

appoint a Committee to report to the Upper on any subject, on which they may desire the judgment of the Lower, or to appoint their portion of a Joint Committee, or may summon the Lower to a conference.

14. Messages from the Upper House shall be delivered by an Officer of the Upper to the Secretary of the Lower, by whom they shall be communicated to the Prolocutor, who shall communicate them to the House.

15. The Lower house may present to the Upper any matter which they conceive to be a grievance or to require amendment, even when they have no proposition to make on the same; and the Upper House shall thereupon place it in order for consideration, with the view of providing a remedy; and shall, before the conclusion of the session, declare to the Lower House the result.

16. The Prolocutor shall have the right of admission personally or by Committee to the Upper House, to communicate the desire or decisions of his House; and in such case, he shall ascertain by message when he or the Committee can conveniently be received in the Upper House, and act accordingly.

17. It shall be competent to the Lower House to request a joint committee or conference on any special object, beyond those submitted to it by the Upper House, or to propose for discussion any specific measure; to which request an answer shall be given; but it shall be at the option of the Upper House to accede to their request or not.

18. When either house shall desire a conference with the other, or a joint committee, the reason for either shall be agreed to by the house desiring it, and communicated in writing to the other; the Prolocutor personally or by committee in either case proceeding to the Upper House, either to deliver or to receive such reasons.

19. When either House shall have come to a decision upon any subject in which the other House is concerned, it shall communicate its decision to the other.

20. If the Lower House should not concur in a decision of the Upper, they shall, in stating their non-concurrence, state their reason, and may either propose an amendment, or request the Upper House to suggest an amendment to meet their reason, or request a conference.

21. If the Upper should not concur in a resolution or decision of the Lower, they may, in stating their non-concurrence, either state their reasons or not; and may either propose an amendment, or request the Lower House to prepare an amendment, or appoint a conference, to which the Lower House shall always give attention.

22. The conference may be either by deputation from both Houses, or by deputation from the Lower House, or by open conference, as the Upper House may think fit, and the place shall be appointed by the President.

23. No proposition shall be considered as sanctioned by the Provincial Synod, until it has received the separate sanction of both Houses, which shall be declared by the President in writing.

24. Committees, whether of either House, or of the two Houses, may hold their meetings either during recesses in the session, or during the prorogation of the Synod.

25. No alteration of the Constitution or Canons shall come into operation, until it has been confirmed at a second session of the Provincial Synod.

Each meeting of the Synod shall be preceded, or commenced by morning prayer and a sermon, if so ordered by the Metropolitan, and on the first day of such meeting the Holy Communion shall be administered.

The business of each day shall be commenced

by prayer for the Divine guidance and blessing, according to a form authorized by the House of Bishops.

The election of the Clerical and Lay Delegates shall be certified under the hand and seal of the Bishop of the Diocese which they represent, and such certificate shall be final and conclusive.

He then moved that the Prolocutor do name a committee to carry the Constitution just adopted to the Upper House and pray their Lordship's concurrence. Carried.

The Committee having been named,

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PATENT OF METROPOLITAN.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON brought up the third report of the committee appointed to consider the Letters Patent appointing the Metropolitan. This report consisted of an extract from the Letters Patent already published, with certain short alterations, which lodged the appointment of the successors of the present Metropolitan in the Provincial Synod, and made the exercise of the powers conferred, to be subject to the Synod Act, and the canons and rules to be enacted by that Synod.

The Very Rev. DEAN OF MONTREAL moved that the second report of the committee on the Constitution and Letters Patent brought up in the morning session, be now read and considered.

Mr. IRVINE moved in amendment, seconded by Major CAMPBELL, that the second and third reports be considered together, and that the rule requiring notice be suspended for that purpose.

Rev. Mr. SLACK moved an amendment, seconded by Rev. W. ANDERSON, that the consideration of the third report be postponed until to-morrow morning, and that in the meantime it should be printed for the use of the members.

Rev. Mr. ROE thought the amendments of the Patent were very few, simple, and easily understood, and members did not require to wait for them to be printed.

ARCHDEACON BROWN thought the matter of so much importance, that they should go on with it at once, in order to enable those members who must leave that evening or next day, an opportunity of expressing their opinion, and if possible, of voting.

Mr. SLACK's amendment was put and lost.

Mr. IRVINE's was then put, and carried.

The Hon. Mr. CAMERON then said, that as a member of the committee which had prepared these reports, he desired to make some explanation of the reasons by which they had been guided, and the decisions at which they had arrived. The only point which it was necessary to refer to in the second report, was its affirmation of the legality of the Letters Patent. In the third, they had made certain amendments to the terms of the proposed Letters Patent, endeavouring to make them accord with the Canadian Statute. The first amendment went to the root of the whole question of legality. In passing the Synod Act, it was necessary to obtain the sanction of Her Majesty, and that was obtained in consequence of a declaration that whatever should be done by the Synods, should not derogate from the prerogative of the Crown. At the same time it was necessary to remark that these acts were permissive, and not compulsory. No diocese was thereby bound to create a Synod, and adopt its provisions. It remained open for them to organize a Synod, and to elect their Diocesan under the act, or to remain under the old law, and have their Diocesan appointed by the Crown, as formerly. They might occupy a different position after having organized a Synod under the Act, and thus adopted its provisions. But it was left entirely with the Clergy and Laity to take the first step and by accepting the Act to place them-

selves under its authority. If they had all declined to do so, the Act would have been left a dead letter, obligatory on no one. The Queen had assented to the Act granting authority for the organization of the Provincial Synod, and he was of opinion that that Synod, if organized, might have elected a Metropolitan. But they had not organized such a Synod, nor accepted or used the powers conferred by that Statute. The law remained then as before. The power in reference to this matter remained with the Queen, precisely as before. Now, no one could doubt that the Queen had had the power to create a Metropolitan Bishop here as in England or in any other part of her dominions. She had done so in Australia, as well as in England. He repeated she had not had that right taken out of her by any action of the church here. These same reasons had been seen and concurred in by all the members of the Committee, at least by all the legal gentlemen upon that Committee. There was then, he was confident in asserting, no legal impediment to the issue of Her Majesty's Letters Patent, creating a Metropolitan Bishop. He had heard indeed that a letter had been received from the Queen's Advocate, either addressed to the Governor General or to the Duke of Newcastle, when in Canada, which threw doubt upon the legality of these Letters Patent. But he could not conceive that that could be the case, and that Sir J. Harding had thus raised doubts about what he had previously advised Her Majesty to do. Nay further, he had sent out a second draft asking suggestions with respect to amendments. Lest such a letter might be in existence however, he had telegraphed to the Attorney General at Quebec for information on the subject. He was absent, but his secretary had replied, that so far as he could learn, no such letter existed. But even if it had existed, he thought that Provincial lawyers, though not having always at hand the means of reference possessed by the Queen's advisers in Britain, could yet see all the force and reason of a legal proposition—and law was said to be the result of the highest reason—such as that were only a permissive act had been passed, and that not acted upon, it could not possibly involve any limitation whatever of the Queen's prerogative. They had next to consider of the powers which should be granted to the Metropolitan by the new Letters Patent, and here he might remark that while some had said that the Queen had attempted to override the law in this appointment, it seemed to him that quite the contrary disposition had been manifested, and a very unusual courtesy displayed. When asked to correct errors in the first Patent, she not only corrects them but specially calls the attention of the Metropolitan to the question whether any other changes would be desirable in order to make the Patent agree with the Colonial Act: taking these unusual pains to put the Patent in such a shape as would be most advisable and acceptable. The Patent confers on the Bishop of Montreal, and his successors Bishops of Montreal, the dignity and powers of Metropolitan Bishops. On that point, the Committee first took issue with the framers of the original Patent. And they proposed that the successors of the present Metropolitan should be appointed in such manner as the Provincial Synod should see fit to ordain. The Committee had not presumed to offer any suggestion to Her Majesty or that house with respect to the particular manner in which future Metropolitans should be appointed. That was a separate, and a large subject, which did not strictly come within the jurisdiction of the Committee. The next point in which they thought an amendment necessary was that although at the time of the issue of the Patent, the Diocese of Huron had