

Delegate before
of his expenses,
having no claim

er's report deals
ters mentioned
treasurer be ex-
committee. The

\$1,455.91; Oct.
70.35.

s, distributing,
on account of
ments, viz: To
umbria, \$149.29;
ppelle, \$85.28;
e, \$57.95; Sac-
otal, \$1,455.91.

alkem presented
itting a canon
of appeal for the
eals against the
courts on ques-

where a bishop
erse to him has
ermine whether
an or Provincial
is to consist of
nada and of five

court may be ex-
f not less than
this committee
all court, except
assent of two-

make it binding.
unicants of the
and resident in
me court of law
least ten years

ise the court on
sit as members
members of the
ndgment. The
rt are all set out

and considera-
of that on the
to be sent to the

alkem presented
e on the consti-
tutional.

ame a scheme
e tribunal under
ynod, have the
on for adoption

urt of appeal for
ion of Canada:
of appeal for the
einafter referred

shall be called
the Church of

after presented,
ediction to hear
judgments or
astical province,

al, or as a court
e judgments or
e bishop of
vincial court of

reme court only
affect the sub-
—or where a
adverse to him

e request of any
the House of
thority to deter-

y the Synod of
tutional or ultra

e request of any
the House of
ity to determine

passed by any
any question of
ubmitted for its

the supreme court
ept when such
y written docu-
n appeal from a

bishop.
composed of all
and in Canada
al Synod, and of
manner herein-

the court may be
consisting of the
of a sufficient
d by the House

of Bishops to make up the number of the committee to no less than seven. Should any of the members of the committee be made to act, or should it be desirable that any particular number shall not act, his place shall be filled by another bishop to be elected in the manner aforesaid. The judgment of the committee shall be regarded as the judgment of the full court except in cases involving any question of doctrine, in which cases no decision shall be valid or binding unless and until a copy of such decision and the reasons therefor shall have been sent to all the bishops, and the concurrence of two-thirds of the bishops in the decision shall have been obtained in writing. Should two-thirds of the bishops fail to concur in the conclusion arrived at by the committee, the judgment appealed from shall not be enforced and shall not be regarded as affirming or denying any doctrine.

9. The duty of presiding in the court of appeal shall belong in the first place to the Primate, next to the Metropolitan in the order of seniority, next to such bishops as may be elected president by the bishops sitting on the appeal.

Assessors.—10. There shall be five lay assessors resident in Canada, communicants of the Church of England in good standing, and judges of some court of law in the Dominion, or barristers of at least ten years' standing at the bar of any of the provinces, at each regular session of the General Synod; the Upper House shall send down the names of five persons qualified as aforesaid to the Lower House. If any of them be not accepted, the Upper House shall send down another name, or other names as may be required. Should this second nomination not be acceptable, the Upper House alone shall appoint, but no person shall be so appointed who has been rejected by the Lower House. The assessors so appointed shall continue to be assessors until they have been replaced or re-appointed. Should a vacancy occur between two sessions of Synod by death, resignation or disqualification, such vacancy may be filled by the Primate or Metropolitan.

11. The assessors shall advise the court on all questions which may be submitted to them by the court for their consideration, and shall have right to sit as members of the court during the hearing of an appeal. They shall not, however, be members of the court for the purpose of giving judgment. The court shall sit with at least three assessors. In case any of the assessors should be unable to attend on the hearing of the appeal, an assessor ad hoc duly qualified, as hereinbefore provided, may be appointed by the court to advise instead, for the hearing of the appeal.

12. Any party to a cause or matter which is appealable to the supreme court, may appeal.

13. No appeal shall be for error or defect in form in any proceeding or judgment.

14. The supreme court may only sit in any diocese at such time and place as the president of the court may order and direct.

15. Written notice of appeal from any judgment or decision proposed to be appealed from must be given within — calendar months from the time of pronouncing such judgment or decision. Such notice shall be given to such persons and in such manner as shall be prescribed by the rules of providence to be framed under the provisions of this canon.

16. Every appeal shall be heard and disposed of by the supreme court within two years from the time the judgment or decision appealed from was pronounced.

17. The supreme court shall have power to award costs to any of the parties on appeal, to be paid by the other or others, and to make orders for the giving of security for the costs of any appeal or matter brought before it for its consideration.

18. The supreme court or a committee of members thereof, shall from time to time make all the necessary rules or orders, with respect to the officers of the court, and the mode of appointment, the fees to be paid the officers, the mode in which interlocutory application shall be heard, the procedure in the court, and other matters necessary for the effectual carrying out of the provisions of this canon, and in so doing shall be assisted by the assessors or one of them; such rules or orders may be altered from time to time as may be necessary. They shall be prepared within — months from the passing of this canon, and shall be printed in the journal of Synod as an appendix thereto.

19. The time for taking any proceeding under the provisions of this canon or the rules of procedure may be extended in such manner as the rules may provide.

It was ordered that a copy of this report be sent to the House of Bishops.

Notices of Motion.—Canon O'Meara gave notice of a motion, to be seconded by Judge Hannington, deploring the evils of gambling and betting, and urging the Church throughout the Dominion in every way to discountenance these practices.

Archdeacon Weston-Jones gave notice of a motion, in view of the misunderstanding in reference to the

passing of a resolution respecting a new hymn-book for the Canadian Church, that the resolution be re considered.

The Revised Version.—Rev. Prof. Clark moved, seconded by Mr. A. H. Campbell, the adoption of a resolution providing that the Scripture lessons in the churches may be read from the revised version at such times as may be allowed by the ordinary. The mover referred to a report that had been sent to the Old Country to the effect that a similar motion which he had brought up at the last Provincial Synod of Canada had received the support of only the mover and seconder, as an incorrect statement of the fact. While appreciating the attachment to the ordinary version that prevailed, he did not think that the position of the Church would be improved by retaining its mis-translations. He gave an interesting account of five or six versions that had been produced in some eighty years, and pointed out that the authorized version dating from 1611, had remained untouched from that time. In showing the necessity that existed for a revision, he mentioned that greatly superior manuscripts were now possessed, the three greatest having been discovered since the authorized version was made.

(2) Certainly, also, he said, the New Greek Testament is better known now than it was then. He asked, were we justified in leaving the authorized version in its position simply because it hurts our feelings to correct manifest errors? The rules adopted by the revisers were that they should make only necessary alterations; secondly, that there must be a majority of two-thirds before any change was made. As to the work done, the speaker said there was first the alteration of the Greek text from a comparison of the many various readings. According to the number of these readings was the purity of the text. The text adopted by the revisers was not one of an extreme type, and it did not follow any particular school of critics. It was a rule that they would not introduce any words that had not been in use in the time of King James I. The speaker approved of this; he said he would not have liked to see the Bible translated in the dialect of the Daily Telegraph. He gave a considerable number of examples, taken from Scripture lessons read during the Synod gathering and from other familiar passages, showing the superiority of the revised version, and the manifest errors of the authorized version. The revised version showed where the writers coincided and where they differ. Where the same words were used in the original, as in some passages in Matthew and Mark the same words were used in English in the revised version; while frequently in the authorized version different words were used, the translators having worked apart. The use of the same English words where the Greek words were identical sometimes read awkwardly; but St. Paul wrote awkwardly; the speaker was sorry St. Paul could not write better Greek, but he preferred his awkwardness to the elegances of the authorized version. He did not claim that the revised version was beyond improvement; there were passages in which he would have preferred the word "demon," instead of "devil," as the rendering of "daimon," and he thought "advocate" would have been better than "comforter" for "paraclete;" yet it was of importance as deeply affecting the religious life of this country that we should come as near as possible to the utterances of inspired men.

Dr. Clark spoke for an hour, and delivered an argument for the revised version such as has never been heard before in Winnipeg, and rarely indeed anywhere else. It was a masterly address from every standpoint, and was as fully appreciated by those opposed to the reading of the revised version in the Church as by those in favour of it. The Bible students of Winnipeg would have a great opportunity, the opportunity of a lifetime, if Dr. Clark could be got to deliver a public address during his stay in Winnipeg.

Canon Bland supported the motion, believing the use of the new version at the reading desk would awaken interest in Bible study in the members of the congregation.

Dr. O'Meara held that all members of the Synod were under a deep debt of gratitude to Dr. Clark for his able exposition. The Church of England was above all things the Church of the living word of God; she was the keeper, not the keeper-back, of Holy Writ. He hoped the motion would carry unanimously.

Dr. L. H. Davidson, as a layman, raised his voice against the use of the revised version in the service. He rested his objection on the opinions of able men, and on the custom of the mother Church in England and the great sister Church in the United States. He was afraid the use of different versions would weaken the trustfulness in the authorized version.

Dr. Allnatt, while agreeing with Dr. Clark in many respects, doubted the wisdom of undertaking the responsibility of authorizing the revised version. He also pointed out that the Greek text of the revised version was the text of only one of two schools of critics.

Prof. Johnson, as a layman, agreed with many of Dr. Clark's premises, but entirely disagreed with his conclusions. A point which had been overlooked was that the people had many other opportunities of reading the revised version outside of the Church. Personally, he had been much disappointed in the revised version.

Archdeacon Brigstocke was surprised that after his crushing defeat in the Provincial Synod, Dr. Clark should so early invite a repetition of that disaster. He thought all Prof. Clark's arguments for the revised version were beside the mark. It was but the translation of a committee of eminent scholars for the information of the Church, was never intended to supplant the authorized version, and never would supplant it. The authorized version was the version of the English-speaking world, and had been translated into two or three hundred tongues.

Archdeacon Dixon opposed the change, and read a passage in the two versions to show how unpleasant the revised version was.

One of the audience caused considerable merriment by saying the difference was caused in the reading.

Rev. Finnes-Clinton supported Professor Clark's motion.

Archdeacon Bedford-Jones supported the motion. He had great reverence for the authorized version, but he had greater reverence for God's truth. He asked who authorized the so-called authorized version? It was only a name; the Church had never authorized it.

Judge Hannington thought this resolution was the thin edge of the wedge which would ultimately disrupt and break up the Church. He held it put altogether too much power into the hands of one bishop and one clergyman. Not one religious body in Europe or America had adopted the revised version. He wanted to stand by the Book for which the old fathers of the Church and martyrs were willing to die. The old version was authorized by the Parliament of Great Britain. He had been a Sunday-school superintendent for thirty eight years, and he believed that these changes were likely to tend to the unsettling of the faith of the young. The matter ought to be left to next Lambeth Conference.

Canon Matheson agreed with Dr. Clark's words so far as they had to do with the book, but his speech as to the propriety of reading the revised version in Church was weak. He opposed it on the same ground that he would the revision of the Book of Common Prayer. He did not think such a young daughter should take such a step when the old mother Church had not.

Archdeacon Cooper felt that the great strength of the Church of England was that she always went back to truth. This was the source of her strength in her conflict against Rome and against Geneva. He did not like to stand up and read a version which he knew was not correct. As to breaking away from the practice of the English Church, he held they had already done this in electing Canadian archbishops, and in this matter, if it were right, then let the Church in Canada take the step.

Rural Dean Burman pointed out that the same provision is already granted. The bishops have the power to sanction the reading of the Bible in any tongue understood by the people. The bishops in this Synod now allow the Bible to be read in Cree, Sioux and other Indian tongues, and even Chinese, from versions supposed to be as accurate as could be obtained. This being so, he did not see why a bishop could not allow the Bible to be read in the revised version in English. The principle he claimed is one already admitted.

On being asked from which version these Indian Bibles were translated, Mr. Burman said the New Testament was in most cases translated direct from the Greek and the Old Testament from the authorized version.

Rural Dean Bogert favoured passing the question on to the Lambeth Conference.

Rev. J. C. Roper pleaded for gentleness and time in dealing with this question. He believed with Dr. Clark that it was a better version, but not by any means that it was the best possible version. But even if it were accepted as proposed, it would not affect truth. Some had spoken of martyrs dying for the truth, but in many cases they died for versions other than those from which the present authorized version was taken.

Archdeacon Weston-Jones objected to the use of the revised version chiefly on practical grounds, as its use in some parishes and non-use in others would lead to diversity and consequent trouble.

Mr. N. W. Hoyles took the opposite side to the laymen who had spoken before. He believed that a majority of the studious laymen of the Church were in favour of the revised version. He believed the revised version was one of God's ways of increasing knowledge in these latter days. He wanted a Bible for the common people, not for the clergymen, who had their Greek Testaments. Why should not the