

Mr. M. Wilson thought that the wisest course for them to pursue was to refer the question to the General Synod. If that body saw fit to wait until England had pronounced upon the matter, it could do so just as well as the Provincial Synod could.

Mr. R. T. Walkem dissented from Rev. Prof. Worrell, and contended that referring the question to the General Synod was not shelving it at all.

Rev. E. J. Fessenden did not favour the matter being referred to the General Synod, as he considered that there was nothing like the intelligence in that body that there was in the Provincial Synod. "We are represented here," said the rev. speaker, "by 24 from the eastern Dioceses. We will only be represented in the General Synod by one-half or one-quarter of what we are represented here. The rest of Canada is a new country, and the intelligence of a new country and the conservatism of a new country is not that of an old country. The danger of the General Synod passing bad legislation is a hundred times greater than that of this Synod."

Dr. Alex. Johnson pointed out that the question had changed its aspect in the course of the discussion, and had really become a matter of confidence or non-confidence in the General Synod. If the latter had no power to deal with the question he did not know what body had.

Rural Dean Bogert favoured delay until some means might be taken of settling what were the powers of the Provincial Synod and what were those of the General Synod.

Mr. J. J. Mason concurred in referring the question to the General Synod. He did not think that there was any pressing demand for legislation on the point. Anyone in the position dealt with in the committee's report was not hankering after legislation; they could afford to wait.

Dr. L. H. Davidson, in order to show that there was necessity for action, mentioned that in his professional capacity he had within the past year had no fewer than four applications for a legal opinion on this very question, and these from clergymen who were placed in a difficulty as to what they should do under the existing laws of the Church when they were called upon to marry a divorced person, innocent or guilty. It, therefore, was not quite right to say that the whole matter was simply one of a demand being made on the Church for legislation by those who are guilty of divorce for cause or not; it was to meet the wants of the clergy, who wished to act honestly and conscientiously up to the rules of their Church. There was, unfortunately, a very grave doubt as to what the law of the Church was on the point. He was in favour of the matter being referred to the General Synod.

Messrs. R. P. Campbell, Chas. Jenkins and Judge Fitzgerald having taken part in the debate, the vote was called on the motions submitted on the previous day, with the result that the amendment proposed by Mr. R. Bayly, and seconded by Mr. R. T. Walkem, was adopted, viz:—

That the subject dealt with by the reports of the joint committee on marriage and divorce be referred, with the reports, to the General Synod for its consideration and for such action, by way of legislation or otherwise, as will commend itself to that body, and that the secretaries take the necessary steps to bring the action of this Synod before the General Synod.

The business of the Synod was then suspended in order to allow of the reception of the delegation from the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. The delegation, which was accompanied by the representatives of the House of Bishops, was escorted by the following representatives of the Lower House, to whom had been assigned that duty:—Rev. Dr. Langtry, Ven. Archdeacon Lindsay, Ven. Archdeacon Kaulbach, Very Rev. Dean Partridge, Very Rev. Dean Innes, Very Rev. Dean Smith, Dr. Heneker, Mr. Strachan Bethune, Mr. R. T. Walkem, Judge Hanington, Hon. Geo. Irvine and Dr. L. H. Davidson. The delegation consisted of the Bishop of Maine, the Bishop of Michigan, Rev. Dr. Brown, of New York; Rev. Dr. Prowell, of Michigan; Gen. John Marshall Brown and Mr. Sowden, of Boston.

Bishop Lewis, Metropolitan, having in a few kindly words introduced the delegation, the Bishop of Maine explained that they brought the cordial greetings of the Sister Church in the States, and they thanked the Synod most heartily for the welcome accorded them. He remembered, he said, how, in the first year of his Episcopate, when he went as a stranger to Maine, he was cordially greeted by his nearest Bishop, who was subsequently Metropolitan of Canada, the late Rev. Dr. Medley. In that year he was also present at a meeting of the Canadian Provincial Synod, presided over by the Rev. Dr. Fulford, the then Metropolitan. He remembered also that he assisted at the consecration of three of the Bishops: then on the platform, those of Fredericton, Niagara and Nova Scotia. He considered that these were peculiar circumstances which ought to draw the Church in Canada and the United States into sympathy with each other. His Lordship then

went on to refer to the fact that Nova Scotia received its first Bishop in 1787, the same year as the American Church received the Episcopate from the Mother Church. Proportionately to the population, Canada was stronger to-day in regard to clergy and bishops than was the United States. But the Church of the latter had done something; it had covered the country nominally. He referred to the fact that the Canadian Church having founded missions on Alaskan soil before that country came into the possession of the United States, and said it was his intention at the forthcoming convention of his Church to suggest that instead of appointing a Bishop for Alaska, they request the Bishop of Selkirk to perform Episcopal acts on the Yukon River, compensating him for the same.

The Bishop of Michigan alluded to the fact that from 1785 to 1821 or 1822, when there was a little band of Churchmen in what was now the prosperous city of Detroit, whatever ministrations of the Church they enjoyed were rendered by clergymen of the Canadian Church, a fact for which he (the speaker) that day desired to express grateful acknowledgments. He referred to the remarkable spread of the Church within the last half century in both Canada and the United States, every acre of the latter of which was now under Episcopal jurisdiction.

Rev. Dr. Brown congratulated the Church in Canada on the prosperity which had marked its history during recent years, and also upon the consolidation which had been effected in its unity. In conclusion, he spoke of the wonderful success of the Woman's Auxiliary.

Rev. Dr. Prowell spoke of the equality of the bishops in the American Church, and said he hoped that this would always be preserved, for he was sure that so long as it continued peace and prosperity would rest upon them. He congratulated the Church in Canada upon the fact that it had become one ecclesiastically, and remarked that the Churchmen of the United States had sometimes been surprised that this coming together had been so long delayed. "As we all hope," he concluded, "that England and her colonies may come closer and closer together in one great federation, so do we hope that the other great branch of the English-speaking people will not be left out, and that as there is a confederation of dioceses, so may there be a confederation of all the English-speaking people."

General J. M. Brown having spoken a few words of greeting, Mr. Sowden spoke of the great good which was being done in the States by Church clubs in the way of training laymen, not only in the ceremonials of the Church, but also as members of standing committees and delegates to conventions; and this would go on until the Church had got a body of trained, thoughtful, educated Churchmen, men who had got the Church idea in them. He recommended Churchmen in Canada to establish such clubs in the cities and larger towns, and that they go into fellowship with their brethren in the States and discuss with them all such questions as ought to interest Churchmen.

The Prolocutor, on behalf of the lower house, and the Metropolitan, on behalf of the upper house, having expressed thanks to the delegation for its words of fraternal greeting, the delegation and the bishops withdrew, and the lower house adjourned for luncheon.

During the morning session the lay secretary, Dr. L. H. Davidson, announced the reception of a memorial from the Synod of the Diocese of Toronto in favour of an increase in the Episcopate.

The report of the treasurer was also submitted. It showed receipts amounting to \$1,311.44, and an expenditure of \$811.95, leaving a favourable balance of \$499.49.

The report of the nominating committee was likewise presented, and was concurred in.

On the Synod reassembling in the afternoon, the first business was the consideration, clause by clause, of the following message from the upper house:

"That the following words be added at the end of Canon XIV.: 'And no bishop within this province shall hereafter ordain, license, institute or create anyone who has not subscribed to the foregoing declaration and taken the foregoing oaths.'"

"That Canon II., being now included in Canon XIV., be repealed, and that Canon XIV. be amended by striking out from sec. 2 the words, 'as required by Canon II. of the Canons of the ecclesiastical province.'"

"That Canon XIV. be amended by adding to the seventh line the following: 'Provided that the declarations and oaths, when once taken and subscribed to, shall suffice for every license given in the same diocese.'"

The first and second clauses were concurred in, but the third was dissented from, and, on the motion of Canon Young, seconded by Mr. J. A. Worrell, it was decided that the Prolocutor name a committee to state and submit to the lower house the reasons for non-concurrence in the clause. The following were appointed the committee referred to: Archdeacon Roe, convener; Archdeacon Brigstocke, Canon Young,

Mr. R. T. Walkem, Mr. J. A. Worrell, and Dr. L. H. Davidson.

Canon Henderson moved that the following words be added to the fourth section of the Canon relating to the voluntary preliminary examination: "The same exemption shall be granted to those who pass the English Cambridge preliminary." Canon Henderson explained that the object of the motion was to equalize the privileges of those who had taken the Cambridge preliminary and those who had taken the preliminary examination in Canada. According to the present regulations those who had taken the Canadian preliminary are entitled to exemption from two of the examinations for the degree of B.D.; those who had passed the Cambridge were not. It seemed to him that there was no good reason why the privilege granted to the one should be denied to the other. It must be admitted, he said, that the Cambridge preliminary examination was equally as good a test of attainments as the Canadian voluntary preliminary examination.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Charles Jenkins. Ven. Archdeacon Roe thought there could be no question that the Cambridge preliminary examination was quite equal to the Canadian voluntary preliminary.

After further discussion it was decided to refer the matter to the board of examiners, with a request to report thereon to the lower house.

A message was received from the House of Bishops regarding a letter and a resolution from the Anglican bishops in Japan suggesting the formation of a Canadian diocese on the western coast of Japan. The upper house recommended that a joint committee of the two houses be appointed to study the letter and the resolution, with instructions to make their report to the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society to-day. The Bishops of Toronto, Huron, Niagara and Fredericton, the message stated, had been appointed to represent the upper house on the joint committee.

The message was concurred in, and the following were appointed to represent the lower house on the joint committee: Archdeacon Brigstocke, Archdeacon Kaulbach, Rev. Dr. Pearson, Canon von Ifland, Rural Dean Bogert, Judge Macdonald, Mr. A. H. Dymond, Dr. Alex. Johnson, Mr. Matthew Wilson and Capt. Carter.

Mr. R. T. Walkem moved to amend Canon V. of the Provincial Synod, to the effect that the Court of Appeal might, in its discretion, dispense with the attendance of two of the assessors, and sit with one alone.

This was concurred in, and on motion of Mr. Strachan Bethune, the following was also agreed to:

"(a) To amend Canon V. of the Provincial Synod as follows: By inserting after the word 'them' in the first line of the sixth paragraph, the words, 'when all three assessors are present, or one of said assessors, when only one of them is present,' and by striking out the words 'the assessors' in the second line of the said sixth paragraph. (b) By inserting after the word 'assessors' in the first line of the seventh paragraph, the words, 'or assessors.' (c) And by inserting after the word 'court' in the second line of the eleventh paragraph, the words, 'or the Metropolitan or the president of the upper house, or the senior bishop in their absence.'"

A message was received from the upper house to the effect that the memorial of Mr. George Mercer, of Toronto, regarding amendments to the marriage laws of the Province of Ontario, be received and referred to a joint committee, to consist of the Ontario members of the upper house and members of the lower house to be appointed from among the representatives from the Ontario dioceses, the committee to have power to apply to the Ontario Legislature for such amendments to the marriage laws of that province as seemed to them to be called for.

Ven. Archdeacon Brigstocke moved that the message be concurred in.

Rev. A. Brown, in seconding the motion, said that any person who had any acquaintance with the marriage law of Ontario knew the facilities it afforded for clandestine marriages, and that under it those portions of the province which were adjacent to the States gave greater facilities for clandestine marriages than did the adjoining States. In Windsor the marriage rate, in proportion to the population, was very much greater, some 100 per cent., than any other town in Ontario. The reason was, he believed, that in the State of Michigan, when a marriage license was required, it was necessary that the names of the parties should be published within a given period. The consequence was that many persons in Detroit who did not wish their names to be published or their marriages to be made known, went over to Windsor. The license system was an invitation to young people to get privately married. He was sure that licenses were granted in a great many cases without any investigation or publicity; that perjury was committed, and the clergyman was an innocent party in solemnizing marriages that were an outrage against the laws of God and man. He thought that it would be within the memory of the clergy of