

despotism. Such conflicting charges might, perhaps, be left to neutralise one another, and it is not my purpose to defend the reports from the various objections that may be made against their details. Those, indeed, who view the whole scheme with suspicion as a conspiracy against the liberties of clergy or laity, are so ingenious in detecting evidences of this, that it is impossible to anticipate or follow their objections. When, for example, an ex-M.P. professes to give a searching analysis of the scheme, and in trenchant style—much applauded by those who have never troubled themselves to study the original documents—declares it a firmly compacted system of tyranny unprecedented in the history of the world, except in the Church of Rome, it almost staggers our belief in our own intentions. We begin to fear, at least, lest, inadvertently, we have called into being some ecclesiastical monster. It is a relief to find, however, that this searching analysis is a series of most singular mis-statements, either expressly contradicted by the very language of the reports, or the mere offspring of the writer's lively imagination: such as that "it appears to be left to the bishop to suggest how many laymen, or how few" should attend a synod; that "any clergyman whom the bishop rejects will be excluded from the synod;" that "two bishops may decide the faith and fate of the third;" that "in the case of a clergyman the bishop sits alone on his tribunal;" that on the provincial tribunal of appeal the clergyman "will find his own bishop seated beside two other bishops," &c. It really comforts one to find that the writer must so utterly despise sober matters of fact in order to prove his case. And when even the *Times* newspaper is driven to the argument, in its condemnation of the proposed central tribunal, that "as seven are to form a quorum, and there is nothing said to the contrary, it follows inevitably that five American and two Scotch bishops might pronounce an irreversible sentence against an English clergyman without the presence of a single English bishop" which is about as reasonable and logical as to argue that because there are Irish and Scotch enough to make a house in parliament, therefore an English question might be settled without the presence of a single Englishman; and when it boldly affirms that "it is no mitigation, but rather an aggravation of the case," that the plan "depends for its adoption on the free will of the

Colonial
would b
cannot

My p
to answ
attentio
my obse
My only
to the t
this sch
to expre
giving a
be furth
do not t
stating
underst
am that
ment, n
tism, I
of such
prejudic

The s
far the
form of
The oth
disciplin
cial fun
in due
in the
continu

I. T
based o
accordi
the gen

If th
vigore
alterati
ed Chu
But no
life is i
suited