

several speakers in Synod observed, is the higher office, and nothing has been added to the dignity or responsibility of the Primate by giving him the title of Archbishop.

The question of fixing the primatial seat in one See was bound to arouse discussion. The practical advantages of a fixed primacy would have been great but it would have been difficult to draw up regulations for the election of a Primate which would not either restrict the primatial See in its rights of free election of its Bishop or deprive the province of an adequate voice in the appointment of the Primate.

A lot of rubbish has appeared in the Secular Press and a rather silly article in the "Drifter" about the title of Archbishop being "undemocratic." Thank goodness we have not yet reached the Bolshevik position when offices are not to be distinguished by names, and it is only ignorance which strikes people with awe or repugnance when the word "Archbishop" is used. The Church of Australia is divided into several provinces—the chief bishop in each is an Archbishop. The provinces are grouped into one national church, the chief bishop of this church is the Primate (the Archbishop of Sydney). The time may come when the "Province" of New Zealand may become two or more provinces—at present the New Zealand Church is but one. The chief bishop of this province is therefore necessarily an Archbishop, he is also "Primate," from the fact that his is the only province. The recognition of this fact by General Synod is not the addition of a new office or title but merely a recognition of a position that already exists. It is also a mistake to suppose, as some seem to do, that the title has been "conferred" on the Bishop of Christchurch as a personal honor. It would have been given to any other bishop, had he been elected Primate. The chief advantage to be derived from the use of the new title is that ignorant people who did not understand the position of a Primate, are able to grasp the meaning of a more familiar and higher sounding name.

Strange as it may seem, at the Lambeth Conference, when bishops were marching in procession our own Primate was on one occasion placed below the Archbishops!

WOMEN ON CHURCH COUNCILS.

The abolition of sex distinction in the election of Church officers, etc., was bound to follow the decision of General Synod in 1919 to enfranchise women. Women may now be elected to any lay office in the Church. They may be vestry "men," churchwardens, Synods "men," members of General Synod, members of Standing Committee and of local Church Boards. Apparently Clause 1 of

Canon VI, "The Diocesan Synod may constitute a Cathedral Chapter, which shall consist of the Bishop and such other persons... as may to the said Synod seem necessary" leaves it optional to each diocese whether the "lay members" of the Cathedral Chapter may include women (!).

Although the admission of women to parochial offices has been under discussion for a long time, the new definition is so far-reaching as to be almost revolutionary. We are almost afraid that many of the women who would be most useful on Church Councils will be among those who will be most loath to accept appointment.

BIBLE IN SCHOOLS.

We are glad to note that the Synod did not approve of Canon James' motion for Bible reading in schools by the State school teachers and the refusal of the right of entry to those who alone are qualified by their special training to be religious instructors. We heartily concur in the opinions expressed by the Primate.

Speaking of the League's endeavors to introduce the New South Wales system, he said:—"We maintain the principles in support of which we leagued together, and we are not prepared to abandon our claim for right of entry."

"It is a real pain to me that I cannot agree with my brethren of other churches, nor with those of my own communion who will support them. I am prepared to grant that the use of a Scripture text book, with the recital of the Lord's Prayer, will be an advance upon the present system—sufficient perhaps to salve the national conscience, and block the way to any genuine means of religious instruction. If that is all the churches want, they are certainly content with very little. But the temper of the people is changing. Religious instruction will be given effectively. The people themselves will demand it. Meanwhile, we must do the best we can. We must build and maintain our schools, train our teachers and scholars, make our Sunday Schools effective, our Bible classes vigorous and strong, and use to the utmost every facility afforded to us of teaching in the State schools."

After much discussion in Synod and a conference between the proposers of different schemes, the Synod passed the following resolution:—"That the General Synod, having at previous sessions adopted the programme of the Bible in State Schools' League in unison with the authorities of other churches, can modify that programme only in consultation with those authorities, and therefore respectfully requests the bishops, in conference with the heads of other

Christian bodies and later with representatives of the Education Department and of the State school teachers, to find, with as little delay as possible, some method acceptable to all parties which will make it possible for the State school teachers to give religious instruction to the children in school hours." The question of the "right of entry" was left in abeyance.

BUILDING OF CHURCH SCHOOLS.

As a further recommendation from the conference, Bishop Averill moved that the clergy be urged: (1) To make all possible use of the facilities at present available for the religious instruction of school children; (2) to try to organise and equip a parochial band of teachers willing to help them in this work; (3) to endeavor to create a united public opinion in favor of the religious instruction of the children in the Dominion; and that the Synod call upon the whole Church of the province seriously to consider the advisability of persevering in the policy of building Church schools wherever it is found to be practicable.

Bishop Averill said that the Primate's motion and his own were separated after consideration by the conference. The latter motion embodied Canon Wilford's original amendment, and clause 3 embraced a proposal by Mr E. D. Ritchie, of Dunedin. He hoped that his motion would not be taken as a contradiction of the Archbishop's motion. They urged the building of Church schools wherever possible, but this fact was not in opposition to the spirit of the Archbishop's motion.

The motion was seconded by Canon Wilford, of Christchurch, and was supported by Bishop Richards, of Dunedin; Dean Fitchett, of Dunedin; and others.

Both motions were carried unanimously.

MORALS.

Mr E. C. Cutten, S.M., addressed the Synod on the state of morals in New Zealand, and a discussion of the subject was introduced in Synod by a motion of the Bishop of Waiapu on behalf of the Social Questions Committee, enjoining Churchmen to support every effort that aims at bettering moral conditions.

The motion was referred to the Sessional Committee on Social Services.

THE PAROCHIAL SYSTEM.

A motion was carried approving of the appointment of non-parishioners as churchwardens and vestrymen, provided that any such churchwarden or vestryman on taking office surrenders, for the meanwhile, his parochial rights in the parish in which he is a parishioner. Another motion was