

The Church Society is not authorized to deal with the relations of the Churchmen of New Brunswick to one another, and to the Mother Church. It cannot entertain questions of discipline. It cannot speak with the authority of a Synod. Most useful in its sphere, it is limited to that sphere, and beyond its written legal constitution it cannot go. In all the Canadian or Australian Dioceses, they have never found that any thing less than a Synod can do the work of the Church, and do it successfully and effectually. Nor does any difference in theological schools prevent our brethren in those Dioceses from uniting together in Synod. Huron is as active in Synodical action as Ontario, Melbourne as Auckland and Tasmania. A Synod is as comprehensive as the Church itself, and allows as much freedom and scope as the formularies of the Church. There is no stifling of thought, no pressure to prevent its expression, but the very fact of men being brought together to discuss important subjects leads them to be less suspicious of each other, and to learn in what points they can all unite. Why should Churchmen in Synod be less able to discuss subjects temperately and freely than in the Church Society, when the organization is the same, and the men are the same? Clergymen and Laymen are associated in the one, Clergymen and Laymen would be associated in the other.

Some objections to Synods may also be considered. It is supposed that Synodical action may tend to separate us from the Mother Church, and unloose those holy bonds of communion in which we have been hitherto bound. As far as the legal aspect of the question is concerned, the Judicial Committee has decided that our position is not identical with that of the Church at home. But as regards the moral and spiritual aspect, there is no point on which Colonial Churchmen are everywhere more unanimous, than in the wish to preserve our connection with the Mother Church inviolate. We should not meet in Synod to form new creeds, and compile a new Prayer-book; we should not desire new formularies, nor seek any other basis than that of the existing Church. But as the State has cast us adrift from some of our ancient moorings, we wish to drift away no further. We know that without rules, without a settled government, without a status and position, we cannot stand as a Church. We are left helpless on the stream, and may be carried we know not whither. A Synod, we may hope, will tend to preserve whatever is valuable untouched, as well as add whatever is lacking. The heart of our people is sound, and has no desire for separation from the Mother Church, nor need we entertain the fear.

It has been said again, that a Synod will increase the Bishop's power, and therefore should be avoided. A weaker objection could hardly be imagined. The Bishop's power has been called autocratic. What autocrat would think to increase his power by calling a parliament? Who are to register the decrees of the Bishop? Are not the Laity free men, who see general bearing is ample security for their independence? Their number is double that of the Clergy. They would vote by orders, whenever they desired so to do, and both Clergy and Laity have a veto on each other and on the Bishop. I believe that the Bishop's power would be both increased and diminished by a Synod. It would be diminished as far as it is irregular, unlimited and useless; it would gain just where every right-minded person would wish it to be augmented, in the moral force of a united judgment. It would be corrected and amended by discussion, and would be more freely acquiesced in, when it became the judgment not of the Bishop individually, but of the Church. With regard to the veto, which is made so much of by some, every Bishop in the world has it practically, whether you give it to him or no. The Canadian and