

seventeen years to make. The conditions necessary to a constitutional solution of the difficulty are :—

1st. There must be a Bishop of Montreal ; because until there is a Bishop, there can be no Synod, save for election.

2nd. There must be notice given at a regular legal meeting of Synod, the subject discussed, and resolution carried by a two-thirds majority, clerical and lay ; it must then come up at the next Synod, and be confirmed by a similar majority and receive the Bishop's assent.

3rd. The matter must then be brought before two sessions of the Provincial Synod, carried at one session and confirmed at another ; when all this is done, the contract is at an end.

Such are the safeguards with which the forethought of preceding Synods has protected our Church from rash innovation, while yet leaving room for the constitutional reform of intolerable grievances. Without such safeguards all government becomes impossible. To allow a majority unconstitutionally to over-ride these safeguards at its pleasure is anarchy.

It will be remembered that last November the House of Bishops proposed that, if one of their number were elected, he would undertake to resign as soon as this Canon could be repealed. This proposition was rejected, possibly because such an arrangement might be nullified for want of a two-thirds majority at a legal Diocesan Synod. The Diocese might not desire another election, and might refuse to confirm such a bargain. It is, however, doubtful if such a proposal will again be made, for the Synod, by its adopted report, has, with refreshing candour, eliminated two Bishops from discussion, and pronounced against the physical qualifications of the two remaining ones.

To run with a majority is always pleasant, and a minority, among other disadvantages, have generally to contend with some opprobrious epithet lavished with more heartiness than discrimination. The term "lunatic" is not so much to be complained