

eager prepossessions respecting the *veto*, will be to reject the excellent advice of their diocesan ; and the faithful laity will surely see that to save the synod from rushing at the experiment of the *veto*, and to withhold from the bishop that power which can be given at any time, but never recalled, will be but to take the careful and cautious steps which he enjoins.

With regard to the proposal that no one shall be allowed to legislate for the church who is not a communicant, I am surprised that there can be two opinions. In former days, the Test Act was looked upon as the rampart of religion, and the Corporation Act as the bulwark of liberty ; but we live in better times. The principle of the thing is contrary to the feelings of the present age. It has always been a boast of the Anglican Church that, in all that regards participation in the Holy Communion its members enjoy that liberty which christians should enjoy. To make the sacrament of the Lord's Supper a necessary qualification for being a member of the synod is an ill-judged, ill-considered attempt to foster hypocrisy in the laity and to increase the power of the clergy. It *does* seem strange that this one thing only should be deemed necessary to qualify for membership for the synod. Will it be creditable to the synod, that conduct which is condemned even by the world, should be so far venial in the eyes of the church, that the church member, for instance, whose gambling and swindling practices, whose fraudulent bankruptcies, and readiness to grind the face of the poor, combine to exclude him from respectable society, deprive him of commercial confidence, and entail upon him the execrations of the suffering, should be qualified to enjoy the privileges of legislating for the church, if only, fresh from his pursuits, he will but add to his other crimes one crime more, that of unworthily partaking of the Lord's Supper. Guilt, vice, and ignorance can easily conform to such