

obey your Ordinary, and other chief Ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over you, submitting yourselves to their godly judgments?" 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 their Bishop, to the certain peril of violating their ordination vows.

VI. 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.

VII. 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 sympathize 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?

VIII. If we deprive the Bishop of this power, then the regulations of the Synod will incur the danger of never being enforced, and of falling into contempt. Ought a Bishop to be placed in such a position that he must enforce a discipline which, in his conscience, he believes will be pernicious to his diocese?

IX. If the Bishop be not deprived of this power, then a free expression of opinion may be expected in the Synod, and not otherwise. A Bishop would be tempted, —nay, it would be his duty, —to induce a Clergyman, or Layman, to think as he does on any proposed regulation. Are there not many, both of Clergy and Laity, who having privately learned the Bishop's opinion and wishes