

too much to their solicitations. It is not a generous party that we have to do with. It is one that understands concession only as a sign of weakness, and presses hard on a retreating foe. There is nothing then as experience has shown to be gained by a spirit of compromise; there is everything to be lost by the giving up of one principle, or abstaining from one effort in the good cause. Just as the sums paid by our Saxon forefathers to the Danes to keep away from their coasts only acted as so many bribes to renewed invasion, so any yielding of Bishop, Presbyters, or Laymen of the Synod to the wishes of the Anti-Synodites will only encourage and increase their opposition. Our true and safe principle is to ignore them altogether, to regard not their futile objections, to despise their foolish threats, to leave them alone, to go vigorously, earnestly, quietly, and surely on our own way. Truth in the end will prevail, prejudice cease—enmity die away. When our friends find, as Anti-Synod shows they are already beginning to find, that they are left out in the cold, that the Church under new auspices and a better government steadily progresses in numbers, in prosperity, in peace and happiness; they will be ashamed, have no alternative but to forsake their opposition, and acknowledge the truth, and call themselves members of the Synod, rather than followers of Anti-Synod.

I had intended a few remarks on the logic of Anti-Synod's third deduction from the judgment of the Privy Council. Time and space, however, forbid. Hoping that you will kindly find room for that which I have already written in your next number.

I am yours, &c.

S. M. C.

*Messrs. Editors.*—I perceive in your number for September a communication with the signature of Anti-Synod containing many assertions, in support of which the writer does not advance the shadow of proof. I presume that the communication is from the same source from which flowed a circular of the same character in opposition to the establishment of a Synod and of which I was favoured with a copy. I was in hopes that the establishment of the Synod by so large a majority of our Church and the example of so many of our larger Colonies would have shown its opponents the futility of further opposition, and that the persons opposed to it would have united with its advocates in endeavouring to establish our Church on a firm and prosperous footing; but unfortunately it appears that there are some persons who seem more anxious to perpetuate party dissension than for union.

When so large a majority of Churchmen are in favor of a Synod, which is the primitive constitution and mode of government of the Christian Church, recognized by the Church of England, which professes to return to the primitive model; and as the establishment of the Synod has become a fact of several years standing; and as it has been conducted with remarkable unanimity and temper, and has now become a necessity by the position in which we stand by the late decision of the Privy Council and the Law officers of the crown, which has cast the Colonial Churches adrift, without any Church government at all—it appears to me that if strife, and divisions, and elements of contention arise among us they will proceed from that very party of dissentients who are endeavouring to gain the ascendancy and government of the Church by placing it in the hands of the Diocesan Church Society, of which it forms the most numerous and influential part. And as they are mostly resident in Halifax and its immediate vicinity, they can more readily and conveniently attend the meetings of the Society, and consequently have everything their own way.

The writer seems to take credit to the *party* (for a party they are) that they have acted rather on the defensive than the aggressive; that "It has all along been conscientiously and consistently *opposed* by a large number of intelligent and influential Churchmen in every part of the Diocese, as a powerless and costly encumbrance." When it was first proposed to establish the Synod, was not every endeavour made to deter Churchmen from adhering to it? Does not this look like *aggression*? Did the opponents of the measure attend the meetings and openly discuss the merits of the proposed measure, and state their views? Was this *defensive*? Was not opposition confined to the *party* in the Church who held peculiar views? And were not the same