

gesting one of themselves for the succession. He thought that the Laity should have a voice in this matter, as they had in all the other matters of the Church, and he thought a fundamental principle would be violated in not granting them a voice in the matter. He hoped the Synod would not nullify a principle so long established and so successful in its operation.

Rev. Mr. Bond, in seconding the amendment of Dr. Bancroft, said the Diocese of Montreal would certainly have no voice in the election of their Bishop, according to the present construction of the report. He also thought the Bishops would feel a delicacy in recommending one of themselves for the succession. (Hear, hear.)

The Metropolitan said there should be no delicacy in the matter; he would with a great deal of pleasure recommend a brother who was sure to ably administer his diocese. He could see no reason why three of the Bishops could not ask the fourth to accept the office of Metropolitan. (Hear, hear.)

Rev. Mr. Bond continued—He was not a Bishop yet, and could not say how he should act under the circumstances. He would say no more on that phase of the subject, as the weight of his Lordship's remarks would be against him. He thought the people should have a voice in the matter. (Hear, hear.) To avoid such discussions as some seemed to anticipate, he would suggest that the voting be conducted in silence.

The Very Rev. the Dean moved in amendment to Dr. Bancroft's amendment, seconded by Mr. Hutton, to strike out the last clause and substitute the following therefor:—

That the House of Bishops shall present two or more persons to the Synod of Montreal, one of whom may be elected by such Synod as the Bishop of Montreal; and in case no election shall take place of either the persons so nominated, the house of Bishops shall again exercise the same right of nomination until a choice shall be made by the Diocesan Synod.

His reasons for making the amendment were that according to the plan of the report there might result no election, and the Diocese would be without a Bishop for an indefinite period. The Diocese having only the right to vote they might object for years, as was the case in Baltimore when a vote of two-thirds of the Synod was required to elect. For ten years it was impossible to elect a Bishop. He suggested that they "shall" elect one or other of the two.

(The amendment as given above is presented in a modified form.)

The Hon. Mr. Justice McCord said the question of leaving the nomination in the hands of the Bishops was discussed in Committee for three hours, and was finally agreed to by a vote of 10 for and 6 against. He was about to move an amendment, but two amendments