

empire, and it was in consequence of their temporal position and not their spiritual, that a locality had to be fixed for their jurisdiction. But the same reasons for such a state of things did not exist in Canada. And as in this country there could be no question of temporal power, but solely of spiritual jurisdiction, there could be no reason why the office of Metropolitan should not be as well exercised by the Bishop of Quebec or the Bishop of Huron. Various plans had been proposed to meet the difficulty involved in the appointment of Metropolitan. Some proposed to elect the senior bishop, and some proposed other plans. With regard to seniority it was true they had the example of the American church before them in favour of this course. He had heard, however, clergymen of the church in the United States declare that if the constitution were to be framed again they would do the very thing which this canon proposed. They declared the appointment of the senior bishop was not the wisest course; it might happen that the senior bishop was enfeebled by age, and thus prevented from discharging efficiently the duties of his office. In the other case, if the Metropolitan should become old he would become old in his office, and not, being old, be elected by accident. He (Mr. Cameron) did not believe the seniority principle should be adopted. The principle of a fixity of see, and the appointment of bishops might, in theory, be the best. But how often had men been appointed in England who were said afterwards not to have been the best fitted for the office; and often had it been a charge against the ministry in England that for some particular purpose a man had been chosen, not the best qualified to perform the duties of diocesan or archbishop. With us there was no such appointing power, and the consequence was the election by each diocese of the person thought best qualified, and thus they had the best men from which to select the Metropolitan. When they had placed men in the office of bishops there was no reason why they should not give them the power to select a Metropolitan. Surely the Synod acting in this matter would do nothing that would tend to create among themselves discord or separation, which they were all trying to prevent or put down; and while shewing to the people a commendable unanimity on many points on which it was considered there could be no agreement during this Synod, they should not introduce among themselves, by throwing the election of Metropolitan into the hands of the Provincial Synod, any element of discord. (Hear, hear) When they took the whole matter into consideration, when they saw the authority the Crown and Provincial Parliament had given them, and when they saw the manner in which primitive usage had been departed from in this case,—and when they considered the Scottish church by which the first bishop in the American church had been consecrated, when they found the principle had worked so well, he did think it would be wisest and best for this Synod, in the course they had to pursue, in the providence of God, to endeavour to meet this question in the way in which he thought it could be best met—by placing in the hands of the learned, able and religious men appointed over them the power of declaring who should be their own head—who should bear and exercise Metropolitan jurisdiction in this country. To those who had advocated the Bishop of Montreal always being Metropolitan he had only to say such would not be satisfactory either to the clergy or laity of many of the dioceses of this country. It would not be proper for the Synod, which was the higher body, to be directed in this matter by the diocese of Montreal, which

was only an inferior jurisdiction. Besides, at any time any Synod might reverse the acts of the previous Synod, and exercise an authority against the wish of all the other dioceses. He hoped that all present would feel that the wisest course and the one most consonant with the interests of the church was to invest with the power in question, these reverend fathers in God whom they had set over them for the well-being of the church. (Applause.)

Rev. Mr. BLEASDELL fully concurred in the Ven. Bishop of Quebec's reasons for having the Metropolitan in the Diocese of Montreal. He believed Mr. Cameron's remarks did not meet the difficulty of the case. He did not know the advantages there were to be derived from the proposed change, therefore he would give it every opposition he could. He considered this question of the greatest importance to them. A strong argument in favor of his views was that the practice he advocated had been that of the church from the earliest to the present time. The words which had been put in the patent last session would again turn out to be bones of contention, and he called attention to their dangerous character. He considered it would be unwise to remove the Metropolitan See from the Diocese of Montreal, which in every respect was the most important of this Province. The inhabitants of Montreal had with their well known spirit erected here a Cathedral like of which they of the present generation might not expect to see again in the Province; and he feared it would be inexpedient to adopt a measure which would lead to any such change as that proposed. The expedient adopted by the Scottish church in difficult circumstances, should not be adopted by this Synod as a principle, and no argument ought to be drawn from that fact. He believed it would be unwise to adopt the practice of the church in the United States, which had been determined by the democratic spirit of the people there. The canon before the House should not, he believed, be adopted. He would move, in amendment, seconded by the Rev. J. C. Davidson, "That the canon for the election of the Metropolitan, in the way proposed, be not received, but that the office be vested or remain with the Bishop of Montreal."

Dr. BOVELL rose to move an amendment, but it was with considerable reluctance that he attempted to offer an amendment to the canon brought up by such a committee. He thought the Synod ought to weigh well whether it would not be more desirable to refer the canon back again to the committee, so that it might come up for consideration on another occasion. To adopt it in its present shape would be detrimental to the very best interests of the church. He thought a very great principle was involved in the proceedings they were about to take. It was the custom of the Primitive Church that the Metropolitan See should be fixed. Very recently we had passed through a painful period, when much anxiety had been felt in England that we would not put forth those efforts which were supposed to be necessary to our preservation. Much the same feeling at this moment animated the English bishops with reference to the colonial church. At the Provincial Synod of Canterbury some of the bishops stated that they did not know whether the colonial church wished to sever itself from the connection which ought so closely to bind it to the mother country. How much better then would it not be to wait and see what action would be taken on this question in England. He thought they should consider the matter well and pause before they committed themselves irretrievably by electing a Metropolitan. The speaker then went on to allude to the prac-

tice of the church in Scotland, where the title of Metropolitan was not given, but a president was elected. If there were legal impediments, however, why the church in this Province should not have a fixed Metropolitan See, let us know what they were; but he did not believe that there were such impediments. So far from hampering themselves by any deviation from English custom, they ought first to see what action the church in England would take. By prematurely deciding upon the course they would take, they would only fetter themselves in their future movements. There was no reason for haste, and he, therefore, asked the Synod to pause, and refer the matter to another committee, so that having the benefit of increased experience they might arrive at some wholesome and judicious decision. He would, therefore, move the following resolution, seconded by the Rev. Mr. Roe:—

"Whereas, it is the duty of the church in this Province to conform herself as far as possible to the model of the Primitive church, and more particularly are we in duty bound to keep closely to the principle which governs the mother church in England: and whereas, according to that model, with only one exception, the Metropolitan See in each ecclesiastical province has always been fixed in one city: and whereas, according to the most ancient precedent the Metropolitans were elected by the bishops of the whole province: and whereas, as yet by Provincial act of Parliament each diocese in this province has the right of electing its own bishop; therefore,

Resolved, That, the House of Bishops concurring, a joint committee of the two Houses of this Synod be appointed to confer with the Synod of the Diocese of Montreal with the view to devise some measure for the election of the Metropolitan, and to ensure that the Metropolitan See remain fixed at Montreal, which shall receive a share in the election of the whole church in the province, without depriving the diocesan Synod of Montreal of the right of electing their own bishop; and to report to the next meeting of the Provincial Synod, and that the following canon be referred to the committee:—

"When a vacancy occurs in the Metropolitan See, the senior bishop shall within — days from the occurrence of such vacancy, summon a special meeting of the House of Bishops, and of the Synod of the Diocese of Montreal, to be held simultaneously in the city of Montreal within not less than — days, nor more than — days from date of such summons, for the purpose of electing a successor to the See. The House of Bishops shall then select a fit and proper person to hold the office of Metropolitan, and shall nominate him to the Synod of Montreal for election. If the Synod of the Diocese of Montreal shall decline to elect the person first nominated to them, the House of Bishops shall nominate a second, and so on until an election is made."

Dr. BOVELL's motion having been read, the Rev. Mr. BleasdeLL consented to withdraw his amendment.

Rev. Mr. ROE then rose to second Dr. Bovell's. He said that he did so with a great deal of pleasure. He alluded to the fact of the Metropolitan being fixed in the primitive church, and said that the head of the church in Scotland was formerly no more than a presiding officer. When the church was established in America after the Revolution, it was doubtful if Episcopacy would be allowed in the country, and a Metropolitan See could not be created. The Hon. Mr. Cameron had said that it would be highly undignified for this House to propose names to the Diocesan Synod for election; but that was the very course adopted by the primitive church. The people