

of the Diocese, he not having been licensed to any cure within the limits specified in the notification convening it.

His Lordship then pronounced the benediction, and the Synod adjourned till Thursday morning, at 10 o'clock.

Approved.

(Signed,) J. TORONTO.

## SECOND DAY

THURSDAY, June 13, 1861.

Divine Service was performed in St George's Church, at 10 a. m. Prayers were said by the Rev C B Pettit. The Lessons were read by the Rev J. A. Morris.

The Synod met for despatch of business in the Wesley Hall, City Buildings.

His Lordship took his seat at noon.

### MINUTES.

The Minutes of the proceedings of the previous day were read, and being approved, were confirmed by the Bishop.

### CALLING THE ROLLS.

The Clerical Secretary then called over the roll of the Clergy, and marked the names of those in attendance.

The Lay Secretary called over the names of the several parishes, and their representatives.

### COMMUNICATIONS.

The Clerical Secretary mentioned that he had received a communication from the Rev. H. Mulkins, Chaplain to the Provincial Penitentiary, inviting the members of the Synod to visit that Institution. Also, a letter had been received from a dignitary of the Diocese, stating that he was obliged to return to his home, thanking his friends for their kindness in mentioning his name in connection with the new Diocese, but requesting that it would not be put forward.

### BISHOP'S ADDRESS.

His Lordship the Bishop then delivered the following address, the Synod meanwhile standing:

"MY REVEREND BRETHREN AND BRETHREN,—

I feel it my duty on this interesting occasion, to commence by offering the laity of this proposed diocese my hearty thanks for the generous liberality with which they have come forward to establish an Episcopal endowment. Until this primary object was in a great measure effected, we could not make any substantial progress towards the subdivision of the vast Diocese of Toronto, for the Government very wisely required to be satisfied that a reasonable provision should be made for its endowment, before giving their assent to any division, and before the Governor-General could signify his readiness to recommend the appointment by her Majesty of such person as the Bishop of Toronto and Church authorities should approve of. Taking these requirements into consideration, and advert to the Canon adopted by the Synod of 1858, for the election of a Bishop, which has been sanctioned and confirmed by a precedent, it becomes my duty on the present occasion to adhere strictly to its provisions, and accordingly I submit the choice of the new Bishop to you, the clergy and laity of the Church, residing within the limits of the district which is to constitute the Eastern Diocese, convened in Synod under the present Bishop.

"The path of progress being thus graciously opened by her Majesty the Queen, through her representative Sir Edmund Head, Baronet, it was further smoothed and prepared by the wise proceedings of our late Synod, which, among other

things, settled the mode of election, for it was observed that it would be most unfortunate, if at the first meeting of the primary and imperfect Synod, it should be called upon to discharge the difficult and exciting duty of determining the manner in which the election of its Bishop should be made and carried out. This was also found to be the feeling of a great majority, and it was accordingly resolved that "the clergy and laity shall vote separately by ballot, the clergy by individuals and the laity by parishes. A majority of votes in each order shall determine the choice, provided that two-thirds of the clergy entitled to vote be present, and two-thirds of all the parishes entitled to vote be represented; otherwise two thirds of the votes of each order shall be necessary to determine the choice."

"This comprehensive and yet simple method of election is adopted literally, or in substance, by several of the dioceses of the United States, and seems on the whole to work satisfactorily. All things being now in order, we meet this day under a regular call to make choice of a fit person to become the Bishop of the new diocese. But as we are yet not fully experienced in such matters, a few remarks derived in a great measure from the experience of our sister church, may not, on this occasion, be unseasonable. 1st. All who are entitled to vote at this meeting should bear in mind that they come unfettered as to place or person. They may vote or not vote as they feel inclined. They may select their candidate from any diocese or branch of the United Church of England and Ireland, for no other restriction is imposed, and the choice is left to the unbiased conscience of the electors. 2nd. Should the first ballot not decide, a second or even more may be found expedient. 3rd. In cases where the candidates are few in number, and the clerical vote prevails more than once, it is commonly found that the laity, in deference, give way, and seldom claim a third ballot. Having maintained their privilege by using it once, and more than maintained it by voting twice, they are content, for the sake of peace and unanimity, to join their clerical brethren. Moreover, at such a time, the laity feel that to continue voting would indicate something like unreasonable pertinacity, because the clergy have not only a nearer personal interest in the Bishop, but they must have frequent intercourse with him for advice and direction, and it may be justly said without offence that they are in general more accurate judges of his qualifications, hence from these and other reasons which might be mentioned, they have a claim in such cases to some indulgence from their lay brethren. 4th. When the candidates are numerous, it may sometimes be necessary to have many ballots before a satisfactory result can be obtained.

Thus, when my much regretted and intimate friend Bishop Wainright was elected, nine ballots were required. At the first ballot, thirteen candidates for the Bishopric were named, although several of them had only one supporter. As the balloting proceeded, some of the candidates were dropped, and the distribution of the votes continually varied, so that no two ballots were alike, as regarded either persons or votes. At length it became evident that the real contest was confined to two of the candidates, the Rev. Dr. Wainright and the Rev. Dr. Vincent, and the casting of the votes between these two at the different ballots is not without instruction. On the first ballot Dr. Wainright had only twenty-four out of one hundred and eighty-five clerical votes, and thirty one out of one hundred and sixty-nine lay votes, in all fifty-five, while Dr. Vincent had fifty-two clerical, and forty-four lay votes; in all ninety-six, being nearly double. During the seven succeeding ballots, Dr. Vincent's votes varied each time,

but on the whole decreased. On the other hand, Dr. Wainright's votes improved in number at every ballot. At the ninth or decisive ballot Dr. Wainright had one hundred and four clerical votes, having gained eighty over his first ballot, and he likewise gained sixty-three lay votes over his first ballot. Dr. Vincent's last ballot was five votes below the first, being ninety-one to ninety-six; the final ballot gave Dr. Wainright a majority of one hundred and seven votes over every other candidate, and he was accordingly declared duly elected. From this detailed account it appears, that during the last ballot eighty clergymen and forty-six lay members changed in favour of Dr. Wainright; from which it is inferred, that although the voters came all forward at first prepared in their own minds to vote for a particular person, yet finding it impossible from the result of the first ballot to elect their favourite, they voted for another candidate at the second ballot, and indeed such changes multiplied in behalf of the candidate who seemed from the results of the ballots, as they proceeded, to be rising in estimation, till at length Dr. Wainright's majority became overwhelming and triumphant. During this remarkable contest there was much excitement, but yet under proper control all went on in peace and harmony, and what was very beautiful and edifying, the Rev. Dr. Vincent was the first to congratulate the successful candidate, and to move that he be declared duly elected.

Permit me for one moment to draw your attention to the primary convention of Western New York, called for the election of their first Bishop, because it resembles in its meeting and object this present Synod. This convention met on the 1st of November, 1853, and having disposed of some preliminary business, proceeded to elect their Bishop. A few moments were first spent in secret devotion. The convention then united with the presiding Bishop in appropriate prayers from the Liturgy, and these ended, the house proceeded to the election of their Bishop. The chair appointed two clergymen and one layman as tellers, to receive the votes of the clergy. The clergy having deposited their votes, the chair appointed two laymen and one teller to receive the votes of the laity; whereupon the parishes deposited their votes. In a few minutes the tellers announced that, having counted the votes, a majority of both orders concurred in the election of the Rev. William Heathcote DeLaney, D.D., from the Diocese of Pennsylvania.

"Thus a clergyman was selected from another diocese, the convention acknowledging by their votes, that they preferred him to any one from among themselves. I have given these two instances to illustrate the working of the rule for the election of Bishops in the State of New York, and which we have adopted with a slight modification. To behold it in actual operation brings before us its great simplicity, and proves that the judicious introduction of the lay element does not of itself tend to disorder, but on the contrary, strengthens and completes the salutary working of the Church, while it is a return, but in a more orderly form, to primitive usage when the laity were generally present and signified, in some way, their assent or disapprobation. It is indeed well for us that we have the experience of our sister church to guide our proceedings and to supply precedents towards the solution of many important questions which will gradually come before us.

"Having thus brought under your notice such remarks as appear to me not only useful but likewise necessary on the present occasion for your direction in voting by ballot, it only remains to advert to the great object of the meeting of this Synod,—the choice of your Bishop. Having already on a former occasion touched upon the