

a. A Synod being called under the above conditions, if the Laity, in Synod assembled, should withhold their concurrence from any regulation, such regulation might be looked upon as an expression of opinion on the part of the Bishop and the Clergy, but as nothing more :—the Laity refusing their consent, it loses the character of a Canon or Synodical Act.

b. If the body of the Clergy, in Synod assembled, withhold their concurrence from a proposed regulation, such regulation clearly cannot be called an Act of the Synod : one of the constituent parts of that Synod does not ratify it.

c. If the Bishop, in such Synod, refuse his consent to the passing of any proposed regulation, such regulation cannot be binding on the members of the Church : it is not an Act of the Synod, being disapproved by the Bishop and chief Pastor of the Diocese, and one of the three estates composing the Synod.

It seems desirable, then, that each of these three parties, Bishop, Clergy, and Laity, in Synod assembled, should have the power of negating any proposed regulation. And, clearly, it would not be equitable to give such power to either the second, or the third, and withhold it from the first of the three above mentioned parties. How could a Churchman consent to see the Bishop of the Diocese refused a power conceded to the Clergy, and to the Laity also, of that diocese ?

For the following reasons the concurrence of the Bishop ought to be regarded as necessary to the validity of all Acts of a Synod.

I. The power the Bishop would exercise in the Synod could be only of a negative, and not of a positive, character. He could do nothing in the Synod