

sure like the veto? Should it be deemed desirable to make use of the veto in the deliberations of the synod, it is a gift which can at any future time be easily conferred. But prudence would certainly dictate that a trial should first be made without that dangerous power; for we should remember that however objectionable it may be found, it cannot be revoked. If we look across the lines to the episcopal church in the United States, and examine the working of its machinery with regard to vetos, we shall find that where there is no veto, the church flourishes; that where the veto does exist, the church does not advance. Vermont is the only diocese out of the 35 in the United States in which the veto exists. In 1839 that diocese had 22 clergymen; in 1857 the number had increased to 23, thus shewing an increase of one clergyman in eighteen years. The increase during the same period in the other dioceses of New England ranged from 50 to 340 per cent. Such facts as these speak volumes. Our colonial diocesan synods are as yet untested experiments; the organization in the United States has been long tried. It would be well for us to pause and consider before we fly into the face of, and act directly opposite to statements which are supported by such convincing figures. I here agree most cordially with the Lord Bishop of the Diocese, who, in his recent circular, dated 21st February last, solemnly warns the clergy and the people against precipitate conduct in the new experiment of synodical action. He says, "we must guard our people against the imagination that we are to rush at our experiment, as if we had now got at our opportunity to carry out this or that favorite object,—to give vent to, and to exercise some eager prepossession, or to effect some sudden and sweeping renovation of affairs. We must enter upon and with careful and cautious steps, &c." The clerical party will surely see that to give vent to their