

amendment that the word "allowing" be inserted after "necessity of," so that the whole clause will read: That in any scheme of union the Synod affirms the necessity of allowing the retention of provinces under a general synod."

Dr. Langtry made a vigorous speech. He swept aside the objections that the Provincial Synod would have nothing to do when they formed a general synod. Why, it would have more to do. Some people did not like that phrase "shall have no coercive power." They were rather afraid of it. The coercion simply depended upon whether the Provincial Synod would have any of it or not. If they did not want it, they need not accept it. That was all. What was meant by the clause which left matters of doctrine, discipline, and worship to the General Synod, it had been asked. Just such questions as had lately been decided in the British courts—he took it that that was something like what the Winnipeg Conference had in their minds. There had been heresies in the Church in the past; there would be heresies in the future; "Aye, even in Canada," said Dr. Langtry, significantly, "and possibly before many years, a Synod of this kind may be necessary to deal with heresies and the form of worship."

Dr. Davidson, with much logical force, pointed out what he called the absurdity of the contention that in spite of the refusal of Montreal and other dioceses to join the scheme with the provincial systems retained, there could be any legislation on this subject. It would not do to say, no matter about Montreal, no matter about Rupert's Land, we will proceed with the scheme. That was childish. "Was this the union of the Church?" the speaker sarcastically asked. The first block to the scheme came from Rupert's Land, which insisted as an essential upon the retention of the provincial system. Civilly, they were dreadfully over-governed. Why should they be over-governed ecclesiastically. He favoured a motion like Mr. Wilson's.

Rural Dean Bogert was of opinion that the question which they should keep before them was how were they to effect this union and how were they to retain it? If it could be effected and retained without any legislation by some sort of moral force, he thought that they would all be glad and would say: "Let us do so." But it could not be done. There must be some power and synod in order to retain this unity of the different parts, and to retain the unity of the whole with the Mother Church in England. Therefore, why not now establish a synod which would say to the existing provinces: "Go on as you are; deal with matters of doctrine, worship and ritual, if you can manage to go on and keep as you are in unity with the Church of England; but if it be necessary to step in, if it be necessary to throw about the Church in Canada some guard, this upper court will do it." Let the General Synod be established simply for retaining unity in the Church in Canada and the Church in England.

The Rev. J. de Soyars thought that there should always be from the General Synod an appeal to the Convocation in England, which he hoped would soon be the one Convocation, with the Archbishop of Canterbury at its head. There were certain busy theologians who were always rushing forward with measures where the sober old Church of England was afraid to tread, and who would bring the Church law possibly into conflict with the law of the land. So long as there were provincial synods there was not much danger of this, but when they got that really grand deliberative body which the Canadian National Synod would be, there would be a danger, unless there could be an appeal to the Mother Country, that it might, by a hasty vote, saddle them with a terrible burden, which it would be easier to lay on their shoulders than to take off.

Provost Body earnestly argued for the retention of the Provincial Synods; Mr. Worrell thought they could not retain them as at present constituted, and erect the General Synod in the manner proposed; while Judge Hannington insisted upon their retention, because they were schools where Churchmen learned to appreciate not only the good qualities of the Churchmen of the Province of Canada, but they also learned to have a higher appreciation of their status, and, he trusted, of their obligations, not as congregations, but as members of the direct body of the Church.

The Synod adjourned.

*Tuesday.*—After the opening the Rev. J. C. Roper continued the discussion on Church Consolidation, arguing for the retention of Provincial Synods.

Mr. C. R. W. Biggar favoured the establishment of a general synod, and expressed the opinion that much of the opposition and argument for delay was due in a great measure to the same feeling as Sir John Macdonald said he experienced in bringing about Confederation. Those who were at present big men in little provinces preferred it to being little men in big provinces, or, in other words, they preferred being big toads in small puddles to little toads in big puddles.

The Ven. Archdeacon Bedford Jones argued

for a supreme court of appeal whose functions would be, not to initiate laws, but to confirm them.

Several more speeches were made; in the result the following clause was carried:—

"1. Proposed Constitution.—There shall be a General Synod consisting of the Bishops of the Church of England in the Dominion of Canada and the Diocese of Newfoundland, and of delegates chosen from the clergy and the laity."

Mr. Walkem then moved the next clause as follows:—

"The delegates shall be chosen by the several Diocesan Synods according to such rules as they may adopt, or, in a diocese which has no synodical organization, may be appointed by the bishop. The representation shall be as follows: Dioceses having fewer than 25 licensed clergymen, one delegate from each order; dioceses having 25 and fewer than 50 licensed clergymen, two of each order; having 50 and fewer than 100, three of each order; dioceses having 100 licensed clergymen and upward, four of each order."

This led to an animated discussion.

The Rev. Mr. Roper wanted to add "provincial synods" before diocesan synods in the clause; but Dr. Johnson pointed out that by passing that the Synod would stultify itself, as in the morning it had decided to leave the whole question of the provincial synods in abeyance, and Archdeacon Evans said that if provincial synods were insisted on, the whole scheme would be wrecked. He earnestly asked for concession in this matter; let not the retention of the provincial synod be insisted on, at least, for the present.

Canon Worrell moved and Canon Body seconded an amendment to the effect that after the word "bishop" the following be inserted:—"The prolocutors of the several provincial synods shall be delegates."

After discussion a vote was called, with the result that the amendment was lost and the motion for adopting the paragraph carried.

The adoption of the third paragraph of the clause was moved by Mr. R. T. Walkem as follows:—

"The representation shall be as follows:—Dioceses having fewer than twenty-five licensed clergymen, one delegate from each order; dioceses having twenty-five and fewer than fifty licensed clergymen, two of each order; dioceses having fifty and fewer than one hundred, three of each order; dioceses having one hundred licensed clergymen and upwards, four of each order."

Provost Body moved in the direction of leaving to the general meeting in Toronto the question of increasing the representation on the General Synod. This was carried.

The following messages were received in the course of yesterday's proceedings from the House of Bishops:—

"Resolved, whereas the sum of \$40,000 has been invested for the endowment of the Diocese of Algoma, yielding an interest of \$1,900 per annum; and whereas the pledge given in 1886 for the stipend of the Bishop of Algoma expired in 1891, and it becomes necessary to make further provision for said stipend, therefore,

"Resolved that this house recommend to the lower house the adoption of a resolution urging upon the several diocesan synods the necessity of renewing for a further term of three years their further pledges for the stipend of the Bishop of Algoma in the same proportion and amounts from each diocese as hitherto prevailing, in order that the interest and sum now invested may be added to the capital, and the bishop aided to that amount in meeting the conditions on which the S.P.G. and S.P.C.K. and Colonial Bishopric's fund promised a further grant of £500 sterling each to the endowment fund."

"The upper house having had its attention directed to section 10 of the constitution, which provides that both houses should approve of the manner of providing for and managing the financial concerns of the synod, desires information on the subject from the committee of the lower house that they may be able to express their approval or otherwise."

During the day also, the Prolocutor read the following telegram from the Bishop of Algoma:

"The Bishop of Algoma thanks the lower house gratefully for their sympathy, and is glad to report himself a little better, and prays for them right judgment in all things."

*Wednesday.*—The Synod met at ten o'clock.

After the reading of the minutes, the Rev. Septimus Jones read the report of the Committee on Reciprocity in benefits of Widows' and Orphans' Fund. It recommended a relaxation of the severity of the rule in several dioceses respecting the incidence of these funds; a general agreement with the action of the diocese of Fredericton, which continued to the departing clergymen all the benefits from those funds, provided they continued to make the necessary payments; that the committee be combined;

and, generally, that the various dioceses deal with this matter in a generous and liberal spirit, so as to put an end to the hardship which now undoubtedly exists with respect to the participation in the funds of clergymen who leave one diocese and go to another, and, under present usage, lose their interest in these funds.

The Prolocutor, for the information of the House, stated that, with the bishops and clergy, and laity from Provincial Synods and independent Synods, the General Synod would number 86.

*Episcopal Delegates.*—A message was received from the Upper House to the effect that the House had appointed the Lord Bishops of Niagara and Fredericton as the delegates of that House to the convention of the American Episcopal Church.

*Church Consolidation.*—The debate on "Church Consolidation" was resumed. The question of permitting non-resident delegates to take part in the General Synod caused a great deal of discussion. Mr. Bayley was in favour of admitting non-resident delegates; Provost Body was against it; Canon Dickson said the expense of bringing delegates from the Mackenzie River and other very distant places would be very great, and that therefore non-resident delegates should be allowed to represent the dioceses. Canon Brigstocke argued strongly for resident delegates, and insisted that if this were not realized the scheme would fail of fulfilment; Judge Hannington took similar ground, pointing out that if non-resident delegates were allowed, real, live, active interest in the Synod would be lost, and a great mistake would be made; Archbishop Roe held that if people who lived in the centre were permitted to be delegates the result would be that power and influence would be in the hands of a few men, which would surely defeat the end in view. On the other hand, Mr. Wilson held that those who lived at an immense distance, and who could not reach the scene of the conference, except at a great expense, which they could ill afford, should be allowed to provide proxies. He suggested leaving the matter to the General Synod.

The Rev. Mr. Nesbitt thought there was more in this matter than appeared on the project. To admit non-residents to take part in the deliberations of the Conference, men who could have no real interest in or knowledge of the matters affecting the several dioceses, would be a great disaster. Dr. Davidson pointed out that only ten delegates to the General Synod could be affected by direct representation, and he would ask, was it worth while to interfere with the general scheme for that consideration. All the delegates from the other dioceses were within easy reach of the General Synod.

The Rev. Mr. Williams held that as the Pope of Rome, who was a rather important personage, was represented by proxy in the ancient Church, surely there was no reason why the diocese of Moosonee and Mackenzie River might also be heard by proxy!

In the result, the matter was left to the consideration of the General Synod as set forth in the constitution.

Mr. Bayley then moved that there be a vote by dioceses in the General Synod. To this Canon Von Iffland took strong exception on the ground that dioceses from such centres of intellectual thought as Toronto would be far more valuable than missionary dioceses, the delegates from which, in the nature of things, could not occupy their minds with such weighty matters as worship, discipline. The effect would lead to vicious results. On the other hand, Archdeacon Roe held that the vote by dioceses was a conservative safeguard which would prevent any one strong and valuable, and, say, intellectual dioceses, from swamping the work of the General Synod. Chancellor Walkem held that the missionary dioceses did not want what was now proposed to give them. Why should this be given them when it never entered their minds to demand it? Canon Bogart held that the outlying dioceses might give their suffrages to one or two men, and thus defeat the proper legislation of the Church. Canon Weston-Jones insisted that, according to the New Testament, one man was the equal of another man. In matters of religion surely they were all brethren. That was certainly the opinion of the Saviour. Influence or pecuniary considerations, or talents, should not outweigh justice to all. Voting by dioceses was really prepared in the interests of justice.

Archdeacon Bedford-Jones hoped there would not be perpetuated in the General Synod what was so deplorable in the politics of this country, namely, the representation in Parliament by gentlemen of so many parts of the country, instead of a patriotic representation of the whole. He would fain hope that the members of the new Synod would be, first of all, ardent Churchmen, and that instead of indulging a sectional or merely diocesan feeling, all the members would work heartily and loyally in the interests of the whole Church.

Chancellor Heneker was opposed to voting by dioceses, while Dr. Hemming considered it essential to the principle of justice. Mr. Worrell would not