

England possessed Synodical action, would the Synod be sitting there that day? Again, in England the church was still connected with the State. Here it had become law that there shall be no semblance between church and State, and when that law was passed, no protection was afforded by the Church of England to the church of Canada, neither did the Church in England, through the Bench of Bishops, protest against the spoliation of the temporalities of the church in Canada. Therefore, while it should be the endeavour of the Synod to preserve the same faith as that of the Church of England, in temporalities the Church of England had herself shown that she did not desire the church in Canada to be in all respects conformed to herself. On the second question he held that the church in Canada would not approve of the continuation of the Metropolitan dignity as an incident of the rights of the successors of the Bishop of Montreal, and he conceived that the new patent had expressly authorized the Synod to deal with the question. As to there being no need for haste, he reminded the Synod of the sudden death of Prince Albert, and contended that in case of the death of the present Metropolitan, which all hoped would be long postponed, the Synod would be in a more embarrassing position than at present, to decide the question.

Rev. Mr. SLACK contended for the validity and the binding force of the patent. However he felt that it was right to do justice to his brethren of other dioceses. It was doubtless objectionable that the church in the diocese of Montreal should be able to elect a Metropolitan for the entire province. Several methods had been proposed, but all were encompassed with difficulties. Yet, as one delegate from the Diocese of Montreal, speaking, however, he believed, the sentiment of all the diocese, he would say that he desired to meet his brethren by any possible accommodation. He would not dwell upon this part of the question; but rose to protest against the disrespectful language in which so solemn a document as a patent issuing from the Crown had been treated by those who called it mere waste paper.

A DELEGATE thought it was the duty of the Synod to find out the meaning of the patent, and to adhere to it, unless under urgent necessity. He thought in the present state of feeling in England it would be very unfortunate after asking the Queen for the appointment of a Metropolitan, if the Synod should turn round and say that they regarded the patent merely as waste paper. He thought the clear intention of the patent was to make the Bishop of Montreal for the time being the Metropolitan of Canada. There could be no doubt that that was the intention in the first instance; and there was no alteration, whatever, except by the addition of the words, "subject nevertheless as to the succession to the Metropolitan See, to such rules, regulations and canons as shall and may be made in respect thereof by the Bishops, clergy and laity, &c., of the said province." He held that this did not change the original intention of the first patent. Nor did he think with Mr. Cameron that the Synodical acts conferred any power of electing the Metropolitan. The Dioceses and Synods did not conceive they had such power under the act, because they petitioned the Queen to appoint one, in order that the Provincial assembly of the whole Church might be constituted. The clause which gave the Synod power to make regulations for the good government of the Church no more authorized the Synod to make a new rule for the appointment of the head of the Church within the Province, than similar words in the constitutional acts constituting the Provincial Parliament gave the Provincial

Parliament the right to appoint the Governor-General.

Rev. Mr. DARLING thought the Rev. Provost of Trinity College had carried the Synod with him in the views which he expressed. He made some remarks in reply to Mr. Harman, expressing his opinion that the dissolution of such connection as formerly existed between church and State in Canada, was an advantage rather than otherwise, and that though even the abolition of clergy reserves was a wrong in itself, it was not without some advantages on the other side. He did not think with Mr. Harman that it would be objectionable to the rest of the province that the Bishop of Montreal should always be the Metropolitan if it were properly explained. He believed that it would be a great honour to the diocese of Montreal for it to be the Metropolitan See of the Province. That Diocese should, therefore, be willing to accept an equitable arrangement to conserve its present preeminence. He added that in his heart of hearts, he believed the arrangement which must be made to reconcile all sentiments, in order to keep Montreal in that position, would certainly secure to that diocese the very best man who could be found for its Bishop. He believed that some such arrangement as this would moreover tend to destroy that kind of local feeling which he feared was now creeping through the different dioceses, and which tended to make the members of the church in each of them think that the diocese was their property in such a manner that they would feel aggrieved if any clergyman not of their own body was raised to the Episcopate over them.

The Rev. Dr. FULLER rose to speak, when the Rev. PROLOCUTOR said that the Upper House had agreed to the amendment made to the Canons by the Lower House.

The Rev. Dr. FULLER then said the question should not be delayed, and cited several clauses of the letters patent to prove that the Metropolitan See should wholly be in Montreal. It was for the Synod to decide how the succession should run. He did not desire to change the See; but they should not delay the point to a period three years hence.

Archdeacon BETHUNE said he felt that the previous speakers had relieved the committee of the imputation of disloyalty to the mother church. He did not see that the migratory character of the Metropolitan See was inconsistent with the missionary character of the church. It were only right that each of the Dioceses, in its turn, should enjoy the advantages which the See would give them. This would involve a few inconveniences; it is true; but they would be as nothing compared to the advantages which the whole country would derive. They should take a lesson from the exhibitions of agriculture and art, which were yearly held in different sections of the province. (Hear, hear.) He did not think it would be proper to postpone the consideration of the question. They should adopt the report and send it up to the House of Bishops, and, if necessary, appoint a committee to hold communication with their Lordships.

The Rev. Mr. PALMER concurred in this that the question should be settled this session. (Hear, hear.) There was a time when there were few clergymen in the country, and these were scattered over a vast district. This was no longer so; they were now in sufficient number to dispose of any question of importance. The words in the second clause of the synod act led him to believe that the Assembly had the undoubted right to appoint their president. Therefore, under that clause they have the legal power to appoint a president. The first patent issued by the Queen was at the instance of the Synod. It provided

that the succession to the Metropolitan See should rest in the Bishop of Montreal and his successors, unless otherwise provided for by the Assembly. He did not believe, with Mr. Carter and Mr. Dower, that the Letters Patent were binding on them. They had an undoubted moral weight, but were overridden by the act of the Canadian Legislature vesting in them the right to appoint their president, which act, he would further say, was sanctioned by her Majesty. This, he contended, gave them the power to begin *de novo*. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Palmer concluded by suggesting that Montreal be the Metropolitan See, and that whenever a vacancy shall occur the names of three clergymen be submitted to the House of Bishops by the Synod of Montreal, and that the one who shall be selected by their lordships be consecrated and appointed Metropolitan. This proceeding would prove the only solution.

The Rev. PROLOCUTOR here said that Dr. Bovell had agreed to withdraw his amendment, the House consenting.

The Rev. Mr. DUNN was not in favor of delay. Were they now to allow the matter to stand over, a year would elapse before action would be taken in the matter. They were so placed that the decision of the Synod of Montreal was uncertain, and besides, if they came to a decision, they could not tell whether it would be binding on the future Synods of the Diocese of Montreal. Could these difficulties be settled, he would cheerfully vote that Montreal be the Metropolitan See.

Mr. SCOTT thought it impossible to settle the question without appealing to the Legislature. He concurred with Mr. Carter in stating that the letters patent were not waste paper.

Rev. Mr. SMYTH would have no objection to leave the election to the House of Bishops, but he thought the Metropolitan See should be fixed. It had been said that there had been some expressions which went to show that the letters patent had been treated with disrespect, and that the Synod wished to sever the connection with the mother church. Whatever action they took in the matter, he felt sure that they would be actuated by no such feelings.

Rev. Mr. MURDOCH concurred that it would be most disadvantageous for them to adopt the perambulating system which the Provincial Parliament had lately practised. It appeared to be a necessity that the Montreal diocese should elect their own bishop. But he thought the matter might be arranged by providing that on the decease of the Bishop of Montreal one of the remaining four bishops should be elected Metropolitan. How unseemingly it would be to elect a young clergyman Bishop of Montreal and at the same time constitute him Metropolitan, and thus place him over men who had been longer bishops perhaps than he had been in the ministry. By electing one of the four bishops the difficulty would be obviated. The bishop would then simply be translated to the Diocese of Montreal, and his place could be supplied by electing a man from the diocese from which he was removed.

By consent of the House, Dr. Bovell's amendment was here withdrawn.

Rev. Mr. PALMER then moved, seconded by Rev. Mr. BOMB, the following amendment to Mr. Carter's amendment:—

That this House most respectfully represent to the House of Bishops that this House is unable to concur in a canon for the election of a Metropolitan, reported to this House by a committee, inasmuch as this House considers it to be most for the interest of the church that the office of Metropolitan should in accordance with the ancient usage of the Church, and the practice of the church at home and abroad, be attached to a particular See.