

of the previous payment of certain sums by the people, so that in truth the people can deprive the Clergyman of the whole of his maintenance, by stopping their own contributions, and thus the Clergy are made to depend upon *them*, and not upon the Bishop. This is the case of all the younger Clergy, who alone could be suspected of yielding to his influence. The seniors, who are either paid by the government, or by the venerable S. P. G., cannot be liable to any such suspicions.

And then, supposing it possible that any influences, such as are dreaded, could be brought to bear upon the members of the Synod, I ask whether an objection to it, on this score, would not be equally valid against every deliberative body? Is there any Legislature in the world of which all the members are supposed to be entirely independent of every external influence? We may however surely believe that an Assembly, composed of the ministers and communicants of our Church, will be, to say the very least, not inferior to any other in integrity and independence of action.

Fears have been suggested that the Synod may be tyrannical, and may be made the instrument of mischief. And again, we answer that there is this danger, to some extent, in every Assembly, but no one would think of abolishing Parliament on this account. Be it remembered that nothing whatever can be done without the consent of the lay members, and it rests with yourselves to send representatives of ability and integrity who will honestly and watchfully protect your interests. If you do not give sufficient attention to this important matter, you have no right to complain, if you find yourselves affected by measures adopted without your concurrence or even against your will.

Again, some persons are suspicious of Synods, simply because the Bishops are supposed to be in favor of them. This is a strange objection on the part of an Episcopalian; but I ask, is there not reason to suppose that a Bishop is at least as likely as any other person, to be