

NOTICES OF MOTIONS.

Several motions were given: among others the following:—

Rev Mr BLEASDELL gave notice of a motion, to be seconded by the Rev. Mr. MOUNTAIN, proposing an address to the House of Bishops, that an authorized version of Psalms and Hymns be compiled and sanctioned with their Lordships' sanction.

Also, of a motion concerning the Essays and Reviews, declaring them subversive of the truths of Revelation, of the great verities of Christian doctrine, and consequently highly dangerous in character and pernicious to the cause of truth in general.

The Rev. Mr. HOLLAND gave notice of a motion concerning the desirability of a union in one Province of the Dioceses of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, with those of Canada.

Also, of an address promotive of friendly relations with the Church in the United States.

Rev. Dr. FULLER gave notice that he would, on any motion for sending up the address to the Queen to the Upper House, move an amendment similar to Dr. Bovell's motion.

Mr. WUTTELL gave notice of an enquiry concerning the legality of the representation of the proposed diocese of Ontario, in the Synod.

The first report of the Committee on the Constitution, &c., was then taken up and considered clause by clause.

The clauses adopted on the first day of the session stood as Nos. 1 and 2. No. 3 was adopted.

No. 4 being read as below.

Judge McCORD said that he desired to limit the power of calling special sessions of the Synod. They had a precedent in the United States which he thought it would be advisable to follow, and that was to require a requisition from a majority of the Bishops in the Province. The rule worked satisfactorily in the United States.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON could not concur with the amendment. He thought that two Bishops might have matter of importance to bring forward. He thought no mischief could arise from the rule as it stood, and much might arise from the change.

Rev. Mr. SLACK thought they should proceed by principle not by expediency, and would support Judge McCord's motion.

Mr. CARTER thought that as no action could be taken without the majority of the Bishops, it would not be well to call the Synod together unless a majority of the Bishops agreed as to its necessity.

Archdeacon HELLMUTH thought the rule better as it stood.

Mr. HUNTINGTON thought emergencies might arise in one diocese which would render it advisable that a meeting should be called without waiting to persuade a majority of the Bishops of its propriety. After some further discussion the amendment was rejected and the clause adopted.

Clauses 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 were then read and adopted as below.

The Synod adjourned.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Synod met again at three o'clock.

The several remaining clauses of the Constitution were read and adopted as below.

On the motion for concurrence being put,

Mr. LAWRASON moved to reintroduce the former 26th clause struck out by the Committee as follows:

No proposition shall be binding on any Dio-

cese, until it has been either accepted by its Synod, or after a second discussion in the Provincial Synod, has been confirmed by it.

He thought it not fair that the diocese should be heard before laws were finally passed which might interfere with their franchises.

The Rev. PROLOCUTOR said he desired to state that having been consulted in the drawing up of these clauses, he had inserted this one because he found it laid down by certain canonists that this rule prevailed in the ancient church. So decidedly was this the case that within the last 20 years, there were dioceses in France which had not accepted some of the canons passed by the Council of Trent, and were not governed by them. In England a different rule had obtained. There the canons were forthwith binding in all the dioceses of the Ecclesiastical Province. He was not sure that it was expedient to adopt the rule, but it was worth consideration, and he was therefore glad that it had come before the Committee, and that the whole house were now united to consider it.

The Rev. Dr. FULLER saw no propriety to this reference of their legislation back to the dioceses. Men came there representing the various dioceses, elected to speak for them there, and they should be held competent to legislate for the whole Province. It should no more be competent for any separate diocese to hinder the effect of their legislation than for a county or a district represented in Parliament to repudiate any of its acts. Such was not the practice in England; and if he read the law of the church in the United States aright, such was not the case there. They should strive to promote union and unanimity, and each diocese should have confidence in a body in which it was duly represented, that no legislation would be sanctioned to oppress it.

Dr. BOVELL pointed out that the rule only operated as a postponement of any act going into operation. If it were confirmed at a second session by the Provincial Synod the objections of the diocese would be overruled.

Mr. GAMBLE thought the effect would be to prevent uniformity of discipline. Why were they met to legislate for a whole Province if each diocese in it could nullify their acts? All the dioceses were represented, and spoke there, and all should acquiesce in their decisions.

Rev. Dr. PATTON pointed out that the terms of the proposed rule were so broad that they could not pass any motion; they could not adopt a constitution of rules of order, without first waiting for the sanction of the several dioceses.

Rev. Mr. BLEASDELL concurred with Mr. Gamble. Such a rule would be a mischievous one.

Archdeacon HELLMUTH and Rev. Mr. O'GRADY thought the rights of the dioceses sufficiently protected by the Synod Act.

Mr. HUNTINGDON thought the re-introduction of this rule would be an absurdity. When it was proposed on a previous day of the session to vote by dioceses, the opinion of that house was very clearly manifested in favour of uniformity and against the spirit of sectionalism. They would stultify themselves if they now by this rule recognized the sectional principle and voted against uniformity. They were there as a Synod of a united church, and it was their great object to promote union and uniformity.

Rev. Mr. DEWAR said the rule, he conceived, was less to protect the sectional interests of dioceses than to prevent constant tinkering. In the United States before any Canon or Order could be enforced it had to lie over from one session to another and be communicated to the Diocesan Conventions.

A DELEGATE pointed out that here too a Canon would have to lie over, and the Diocesan Synods would surely be informed of what transpired there.

Rev. Mr. MARSH thought such a rule utterly unnecessary.

COL. O'BRIEN thought it a great mistake not to maintain to the uttermost the independence of each bishop and each diocese. That was the true English spirit of individual liberty and decentralization of authority. They might see where an opposite doctrine brought the Church of Rome. Possibly dangers might arise from centering too much power in the metropolitan body here too.

The motion being put, was rejected.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON then moved that clauses 1, 2, & 4, of the Rules and Orders, be added as clauses of the Constitution, and that the rule be suspended for that purpose. This was necessary, as those clauses required the concurrence of the Upper House. Carried.

The whole report as amended was then adopted as follows:—

CONSTITUTION.

1. The Provincial Synod shall consist of the Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, having Sees within the Province of Canada, and of Delegates chosen from the Clergy and from the Laity.

2. The Bishops shall deliberate in one House, and the delegates from the Clergy and Laity in another, and each House shall hold its sittings either in public or private, at its own discretion.

3. The Clerical and Lay Delegates shall consist of twelve of each Order from each Diocese.

4. The Synod shall meet once in three years, or oftener at the discretion of the Metropolitan, or on the requisition of any two Bishops, or of the Bishop and half the Delegates of any Diocese.

5. In a vacancy of the Metropolitan See, a meeting may be called at the appointed period, or on either of the above requisitions, by the senior Bishop of the Church in Canada.

6. A quorum of the Synod shall consist of not less than a majority of the Bishops, and not less than one-fourth of the members of each Order of the Lower House.

7. The President of the Upper House shall be the Metropolitan, or some Bishop appointed by him; and, in the vacancy of the See, the President shall be chosen by the House of Bishops.

8. The Lower House shall be presided over by their Prolocutor, to be chosen *vice voce* on motion of any member of that House.

9. Each House shall appoint a Secretary or Secretaries, who shall keep regular accounts of all proceedings in their own House, shall record them in books provided for the purpose, shall preserve memorials and other documents under the direction of the President and Prolocutor, shall attest all public acts of the Synod, and deliver over all records and documents to their successors.

10. The expenses of the Synod shall be provided for, and its financial concerns managed by a Committee of the Lower House, after a manner to be approved by both Houses.

11. Each House shall establish its own order of proceedings and rules of order, and may publish such of its proceedings as may appear advisable.

12. The Upper House shall propose to the Lower any business they may desire to have treated of or decided; and it shall be incumbent on the Lower House to take up and dispose of such business in preference to any other.

13. The Upper House may direct the Lower to