

DR. M'KINNON LIKELY CHOICE

May Be Elected Moderator of
General Assembly

SESSIONS OPEN ON JUNE 7

St. Stephen's Church, Winnipeg,
Scene of Gathering

BY CLERIC.

It is just six years since the General Assembly met in Winnipeg. Montreal, London, Hamilton, Ottawa and Toronto have been visited in the meantime. There will be considerable changes to anyone who attends the opening session on Wednesday, June 7, in St. Stephen's Church, in the Manitoba capital.

The platform is entirely different, with the eloquent, scholarly and ecclesiastical figure of the venerable clerk, Dr. Robert Campbell, Montreal, absent. He met with an accident some time ago which was the cause of his lamented death. In his place Dr. Thomas Stewart, formerly a professor in the Presbyterian College, Halifax, will be seated. Then the tall, quiet, though able and dignified leader, Dr. John Somerville, joint clerk and treasurer, is no longer in his honored place. Dr. Robert Laird, Toronto, has succeeded him.

At that time Dr. A. S. Grant and Dr. J. G. Shearer were a strong team in the department of home missions and social service. The former resigned and the latter has accepted appointment as general secretary of the interdenominational social service work. Dr. W. H. S. Sedgewick, Hamilton, is convener of the united boards. Dr. R. D. Fraser was then, not only editor and business manager of the publications, but acted as assistant clerk of the assembly. Dr. J. M. Duncan and Rev. D. M. Solandt are now in charge. It is pathetic to recall the great affliction which has fallen upon Dr. Fraser, namely, the complete loss of sight. Otherwise he is quite well.

Fraternizing greetings were presented by the Methodist Church of Canada by Dr. Crumney and Sir James Alkana. The Anglicans had a strong delegation in Dean Coomes, Col. Carruthers and W. J. Tupper. The Church of Christ, Disciples, was represented by Dean Lamon, and the Baptists by Principal John A. Gordon, Brandon, and Mr. A. M. Marshall, Winnipeg.

A GREAT DEBATE.
The great debate of the session was on church union. Right at the threshold of the discussion a protest was raised by Rev. W. Leslie Clay, D. D., Victoria, and signed by six other members of the court, to the effect that the assembly could not entertain a motion to set aside the constitution of the church, and if it did, the motion would be null and void. The question is not to be taken that they have yielded this legal point.

Notwithstanding this, Dr. W. J. Clark, Montreal, moved, seconded by Dr. M. Mackinnon, Regina, the union motion which contained the definite clause—do not resolve to unite—and made provision for carrying out the policy of union and report to the first assembly "following the end of the first year after the close of the war." The amendment to this by the anti-unionists was moved by Dr. E. Scott, Montreal, and seconded by Dr. W. L. Clay, Victoria. Their policy was that, since the church is not ready for union, to prosecute co-operation and urge the new union congregations, some 12 or 15 in all, to connect themselves with one or other of the existing churches. When this amendment was put 102 voted in its favor.

President Falconer, Toronto, presented another amendment, containing the vital sentence—resolve to unite, but owing to the war "the actual consummation be deferred." Major John Pringle, seconded, but it was lost on division, getting only 202 votes. Still another amendment was proposed by the Prof. Ballantyne, later moderator of the assembly and now only recently passed away, and seconded by Dr. Herridge, at present supplying Grace Methodist Church, Winnipeg, which had the significant phrases—unite immediately to proceed; declare union to be the definite policy, but in the interval co-operate in the department of Christian work. This also failed to get a majority, only 170 voting in its favor. The original motion, which had stood all assaults of feeling and logic, was then carried by 406 to 90. There were 44 who either were unavoidably absent or evaded the vote.

The actual taking of the vote was a solemn and lengthy session. Every name was called and they are found printed in the minutes. Equally serious was the protest and dissent made by the opposition. Thirty-one names were signed. It not only contained the above-mentioned clause of incompetency, but declared that only those who voted against the union have the legal right to transact the business of the assembly. This declaration, however, was answered at length by a committee of the following able men: Principal Gandler (convener), President Falconer, Dr. R. D. Fraser, Dr. D. M. Ramsay and J. A. Paterson. The gist of their defense was: The constitution of the union church is essentially the same; the Barrier Act provides for the modifying of doctrine and government; majorities rule not "groups of individuals who defy the decisions of the church courts."

DR. BAIRD IN CHAIR.
The moderator of the last assembly at Winnipeg was Rev. Dr. Baird, who was highly complimented by all parties for the grace, ability and fairness with which he officiated in the chair. His successor is still in doubt. Probably a man from the Far East—Principal Clarence Mackinnon, Halifax—has the

Bilious Attacks

Are Usually Due
to Constipation

When you are constipated, there is not enough lubricant produced by your system to keep the food waste soft. Doctors prescribe Nujol because its action is so close to this natural lubricant. Nujol is a lubricant—not a medicine or laxative—so cannot gripe. Try it today.

Nujol
For Constipation

DECLARES WILSON TRIAL POSTPONED

Canadian Press Denies London
Is Acquitted

LOS ANGELES MESSAGE

Contradicts Telegram Received
by Friends in This City

A message was received yesterday afternoon by the Canadian Press from Los Angeles via New York contradicting the message received by Londoners on Monday to the effect that Herbert Wilson, former superintendent of the City Mission here, had been acquitted on a charge of robbing the United States mails. The message confirms the Canadian Press dispatch of a week ago that the robbery charge had been postponed pending disposal of the murder charge.

LAST CLAUSE OF LOAN COMPANIES ACT DROPPED

TORONTO, May 30.—With a view to meeting the objections raised by the federal authorities to the old act, Hon. W. D. Raney introduced in the Legislature to-night a bill to amend the Loan and Trust Corporations Act passed last year, by striking out the last clause. This provides for the suspension of cancellation of the registry of such companies under certain conditions.

Mr. Raney explained that Superintendent of Insurance Evan Grey reached an agreement with the federal authorities that the clause objected to should be dropped.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

Mr. Grey explained that Superintendent of Insurance Evan Grey reached an agreement with the federal authorities that the clause objected to should be dropped.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

ACREAGE OF 12,760,040 SOLD TO SETTLERS UNDER DOMINION ACT

OTTAWA, May 30.—A total acreage of 12,760,040 has been sold to settlers in Alberta and Saskatchewan under the Dominion Lands Act, according to a statement in the Commons to-day by Hon. A. C. Stewart, minister of the interior. Of this acreage 4,155,738 had been patented and 8,604,302 were not yet patented. The amount paid in the lands pre-empted was \$14,880,067 and there was yet approximately \$12,000,000 unpaid. Purchased homesteads totaling 1,322,840 acres had been sold in these two provinces, on which the revenue was \$3,274,520 and on which approximately \$500,000 was yet unpaid.

MUST AWAIT DECISION OF THE APPEAL COURT

No Further Progress Can Be Made Until Then in the Huston Probe

TORONTO, May 30.—After a morning spent in examination of Richard Richardson, assistant secretary and registrar of the Dominion Board of Railway Commissioners in regard to negotiations and action of that body in regard to the reduction of the freight rates on pulp wood, the inquiry into the charges of A. C. Lewis, M.P.P., against the attorney-general's department in connection with the death of Capt. Orville Huston at Fort Frances was adjourned until Thursday, June 1. The oral evidence was practically concluded at this morning's session. Gordon Waldron, K.C., intimated that further evidence might possibly be adduced, and stated that the commission had now to await the decision of the Court of Appeal in regard to the production of the telegrams which passed between G. C. Porter, The Winnipeg Telegram correspondent, and the editor of that paper.

Herbert Wilson, former well-known Londoner, was arrested in Los Angeles shortly before Christmas on a charge of complicity in a mail robbery at the corner of First and Alameda streets, in which several men held up a mail truck and obtained loot valued at close to a million dollars. Herbert Cox, said to be another of the alleged gang, was arrested at the same time. The men made a daring attempt at escape about two months ago, during which Cox was shot, dying a few minutes later. The authorities claim that Wilson fired the shot which killed Cox and he is to be tried for murder shortly.

Frank Wilson, who was arrested near the courthouse at the time of the attempted escape and held as an ac-

complish in the attempted escape, was allowed his freedom about two weeks ago. Helen Gillespie, a woman charged with assisting in the attempted escape, was also released.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

ACREAGE OF 12,760,040 SOLD TO SETTLERS UNDER DOMINION ACT

OTTAWA, May 30.—A total acreage of 12,760,040 has been sold to settlers in Alberta and Saskatchewan under the Dominion Lands Act, according to a statement in the Commons to-day by Hon. A. C. Stewart, minister of the interior. Of this acreage 4,155,738 had been patented and 8,604,302 were not yet patented. The amount paid in the lands pre-empted was \$14,880,067 and there was yet approximately \$12,000,000 unpaid. Purchased homesteads totaling 1,322,840 acres had been sold in these two provinces, on which the revenue was \$3,274,520 and on which approximately \$500,000 was yet unpaid.

MUST AWAIT DECISION OF THE APPEAL COURT

No Further Progress Can Be Made Until Then in the Huston Probe

TORONTO, May 30.—After a morning spent in examination of Richard Richardson, assistant secretary and registrar of the Dominion Board of Railway Commissioners in regard to negotiations and action of that body in regard to the reduction of the freight rates on pulp wood, the inquiry into the charges of A. C. Lewis, M.P.P., against the attorney-general's department in connection with the death of Capt. Orville Huston at Fort Frances was adjourned until Thursday, June 1. The oral evidence was practically concluded at this morning's session. Gordon Waldron, K.C., intimated that further evidence might possibly be adduced, and stated that the commission had now to await the decision of the Court of Appeal in regard to the production of the telegrams which passed between G. C. Porter, The Winnipeg Telegram correspondent, and the editor of that paper.

Herbert Wilson, former well-known Londoner, was arrested in Los Angeles shortly before Christmas on a charge of complicity in a mail robbery at the corner of First and Alameda streets, in which several men held up a mail truck and obtained loot valued at close to a million dollars. Herbert Cox, said to be another of the alleged gang, was arrested at the same time. The men made a daring attempt at escape about two months ago, during which Cox was shot, dying a few minutes later. The authorities claim that Wilson fired the shot which killed Cox and he is to be tried for murder shortly.

Frank Wilson, who was arrested near the courthouse at the time of the attempted escape and held as an ac-

complish in the attempted escape, was allowed his freedom about two weeks ago. Helen Gillespie, a woman charged with assisting in the attempted escape, was also released.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.

He felt that its removal did not materially affect the last year's legislation.