

House, and without the entry upon the Journals of any division. In the Upper House, however, in which the proportion of Churchmen is very small, it was rejected. Of the nature of the opposition, and of the means used to defeat the Bill in that House, I will say nothing, for the influences which have most power there, must be well known to you. I endeavored, to the best of my ability, to support the claims of the Churchmen throughout the Province, by the following, with other arguments:

1. Synods are part of the Constitution of the Church, and were regularly held in the early ages.
2. That they have been adopted in almost all the colonies, where it has been practicable to convene them.
3. That they have worked well in the United States, and that they are as necessary here as there, on account of the separation of the Church from the State.
4. That without a Synod, we are left without any mode of adapting ourselves to the circumstances of a new country, and of this progressive age,—and that we are almost without laws, except the old Canon Law, since few of the English Statutes passed since the establishment of a Provincial Legislature, have any force here.
5. That in consequence of our peculiar position, as an unestablished branch of a Church established in England, there are many doubts and difficulties which ought to be removed by an Act of the Legislature, recognizing our right to remedy any defects in our system, and to determine doubtful points.

It was, indeed, maintained, on the other side, that we are *not* without law, but they failed to show that any of the English Statutes, determining the mode in which the authority of the Bishop is to be exercised, and limiting its extent, are applicable here. And in the Capetown