the Synod, on several grounds embracing the following, viz: That the whole number of Presbyterians in Southampton were not sufficient to form two congregations, and that those forming the congregation that desire a minister had no charge against the minister already settled in Southampton. The papers were read and parties fully heard. Four motions were proposed, all of them moving to dismiss the dissent and complaint and to confirm the action of the Presbytery, but, in various terms expressing the desirableness of