

a proper light, we have extracted the following reasons from a small pamphlet published a few years ago at Montreal, and understood to be written by Archdeacon Lowery, who at that time was residing in Canada. There was at first a good deal of opposition there to conceding this power to the Bishop; but after awhile better counsels prevailed, and the result is that not only in the diocese of Montreal, but in *all* the British North American dioceses, where Synods have been established, the power of checking hasty legislation has been reserved to the Bishop by an almost unanimous vote. We commend the following reasons to the careful consideration of our readers, feeling sure that they must have great weight with thoughtful men --

"1. The power the Bishop would exercise in the Synod could be only of a negative, and not of a positive character. He could do nothing in the Synod against the will of the clergy, or against the will of the laity. He could only withhold his consent to a measure which he conscientiously believes to be not for the good of the diocese.

"2. It must always be remembered that the Bishop's care is over the whole diocese, that of a clergyman over only his own parish or mission; and a layman's interest is chiefly confined to his own neighbourhood. How can we, of the clergy or laity, with smaller responsibility, wish to force upon a whole diocese that which he who is bound to care for all cannot approve?

"3. A Bishop, whose concurrence in the doings of a Synod is not thought essential, will sometimes be placed in the position of one compelled to act in his own diocese in dereliction of regulations made contrary to his expressed judgment. In that case he is not a Bishop, but the mere instrument of those over whom he is placed, and for the oversight of whom he must give account.

4. It is of the essence of a Bishop's office to rule and to administer the discipline of the Church. At the most solemn moment of his life—his consecration—he was reminded that he was about to be "admitted to the government of the Church of Christ, which He purchased with no less price than the effusion of His own blood," and most solemnly the promise was demanded of him, before he could receive the Bishop's office, that he would administer the discipline of the Church "according to such authority as he has by God's word, and as to him should be committed." How can we expect a Bishop to surrender an authority which God has bestowed upon him? How could we afterwards respect one who had relinquished a sacred right, bound upon his office and person by sanctions so awful?

5. The clergy were asked at their ordination, "will you reverently obey your ordinary and other chief ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over you, submitting yourselves to their godly judgment?" And they answered "I will so do." And yet if this negative power is withheld from the Bishop, they will frequently find themselves in the position of forcing on a measure against the "judgment," perhaps to the grief and vexation of the Bishop, to the certain peril of violating their ordination vows.

6. If we deprive the Bishop of this power we reduce our Church to a Presbytery; one of the main distinctions between the Presbyterians and the Church being that the chief authority lies, with the former in the Presbytery, with the latter in the Bishop. Our regimen is not Presbyterian but Episcopal.

7. If we deprive the Bishop of this power, a faithful Churchman may often be placed in this dilemma, viz: that he must either abide by a regulation passed contrary to the judgment and desire of his Bishop, or sympathise with the Bishop, and reject a regulation imposed by the Synod. Can this be agreeable to the ordinance of God, who is the author not of confusion but of order?

8. If we deprive the Bishop of this power, then the regulations of the