receive the assent of the whole Legislature before it becomes the law of the land.—Similarly, one would suppose that this resolution is merely an expression of opinion, valuable as shewing the sentiments of the Synod, but not law, unless passed as a Canon by both Houses.

But supposing the Resolution to be binding as a law, it merely states in its first part what is a well-known fact, that certain practices have been ruled illegal by the highest Spiritual Court in England. This part of the judgment has, I believe, been accepted by the party to whom it is adverse, and so may be looked upon as the generally accepted law of the Church of England; the Church of Canada, then, simply following the lead of the Mother Church, declares the same things to be illegal within her jurisdiction.

The latter part of the resolution deals with matters, one of which is still *sub judice*, and one is of unquestionable legality. The Synod expresses disapprobation of these, and a resolution to prevent or repress them; but so to do would require a change in the law, which change has not yet been made, and cannot be for at least three years.—The facts of the case, viz., that the resolution, in its first part, accepts the law of the Church of England, but, in the second part, hints at an intention of setting up a different ritual from that of the Mother Church, seem to me to call upon us to join the Provincial Synod, that so the Upper House, the conservative element of the Synod may be strengthened, and the Lower House, including a large number of persons of varied opinions, may be the less likely, by hasty, inconsiderate legislation, to narrow the now wide basis of our branch of the Catholic Church.

Yours truly,

E. T. N.

Sir,—As your space is very limited, I ask room for a very few remarks on the letter of the Rev. F. Almon, in the last *Church Chronicle*.

If any one had a right to complain of a want of harmony in the last Synod, surely the writer of that letter is not the man,—unless, indeed, he covets more than extreme courtesy and forbearance.

Rev. Mr. Almon says that no one can defend the principle which appoints the Bishop to name the clergymen from whom the accused is to select his judges, &c.,—and again that this tribunal for the trial of an offending clergyman "is formed in opposition to the first principle of justice and British law, by allowing the accuser to constitute the court."

This is very trying to one's charity. Rev. Mr. Almon knows very well that it was explained by the Bishop at the last Synod that these rules of discipline were based upon the English Bill passed in the reign of the present Queen; but that whereas, in the English Bill, the Bishop nominates absolutely the three assessors; in *our* rules he is required to furnish a list of nine clergymen, from whom the accused is *himself* to select the three whom he prefers to assist at his trial. For the *preliminary* enquiry we have adopted the English regulation, that the Bishop shall nominate *five* persons to investigate any charge made against a clergyman in any evil rumour concerning him, and to report whether there is sufficient *prima facie* ground for further proceedings. As Rev. Mr. Almon professes special admiration of the English Ecclesiastical Law and Court of Appeal, he is the last person who ought to find fault with us for adopting a portion of it. In any case he cannot be justified in representing what is copied from the English system as being opposed to the first principles of justice and British law, nor even excused from doing so, except on the plea of ignorance.

Until the adoption of the Rules of Discipline, of which Mr. Almon so bitterly complains, the trial of an offending clergyman was left far more to the Bishop's management than it is now. Our Bishop, instead of ruling alone, calls in the aid of a Synod in the government of his Diocese, and greatly enlarges the range of assessors (not judges) in the trial of clergymen. Patience with this continual groundless carping is anything but complimentary to the fault-finders.

HONESTY.