

would be returned by the House of Bishops this day.

That accordingly to-day the House of Bishops sent down a message containing the names of the Bishops of Newfoundland, of British Columbia, of Huron, of Ontario, of Quebec, and of Toronto, with the understanding that if a Bishop of the Province should be chosen by your Synod, he should hold the office only until a Canon should be passed, leaving the election of Metropolitan in the hands of the House of Bishops, and placing the election of a Bishop of Montreal without restriction in your Synod; but your Synod resolved that it could not receive a message containing the names of persons for election if coupled with conditions and extraneous matters not authorized by the Canon.

That soon after the House of Bishops sent down to your Synod a message repeating the names of the Bishops of Newfoundland, of British Columbia, of Huron, of Ontario, and of Toronto, which having been rejected before by your Synod, were rejected again.

That the House of Bishops then sent down to your Synod another message containing the names of the Bishop of Columbia, of the Conjoint Bishop of Newfoundland, and of the Dean of Norwich, for election, none of which received the number of votes in your Synod necessary to a choice.

That thereafter the House of Bishops transmitted a message to your Synod, informing it that they were not prepared to submit any further names to your Synod without inquiry and delay, and that they would adjourn until the month of May next.

That your Committee have to point out to your Synod that among the above names so laid before it by the House of Bishops, one is that of the Dean of Norwich, a dignitary of the church, residing in England, concerning whom your Synod had no information that he would resign a large income, and sacrifice all the social and other advantages to which he was accustomed, in order to assume the charge of this Diocese with its labours and inconveniences, even if the state of his health, otherwise permitted; but another name is that of the Bishop of Grahamstown, a see on the coast of the South East of Africa, of whom almost none of the delegates in your Synod had ever heard; that another name is that of the Bishop of British Columbia on the Pacific shore of North America, and almost totally unknown even by name or reputation to the delegates; that the list embraces also the names of the Bishops on the Atlantic Coast of British North America, with those of the Bishop and of the Conjoint Bishop of Newfoundland, of whose existence the members of your Synod are no doubt cognizant, but with whose history or persons they are entirely unacquainted, and concerning not any one of whom had they the smallest information or assurance that they would forsake sees in which they had laboured for years to undertake the duties of that of Montreal.

The Synod will remark that with respect to British North America, the name of every Bishop holding a see therein was submitted to your Synod, with the single exception of one, although they were all in a measure unknown to your members, and whose acceptance or rejection of the office was an uncertainty which could not be resolved until, with respect to some of them, after a considerable lapse of time.

Your Synod will also remark that the omission of the name of the Bishop of Rupert's Land, the exception referred to, was the more pointed because he is the only Bishop whom the members of the Synod have had any opportunity of knowing.

That your Synod will also remark that the House of Bishops refrained from submitting to you the name of any of the Archdeacons in this Ecclesiastical Province, or of any of the numerous Deans, Canons, or Presbyters therein, although your Committee do not hesitate to say that there are to be found among them clergy-men whose zeal, talents, and industry in the performance of their sacred duties are familiar to you, and who, from their acquaintance with the country, you would have felt confident, would have laboured to promote the interests of God's Church in your Diocese and the glory of His name.

That your Committee cannot avoid noticing that the only names submitted for your choice by the House of Bishops, which in reality you knew, were those of themselves; and that the Bishops of Huron and Toronto, two of the four composing that venerable House, were men so far advanced in life that your Synod could not suppose them long to possess the bodily vigour and activity requisite to endure the fatigue necessarily attending the performance of the duties of so extensive a Diocese as that of Montreal, especially when burdened with the additional duties of Metropolitan of the whole Province, to be still further increased, should his ecclesiastical jurisdiction be extended to the other portions of the Dominion.

That your Synod consequently felt that the only choice really left to you, on grounds which you could enter into and intelligibly understand was restricted in reality to the Bishops of Quebec and Ontario; and your Synod also felt that by selecting either one or the other of those venerable dignitaries you would only be filling one vacancy to create another, and in your own Province; and your Synod will also bear in mind that the Bishop of Quebec, having officially intimated to you to-day that he would not accept the office, the real choice then left to you was reduced to one—the Bishop of Ontario.

Your Committee therefore have much to deplore that you had almost no measure of selection in determining your choice, but your Committee deprecate still more that the House of Bishops should have left the Church in this Diocese, and in the Ecclesiastical Province of Canada, without a head, by adjourning until the month of May.

Your Committee is distinctly of opinion that the Canon gives to the House of Bishops no power to adjourn as they have done, but are by it compelled to continue nominations until they should give you the name of a clergyman whom in your consciences and before God you considered it would be your duty to set over the church in this diocese.

The House of Bishops by their adjournment have consequently so far departed from the true spirit and intention of the Canon for the election of a Bishop and Metropolitan as to have virtually abdicated the functions it was their bounden duty to exercise.

That they have by so doing left it also the property of the Church, which is vested in the Bishop as a Corporation sole, entirely, without a protector.

That your Committee have therefore to recommend that steps should be taken during next session of the Legislature to secure such legislation as will vest the senior dignity of the Church next in rank to the Bishop, until a Bishop for this Diocese be duly elected and consecrated, with all the power conferred upon the Bishop by the constitution and the various

statutes affecting the temporalities of the Church.

That your Committee finally recommends that the present powers of the Synod should not be suffered to lapse, and to that end that it should adjourn until some convenient day in the month of May next.

All of which is respectfully submitted. (Signed,) WILLIAM T. LEACH, Chairman.

12th November, 1868.

The ARCHDEACON moved that the report be received.

The Rev. GERSE SLACK seconded the motion.

Rev. Mr. FULTON—I rise to a point of order. The Synod has no right to legislate on any thing, nor to transact any business beyond the election of a Bishop, (crisis, it is the election; laughter and disapprobation.) I move that the report be not received.

Rev. J. B. DAVIDSON seconded the amendment.

The DEAN said the Committee were yesterday appointed by the Synod to consider the present position of the Synod, and ascertain if a remedy could not be found. That Committee has presented a most able report, and it is now moved that the report be not received; How can it be refused? It is strictly in order and must be received.

The motion was put amidst cries of "carried," "no" and great confusion.

Rev. J. C. DAVIDSON as well as could be understood moved that the report be amended, and that a Bishop be named and elected to this Diocese, and as Metropolitan *pro tem*.

The amendment was ruled out of order, the proper time for such an amendment being when the question of adoption was brought up.

Rev. J. B. DAVIDSON protested against the voting of the chair on Mr. Fulton's motion.

Mr. E. CARTER Q. C. said the protest was not admissible. The proper course if he thought there was a grievance was for him to appeal to the Synod against the ruling.

After a few words from Mr. FERRIS, advocating the utmost attitude of discussion, seeing the importance of the crisis, the appeal, which was about to be put to the Synod was withdrawn.

Mr. CARTER moved the adoption of the report. I regret, he said, that unavoidable absence from the city has prevented my attendance during the earlier part of the session, but I may be permitted to say a few words about what has taken place. I must express my entire concurrence in the report, especially as two points have been brought forward which I look upon as of the greatest importance.

By the action taken, and the resolution sent down to this House, it is evident that the House of Bishops has assumed to itself a power which it does not possess, that of enacting that the nominee for the vacant see must of necessity belong to the episcopal order. It must occur to every one who reflects on the subject, and reads the canon on the election of a Bishop, that the House of Bishops has exceeded its jurisdiction, as it goes beyond the canon. It was out of its power to impose conditions, and there was nothing in the canon to show that the choice must be restricted to the episcopal order.

I was one of those who had a share in framing the canon, and if I had had the slightest suspicion, while conferring on the Bishops the right of nomination, that we were likely to be hampered, or that the right would lead to the scenes of the last few days, I would never have consented that the right should have been conferred. Under the canon the field of choice was not restricted as had been done by their Lordships. They had the right to nominate from a much wider range, but they had restricted the choice to the episcopal order. They had no such power, and the action of the Synod in declaring so, and refusing to receive the message, has been perfectly correct, and I regret that when this House declared they had no such power, the House of Bishops acted as if it had, and seemed determined to adhere to the rule laid down by itself in this respect. Then the Bishops erred on another point. In a message subsequently sent down they had attempted to dictate, as conditions, that the appointment should only be temporary, until a canon could be passed to separate the office of Metropolitan from that of Diocesan Bishop. But the Bishops could not themselves make such a change in the law, to elect a Bishop temporarily, till another change could be made. What I can say is that I would tell him that he must now leave his office, and make a bargain for a temporary engagement, contrary to the canon, which declares the appointment shall be permanent. The Bishops have no such power. We are certainly in a position of great embarrassment, and I would gladly see the connection between our House and the House of Bishops done away with. It is a matter of sufficient difficulty for us to agree among ourselves, to arrive at a harmonious conclusion, and to decide in a manner satisfactory to the various members of the House. But when to this is superadded the task of agreeing also with the Bishops, then the task becomes one almost altogether impossible. It would be infinitely better for us that the Metropolitan should be chosen by the Bishops from among themselves, thus leaving us free to elect our own Bishop. But when the position of Metropolitan was fixed, as we see it fixed now, it became necessary to adopt some such canon as that which now exists; but the mode in which the Bishops have exercised their power has led to great embarrassment. There is nothing now to be done but to adjourn, but there is a legal point to be considered before we do so. It is necessary that we adjourn some specific day, otherwise, there is no definite adjournment sufficient to enable us to meet again. It had pleased their Lordships to adjourn indefinitely till the month of May, without consulting in the slightest degree our convenience. Their Lordships might have had some opinion from the Synod before they had adjourned. I am not aware if they have fixed any specific date.

The DEAN said he had applied to know when they would meet, but the answer was they could not tell, but due notice would be given.

Mr. CARTER, I am glad to hear that, but I complain that their Lordships arrived at a determination without consulting this house, and sent down a message to announce what they had done. Before leaving for months, and breaking up the Synod, they should have had the consideration to send down and ask our concurrence. It would have shown at least a due regard to the best interests of the diocese. I regret the scenes that have taken place here and the collisions between this House and the House of Bishops; no one could be more desirous than I am to see harmony prevail, in carrying out the new constitution. But their Lordship must recollect that it is not their convenience alone that is chiefly concerned. Their Lordships must have known that they were called here to perform a work infinitely more important to the diocese of

Montreal than the particular matter in which they were concerned chiefly was to the ecclesiastical Province. They should have consulted this House before leaving the see vacant for months, and it certainly would have been more courteous for them to have solicited the co-operation of the Synod. Had they sent down to a message that they required further time for enquiry, giving good reasons for delay, I know that the members here would have willingly consented. But by the course their Lordships have taken they almost put it out of our power to meet again. There is no other way than to adjourn till the 1st day of May, and then if their Lordships will condescend to tell us when they can meet we can adjourn till that day. I hope it will be the last time this House will be subjected to such treatment as they have suffered from the behaviour of the Bishops.

Rev. DEAN the course you propose will involve several meetings.

Mr. CARTER, exactly, which aggravates the conduct of the Bishops.

Rev. Canon BANCROFT seconded the motion.

A member suggested that in view of what had taken place, they should adjourn to meet on the 1st April (hear, and a laugh.)

The Rev. Canon LOOSEMORE, seconded by Hon. JOHN HAMILTON, moved that the report just received be sent back to the Committee for revision.

Some discussion took place as to whether the motion, as presented, was in order, and it was contended that a motion to revise must specify the omissions complained of, or the parts it was sought to amend, and it was ultimately understood that the motion was to defer the consideration of the report.

Rev. Canon LOOSEMORE said it cannot be supposed for a moment that I appear as the apologist of the House of Bishops, not one member of which is not able to defend himself, but I object to the report just received. The strongest part of the report is the legal point raised, and it is that which chiefly forms the burden of Mr. Carter's speech. In that point I can clearly trace the Chancellor's hand, and that the more especially, as one or two of the Bishops had themselves some doubts as to the clear legality of adjourning. I think it would have been well to have stated that. I think that some of the details contained in the report are discourteous, and some of them are incorrect, and I think the Synod would certainly not admit them all. In the first place there were the references to the names of the candidates. It is stated in the report, and I hope I will be corrected if I am wrong, that the Bishop of Grahamstown is unknown, living about some seaport of Southern Africa, whose name has scarcely been heard of. I recollect a fact which occurred in the Diocesan Synod of Montreal a few years ago, where the name of the Bishop of Grahamstown is not known, that the Synod passed a vote of thanks to the Metropolitan of South Africa for the noble stand he had made for the maintenance of the faith. (Loud cheers.) Is it too strong to say that the Synod will still itself if it adopts as its own the action of the Committee? (Applause.)

The names of candidates on the Episcopal Bench have been dragged into the arguments, and even their personal characteristics displayed. Do I feel too strongly the discourtesy shown in the report in describing the personal appearance of the Bishop of Toronto, and the chances of life and usefulness of the dignitary who was so lately raised to that see? I protest against the reference to the conduct and capacity, and the personal references to the venerable Bishops. (Hear, hear.) I think the Committee have mentioned that there has been no election of any of the candidates sent down from the House of Bishops; but I ought, in justice to the clergy, to say that, as far as they were concerned, there has been an election (cheers), and in revision of the report I would suggest that that point should be made clear. There are incorrect statements in the report, and a want of courtesy. The only strong part of the report is the legal point. That may be passed, but it is the only one that can be maintained. (Cheers.)

Rev. J. C. DAVIDSON moved that the report be considered paragraph by paragraph, so that each may be adopted or rejected, as the case may be. I have been pained by the discourtesy shown to their Lordships, by the sneer which runs through the report against the Bishops, and which runs through the speech of Mr. Carter. Every point possible has been made against the Bishops, but this Court must remember that while they are careful to guard their own rights, they must also guard the rights of the Bishops. In their communications with the Synod their Lordships might have shown a little more of the *suaviter in modo*, but why sit in judgment on such failings and report in the terms that had been made use of.

Rev. Mr. FULTON seconded the amendment. He wished to re-view the position since the Synod had met. It had been decided that the Metropolitan see should be that of Montreal. For this purpose there had been a solemn compact made with the other dioceses. Now there had been on Monday a solemn caucus held to nominate candidates, as if they had been determined to thrust forward their own candidate. (Cries of order, hear, not in the report.) They had endeavoured to coerce the Bench of Bishops and there had been evidenced a desire to throw odium upon them.

Mr. CARTER rose to remove a misapprehension that appeared to exist. He had agreed the legal position in which the House of Bishops had placed them. But he would never submit to dictation whatever respect be entertained for their Lordships. He was happy to say that since the point had been raised as to the unfortunate position in which the Synod was left by the want of a definite time of adjournment he had learned that they were willing to name a definite day for re-assembling.

Mr. F. MCKENZIE said the report contained a calm and temperate expression of the opinion of the Synod. (Yes, yes, and no, no.) Had Canon Loosemore quoted the *ipsisima verba* of the report he would not have maintained the ground he had. In particular he had dwelt upon the remarks made on the Bishop of Grahamstown. It was true that a few years ago he had written a protest against Bishop Colenso. That was no doubt a very laudable thing, but how many knew who the Metropolitan of South Africa was? It did not follow that because the Synod approved of this one action that therefore they were prepared to approve of him so far as to elect him there Bishop. The Archbishop of Canterbury had died lately, how many knew what his name was and what his course of conduct had been. [Laughter.] The candidates from all parts of British North America, the Conjoint Bishop of Newfoundland, the Bishop of British Columbia and others it was known held certain sees, but what was known of them? Absolutely nothing, yet they were expected to accept these candidates without asking questions. [Hear, hear.]

Hon. L. S. HUNTINGTON said—I had no intention of addressing the Synod in defence of this Report, which appears to me to convey its own justification, in the speech of the Rev. Canon (Loosemore) balances a reply. We may as well consider the consideration of the subject by the frank avowal that there are two distinct parties in this Synod.—(Cries of hear, hear, and no, no.) It was true, and the fact should be fairly acknowledged by the Synod, that there were two parties—the one maintaining the attitude assumed by this House, and the other justifying as course of the House of Bishops. True, indeed, this fact was not apparent on the first day of the Session, when the House seemed unanimous in its resistance to the course which the Bishops pursued, but when on the second day a Conference was sought and obtained a reverend Canon of the deputation which sat upon their Lordships in the name of this House stated distinctly to the House of Bishops that so far as he was a representative of the views of this Synod he fully approved of their course, and thought the Synod had taken a false step. [Sensation.] I am only doing my duty to this Synod when I make this statement, nor have I, acting in their interest, the right to withhold the name of that delegate who so assumed to speak for the House. It was Canon Loosemore (Hear, hear.) If this statement is incorrect, the Rev. gentleman will correct me.

Canon LOOSEMORE—Of course I shall have the right to explain when Mr. Huntington has concluded.

Mr. HUNTINGTON—It will be far better if the Rev. Canon has a correction to make that he should do it now. I will gladly make way for him, and should not like to speak of him under a misapprehension.

Canon LOOSEMORE—I understand Mr. Huntington to intimate me as having acted on that deputation to the House of Bishops as the representative of a party. This I deny. I was not a partisan, nor am I such in this House. (Hear, hear.) The Rev. gentleman then related at some length the steps which the deputation had taken in their interview with their Lordships' House—and said that in answer to a calm and temperate statement of the presiding Bishop, that the course of the Synod was unprecedented in rejecting all the names without giving a second ballot, he had observed that there was a feeling among a great many members that this course should have been pursued. He continued—The House may or may not support this opinion which I expressed. When a better Canon on that deputation mentioned to their Lordships the names of two persons who would be acceptable to the House, I protested against such a course. (Cheers.)

Mr. HUNTINGTON—I think the House should thank me for giving the Rev. Canon an opportunity for the eloquent disclaimer we have just heard (Hear, hear.) I had no intention to charge him with any personal impropriety. It is sufficient for my purpose, that we find him as early as the second day of the session speaking for—I say a party in this House before the Bishops—but he says he only spoke for a great many members. (Cheers and laughter.) The Rev. gentleman explains in this way that he is not a partisan. I am not going to dispute about trifles—or whether a word is to be taken in its scholastic or literary or technical sense—but I say that he did represent a party before the Bishops, and he is the undoubted leader of the same party in this House. (Cheers.) The Rev. gentleman must not be too modest. He has been very pertinaciously doing the work of an active partisan, and has no right to claim the immunities of a neutral. (Cheers.) I do not deny him the right of free speech, and free speech—but as the under-secretary of the majority of this House, or professing impartiality in his judgement of our sentiments. (Hear, hear.) He opposes the report, of course, as the leader of a party in this Synod which has been opposed to its views from the first. No report could have had his support which did not condemn us, and support the Bishops. (Hear hear—cheers.)

Canon LOOSEMORE protested against this view of his position. The speaker had no right to presume that because he (Mr. L.) had pursued a certain course one day it was impossible for him to change.

Mr. HUNTINGTON—If the Rev. Canon wishes me to understand that I have been so fortunate as to shake his confidence in his own position, (great laughter.) I shall be delighted to welcome the change, (roars of laughter,) but I shall believe that we must continue to regard him as the able and persistent adversary of the position which the Synod has taken in this great crisis. (Hear hear.) Mr. Huntington then continued in defence of the report of the Committee which simply stated, first the history of the proceedings, second, the motifs for the action of the Synod, and thirdly a recommendation as to the course necessary to prevent the Synod from lapsing, and to protect its temporal interests during the interregnum which must ensue. He continued, I must say a word as to a charge which has been brought against us, that we are not obedient to constituted authority, and I make a broad distinction between the defence due to our Bishops in spiritual matters, and the object humility which is recommended to us in regard to temporal affairs. (Cheers.) I am not one of those who would exalt the episcopal or clerical authority to the position of an absolute oligarchy in temporal affairs. I will have no controversy about questions of faith or spiritual ministrations—but I will not, on the other hand, trouble my priest or my Bishop to think or speak or vote for me in mere matters of temporal or secular concern. And upon this principle I, and those who act with me, repudiate this prophetic appeal to our respect for constituted authority. (Cheers.) There has been a taunt thrown across the House that the clergy had elected a Bishop, and that if the laity had been like minded the present deadlock might have been averted. But the laity believed that a principle which was worth fighting for one day should be consistently maintained, the next. At the beginning of the session the clergy concurred with us that the names submitted were not worthy of confidence. On that day, at least, the conduct of the laity is not to be impugned, because the clergy led them on. On the second day there was a fluttering on the clerical side—and some evidence of defection. The course of the Bishops seemed to gain favour in their eyes, and there was dread of revolution and dissent, and some seemed to see the ghost of Oliver Cromwell stalking openly among us. [Loud cheers.] But the laity adhered to their principles. The nominations were the same, and were met by them in the same spirit. We do not taunt the clergy with their change, but let them not blame us for our consistency, [cheers.] After all we were only fighting their battle. [Hear, hear.] We were resisting an open and unjustifiable attempt to shut the avenues of preferment against them for all time, and if they do not thank us for it now, they will do so hereafter. (Loud cheers.) We saw the clergy under some unseen mysterious influence falling away from their first calm views and consenting to their own immolation. (Cheers.) We have saved

them from themselves. (Cheers.) There is a party in this House, led by the learned Canon, which desires to put the Synod in the wrong—I beseech, I implore the Synod to be firm once more. (Cheers.) What would have been our position to day if you had yielded the principle upon which you united yesterday. It would have been said that there was no independence among us—that we were the miserable tools of ecclesiastical authority. (Hear, hear.) We are not acting alone for ourselves—our example, if we are firm, will exercise a blessed influence throughout the Empire. The friends of Synodical government everywhere will be cheered by it—our spiritual superiors will learn to respect our rights—and in the end, I doubt not, the Rev. Canon himself will be found numbered among the multitudes within and without our Communion—who will thank God that in this great crisis the Laity of the Diocese of Montreal have—always within the law—pursued a wise and temperate and independent course to the last. (Cheers.)

Rev. J. B. DAVIDSON began to speak, but was at first inaudible. He was understood to say that he took exception to the position of his learned friend. He objected to call any man a leader of the clergy. The gentleman referred to had endeavoured less than any to influence his brethren, and he believed he was less influenced by others than any of the members. The last speaker speaks as if party lines were sharply drawn, and that he alone is authorized to speak for his side. I object to the report which is a party report and evidently full of special pleading. I will not allow credit to be given to its statement that the clergy are antagonistic to the Bishops. No; let the laity have full credit for that, and for the idea of the league that even out of the whole Bench of Bishops presented, any one of who was admirably fitted for the position, there could not be one found worthy of a vote, the intention of the unconvertable party being to oppose the nomination of all the Bishops of British North America. I have no doubt that a special coercive influence was attempted to be brought to bear against the House of Bishops in favour of a popular candidate. (No, and cheers.) Their conduct is quite opposed to the principle of the Canon, which they are bound to carry out in good faith, and to vote for those sent down. They have no right to ostracise any one class. I will not undertake the defence of the Bishops. When their first message was rejected, they had withdrawn it, and substituted another, treating this House with proper respect. It is for this House to show proper respect for the House of Bishops. Because an error had been committed at the outset, but rectified at once when pointed out, was that a reason why the whole Bench of Bishops but one should be ostracised. On contrary it was the part of noble men to forget. It was evident that part of the Synod had made up their minds to compel the Bishops—having once broken the rule unwise made, or rather announced, (laughter,)—to go on until they sent down the name wanted. He combated the idea that there would be any difficulty about meeting, as the law provided that if an adjournment took place, and a quorum was not present that it could always be adjourned to another day. With respect to the reception of the report he said, I hope it will not pass, as it was illegal to receive it, since no business can be brought before the meeting except the election of a Bishop. (Cries "It has to do with it.") The recommendation in the report to apply to the Legislature for a change in the Constitution, because certain members want their own way, is surely not part of the election; and if such changes as are sought there might be more cropping up when the application was laid before Parliament. If the report was adopted, there was no security as to what would follow.

The hour of adjournment having arrived, it was agreed that Mr. Robbuck, who had risen, should speak first after re-assembling.

THE SYNOD MET AGAIN AT HALF-PAST TWO P. M. Mr. ROEBUCK said he had moved the Conference with the Upper House, and they all knew the spirit in which he had done so. He had gone to their Lordships and prayed them, almost on his knees, to give peace to the Church, and so promote the glory of God. Now he had to state a fact, that the Rev. Mr. Loosemore did represent himself as representing a large part of the Clergy of Montreal. But for that he believed his (Mr. Roebuck's) request would have been assented to. As it was, it was refused, their Lordships being led to believe that they had large support from the Clergy.

Rev. Mr. NORMAN said he did not rise to defend the Bishops, in so far as their conduct was illegal he disapproved of it. But he opposed the report. Mr. Huntington had taunted the clergy with inconsistency and tergiversation because they had first rejected one candidate, and then had voted for the same candidate, and had thus shown themselves in a manner which contrasted with the position of the laity, who had acted consistently; but who he (Mr. Norman) might say, had very much obstructed the course of the business of electing a Bishop. He acknowledged no leader; he had formed part of no organization; and the men with whom he had acted, because he and they thought alike, were men of independent minds as he had ever met with. He was a high Churchman, but he would not like to see a high Churchman chosen Metropolitan Bishop, because he thought the cause of the Church would then be in danger. Nor would he like to see a low Churchman elected, for that would also be a cause of evil. He had, therefore, sought not to elect any one man, but rather to elect a man who would take a comprehensive view of things, and who would sympathize with all who desire to do the work of the Church. Instead, therefore, of being accused of tergiversation, he thought the clergy who had voted as he voted might fairly claim the credit of having sought to meet the views of their reverend fathers, and to give the diocese a Bishop, while the laity had, by their conduct, either out of opposition to the House of Bishops or out of party spirit, prevented any election.

Hon. L. S. HUNTINGTON explained that he did not taunt the clergy with changing their votes. He had distinctly said that no man had a right to taunt the other. It was, therefore, unfair to make this charge against him. But, in answer to a statement that the laity had obstructed the business of the Synod, which the Rev. Mr. Norman had now repeated, he said that the sin which the laity had committed the second day, the Clergy had committed on the first.

Mr. THOS. SIMPSON said the Canon authorized the Bishops to send down two or more names, from whom the Synod was to elect a Bishop. When the Synod passed that Canon, they had no idea that the House of Bishops would come down and say that none but a Bishop should become Metropolitan. The laity had stood by the Presbyters of the Diocese, some of whom had been fifty years in the service of their Lord and Master, and of whom there were many of high intellect and piety who might have well been elected to the Bish-

opment of the Synod. (Cheers.) We have saved

them from themselves. (Cheers.) There is a party in this House, led by the learned Canon, which desires to put the Synod in the wrong—I beseech, I implore the Synod to be firm once more. (Cheers.) What would have been our position to day if you had yielded the principle upon which you united yesterday. It would have been said that there was no independence among us—that we were the miserable tools of ecclesiastical authority. (Hear, hear.) We are not acting alone for ourselves—our example, if we are firm, will exercise a blessed influence throughout the Empire. The friends of Synodical government everywhere will be cheered by it—our spiritual superiors will learn to respect our rights—and in the end, I doubt not, the Rev. Canon himself will be found numbered among the multitudes within and without our Communion—who will thank God that in this great crisis the Laity of the Diocese of Montreal have—always within the law—pursued a wise and temperate and independent course to the last. (Cheers.)

Rev. J. B. DAVIDSON began to speak, but was at first inaudible. He was understood to say that he took exception to the position of his learned friend. He objected to call any man a leader of the clergy. The gentleman referred to had endeavoured less than any to influence his brethren, and he believed he was less influenced by others than any of the members. The last speaker speaks as if party lines were sharply drawn, and that he alone is authorized to speak for his side. I object to the report which is a party report and evidently full of special pleading. I will not allow credit to be given to its statement that the clergy are antagonistic to the Bishops. No; let the laity have full credit for that, and for the idea of the league that even out of the whole Bench of Bishops presented, any one of who was admirably fitted for the position, there could not be one found worthy of a vote, the intention of the unconvertable party being to oppose the nomination of all the Bishops of British North America. I have no doubt that a special coercive influence was attempted to be brought to bear against the House of Bishops in favour of a popular candidate. (No, and cheers.) Their conduct is quite opposed to the principle of the Canon, which they are bound to carry out in good faith, and to vote for those sent down. They have no right to ostracise any one class. I will not undertake the defence of the Bishops. When their first message was rejected, they had withdrawn it, and substituted another, treating this House with proper respect. It is for this House to show proper respect for the House of Bishops. Because an error had been committed at the outset, but rectified at once when pointed out, was that a reason why the whole Bench of Bishops but one should be ostracised. On contrary it was the part of noble men to forget. It was evident that part of the Synod had made up their minds to compel the Bishops—having once broken the rule unwise made, or rather announced, (laughter,)—to go on until they sent down the name wanted. He combated the idea that there would be any difficulty about meeting, as the law provided that if an adjournment took place, and a quorum was not present that it could always be adjourned to another day. With respect to the reception of the report he said, I hope it will not pass, as it was illegal to receive it, since no business can be brought before the meeting except the election of a Bishop. (Cries "It has to do with it.") The recommendation in the report to apply to the Legislature for a change in the Constitution, because certain members want their own way, is surely not part of the election; and if such changes as are sought there might be more cropping up when the application was laid before Parliament. If the report was adopted, there was no security as to what would follow.

The hour of adjournment having arrived, it was agreed that Mr. Robbuck, who had risen, should speak first after re-assembling.

THE SYNOD MET AGAIN AT HALF-PAST TWO P. M. Mr. ROEBUCK said he had moved the Conference with the Upper House, and they all knew the spirit in which he had done so. He had gone to their Lordships and prayed them, almost on his knees, to give peace to the Church, and so promote the glory of God. Now he had to state a fact, that the Rev. Mr. Loosemore did represent himself as representing a large part of the Clergy of Montreal. But for that he believed his (Mr. Roebuck's) request would have been assented to. As it was, it was refused, their Lordships being led to believe that they had large support from the Clergy.

Rev. Mr. NORMAN said he did not rise to defend the Bishops, in so far as their conduct was illegal he disapproved of it. But he opposed the report. Mr. Huntington had taunted the clergy with inconsistency and tergiversation because they had first rejected one candidate, and then had voted for the same candidate, and had thus shown themselves in a manner which contrasted with the position of the laity, who had acted consistently; but who he (Mr. Norman) might say, had very much obstructed the course of the business of electing a Bishop. He acknowledged no leader; he had formed part of no organization; and the men with whom he had acted, because he and they thought alike, were men of independent minds as he had ever met with. He was a high Churchman, but he would not like to see a high Churchman chosen Metropolitan Bishop, because he thought the cause of the Church would then be in danger. Nor would he like to see a low Churchman elected, for that would also be a cause of evil. He had, therefore, sought not to elect any one man, but rather to elect a man who would take a comprehensive view of things, and who would sympathize with all who desire to do the work of the Church. Instead, therefore, of being accused of tergiversation, he thought the clergy who had voted as he voted might fairly claim the credit of having sought to meet the views of their reverend fathers, and to give the diocese a Bishop, while the laity had, by their conduct, either out of opposition to the House of Bishops or out of party spirit, prevented any election.

Hon. L. S. HUNTINGTON explained that he did not taunt the clergy with changing their votes. He had distinctly said that no man had a right to taunt the other. It was, therefore, unfair to make this charge against him. But, in answer to a statement that the laity had obstructed the business of the Synod, which the Rev. Mr. Norman had now repeated, he said that the sin which the laity had committed the second day, the Clergy had committed on the first.

Mr. THOS. SIMPSON said the Canon authorized the Bishops to send down two or more names, from whom the Synod was to elect a Bishop. When the Synod passed that Canon, they had no idea that the House of Bishops would come down and say that none but a Bishop should become Metropolitan. The laity had stood by the Presbyters of the Diocese, some of whom had been fifty years in the service of their Lord and Master, and of whom there were many of high intellect and piety who might have well been elected to the Bish-

opment of the Synod. (Cheers.) We have saved

them from themselves. (Cheers.) There is a party in this House, led by the learned Canon, which desires to put the Synod in the wrong—I beseech, I implore the Synod to be firm once more. (Cheers.) What would have been our position to day if you had yielded the principle upon which you united yesterday. It would have been said that there was no independence among us—that we were the miserable tools of ecclesiastical authority. (Hear, hear.) We are not acting alone for ourselves—our example, if we are firm, will exercise a blessed influence throughout the Empire. The friends of Synodical government everywhere will be cheered by it—our spiritual superiors will learn to respect our rights—and in the end, I doubt not, the Rev. Canon himself will be found numbered among the multitudes within and without our Communion—who will thank God that in this great crisis the Laity of the Diocese of Montreal have—always within the law—pursued a wise and temperate and independent course to the last. (Cheers.)

Rev. J. B. DAVIDSON began to speak, but was at first inaudible. He was understood to say that he took exception to the position of his learned friend. He objected to call any man a leader of the clergy. The gentleman referred to had endeavoured less than any to influence his brethren, and he believed he was less influenced by others than any of the members. The last speaker speaks as if party lines were sharply drawn, and that he alone is authorized to speak for his side. I object to the report which is a party report and evidently full of special pleading. I will not allow credit to be given to its statement that the clergy are antagonistic to the Bishops. No; let the laity have full credit for that, and for the idea of the league that even out of the whole Bench of Bishops presented, any one of who was admirably fitted for the position, there could not be one found worthy of a vote, the intention of the unconvertable party being to oppose the nomination of all the Bishops of British North America. I have no doubt that a special coercive influence was attempted to be brought to bear against the House of Bishops in favour of a popular candidate. (No, and cheers.) Their conduct is quite opposed to the principle of the Canon, which they are bound to carry out in good faith, and to vote for those sent down. They have no right to ostracise any one class. I will not undertake the defence of the Bishops. When their first message was rejected, they had withdrawn it, and substituted another, treating this House with proper respect. It is for this House to show proper respect for the House of Bishops. Because an error had been committed at the outset, but rectified at once when pointed out, was that a reason why the whole Bench of Bishops but one should be ostracised. On contrary it was the part of noble men to forget. It was evident that part of the Synod had made up their minds to compel the Bishops—having once broken the rule unwise made, or rather announced, (laughter,)—to go on until they sent down the name wanted. He combated the idea that there would be any difficulty about meeting, as the law provided that if an adjournment took place, and a quorum was not present that it could always be adjourned to another day. With respect to the reception of the report he said, I hope it will not pass, as it was illegal to receive it