

Church Observer.

A Journal advocating the interests of the United Church of England and Ireland in the Dominion of Canada.

"THIS PROTESTANT KINGDOM."—BILL OF RIGHTS, 1688.

VOL. I.—No. 41.

MONTREAL, THURSDAY, 19TH NOVEMBER, 1868.

\$2 per An.—Single copies, 5 cents.

Diocesan Synod.

SPECIAL MEETING—NOMINATION OF BISHOP AND METROPOLITAN.

WEDNESDAY, NOV. 11, 1868.

Yesterday, in accordance with the circular of the Dean of Montreal, the Diocesan Synod met for the purpose of electing a successor to the late Metropolitan. The number of delegates from all parts of the Province was very large, the utmost interest being naturally felt in the result of the election to so important an office. At 11 o'clock public service was held in the Cathedral. The prayers were read by the Rev. Mr. Slack, Rector of St. George's, and the first lesson by Ven. Archdeacon Leach. The concluding prayers were read by Rev. Canon Loosmore.

The Rev. Canon Balch, D.D., then preached from 2 Timothy iii. 13—"Study to show thyself approved unto God." After a few introductory remarks on the general principles involved in the text, he applied it to the conduct and teaching of ministers themselves and showed how their energies ought to be directed. He dwelt upon the Diocesan Missions, giving the statistics of the Diocese of Montreal with its 45,000 adherents and seventy-five ministers. He directed their attention to the gradual withdrawal of the contributions of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, in order that the Church here may help herself the more, now that she is past the stage of infancy. More than \$12,000 a year must, therefore, soon be withdrawn, and it would be necessary to be prepared for that as well as to provide for their present deficiency. He was of opinion that a special sum of \$5,000 this year should be raised to be applied to next year's operations, and so on yearly, that there might always be a year's funds in hand for the following year. In this he had the full concurrence of the late Bishop. He had already made a beginning in raising that sum, and trusted the whole amount might be raised by January. To meet the deficiency, and the withdrawal of the Propagation Society's grant, it would be necessary to raise the sum of \$25,000 annually from the Diocese, but this sum could be raised by the exertions of the Synod and the Bishop and with these it could be obtained with less trouble and less inconvenience to congregations than the present amount. He entered upon a summary of the duties devolving upon all entering upon the work they had to perform, and exhorted them to do it prayerfully and with a full reliance upon whom the choice fell.

At the conclusion of the sermon a collection was taken up. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was then dispensed by the Lord Bishop of Toronto, assisted by the Lord Bishop of Quebec.

THE ELECTION.

The Synod met at three o'clock, Dean Bethune in the Chair. There was a large meeting of the delegates. At the request of the Dean, the Rev. Canon Balch read the Prayer appointed for the occasion. Mr. M. H. Sanborn read over the list of the delegates, those present answering to their names.

LIST OF CLERGY AND LAY DELEGATES.

- Names marked thus * were absent.
- CLERGY.**
- Very Rev. Dean Bethune, Rev. C. Bancroft, jr., B.A. use, D.D.
 - Rev. A. O. Taylor
 - Ven. Arch. Leach, D.C.L., Rev. E. S. Tenkyns
 - L.L.D., Rev. C. P. Abbott
 - Rev. Canon Loosmore, Rev. J. B. Davidson,
 - Rev. Canon Balch, D.D., M.A.
 - Rev. E. Wood, M.A., Rev. H. Montgomery
 - Rev. R. W. Norman, Rev. I. Constantine, M.A.
 - M.A., Rev. J. Smith
 - Rev. C. A. Daniel, Rev. L. C. Wurtels
 - Rev. Canon Bancroft, Rev. D. C. Lindsay
 - D. D., Rev. T. W. Munson, B.A.
 - Rev. J. P. Dimoulin, Rev. A. T. Whittier
 - Rev. Canon Bond, M.A., Rev. C. F. Thordyke
 - Rural Dean, Rev. Can. Townsend,
 - Rev. Jas. Carmichael, M.A.
 - Rev. W. B. Curran, B.A., Rev. C. Lancaster
 - Rev. M. S. Baldwin, Rev. H. J. Evans
 - M.A., Rev. E. G. Sutton
 - Rev. J. Ellegood, M.A., Rev. J. Fulton, M.A.
 - Rev. W. Wright, M.D., Rev. E. DuVernet, M.A.,
 - Rev. J. A. McLeod, M.A., Rural Dean
 - Rev. J. D. Berchwick, Rev. W. T. Early
 - Rev. T. M. Bartlett, M.A., Rev. A. D. Lockhart
 - Rev. W. C. Merrick, M.A., Rev. W. Brethour, M.A.
 - Rev. T. A. Young, M.A., Rev. B. P. Lewis, B.A.
 - Rev. J. Merrick, Rev. Ed. Roy
 - Rev. A. Balfour, Rev. H. F. Darvell
 - Rev. Wm. J. Dart, Rev. P. W. Smith
 - Rev. T. Golden, B.A., Rev. W. R. Brown
 - Rev. Alex. Shand, Rev. S. S. Strong
 - Rev. W. M. Salmom, Rev. G. O. C. Robinson
 - Rev. J. Allen, Rev. F. S. Neve
 - Rev. Canon Anderson, Rev. J. Johnstone
 - Rev. O. Fortin, B.A., Rev. J. Codd
 - Rev. F. Robinson, M.A., Rev. F. Rollit
 - Rev. G. Slack, M.A., Rev. J. Seaman
 - Rural Dean, Rev. E. G. Braithwaite
 - Rev. E. F. Fossenden, M.A.
 - Rev. J. C. Davidson, Rev. Mr. Prime
 - Rev. J. Godden, Rev. J. Gribble
 - Rev. A. Fortin, Rev. R. Londell, M.A.
 - Rev. W. Jones, Rural Depp.
 - Rev. T. W. Fyles, Rev. C. J. Kaapche
 - Rev. R. Lindsay, M.A., Rev. Jas. Pyke

LAYTY.

- Rev. J. Braithwaite, Rev. J. Jones
- Rev. T. Johnson
- Strach in Bethune, Q. C. R. W. Shepherd
- M. H. Ganit, W. Mcade Pattison
- Capt. Hk rs. R.E., T. R. Roberts
- E. Lisher, D. T. R. Ne
- E. P. Hannaford, W. S. Holapple
- Charles Garth, George Mitchell
- H. M. Whitney, Moses Corey
- T. H. Schneider, John C. Corey
- Chas. Smallwood, M.D. John C. Corey
- D.C.L., L.L.D., E. A. Dyer
- John Empson, C.E., Thos. Newton
- Thos. R. Johnson, I. J. Gibb
- Hezekiah Arnold, Benjamin Seaton
- C. Dorwin, Geo. Deveraux Van
- Frederick Kingston, Walter Crocker
- Thomas Hawkins, H. L. Robinson
- Thomas White, W. G. Parmelee
- W. Hobbs, Hon. A. B. Foster
- W. H. Tapson, Hon. L. S. Huntingdon

- H. O. Meigs
- Wm. Cunningham
- Major Campbell, C.B.
- Geo. H. W. Austin
- J. Morrison, M.D.
- Wm. Currie
- Wm. Curry
- Wm. McGinnis
- Edw. Mackay
- F. M. Combe
- W. L. Kerr
- Geo. Reylard
- Thos. Hunt
- Francis Cl-rkson
- Edwin Richardson
- Francis Cookman
- Edward M. Clean
- John Booth
- Robert Foster
- Wm. Couler
- Rich. Moore
- Geo. Moffatt
- G. F. C. Smith
- C. E. Dunn
- Phillip D. Gruchy
- E. Carter, Q. C.
- Frank Bond
- J. M. Drake, M.D.
- M. H. Sanborn
- John M. Standish
- George Carden
- N. S. Brown
- Chas. Watson
- T. B. Anderson
- G. C. Baker
- James Reuter
- Edson Kemp
- L. H. Davidson, M.A.
- B. C. L.
- Geor. E. Cutton
- Hon. Thos. Wood
- W. C. Baker
- James Osborne
- Benjamin Truax
- F. C. Gilmour
- Josiah Payne
- J. G. Whitcomb, M.D.
- Olivier War
- J. C. Spence
- Wm. Hill
- J. S. Faulkner
- H. S. Foster
- Samuel Dawson
- Dr. Prime
- Fredk. Mackenzie
- Walter Drake
- Stephen Chartier
- G. H. Henshaw
- Frederick Castle
- John M. Standish
- R. Dunlop
- Reuben Taylor
- Names marked thus * were absent.

The DEAN then said:—

REV. BROTHERS AND BROTHERS.—The occasion for this special meeting of the Synod of this diocese is the election of a successor to our late much beloved and deeply lamented Bishop and Metropolitan. "That the duty in the discharge of which we are now assembled is one of the very greatest importance and solemnity, I need hardly tell you; but it is one also of very heavy responsibility, and, as we shall have the benefit of the suggestion of the most fit person as the object of our choice by the whole House of our Right Rev. Fathers in God, this should be a great assistance as well as an alleviation of our responsibility. But be this as it may, we should all fervently pray, after the example of those who elected one to fill the first vacancy that occurred in the ranks of the holy Apostles, "Thou Lord who knowest the hearts of all men, show us whether of these thou hast chosen."

Next in importance to the duty which I have thus briefly endeavoured to impress upon you, is that of good order and decorum in the discharge of our high function. The constitution of our Synod and the canon for the election of a Bishop have only provided, in this respect, that the votes shall be taken by ballot, and arrangements for carrying out the provisions of the canon in such a way as to prevent confusion and for the preservation of order. For this purpose I took for my guidance the admirable arrangements made at the late election of a Bishop of Toronto; and I brought the further assistance and valuable aid of our Cathedral Chapter. The result has been the adoption of the order of proceeding, a printed copy of which is now, I believe, in the hands of every one who is entitled to vote.

I shall not detain you any longer, but conclude with the words of my venerable friend the late Bishop of Toronto, on a similar occasion, and ask you, "after fervent invocation of the Holy Spirit, to enter upon and discharge the duty before you in such a manner as in your inward souls and consciences you think will most advance the extension of God's kingdom and the growth of His grace among us."

A discussion was raised by Rural Dean SLACK as to the proper occupant of the chair, his opinion being that the Archdeacon was the proper dignitary to do so. He would not press the matter, but he would ask that the words "arranged by the Dean and Chapter" be expunged from the orders of the day.

The DEAN held that he was the proper dignitary to fill the chair, but called the Chancellor to state the law on the subject.

The CHANCELLOR cited the law, which was conclusive that the Dean was the proper occupant of the chair.

Rev. Mr. DARNELL moved, seconded by Mr. LONSDALE, that the orders as a whole be adopted.

The main motion was then put and carried. The Scrutineers appointed were the Rev. J. Ellegood, Rev. T. W. Fyles and Major Campbell for the clerical vote. The Hon. H. L. Hunt, Capt. Aenes and Rev. W. B. Curran for the lay vote. Committees to examine the lists:— Clerical list—Rev. Canon Bond, Rev. R. Londell, Rural Dean, Rev. R. W. Newman, Hon. L. S. Huntingdon, Mr. J. C. Spence. Lay list—Dr. Smallwood, Mr. W. H. Kerr, Mr. E. E. Shelton, Rev. Canon Anderson, Rev. J. B. Davidson.

The SECRETARY of the House of Bishops delivered a message from their Lordships containing the nomination. Canon BALCH read the nomination of those whom they had selected. They believed that the name should be that of one in Episcopal orders. They therefore sent down the following names:—The Bishop of Fredericton, the Bishop of Nova Scotia, the Bishop of Huron, the Bishop of Ontario, the Bishop of Quebec, the Bishop of Toronto.

A little before six the Committee on the lists of delegates brought in their report and the Synod adjourned till this morning at 10 o'clock.

THURSDAY, NOV. 12, 1868.

Yesterday morning the proceedings of the Synod were resumed. The clergy, in accordance with the order of proceedings, were seated on the right, and the laity on the left of the Chair. The proceedings were opened with prayer by Rev. Canon Balch. The roll of delegates was then called, and the minutes of yesterday read and approved. The first part of the forenoon's proceedings was taken up with hearing appeals in respect to the report of the Committee on lists, which were finished a few minutes before twelve.

Mr. J. M. FERRIS raised the point that the House of Bishops being only entitled to send down a list, from whom the Synod were to choose a Bishop, had no power to express in that message any opinion or determination in addition. The resolution sent down was that only a clergyman holding Episcopal orders should be chosen as Bishop of Montreal. It was a most unfortunate thing for the House of Bishops to do so, if the Synod declined to elect any of those whose names were sent down, they would be obliged to change that resolution.

The DEAN declared the question out of order. Mr. FERRIS appealed to the House, and was sustained. He contended that it was the duty of the Synod to preserve harmony with the House of Bishops, but this could not be without the law being observed on both sides. He thought the best way would be to ask a Conference, and ask the Bishops to withdraw the resolution, substituting another with merely the names. He would, however, content himself with moving that this be not held as a precedent as there was not time for a conference.

The resolution is as follows. That by the Canon regulating the manner in which a Bishop of the Diocese of Montreal and Metropolitan is to be elected, it is provided that the House of Bishops shall lay before this Synod two or more names from which to select, and should not choose by this Synod that the House of Bishops shall again lay before this Synod other names and so on until a choice shall have been made. That the resolution passed by the House of Bishops and laid before this Synod yesterday is precluded by a preamble. That this Synod while respecting the said resolution with all the respect due to the House of Bishops, declares nevertheless that the Canon restricts that venerable body to the sole duty of signifying names to this Synod from which to elect the Bishop of this Diocese and Metropolitan without any declaration of any other determination or of any opinion whatsoever.

That this Synod, therefore, objects to the form of the resolution of the House of Bishops now before this Synod, and will not hold the same as a precedent for the future in so far as it conveys to this Synod any other intimation than the names of persons whom this Synod may select as Bishop and Metropolitan according to the strict provision of the Canon in that behalf.

The Hon. Mr. HUNTINGDON seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

The DEAN said he had known the objection he would not have held Mr. Ferris out of order.

The DEAN then called on the members of the Synod to engage in silent prayer for a few minutes, at the conclusion of which, the balloting began, the clergy voting on the one side of the House and the laity on the other.

At one o'clock the balloting was concluded, and the scrutineers retired with the ballot boxes and the Synod adjourned till two o'clock.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

At the opening of the Session, the Scrutineers returned the following as the state of the ballot:—

	C.	L.
Bishop of Fredericton	2	1
Do of Nova Scotia	0	0
Do of Quebec	33	9
Do of Ontario	4	1
Do of Huron	0	0
Do of Toronto	0	2
Lost votes	0	3
Noes	33	43
	72	59

tended to adjourn in an hour till May next. The message was received with hisses, and cries of "shame," and considerable confusion.

Rev. Canon BANCROFT moved that a special meeting be called to separate the office of the Bishop of Montreal from that of the Metropolitan. The motion was ruled out of order.

Mr. T. R. JOHNSON said the Bishops were bound to send down names until an election was made.

Rev. Canon BANCROFT said the House of Bishops had sent down the names of all the Bishops of British North America but one, and they should send down that one also. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. ROEBUCK moved that a conference be held with their Lordships to ascertain if some better understanding could not be come to. The motion was carried, and the Dean appointed a committee to confer with their Lordships.

About half-past six the Committee returned and announced that their Lordships would be prepared to send down other names immediately after prayers in the morning. The Synod then adjourned.

FRIDAY, NOV. 13, 1868.

ELECTION OF METROPOLITAN.

The Synod met yesterday morning and was organized in the usual manner, the names of the members called, and the minutes of the last meeting read and approved of.

The SECRETARY of the House of Bishops brought in a message from their Lordships. Rev. J. C. DAVIDSON moved the following resolution, seconded by Mr. H. L. Hunt, that upon every nomination said first ballot a second ballot shall take place upon the candidate receiving the largest number of votes in such nomination, that an opportunity may be given for the reconciliation of different judgments and an early harmonious settlement.

The motion was lost: yeas, 63; nays, 94. The message was then read as follows:— That in accordance with a suggestion made to the Conference with the Diocesan Synod yesterday evening, the House of Bishops submit to the Diocesan Synod of Montreal the names of the Lord Bishop of Newfoundland, the Lord Bishop of Huron, the Lord Bishop of Ontario, the Lord Bishop of Quebec and the Lord Bishop of Toronto, with the understanding that if a Bishop of this Province should be elected he shall hold office only until a canon can 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 the Synod of that Diocese.

Hon. L. S. HUNTINGDON announced that these names having been already sent down and rejected, that it is not in order to send them down again. It was a point which the Dean himself must decide.

The DEAN thought the House of Bishops had a right to send down the same names.

Hon. L. S. HUNTINGDON seeing that this point had been ruled out said, that it had been decided yesterday that the surplusage in the message was not admissible. The House of Bishops had no right to send down any conditions as to the circumstances in which the ballot was to be taken, and that for the message could not be received. His application in writing was that it is not in order for this Synod to receive the message just presented from the House of Bishops, the nomination being coupled with conditions and extraneous matters not authorized by the Canon.

The DEAN agreed with Mr. Huntingdon, that the message was not admissible, and the Synod accordingly refused to receive it, a message to that effect being returned.

The buzz and excitement that prevailed was heard as the Secretary of the House of Bishops returned with the message in reply. The names sent down were the same as those already sent with the exception of the Bishop of Quebec. The Secretary explained that the name of the Bishop of Quebec was left out was that he would on no account accept the office. The other Bishops would only accept conditionally. (Cries of no conditions.)

There was some confusion at this point as to the steps to be taken, but it was ultimately decided to take a recess for half an hour before balloting.

On resuming, the ballot was proceeded with and the Scrutineers reported the following as the state of the votes:—

	C.	L.
Bishop of British Columbia	38	14
do Huron	6	1
do Newfoundland	0	0
do Ontario	1	0
do Toronto	1	0
Lost Votes	—	5
Noes	36	34
	70	54

The Bishop of British Columbia had a majority of the Clerical votes, but only 14 Lay votes, 28 being necessary.

Hon. L. S. HUNTINGDON moved that there be no further votes on these names, which was carried.

It was then moved and carried that the Synod adjourn till three o'clock.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Synod met again at three o'clock. Mr. L. H. DAVIDSON, in support of a proposition for reconsideration of the last vote, cited authorities, but was ruled out of order.

After waiting for some time a message was received from the House of Bishops nominating the Lord Bishop of British Columbia, the Conjurator Bishop of Newfoundland and the Dean of Norwich (Dr. Goulburn). The message was received with cries of Goulburn and a movement to elect the Dean of Norwich by acclamation. Order being restored and a short time devoted to silent prayer, the ballot was proceeded with, resulting as follows:—

	C.	L.
Bishop of British Columbia	5	0
Conjurator Bishop of Newfoundland	0	1
Dean of Norwich	38	15
Lost votes	—	4
Nays	24	31
	67	51

Rev. Mr. DAVIDSON moved for a second ballot, Hon. L. S. HUNTINGDON in amendment that no further ballot should be taken on this nomination. The yeas and nays were demanded to be

taken down and the amendment was carried.

Rev. GEORGE SLACK moved that a conference be requested between the Clergy, represented by six of their number and the laity represented by an equal number, to see if no understanding could be come to whereby a unanimous vote might be reached.

The result of the last ballot having been sent to the House of Bishops, a message was returned that as they were unable to agree upon any other names to be submitted for election until further enquiry, they would adjourn till the month of May next.

The message was received with considerable manifestation of feeling, approbation and disapprobation being both loudly expressed.

THE DEAN said that nothing further remained to be done. The Synod could either adjourn sine die, or adjourn to meet at ten o'clock to-morrow (the morning).

A number of the representatives from the country said they had already wait d longer than was convenient for them, and a feeling was expressed to have an evening session.

Mr. J. M. FERRIS urged that they should wait till another day. He could quite understand the desire of representatives from the country to get home, but it would be for the best interests of the Diocese, under the painful circumstances in which it was placed, that they should remain. He moved that the Synod do adjourn till ten o'clock to-morrow (this morning).

Rev. Canon BANCROFT moved that the discussion continue until the usual hour of adjournment—six o'clock.

Mr. F. MCKENZIE moved that, there should be an evening session.

The resolution of Dr. Bancroft was carried. Mr. FERRIS said it became the members of Synod under existing circumstances to consider their position with the decorum and calmness which the position demanded. As the best thing to be done now he would move that a Committee be appointed to consider the whole matter and report in the morning at ten o'clock.

It was here suggested and generally approved of that the Committee report at an evening sitting to be held at eight o'clock, and Mr. Ferris altered his motion accordingly; the Committee to consist of ten members, five of the Clergy and five of the Laity.

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGDON said there were serious questions to be settled before the Synod could adjourn sine die, and grave doubts existed as to the power of summoning the Synod again in that event. These and other matters must be taken into consideration.

Before the vote was taken the DEAN said it would be impossible for him to be present in the evening, and as he had not so long he was anxious to see it out. It was, therefore, resolved, the motion having been agreed to, that the Committee report at ten in the morning, and the Dean appointed the following as the members: The Archdeacon and four rural deans for the clergy, and Messrs. Ferris, Huntingdon, Hamilton, Smallwood and Hutten for the laity, and requested country members to defer leaving till the business was concluded.

The Synod then adjourned till ten this morning.

SATURDAY, NOV. 14, 1868.

The Synod met yesterday at ten o'clock, the Venerable the Dean presiding. The usual prayers were read, the roll of members called, and the minutes of the previous day's proceedings read and approved of.

There was some little delay, the committee not being prepared with their report, but shortly before eleven o'clock the members entered the Court.

The Venerable ARCHDEACON LEACH said, in presenting the report I mention, in the first place, that the Committee invited the Chancellor to be present at its deliberations and have led the benefit of his experience, and, in the second place, that the Hon. John Hamilton dissents generally from the contents of the report. Although the name of the Hon. Mr. Huntingdon does not appear attached to the report itself, yet he was present at the deliberations and approves of its contents. The report is in the hand-writing of the mover, and I propose he shall read the report himself.

Mr. J. M. FERRIS read the report which is in the following terms:—

The Committee appointed by the order of reference of this date to consider the state of the Synod has the honour to report.

That the Synod of this Diocese assembled on the 4th of November, instant, for the purpose of choosing a Bishop and Metropolitan.

That, by the terms of the Canon regulating the election it is the duty of the House of Bishops to send down to the Synod two or more names, from which the Synod is to select one for Bishop and Metropolitan, and in case a selection should not be made from those names the House of Bishops should again send down other names until a choice should be made.

That the House of Bishops, in terms of the canon, sent down on the same day the names of the Bishops of Nova Scotia, of Fredericton, of Huron, of Ontario, of O. Tago, and of Quebec, accompanied by a declaration of their determination that the interests of the Church required that the person to be elected to the Metropolitan See of Montreal should be of the Episcopal order.

That your Synod did not choose any one of the names so sent down to it, but intimated to the House of Bishops that the declaration of any determination, or of any opinion of theirs accompanying any names submitted was not in accordance with the law.

That the House of Bishops, on the 11th inst., sent down the names of the Bishops of Newfoundland, of Grahamstown, and of British Columbia, and the Synod having voted thereupon, a choice again failed.

That the House of Bishops then after transmitted a message to your Synod, declaring that they were not prepared to submit, without delay and enquiry, any further names than those already sent down, and that they would adjourn in one hour, and renew their nominations in the month of May next.

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 Conjunct 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 Conjunct 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 seen 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 among the members of the Synod who 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 deprecates 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. GIBBS 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 latitude 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 nominees 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, and gone 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 be taken from the laity, 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 advise the House to depose a Bishop without a cause; 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 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 on 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 Montreal, 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 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 considerately 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 suspected 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 stuck at 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 secretly 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 justify 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 renew 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 urged 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. 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 Conjunct 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 candidacies 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 acted 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 resumed 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 am 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 any 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. Had he been 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. (Hear, hear.) He does not deny him the right of free speech and free speech—but as the undoubted majority of the majority of this House—he must not attempt to speak with our voice, or profess impartiality in his judgment 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 motives 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 interest 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 defiance due to our Bishops in spiritual matters, and the abject 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, and those who act with me, repudiate this sycophantic 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 avenue 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 whom was admirably fitted for the position, there could not be one found worthy of a vote, the intention of the unconveritable 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 you think 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. Roebuck, who had risen, should speak first at re-assembling.
AFTERNOON SESSION.
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 laity who had committed the error the second day, the Clergy had committed on the first.
Mr. THOR 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-

opric of the Diocese. He was glad to find that some reverend gentlemen had changed their views as to Episcopal authority. (Lauder and others.) But he saw no reason for changing the course he had adopted, nor for submitting to dictation by the Bishops who had used in an arbitrary manner a power which the Synod had placed in their hands. The laity had acted in good faith, and in accordance with the Canon. The first ultimatum did not come from the Synod; and he held that the names of the seven Bishops which were sent down with that ultimatum were most properly rejected, and most properly rejected again. At last, however, their Lordships did send down the name of a Presbyter; but he went as far as England to fetch him, though he did not believe that any one could tell whether that Presbyter would give up his position in England to come to Canada. What the laity had done yesterday, they would do again to-morrow.

Rev. Mr. BALFOUR spoke at some length amidst many marks of impatience. We understood his object to be to induce the Synod to elect the Bishop of Quebec, who would not consent to be Metropolitan to the See of Montreal. That Prelate would administer this Diocese in the meantime, and there would then be time to reform the Canon.

Rev. Mr. BOND for his part and for a large number of the clergy of the Diocese returned to the laity their sincere thanks. In time to come they would all, he was sure, thank God that they had such a body of faithful men to aid them in the Synod, and he thought it right especially to name in this connection Messrs. Huntington and Ferris. Allusion had been made to a caucus. But he came there not knowing for whom he should vote. He and others had come, he was sure, prepared to vote for a man who would maintain the government of the Church according to the spirit and the forms prescribed in the Prayer Book. He came, though it might surprise many to hear it, expecting to vote with the Ritualist, who were understood to favour a certain Prelate. If he had been named, the Ritualists would have voted for him. He and his friends would have also voted for him, and the laity would have voted for him. As to the Conference, he believed that the Committee went up with the sincere desire to get out of the difficulty they were in. He defended the clergy against the statement that they had been wrong in not voting for certain names who were sent down. But in fact there were no more than two names for one of which they could conscientiously vote. He regretted that they were not allowed a larger field; had they been he thought there would have been an election, since he was sure that a large majority desired to elect a good man, though that man might not be the precise choice of each who would vote for him. He expressed the hope that the report of the Committee would be put before the Synod, and that instead of discussing exasperating details brought up by reading separate paragraphs, that the Synod would vote on the whole report at once.

Rev. Mr. JOHNSON declared that in his opinion the laity was the real strength and support of the Church. He also expressed great pain at the result of the meeting of the Synod since Tuesday.

Mr. JAS. HUTTON said, in reference to what we understood to be Mr. Simpson's remarks, that he wished it to be understood that he had never made up his mind not to vote for a Bishop. He and others who had acted with him were ready to vote for the best man.

Rev. Mr. ELLEGOOD asked if the report stated that it would be illegal for the Synod to adopt the suggestion of the House of Bishops, and to elect a Bishop to administer the Diocese, until the Canon could be reformed? He thought that it would be desirable to take that course in the spirit of compromise.

Mr. FERRIS said, in reference to the motion to read the report paragraph by paragraph, that he had never heard of such a proceeding in all his experience. The proper course was to move that the report be sent back.

Rev. Mr. LOOSEMORE bore testimony to the courteous manner of Mr. Huntington when ever he had made any personal allusion. As to Mr. Ferris's remarks, he had asked Mr. Ferris what course he should take to obtain his object, and he was sorry Mr. Ferris had not told him the manner in which he ought to have proceeded. He denied on his own part any disposition to cast the slightest reflection on the laity, whose concurrence in all the assemblies he always valued and desired. As to the report he could not vote for its adoption in its present form, and he desired its revision by whatever means that could be effected.

After some further conversation the vote was taken on the amendment proposed by the Rev. Mr. Davidson, to the effect that the report be considered paragraph by paragraph, and adopted or rejected as the case might be.

Rev. Mr. LOOSEMORE called for the vote to be taken by orders.

Mr. FERRIS, admitting his right, requested him not to insist, as gentlemen from the country wished to get away.

Hon. L. S. HUNTINGTON also said that although he knew he was out of order, he wished to remark that if by this mode of voting, the Synod was separated into two houses the clergy on one side and the laity on the other, it would not be the fault of the laity. The following was the result of the vote:—

CLERGY.—Nays: The Very Revd. Dean of Montreal, Ven. the Archdeacon, Revd. L. P. W. Balch, D.D., Secretary, Rev. Canon Bancroft, Revd. Canon Bond, Revd. Jas. Carmichael, W. B. Curran, M. S. Baldwin, J. A. McLeod, W. M. Seaborn, J. Allan, Canon Anderson, O. Fortin, F. Robinson, G. Slack, R. D., E. F. Fessenden, A. Fortin, R. Lindsay, Chas. Bancroft, A. O. Taylor, E. S. Jenkyn, J. Smith, L. O. Wurtele, D. Lindsay, T. W. Mussen, A. T. Whittton, E. DuVernet, R. D., B. P. Lewis, Ed. Ray, H. F. Darnell, F. S. Neve, R. Lonsdell, R. D.—32.

Yeas: Rev. Canon Loosemore, C. A. Daniel, T. A. Young, A. Balfour, J. C. Davidson, J. Godden, J. B. Davidson, J. Constantine, C. Lancaster, H. T. Early, P. W. Smith, W. R. Brown, G. C. Robinson, F. Codd, J. Rositt, J. Scaman, J. Gribble, Jas. Pyke, A. Prime—19.

LAITY.—Yeas: L. H. Davidson, Wm. Hill, Samuel Dawson, J. J. Gibb, J. B. Morrison, M. D. Hon. John Hamilton, 2 votes; Walton Smith, T. P. Roe, G. W. Simpson—10.

Nays: M. H. Gault, G. F. C. Smith, 2 votes, C. Garth, T. Schneider, Dr. Smallwood, John Empson, T. R. Johnson, H. Arnold, F. Kingston, W. Hobbs, W. H. Tapon, E. E. Shelton, Cuthbert Forrester, Henry Roebuck, Jas. Moir Ferris, Josiah Withers, Thos. Simpson, Robert Leach, Jas. Hutton, Wm. Turner, Phillip DeGruchy, E. Carter, Esq., M. H. Seaborn, John M. Standish, George Carden, Chas. Watson, George B. Baker, Edson Kemp, Hon. Thos. Wood, Jas. Osborne, Benj. Irvine, Josiah Payne, H. S. Foster, Fred. Mackenzie, Stephen Chartier, G. H. Henshaw, L. H. Knowlton, D. T. R. Nye, H. L. Robinson, W. G. Parmelee, Hon. A. B. Foster, Hon. L. S. Huntington, Wm. McGinness, Geo. Ringland, Robt. Foster, Wm.

Burrett, Jean Roy, F. P. Rubidge, E. C. Hayden, Geo. Rogers, G. Earnston, Geo. Schneider, R. W. Shepherd.—55.

The Synod then adopted the report by the same majority.

Mr. HUNTINGTON then moved the adjournment of the Synod, giving as a reason that the Synod could do no business, except that relating to the election of a Metropolitan, especially as many members desired to leave. It had been suggested to him to fix a day. Canon Loosemore said the second Tuesday in May, to which he would willingly consent. It had also been suggested that some votes of thanks should be passed. To that he had no objection, if it were understood that any business must be of a *pro forma* character.

Rev. CANON BALCH said he had received a protest, signed by several clergymen and laymen, and he desired to have an expression of opinion whether it should be placed on the minutes. (Cries of "No.")

After some further conversation, Hon. L. S. HUNTINGTON said that he should now press the motion for adjournment, which was carried, and the

Rev. the DEAN then pronounced the usual benediction.

Rev. ARCHDEACON LEACH having then taken the Chair, a vote of thanks was unanimously and amidst loud cheering, given to the Rev. Dean of Montreal, on the motion of Rev. Mr. Bancroft.

VISIT A. J. PELL'S GALLERY OF ART, 345 NOTRE DAME STREET, In rear of Post Office, MONTREAL.

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We must beg our friends to write the names of persons and places as distinctly as possible. This will save much annoyance.

Communications received later than Wednesday morning must stand over till our next issue.

We cannot undertake to return rejected manuscripts.

Back numbers will be sent only on application.

*Subscribers are especially requested to make complaint at once to the office of any irregularity in mailing or delivery of their papers.

Church Observer.

—"THIS PROTESTANT KINGDOM."—

—Bill of Rights, 1868.

MONTREAL, 19TH NOVEMBER, 1868.

THE LATE NOMINATION.

The special Synod of the Diocese of Montreal is over. The Bishops have met and returned to their homes; but the Diocese is still without a Bishop and successor to the late Metropolitan. In our last issue we expressed the determination to wait with quiet confidence the action of the House of Bishops, persuaded that in the very anomalous position in which they were placed they would, as a body of God, faithfully discharge their task, and that the result would be satisfactory to the church at large. Has it proved so? The full details of the proceedings found in other columns will furnish the answer. When it was discovered that their Lordships, in direct contravention of the spirit of the canon, were determined to nominate only Bishops, and would persist in sending down their own names,—and when the announcement was made that they could agree upon no further names, and would resume their nomination in May next, the indignation of the great majority of the Synod knew no bounds, and it was evident that unless some way of escape could be found from the difficulty, most disastrous results would ensue. The conference, in which the Synod was represented by venerable and tried men, inspired the hope that all might yet be well, and there was ground for encouragement; for now, together with their own names, came down that of a distinguished English presbyter. It was opening the door to further nominations. It was a relinquishment of the ground previously taken, and the Synod, while expressing their non-concurrence, felt sure that other names would be submitted and a choice reached. It was doomed to disappointment; no further names could be agreed on by the Bishops. They would adjourn until May, to make further inquiries, before submitting fresh names to the Synod, and the diocese as we have said, still without a Bishop.

The report of the committee adopted by the Synod will, as a matter of history, place the event in its true light; it is exhaustive, and unanswerable. The Synod had discharged a duty to themselves and to the whole church; and we regard it as a direct answer to prayer, that the laity, under their wise and able leaders, were enabled to be faithful in this hour of trial. A great principle was at stake, whether our Bishops were to be governed by the canon law of the church, or whether they were to be vested with absolute authority. We are persuaded that hereafter, some of them at least will see their error, and be thankful for the rebuke they have received, painful and humiliating as it has been to themselves and to the whole church. Had the counsel of the venerable presiding Bishop (Huron) prevailed, it is most probable that we should not now be without a Bishop. In his view the office of Metropolitan was clearly secondary to the interests of the Diocese, and he was prepared, as was most evident from his message, and from the views expressed in the conference, to allow to the Diocese a wider range of choice. He was, however, but one of four; and will,

in the eyes of the world, unfortunately share their reproach.

We feel that great scandal has been cast on our church by the events of the last few days, which years of faithfulness will not wipe away. We have been taught the danger of vesting irresponsible power in any body or party in the church so limited as the present House of Bishops.

Meanwhile, the duty both of the clergy and laity is clear, not to doubt the headship of Christ over his church, or the efficacy of prayer, nor to relax their efforts. It is not that the Lord's hand is shortened that it cannot save, but it may be that our iniquities have separated between us and our God,—our uncharitableness, our exclusiveness, our anxiety for place and office, and worldly pomp, instead of spiritual gifts, and endowments. It is a bitter lesson, but it may be a profitable one. We may yet look back to this day of humiliation and reproach as a new era of spiritual life in our church. There may be a reviving of love and zeal and charity, in many now apparently dead or slumbering,—an awakening to new life and energy in the cause of Christ. We may find it to be our duty, as well as our happiness, to bind ourselves together as one in the work of God, dropping petty jealousies and differences, and with shoulder to shoulder going forth to fight the battles of the Lord.

We do not apprehend that the interests of the diocese will suffer for the few months that we may be without a bishop. The Dean and Archdeacon will be in charge, and may at any time seek the services of the presiding Bishop, who by virtue of his position will no doubt regard himself as the guardian of the Diocese in its bereaved state, and who will be cordially welcomed by the clergy and laity. We earnestly trust there will be no impatience manifested, but that all will be willing to suffer the inconvenience until an adequate remedy shall have been found for the evil. The Diocese of New York was long deprived of its head, and some of the English Dioceses have for lengthened periods been dependant on the services of Bishops other than their own.

THE SEE OF CANTERBURY.—By the Atlantic Cable, it was announced yesterday that the Bishop of London has been appointed Archbishop of Canterbury.

WHY WAS THE NAME WITHHELD?

There are some events which set at nought so effectually all efforts at explanation, that they have to be left to the revelations of the future. An event of this kind occurred at the late Synod—the withholding from the nomination by the House of Bishops the name of the Bishop of Rupert's Land. Why would not the House of Bishops send down his name? This question was put again and again in the Synod; and has been repeated as often outside of its doors. No one seems satisfied with any of the various replies, and the motive for this strange act remains as much as ever a mystery. And yet, while men are questioning, they are pondering; and, whether right or wrong, arriving at a settled conviction. Did the House of Bishops know that the name of the Bishop of Rupert's Land would find favour in the eyes of the members of the Synod? is asked. Unquestionably, that fact cannot be disputed. Well, it may be argued, perhaps that was the reason; it might be felt that there was a desire to coerce the House of Bishops? No, that could not be; the Bishop of Rupert's Land was only one among several freely spoken of, one of whom was nominated; but then the latter was a member of the House of Bishops.

Peradventure, then, he was not fit to preside over the House of Bishops?—that the House of Bishops could not send down his name as the name of one whom they considered a fit and proper person for the office? That is possible; but who can surmise why? Names were nominated to the Synod of dignitaries who, it was known, would not accept if selected; of others who, it was not known, would accept. That would not furnish a reason. Was there then any objection on the score of learning? That would hardly be raised against a man of his standing. Has he manifested any lack of administrative ability? No. Is there any want of activity, energy, or missionary spirit? His greatest enemy could not say so. What then of his moral character? Some have meaningly said—"surely the Bishops must know something against him." His moral character defies even the tongue of scandal. What then can it be? Perhaps he is not sound in the faith? This objection can be answered still more satisfactorily. The late Metropolitan, who was particularly cautious in committing himself, fully endorsed in writing as well as in other ways, the Bishop of Rupert's Land. The members of the Provincial Synod had the opportunity of hearing him preach and lecture, and his utterances commanded their praise; and churchmen in this city met him in private and social life, and were struck by his humility and piety. So that high churchmen and low churchmen agreed on this one point—they would vote for the Bishop of Rupert's Land. What then was the objection to such

a man on the part of the House of Bishops? There is no doubt he is a superior man; but that could not be the objection—what then can it be? It might be possible to name it. We must, however, still leave our readers to their own surmises.

It may be well to remember that the House of Bishops was not unanimous; that there was one Bishop who did not share in this unaccountable opposition to the nomination of a good man.

The mistake has greatly prevailed that the nomination, in the eyes of the Bishops, ought to be mainly that of Metropolitan. Surely if the canon did not indicate that the first thought of all should be that of securing a fit and proper person as Bishop of Montreal, the weighty interests involved to the Diocese of Montreal, and consequently to the whole church, would so indicate. The powers of the Metropolitan are very limited, and with little probability of being called into action more than once, and that for a brief period each three years, for the power of visitation cannot be exercised without a memorial signed by two-thirds of the clerical and lay members of the Diocesan Synod. But what an influence the Bishop of a Diocese exercises!

REV. MR. CARMICHAEL'S LECTURE.

On Thursday evening last, the Rev. Mr. Carmichael delivered a lecture in the basement of St. George church, on "The times we live in." The lecturer commenced by remarking at the comparative non-progressiveness of the past age, when contrasted with the remarkable achievement of the present. The follies and humbugs of the day were portrayed in the most humorous manner, in which the dress of both young ladies and gentlemen received a favorable notice; also the man who sells his goods at an "alarming sacrifice," and the inventors of patent medicines of most wonderful healing virtues. The Rev. lecturer denounced, in most fitting terms, the want of a right principle in those men who seek to cheat the public by gross falsehood; and said that now, as formerly, things should be called by their right names,—that a lie was a lie, a robber was a robber, and a thief was a thief. He inculcated the principle of truth saying that every one should speak the truth at all times, and that, when temptation assailed them, should stand firm and resist it, putting their trust in God for assistance. The lecture was an excellent one, and during its delivery received great applause. A vote of thanks was given to Mr. Carmichael, and, after a few remarks from Canon Loosemore and the Chairman, Rev. Mr. Curran, an anthem was sung and the audience dispersed.

ANOTHER RITUALIST GONE OVER.—A telegram from Memphis, Tennessee, announces that the Rev. J. N. Rogers, rector of the church of the Blessed Virgin, and leader of the ritualists in that city, has renounced his allegiance to the Episcopal Church, and declared his intention, over his own signature in a "card" published in the *Appeal*, to unite with the Roman Catholic Church.

(From the Montreal Herald)

THE LATE ANGLICAN SYNOD.—There is ample room for reflection, of no pleasant kind by members of the Anglican communion in the failure of the House of Bishops and of the Synod, which represents that Church in this Diocese to perform the duty for which they assembled, and which was confided to them by the Provincial Synod. After the numerous prayers for divine assistance, to choose a Bishop, which have been offered week after week in all the churches of Canada, there appears to be an irony which, perhaps, it is well not too critically to analyse, in the solicited assistance being barred out by a course which was plainly dictated by personal considerations, and which can only escape censure from the fact that it was taken by reverend Prelates instead of by politicians or jobbing railway Directors. It is among the acts of the latter class of governing bodies, that we must search, if we would find the closest parallel to the dogged determination, which was manifested by the House of Bishops to preserve the Metropolitan honours for one of themselves. The primitive manner of making choice of a governing pastor, which has been for several weeks back frequently cited in all the Anglican churches was by lot, and it may seem to many that the same method may be advantageously revived if human wisdom, with all the enlightenment which may be supposed to be derived from holy orders of the highest degree and a Christian sense of self-denying duty, can do nothing more than was done last week. Such a method might in pious minds excite the hope, which animated the Apostles, that the divine guidance which had been asked for would really direct the issue, apparently left to chance. And persons who would hardly hope for that kind of interposition, would find a practical and decorous solution of a question, which perhaps, cannot otherwise be settled, or if at all, only after a contest of electioneering strategy little becoming the occasion. We are bound to say that throughout the proceedings the majority of the Laity, who we presume had the majority of the clergy with them at the close, were wholly in the right. The canon under which all parties were bound to proceed to elect a Bishop of Montreal and a Metropolitan of Canada is perfectly clear and admits of no ambiguous interpretation, except such as mere perverseness may affix to it. The chief thing it prescribes is that there shall be a choice. The subsidiary part of its directions point out how the choice shall be made. In the end that

choice, under the law, fell to the Synod, to be secured by that body if it thought fit so to secure it, by the gradual rejection and elimination of all possible names which, one after another, should be sent down to it, until that name was sent down which should command a majority of votes. The House of Bishops was undoubtedly to have an influence in the election—that great influence which is always possessed by those, who like the Ministers in England, or the President in the United States, have the initiative in the one case of legislation, in the other of appointments. But the final decision was, we repeat, with the Synod, and could as we have shown, citing an extreme case, have been exercised so as to insist on a particular individual, if any individual were the choice of both laity and clergy. The whole clergy list might be exhausted by the Bishops, in an obstinate attempt on their part to exclude the one man desired by the Synod; but the Synod must succeed at last. Almost every step of their Lordships was, therefore, clearly illegal. They had no right nor power to decree that the choice should be made from the existing bench of Bishops, as indeed is made manifest by their failure to enforce the rule which they improperly sought to engrave upon the canon. They had no right to attempt to make conditions which the Synod could not legally accept, since both bodies were acting under the legislation of a superior body. We do not say that they had no right to send back names which had been once rejected, provided on each occasion they sent at least one new name; but a decent respect for the body with which they were acting, and a reasonable comprehension of the management of public business would have led to their dropping at each fresh nomination those names which had been found on a ballot to be in a hopeless minority. They had above all no right to adjourn until an election had been made, since they were bound to go on nominating until a choice had been come to. We say nothing of the good taste of nominating every Bishop in British North America except the one who some believe would have been elected if nominated; nor of the eccentricity of leaving him on one side in order to seek in South Africa for a prelate whom Canadian churches had hardly heard of; nor of the inconsistency shown in first declaring that they would name no Presbyter; in naming one who, it was almost certain, would not accept if chosen, and in then having thus departed from their determination, in still refusing to act seriously upon their better second thought. All this was in their Lordships' own bosoms. If they chose to do what hardly any body of gentlemen in a merely secular election would think of doing—to show that they were labouring by all legal means to keep out every one not of their own body, however much some other might be desired by the electors, that was their own affair. Only, whatever they did ought to have been in accordance with law, if not with delicacy of sentiment. We do not suppose that the lay members of the Church who resisted the attempted encroaching dictation, nor the clergy who acted with them, were lacking in respect for the Episcopate; or were actuated by any foregone conclusion against the choice falling upon one of their Lordships House. They were moved first by a clearer appreciation than that of their Lordships of the necessity of conducting public business, in a business like manner, and in strict conformity to the law, which alone could give force to that which might be determined on; and second by a determination, while they gave due honour, and accorded due influence to the House of Bishops, to maintain intact whatever powers and duties the wisdom of the whole Church had committed to the laity and order of Presbyters. If the present mode of government in the Canadian Episcopal Church is to continue, and not to end either in slavish submission to Prelatical rule, or in open revolt against it, the Synod fulfilled a serious duty, for which, as was said on Friday by some of the clergy, the entire Church will hereafter have cause for thankfulness.

Having said so much, it is just to add, that though the Bishops managed their part of the affair in the worst way possible, they were placed in a position where it required an unusual share of Christian self-denial, and of worldly prudence to acquit themselves with applause. The canon under which they and the Synod acted, was a compromise, and like compromises in general, tilted over an immediate difficulty only to create a more serious one at a later day. The truth is, that the Metropolitan dignity and duty, whatever that is, has no necessary connection with the Diocese of Montreal, and ought not to depend upon it. The Churchmen of that Diocese have the right, like those of any other Diocese, to have the Bishop of their choice—to promote to that post, if it so please them, some Clergyman who has earned their love and respect, and has demonstrated his fitness by labours under their own eyes. The Bishops on the other hand have a great interest, and something at all events like a right, derived from that interest, in the choice of one whose duty is to reside in their House. It would be unfortunate that they should have forced upon them, as their Chairman, a person who was either obnoxious to them, in the ordinary sense of that word, or who even seemed to them to be unduly advanced over their heads to the highest place. If they desire a reformation of the canon so as hereafter to limit the effect of an election by the Synod of Montreal, to the mere Bishopric of that Diocese, they must be admitted to have reason on their side. If while respecting the actual law, they had sought some method of securing a change within a reasonable time—and a very graceful way of doing that was obvious to every one—they would we believe have met with general sympathy and support. No reasonable man can doubt that there is *prima facie* reason for supposing that the most suitable candidate for the Primacy may be on the existing Bench of Bishops. But it is an invidious arrangement which, in order to give this idea a chance of realization, forces that which in secular life few candidates for election think of doing ostensibly—forces the candidates

to name themselves, or mutually to name each other. If their Lordships felt this, desired to change it, and had simply pointed out the evil and thrown themselves upon the good feeling of the Synod to lessen and shorten the evil as much as possible, they would have done well.

THE ELECTION OF METROPOLITAN.

From the DAILY NEWS. The report of the Committee of the Synod, which we published on Friday afternoon, placed our readers in possession of the authentic date touching the controversy that has arisen between that body and the House of Bishops. The report betrays evidence of having been framed with great caution, and is replete with proof of the ability and sagacity enlisted in its composition. It is tersely logical, and the inference to be drawn from the arguments employed seem unanswerable. We cannot lightly assume that the House of Bishops had no color of authority for the course it has pursued.

THE METROPOLITAN SEE.—The clergy and laity of the Anglican church passed the first afternoon of their Synod in excited expectancy of a nomination from the Upper House, which was not received until just before their adjournment, when the announcement was read that the lords spiritual had nominated themselves, including in the list the Bishops of Fredericton and Nova Scotia, but not his lordship of Rupert's Land, a distinction for which there is doubtless some good technical reason.

Correspondence.

We are not responsible for any opinions expressed by our correspondents.

CHURCH BAZAARS, &c.

[To the Editor of the CHURCH OBSERVER.] Dear Sir,—Your correspondent from Quebec, upon the subject of church bazaars, has touched a question which all good people should ponder well in their hearts.

Dear Sir,—Your correspondent from Quebec, upon the subject of church bazaars, has touched a question which all good people should ponder well in their hearts. I write to your paper in order to help on a friendly talk about these things, such as "An Inquirer after Truth"—a good title—has been. I remember some time ago reading an article in the Toronto Globe upon concerts, and such like, in aid of churches. The occasion of it was a ball which had been given some where in the States for the profit of the church. The Globe spoke out strongly upon the subject, against all such ways of getting money for church wants. Next day the Leader had an answer to the Globe. The Leader called the Globe Puritanical, not meaning it for a good term. The substance of what it said was that those ways could not be wrong which had a good end in view. This your "Inquirer" calls "a vain argument," and there he speaks the truth.

At Calton, on the 9th inst., Elizabeth, wife of Samuel Thompson, Esq., and eldest daughter of the Rev. H. C. Cooper, B.A., Rector of Christ Church, Mimico. BAKER, POPHAM & CO. WHOLESALE CLOTHIERS, Nos. 512 and 514 St. Paul Street, Montreal.

MONTREAL SCULPTURE AND GENERAL MARBLE AND GRANITE WORKS. (New Premises.) Corner of St. Alexander and St. Catherine Streets.

JAMES MAVOR & CO. Mural Tablets, Baptismal Fonts, Tiling for Aisles, Transepts, &c. Churchyard Memorials in Stone, Marble, Granite, &c. Chimney-pieces, Slabs, Table-tops, and House Work of every description. Designs and Estimates furnished promptly on application. April 30. 14

WOODWARD'S IMPROVED CARBONIZER.—Look to your own interests, and try Woodward's Improved Carbonizer, which is warranted to increase the light, decrease the smoke and smell, and save 33 per cent. of the cost to the consumer.

MONTREAL, August 31, 1867. My DEAR SIR,—I have much pleasure in certifying that I consider your Patent Gas Carbonizer a most valuable introduction, especially when the quality of the gas, and the high price charged for it, is considered. I have one now in my house put up by you, and find I have a much better and brighter light totally free from smoke or smell of gas since its introduction.

MONTREAL, 4th September, 1867. Sir,—I take pleasure in certifying that I have one of Woodward's Patent Carbonizers in use in my house for some time, and am perfectly satisfied that it is a valuable improvement. I believe that I am saving a large amount of gas, as I am using one-foot burners instead of three feet, which I formerly used, and have more light now than I had with the large burners without the Carbonizer.

MONTREAL, 9th Sept., 1867. Dear Sir,—I have much pleasure in adding my testimony to the usefulness of Woodward's Carbonizer, both as regards increased illuminating power and also diminished consumption. Having now had one on my premises for some time, which is working with undiminished vigour, I very confidently recommend it as being able to do all you promised for it. I am, &c. D. H. FERGUSON, 100 McGill Street.

MONTREAL, 9th Sept., 1867. Dear Sir,—In answer to your enquiry, it gives me much pleasure to say that Woodward's Patent Carbonizer, which you placed in my billiard-room in Victoria Square, has so far given entire satisfaction. I have no doubt of its economy, as I am now using two feet burners, and have fully as good light as I had with four feet burners without it.

MONTREAL, 5th Nov., 1867. Dear Sir,—In answer to your enquiry, we would say that your Carbonizer, placed in our billiard-room on Great St. James Street on the 4th September, has given us entire satisfaction. Before we had it introduced we were burning about 1200 feet of gas per night, with 50 burners, running about 5 hours. We are now burning less than 2000 feet per night, running about 64 hours, with 62 burners, and fully as much light. We therefore confidently recommend it to all who wish to economize in burning gas.—Very truly yours, Jos. Dixon & Bro.

The Subscriber begs leave to call the attention of all who are using gas to the above really valuable improvement. Do not suffer yourselves to be influenced by the prejudice produced by the numerous so-called improvements which have been offered within the last few years; but see and judge for yourselves. Every information will be given, and the operation of the apparatus shewn and explained by ROBERT ALSOP, at the Office of the Petroleum Gas Co., No. 156 Great St. James Street. May 14. 14

HENRY J. BENALLACK, FAMILY GROCIER, BONAVENTURE BUILDING, (VICTORIA SQUARE), MONTREAL. AGENT FOR Sharpe's celebrated Finnan Haddies

The Canadian Rubber Compy OF MONTREAL, MANUFACTURERS OF Machine Belting, Hose, Steam Packing, RAILWAY CAR SPRINGS & BUFFERS, VALVES, STATIONERS GUM, TELEPHONE RINGS, &c.

INDIA RUBBER OVER-SHOES AND BOOTS, FELT BOOTS in great variety. All Orders executed with despatch. OFFICE AND WORKS: 272 St. Mary St. F. SCHOLTS, Manager. May 14. 16

W. D. McLALEN, DEALER IN Fine Teas, Coffees, Sugars and General Groceries. Goods packed for the Country or delivered in the City free of charge. No. 24 ST. LAWRENCE MAIN STREET, Corner (639) of St. Catherine Street. MONTREAL. May 14. 16



PAIN KILLER!

IT IS A BALM FOR EVERY WOUND. OUR FIRST PHYSICIANS USE

And recommend its use; the Apothecary finds it first among the medicines called for, and the Wholesale Druggist considers it a leading article of his trade. All the dealers in medicine speak alike in its favor, and its reputation as a medicine is of great

MERIT AND VIRTUOUSLY AND PERMANENTLY ESTABLISHED, AND IT IS THE GREAT

Family Medicine OF THE AGE.

TAKEN INTERNALLY, IT CURES Dysentery, Cholera, Diarrhoea and Cramp and Pain in Stomach, Bowel Complaint, Painters' Colic, Liver Complaint, Dyspepsia or Indigestion, SORE THROAT, SUDDEN COLDS, COUGHS, &c.

TAKEN EXTERNALLY, IT CURES BOILS, FELONS, CUTS, BRUISES, BURNS AND SCALDS, OLD SORES, SPRAINS, SWELLING OF THE JOINTS, TOOTHACHE, PAIN IN THE FACE, NEURALGIA AND RHEUMATISM, FROSTED FEET, &c., &c.

Pain is supposed to be the lot of us poor mortals as inevitable as death, and liable at any time to come upon us. Therefore it is important that remedial agents should be at hand to be used on an emergency, when we are made to feel the excruciating agonies of pain, or the depressing influences of disease.

Such a remedial agent exists in PERRY DAVIS' PAIN-KILLER, the use of which has extended over all the earth. Amid the eternal ices of the polar regions, or beneath the intolerable and burning sun of the tropics, its virtues are known and appreciated. And by its use, suffering humanity has found relief from many of its ills. The effect of the Pain-Killer upon the patient, when taken internally in cases of Cold, Cough, Bowel Complaints, Cholera, Dysentery, and other affections of the system, has been truly wonderful, and has won for it a name among medical preparations that can never be forgotten. Its success in removing pain, as an external remedy, in cases of Burns, Bruises, Sores, Sprains, Cuts, Sting of Insects, and other cases of suffering, has secured for it the most prominent position among the Medicines of the day.

Read the following Testimonials:

Rev. J. E. CLOUGH Missionary at Ongole, Southern India, writes: "We esteem your Pain Killer very highly for scorpion stings, cholera, &c., and cannot very well get along without it."

Rev. I. D. COLBURN, Missionary at Tavoy, Burmah, writes: "I shall be happy to assist in extending a knowledge of a remedy so speedy and effectual."

Rev. M. H. BIRBY Missionary to the Shans, writes:—"Your Pain Killer cures more of the ailments of the natives here than any other medicine. There is a great call for it," &c.

Rev. H. L. VAN MATER, writing from Burmah, says: "The Pain Killer has become an almost indispensable article in my family."

Hundreds of missionaries give similar testimony to its virtues. Rev. J. G. STEARNS writes: "I consider it the best remedy for Dyspepsia I ever knew"

Rev. JABEZ SWAN says: "I have used it for years in my family, and consider it an invaluable remedy."

PERRY DAVIS' PAIN KILLER.—This medicine has become an article of commerce, which no medicine ever became before. Pain Killer is as much an item in every bill of goods sent to country merchants as tea, coffee, or sugar. This speaks volumes in its favour.—Glens Falls Messenger.

A speedy cure for pain—no family should be without it.—Montreal Transcript.

Our own opinion is, that no family should be without a bottle of it for a single hour. In flesh wounds, aches, pains, sores, &c., it is the most effectual remedy we know of.—News, St. Johns, Canada.

After many years' trial of Davis' Pain Killer, we advise that every family should provide themselves with so effectual and speedy a Pain-Killer.—Amherst (N.S.) Gazette.

The Pain Killer of Perry Davis & Son we can confidently recommend. We have used it for a length of time, and invariably with success.—Canada Baptist.

It has been tested in every variety of climate and by almost every nation known to America. It is the almost constant companion and inestimable friend of the missionary and the traveller, on sea and land, and no one should travel on our lakes or rivers without it. Beware of Counterfeits and worthless imitations; call for PERRY DAVIS' VEGETABLE PAIN KILLER and take no other. Sold by all Druggists and Dealers in Medicines. Prices, 15 cts., 25 cts., 50 cts., per Bottle. PERRY DAVIS & SON, MANUFACTURERS AND PROPRIETORS, 380 St. Paul Street, Montreal, C.E. April 30. 14

FRANK BOND, STOCK AND SHARE BROKER, 7 St. Sacrament Street, MONTREAL.

All descriptions of Stocks, Bonds, &c., Sterling Exchange, American Gold, and Railway Shares bought and sold, strictly upon Commission. Investments made in Mortgages, Real Estate, &c. Jan. 30, 1868. 1

THOMAS MUSSEN, IMPORTER OF

British, India and French Goods, CARPETINGS, RUGS, DRUGGETS, FLOOR OIL CLOTHS TRIMMINGS AND SMALL WARES MONTREAL. March 12, 1868. 1y 7

PHENIX FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY OF LONDON. Established in 1762.

THIS COMPANY having invested, in conformity with the Provincial Act, ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS for the SPECIAL SECURITY OF POLICY HOLDERS IN CANADA, is prepared to accept RISKS on DWELLING HOUSES, Household Goods and Furniture, and General Merchandise, at the lowest current rates. JAMES DAVIDSON, Manager. GILLESPIE, MOFFATT & CO., AGENTS FOR CANADA Feb. 27, 1868. 5

WILLIAM P. JOHNSTON MANUFACTURER OF BOOTS & SHOES IN EVERY STYLE, (FOR GENTLEMEN ONLY,) 147 St. James Street, MONTREAL. Feb. 13, 1868. 3

LIFE INSURANCE, ESTABLISHED 1825.

SCOTTISH PROVINCIAL ASSURANCE COMPANY, Incorporated by Act of Parliament.

CAPITAL, - ONE MILLION STERLING. Invested in Canada. \$500,000. CANADA HEAD OFFICE, MONTREAL.

DIRECTORS: HUGH TAYLOR, Esq., Advocate, Hon. CHAS. WILSON, M.L.C., WILLIAM SACHE, Esq., Banker, JACKSON RAE, Esq., Banker.

Secretary, - - - - - A. DAVIDSON PARKER Life Department. Attention is directed to the Rate of Premium adopted, which will be found more moderate than that of most other Companies. Special 1/2 Half Premium Rates. Policies for the whole of Life issued at Half Rates for the first five years, so adjusted that the policies are not liable to arrears of Premium. Age 25, yearly premium for £100—£1 1s. 9d., or for £500, yearly premium, £5 9d., at other ages in proportion. Feb. 13, 1868. 3

ESTABLISHED 1859.

HENRY R. GRAY, DISPENSING AND FAMILY CHEMIST

144 ST. LAWRENCE MAIN STREET, MONTREAL.

N.B.—Particular attention paid to the Dispensing of Physicians' Prescriptions. Physicians supplied cheap for cash. April 30. 14

SEEDS! SEEDS!! SEEDS!

JUST RECEIVED, MY new SEEDS, from France, England and the United States, all guaranteed FRESH. One of the best collections in CANADA, either in FLOWER, VEGETABLE, or FIELD SEEDS, viz.:

- Beans, Cucumbers, Parsley, Peppers, Lettuce, Mangold Wurtzel, Peas, Cabbage, Carrots, Melons, Radishes, Cauliflowers, Mustard, Spinach, Celery, Onions, Turnips, Corn, Parsnips, Tomatoes, Mushroom Spinn, &c., &c.

A liberal discount allowed to Dealers and Agricultural Societies, on taking large quantities. Call and get Catalogues. JAMES GOULDEN, 117 & 119 ST. LAWRENCE MAIN STREET, April 30. 14

Agents for the Church Observer.

- Mr. Geo. Wilson..... Amherstburgh
- Rev. F. Harding..... Aylmer, Ont
- Mr. W. D. Ardagh..... Bagby, County Simcoe
- Mr. Alex. Gavilliers, Bondhead, County Simcoe
- Mr. Schneider..... Carleton Place
- Rev. W. B. Evans..... County Grey
- Mr. A. Hewson..... Cobourg
- Mr. A. M. Ballantine..... Hamilton
- Mr. Reay..... Huntingdon, Q.
- Mr. Stacey..... Kingston
- Mr. John Golden..... Kingsville
- Mr. E. A. Taylor..... London
- Mr. John W. Mencke..... Nanticoke
- Mr. G. May..... Ottawa
- Mr. J. M. C. Delesderniers..... Peudleton
- Mr. Isaac Robinson..... Peterborough
- Mr. Highfield..... Quebec
- Mr. Thomas Owens..... Stonefield
- Mr. Henry Davis..... Stratford
- Mr. H. T. Lonsdale..... St. Andrews, Q.
- Rev. Mr. Darnell..... St. Johns, C.B.
- Mr. M. Caldwell..... St. Thomas, Ont.
- Mr. Rawlinson (Messrs. Chewitt & Co.) Toronto