

Having thus set forth his idea of a suitable congregational organisation, it becomes the task of the writer to endeavour to devise one for the synod. This, he thinks, should consist of the bishop, *ex officio* chairman, all the clergy in the diocese in priests' orders and in actual employment, and of one or more delegates from each congregation, to be chosen as follows:—

For every congregation numbering more than five hundred souls, and containing three hundred occupied and paid for sittings, two delegates are to be sent, to be elected at a general meeting of the voters, and their election recorded as usual; for every congregation or collection of congregations, supporting a minister, but containing less than the above number of sittings, one delegate; while every congregation employing more than one clergyman is to be entitled to send delegates in proportion to its numbers, *e. g.*, a congregation containing sixteen hundred persons, with one thousand sittings occupied and paid for, and which maintains three ministers, may send six delegates to the synod. The clergy, in consideration of their deeper interest, should be allowed, wherever their flocks send two delegates along with them, a double vote, so that, though fewer in number, their collective vote may equal that of the laity. It appears to the author to be but fair that this privilege should be conceded, and he would incidentally remind them that there is more in it than meets the eye; for, as all who have ever witnessed a debate in which such a privilege was granted to either side well know, one hundred double votes, though theoretically only equal to two hundred single ones, are, practically speaking, very much superior in value, as the chances of desertion, or at least division in the camp, increase greatly with any augmentation of number. And here the writer must enter his protest against any such project being attempted in future as that of sending two delegates for each congregation, one of whom is to be nominated by the clergyman himself. With whatever motive this proposal may have been made—and he is quite willing to grant that whoever advised it did so under the belief that he was thereby providing for the welfare of the church—he must say that it seems to him a perfect mockery to invite the laity to take part in the deliberations of an assembly, in which they know one half of their nominal representatives are in reality the mere puppets of the clergy, and that care has been taken, in the event of any serious difference arising between