

they are so too, a reason which would equally have made them Jews or Mahomedans, if their parentage had been such. On no occasion have they given any trouble in the conventions; indeed, so far from such being the case, on some occasions, where bodies of the clergy have displayed an anxiety for change, and a disregard of their constituted authorities, *they* have invariably taken the side of order and good government. To prevent the possibility of their power becoming greater in the conventions than that of the clergy, a canon has been adopted, by which, on demand for its operation, the clergy and laity are called to vote by orders, the clergy first, and the laity afterwards; and, then, without a majority of each order, no measure can be adopted.^(h)

And why, I would humbly ask, are not we, my Rt. Rev. Father and my Rev. Brethren; why are not we to adopt the same measures, which have, with God's blessing, raised our sister church from her low estate, and rendered her the most flourishing body of christians in the Union? Will our superiors in England say "nay" to us? Their wish must be, the prosperity of our Zion, and if we can convince them that by the adoption of the means here recommended, that prosperity will be greatly promoted, I feel assured that they will wish us "God-speed" in the name of the Lord. I trust that it will not be objected, that the church of England knows nothing of lay delegation, and that, as a branch of that church, we must think of nothing of the kind. Should, however, such an objection be made, I reply, that it is asking too much of us, to leave us here without the decided advantages derived by the church in England from her connection with the state, and, at the same time, to debar us from availing ourselves of those advantages which she would embrace, were it not for that very connection. Is it to be supposed that the church in England would refuse to avail herself of the assistance which the laity only can afford, and to admit them into her councils in order to obtain it, if she should be suddenly deprived of her right to tithes and the other property she possesses. But I suspect that *the laity have more control over the church in England* than many imagine. I ask, by whose authority was the present order of common prayer confirmed and allowed to be used in churches, but by that of the Parliament, composed of the three estates of the realm, in one only of which have the clergy any voice, and that but a slight one? By whose authority are some sees being abolished and others established, but by the same? By what authority can tithes be commuted? In short, who has the regulation of her revenues, but the same king, lords and commons? But further, by whose authority only could the slightest alteration be made in the order of her services, as prescribed

(h.) Our Synods, adopted in 1853 and subsequently, are modelled on the conventions of the church in the United States.