

this will be entitled to a very large amount of respect.

The Bishop of Capetown—I was going to take very much the same line as has just been taken by the Bishop of Vermont. In most of our churches we have diocesan Synods, and the question is, how shall these synods be kept from falling away from the other Churches of the communion? If they are left in their present isolated condition, I believe we all feel that there will be great danger. What we want to do is to control the diocesan synods, so that they may not exercise too great a coercive power or enjoy too much liberty. But how are they to be controlled? We say that they may be controlled by placing them in subordination to provincial synods and depriving them of the power to legislate or decide upon any point upon which the provincial synods themselves may choose to legislate or decide. Then again comes the question, how are the different provinces in India, in South Africa, in Canada, in New Zealand, in Australia—how are the dioceses, not yet brought into provinces, though I trust they one day will be—to be controlled? Are they to be left in a state of perfect independence, or is any check to be placed upon them? They are all most anxious to remain bound to the mother Church; but as that cannot be done by any legal power, it can only be done by a self-constituted, spiritual subjection, by their consent to yield obedience to the decision of some higher synod, to be gathered together in England or elsewhere. We see no other way of preserving unity of faith, and so far as is needed of discipline. Let us, therefore, all meet and lay down certain rules which shall be binding on all the Churches in our communion if these Churches mean to remain in communion with us. The Bishop of St. David's says we have no means of enforcing such rules. But the Bishop of Vermont has shown how they can be enforced; they can be enforced as the decisions of Ecumenical Councils have been enforced. There have been decisions of Ecumenical Councils which have not been insisted on by the Church. A decree of an Ecumenical Council is not binding till the whole Church has accepted it, and there are Ecumenical Councils which have never been received. Many portions of the decrees of the Council of Trent has never to this day been received by the Gallican Church. We propose that the higher synod mentioned in the resolution should meet and lay down limits within which a certain amount of liberty should be allowed, but beyond which no inferior synod shall travel. We in the colonies shall most gladly submit to the authority of this higher synod, call it a general or call it a national one. There is no danger that its decisions would come in conflict with any decisions given by the Church at home, for if the Church of England did not accept any conclusion arrived at by the higher synod, that conclusion would not be binding upon it. I see, then, no reason why the resolution should not be accepted. We say "general" rather than "national" synod, because we hope our brethren in the United States will come into the arrangement, and it would, therefore, be entirely out of the question to call it a national synod, because it would be the synod of two nations. Of course if his Grace were called upon to accept the office of Patriarch, it might be called a patriarchal synod.

The Bishop of Salisbury—It would be possible to call his Grace Patriarch; but is it possible for any power short of an Ecumenical Council to make a Patriarch?

The Bishop of Capetown—The Archbishop of Canterbury was in former days called Patriarch; but whether his patriarchate could be extended over the whole Anglican communion is another question. I suppose that if we give it to him it would be a voluntary act of submission on our part. I see no reason why we should not accept this very simple resolution. It is only in submission and obedience on the part of the colonial Churches that an effectual means can be found to do what we desire. It cannot be done by legal means. We could never consent to it. I am sure I am speaking the sentiments of colonial Churchmen when I say, God forbid that we should be legislated for in all our affairs as the Church of England is legislated for, or that we should be placed in the same danger by means of the Privy Council. I believe it would cause a schism if the

attempt were made to force it upon us. We are anxious to bind ourselves to our dear mother Church of England, and we are ready to submit to what we ask her to impose upon us.

The Bishop of St. David's—When I used the word impractical, I meant that, at the utmost, what we could do was only a recommendation of something that in the opinion of the conference appeared to be the most likely thing to maintain amongst the several branches of the Anglican communion—union in the faith and fellowship in the one Body of Christ, something which not only does not now exist, but something the existence of which is to my mind exceedingly doubtful. This kind of synod is at present nothing but an idea which has never been reduced to practice, and which not only requires some other further measures, but demands some radical change in the state of things before it ever can be brought into practice. That is why I called it impractical and unreal. If only to give the appearance of consistency to our proceeding, some alteration is required in the terms of the resolution. The question which the resolution really purports to answer is, what are the conditions of union? And to say that this proposed organisation is to be a condition of union is something which is impractical, because it is something which never has been and probably never will be realised. Indeed to make this a "condition of union" seems to me somewhat bordering on absurdity. "Condition of Union" I take to be an improper title, and I should be glad of an explanation from the Bishop of New Zealand as to how he considers what he proposes a condition of union.

The Bishop of London—I am very desirous that this resolution should be put in such a form as to make it acceptable to all of us, because it is of the greatest importance to do what has been urged upon us both by the Metropolitans of New Zealand and South Africa and the Bishop of Grahamstown, for we are told that our brethren in the colonies are anxious to have our advice upon these points and are willing to follow our advice. I agree with the Bishop of Vermont most thoroughly, that a gathering of Bishops must always have a great moral weight, and I apprehend that that weight which he has attributed to many councils of old is exactly the same sort of weight as the body which is at this moment assembled, and which is no council of the Anglican Church as your Grace has informed us, will have with our brethren both at home and at a distance. Therefore if there were nothing more in the proposal of this Pan-Anglican synod, or conference of Bishops, or whatever else you like to call it, than this, we should have reason to rejoice. That there should be a gathering together for a conference which should express its opinion upon certain weighty points, and that those opinions should go forth to the Christian world with the weight which attaches to them from the names of the various persons who compose this assembly is something we must all desire, and, indeed, the presence of every one of us to-day is a proof that we do value such a gathering, and do desire that the opinions which are arrived at after having solemnly invoked God's guidance upon our deliberations should have weight with the Christian world in general. But when I turn to the resolution I confess it appears to me that something different from that is intended—that it is intended as far as is possible to be a real synod with real power to enforce its decisions upon the Church and the various branches of the Church—not, indeed, with that sort of power which an established Church has by its connection with the State, but by calling to its assistance every sort of help which the spiritual convictions of the great Christian community will give, and that, therefore, it might be implied that if any one acted contrary to the decisions of this gathering, there would be no impropriety in his being pronounced excommunicate. ("No, no.") I hope that this is not the meaning of any of my brethren, but we must be very cautious that when we talk of the advantage of such a gathering, we do not express ourselves to mean something which will place this general conference in exactly the same position for example, in which the provincial synod of Capetown considers itself placed with the diocesan synods of Capetown, or in fact, in any position in which diocesan

and provincial synods stand to those bodies which are properly submitted to them either by the actual state of the law of the land, or, let us say, for supposition's sake, by the law of the Church. There are words in this resolution which will, to say the least, require much explanation, if nothing more is meant by the Pan-Anglican synod than what the Bishop of Vermont mentioned in his speech. I, for my part, am glad indeed that we have the advantage both of American and Scottish Bishops to assist us. I say this because at a preliminary meeting I said there were questions upon which it would be very awkward if when we came to divide, those who did not belong to the Established Church overpowered by their vote (which, of course, they would never think of doing) those who did belong to it. But their brotherly assistance in determining these intricate questions is hailed by every one of us. With questions like that before us their assistance is especially valuable. This great Church of the United States of America, to which we should desire to do all honor, has gone on from the day of its first formation without this sort of organisation which is now proposed to have. ("No, no.") There is no Archbishop there, there is no Patriarch, there is no synod. It is an aggregate collection of perfectly free dioceses, the Bishops of which are perfectly equal, except that one becomes for the time being president of the body. Therefore I should be sorry to join in any sort of resolution that appeared to imply a reflection upon the United States of America, and to say that it had missed the best mode of maintaining the unity of the faith and fellowship in the one Body of Christ.

The Bishop of Vermont—I will for a moment interrupt to explain that with us every diocese has its own synod, and that the General Convention overrules all the rest.

The Bishop of London—Yes; but there is no Archbishop or Metropolitan in the American Church; and the whole thing now before us appears to me to establish and give weight to the position of a Metropolitan. This is all quite right and rational; and if I were a Metropolitan, I should insist upon it as much as they do. But we have here the advantage of the presence of the Bishops of the American Church, and of that Church which we won't name in Scotland. That Church has no Archbishop and never has had since the time of the Reformation, and is therefore in precisely the same condition with reference to this matter as the American Church. I, therefore, deprecate anything that would seem to say that they had missed the true mode of maintaining the unity of faith. I can imagine a body of ecclesiastics meeting together reverently, and yet with a certain degree of excitement as to the great subjects with which they have to deal, coming in their united councils to some sort of decisions which, if they did not entirely conflict with the law of the land, would appear to do so, and I should deprecate above everything any kind of statement from ourselves which would seem to point to a condition in which some synod or universal body of the Church might be called together to act independently of the law of the land.

The Bishop of New Zealand—What land?

The Bishop of London—That in which I, as a clergyman, live.

The Bishop of New Zealand—Twenty of our brethren have a different land.

The Bishop of London—Of course, in America there is a different land; but I do not know that the law of the colony is so different as compared with that in England. However, let that pass. I am talking now as a clergyman of the Church of England, and of my reason for not wishing to see such a body called together. I want this resolution modified, and I think I forgot to say that the Church of India would be concerned if we pass this resolution, because the lay members there are a very fluctuating body, who are thinking more of coming home than of calling a synod. I have expressed the difficulty that would arise more or less with regard to bodies represented here. You talk of our offering the patriarchate to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and there is no man to whom I would so readily offer so high, or even higher honors, if that was the law of the Church.