

suasion that I ought to lay before you some reasons why it seems advisable that we should apply to the legislature for an act, conferring on this Synod all the corporate rights and privileges possessed by any church society incorporated in this province. And first, I would remind you that from the time synods were first contemplated, their incorporation was anticipated also. In the indentures made between the Church Society of the Diocese of Toronto, and the clergy who commuted their salaries in February, 1855, a clause was inserted to the following effect:—
 “And in the event of the Synod of the said diocese being legally invested with corporate powers, so as to be able to carry out the trusts aforesaid, the church society shall and will transfer and assign the said commutation money, and any securities in which the same may be invested, and all interest and proceeds then unappropriated arising therefrom, to the said Synod, by whatever corporate name called, upon the same trust and interest.” Hence it appears that the church society and the commuting clergy considered it more satisfactory to all concerned, that provision should be made (in case of the Synod receiving corporate powers) that so large an amount of money as the commutation fund should be held and managed by the church through her representatives in Synod, rather than by the church society. Again, the expediency of the Synod managing the property of the church is acknowledged and the right to do so conferred by the statute “*enabling the church to meet in Synod*,” which gives this Synod a quasi-incorporation. It is enacted as follows:—“The bishop, clergy, and laity members of the United Church of England and Ireland in this province may meet in their several dioceses, which are now or hereafter may be constituted in this province, and in such manner and by such proceedings as they shall adopt, frame constitutions and make regulations for enforcing discipline, &c., “*and for the convenient and orderly management of the property, affairs, and interests, of the church.*” Thus you perceive that, my suggestion is one which has not been suddenly started, but that, on the contrary, the idea of incorporating the Synod was from the first contemplated.

I now proceed to give my reasons for suggesting that we should apply for an act incorporating the Synod of the Diocese of Ontario. In the first place, we require strong arguments to prove the utility of two organizations, when, to all appearance, one seems altogether sufficient. There might be plausibility in maintaining the utility of the diocese having two bodies working in different ways for the good of the church, if the two bodies had different fields of labour or were independent of each other. But a church society cannot for the future be independent. It must obey the canons and yield to the expressed wishes of this Synod, for should it disobey, it would lose the confidence of the church, and receive no contributions. Simplicity, therefore, will be gained and expense saved, by the employment of one well appointed and general machinery. In the second place, it must be remembered that a church society is a close corporation, not a representative body. It seems quite unreasonable that all the funds of the church, including the commutation fund, which in our diocese will probably amount to \$390,000, shall be controlled and managed by a corporation which does not fully represent the church; the members need not be communicants, their only qualification being election by ballot, and the payment of \$5 per annum. But the Synod is a faithful and liberal representation of the 81,000 lay members, and includes all the licensed clergy. A church society, however useful in past times, and for

certain purposes, can lay no claim to be a representative of the whole church, while the misfortune is, that the church suffers by any failure of a church society to answer public expectations. It is unreasonably supposed that the receipts of the society are the receipts of the church, because in the opinion of the public, the church society and the church are thought to be identical, an error which might perhaps have been avoided, had the name of the church aid society been originally adopted. In the third place, I am not afraid to confess that the church society has not answered reasonable expectation in this portion of the former Diocese of Toronto. The society, from whatever cause arising, is not popular in the Diocese of Ontario. In many parishes the very name of church society is suppressed, and the annual parochial meetings are called mission-ary meetings. When we take into account the numbers, wealth, and intelligence, of the churchmen of the diocese, the smallness of the means contributed to meet the requirements of the society, is unaccountable and disheartening. It is agreed that this disinclination to contribute has arisen from discontent with the tendency of such societies to centralization, by means of which all management rested with a few persons in Toronto. If this be the cause of failure, then I fear the same result in the Diocese of Ontario. Similar jealousy of centralization in Kingston will arise for the same reason on the part of distant missions on the Ottawa. But I cannot altogether attribute the unwillingness to contribute to the society to centralization. It is easy to find pretexts for non-performance of duty, and church society meetings largely partake of such ingredients. Churchmen in Toronto cannot plead centralization as an excuse, and yet out of the seven parishes in that city four appear, from the last report, as having remitted nothing from their parochial branches, one of them being the cathedral parish, probably the largest and wealthiest in British America. Again, the city of Kingston could not have dreaded centralization, as funds subscribed this winter were to be expended in salaries to missionaries in this diocese, and nothing more can be expected from the several parochial branches for another year, and yet the whole amount paid by the three congregations in this city amounts only to £76, of which £18 was contributed by the clergy. From these facts, I argue the unpopularity of a church society.

Now, the vast missionary work before us cannot be done unless the whole church works as a unit. It is too solemn in its greatness to be thrown by us on the precarious charity of isolated parishes, or allowed to be dependent on the popularity or unpopularity of a society. The church expects every parish to do its duty. We need, then, an organization which must command the moral support of every bona fide church member. The by-laws of a society bind its members, and its members only, the canons of the Synod bind every church member. Rules directing the missionary work of the diocese which shall be enacted by the three branches of our Ecclesiastical Legislature, the bishop, clergy, and the representatives of our 81,000 members, challenge the obedience of every loyal adherent of the Church of England and Ireland. Any system of missionary effort solemnly ratified in Synod, is co-extensive with the whole church. No clergyman, nor layman, under ordinary circumstances, can escape the responsibility of disobeying Synodical law. I need not say how different an aspect our organization will assume in the eyes of the diocese if we entrust our missionary work, which is our very life, to a voluntary association within the church, but itself not the church. If, on the other hand, our Synod be itself our church society, and

elect a mission board, and frame by-laws for its efficient working, those by-laws become binding in foro conscientie, and any parish which, without good reason, shall neglect to carry out the spirit of the church rules here enacted, will be liable, through its clergyman and lay delegates, to be interrogated as to the cause of its neglect at every session of the Synod.

The only objection of any apparent force which has struck me as capable of being urged against the incorporation of Synod, is the probability that very many worthy members of the church who would wish to have something to do with the administration of her affairs, will be unable to do so, election to the Synod not being possible to all who would or could qualify themselves for incorporated membership of a society by the payment of \$5 per annum. To this I reply that the Church Society of the Diocese of Toronto, is, by its laws, prevented from having more than 300 incorporated members in addition to those names mentioned in its charter, and I believe that at no period of its existence has the society had its permitted number of members duly qualified by the payment of their subscriptions. But at the present moment this Synod is composed of fifty-six clergymen, and the lay delegates of 60 parishes, thus giving a total of 206 incorporated members should the Synod be incorporated, while the probable increase in the number of our parishes will in a few years give us a list of incorporated members greater than that of any church society in the province, with a further advantage, that these members will not be taken from any particular localities, but fairly distributed over the diocese.

I shall now recapitulate the advantages derivable, in my opinion, from an incorporated Synod. Firstly—A church society will be quite unnecessary, and thus simplicity will be gained in the administration of the church's temporalities, and a saving of expense will be effected in the salaries of secretaries and in printing.

Secondly—The Synod, if incorporated, can manage the funds of the church as was contemplated by the Synod Act and the indentures made between the church society and the clergy, but if unincorporated, a church society must manage the funds of the church, while the Provincial Synod will probably legislate for its most important spiritual interests, and thus little or nothing of practical utility be left for the Diocesan Synod to perform.

Thirdly—The missionary efforts of the church will not be left to a voluntary association, but will emanate from the church herself, which, as a society, is in Synod fully represented.

Fourthly—The commutation fund is too large a sum of money to be intrusted to a society of church members not necessarily communicants, but it will be paid over to Synod if incorporated.

Fifthly—A church society has not hitherto succeeded in winning its way into the affections of the clergy or people so effectually as to warrant us in establishing one without urgent cause, while there is a strong probability that both clergy and laity will feel bound to co-operate with any system of missions authorised by the Synod.

Sixthly—All excuses for withholding aid from a mission board constituted by Synod, on the score of centralization, will be avoided, as all parishes will be equally represented in the Synod.

For these reasons, I venture to recommend that we petition parliament for an act of incorporation similar to that given to any church society heretofore in this Province, and that a committee be appointed to draw up such a bill as we require, and that the members of the Synod who are also members of the legislature, be requested to procure its speedy enactment.