

Mr. Myers Gray, British Columbia, moved for a suspension of the rules of order so that the resolution might be discussed immediately, otherwise he said the diocese of New Westminster would be debarred from attending after the present session. According to the representation now of New Westminster, the diocese was called upon to pay half as much as the dioceses of Toronto, Montreal, Nova Scotia, or any other large eastern diocese.

Ven. Archdeacon Brigstocke had much pleasure in seconding the motion. He held in his hand a document signed by several lay members of the house asking that the matter be brought forward for reconsideration.

Rev. Canon O'Meara said he had been asked by several members to move in the same direction as the Metropolitan of Rupert's Land had done.

It was decided to suspend the rules of order as desired, and Bishop Machray then moved his resolution. He observed that it was contemplated to exclude dioceses with only 10 clergymen. At the present time these smaller dioceses existed simply by the munificence of Churchmen, and if those with only 10 clergymen were taxed there would be no people able to pay the money. Still the same thing practically applied to the dioceses that had only about 25 members. Almost all the clergymen in these dioceses were really there on account of the munificence of Churchmen elsewhere. If the motion as previously adopted was carried into effect, it would simply mean that a number of the dioceses, growing rapidly as far as missions are concerned, could not possibly take part in the work of the Church.

Ven. Archdeacon Brigstocke said he had much pleasure in seconding the motion.

Mr. Matthew Wilson—I would ask his Lordship, does he then intend to require them to pay according to the number of clergymen in the diocese?

Bishop Machray—Yes, of licensed clergymen.

Mr. Wilson—What I wanted to know is this: Does your Lordship intend still to exempt those dioceses having less than 25 clergymen?

Bishop Machray—Yes.

Mr. Wilson—Will your Lordship not agree with me that if you do that—that is, grade the expenses by the proportion of clergymen—that then it should cover all clergymen and all dioceses, because, for instance, Huron, or Ontario, or Toronto, may have strong churches, and may have a strong force of clergymen, yet there are in the out-lying and missionary districts of these dioceses—for instance, north of Lake Superior, and those places—clergymen and parishes that are just as poor and just as unable to contribute as the clergymen or parishes of these missionary dioceses, and I think that your lordships would agree with me that if we are to take the clergymen as the test that then there should be no exception made at all.

Bishop Machray—Well, I pointed out to you that the exemption up to 10 is an absolute necessity. In those cases the clergymen are entirely supported from outside. There are no people that could possibly contribute to it. That does not apply so much to the dioceses that have more than 10. No doubt there may be something contributed, but I think it would be a very difficult position in that case, there being such a total want of parishes that are able to contribute. I think it would be better to leave it as I proposed.

Bishop Sweatman held that the number of clergy in a diocese was no test of its financial position. One of the smaller dioceses for clergy was Columbia.

Bishop Perrin—We have 25.

Bishop Sweatman—In proportion to the number of clergy, that for example is a much wealthier diocese than others having the same number. It is a very imperfect test.

Bishop Perrin expressed his thankfulness for the motion, because otherwise it amounted to actual disfranchisement of his own and several other dioceses. As to the question of 25 members that was not a thing about which they wished to contend.

Mr. Myers Gray wished it to be understood that the delegates from British Columbia did not wish to come to the synod as beggars, but they were willing to pay their fair share of expenses.

Bishop Machray said he was quite willing, if his seconder consented, to have the motion read thus:

"For the expenses of the synod, including the necessary travelling expenses, there shall be an annual assessment of the dioceses, in proportion to the number of licensed clergymen, only exempting those which have only 10 clergymen."

Bishop Sullivan said he was entirely dissatisfied with the proposed further amendment. His diocese at the present moment had under 25 clergy, and practically there was not a parish or mission in the whole diocese able to support its clergymen. Until the last year there were two that had been paying their own clergy. True, the salaries were small, but they were content with them. At the present moment those two missions had to be aided from the general fund simply because the existing circumstances rendered it absolutely impossible to

maintain their clergymen out of their own resources. The adoption of the further amendment would be to disfranchise Algoma and exclude either the bishops, clergy or laity from taking any part in the proceedings of the synod, because it was utterly impossible at the present moment for Algoma to contribute anything towards the expenses of the general synod. The financial position of the diocese was very low, and it would become still lower if further burdens were placed upon it.

Rev. Provost Body pointed out that no one seemed to have noticed the enormous change of principle in the resolution now proposed by the Metropolitan of Rupert's Land. As things stood before, the small dioceses and the large dioceses were graded in the exact proportion of two to four in these expenses. The change proposed simply revolutionized the basis of assessment that prevailed before, and instead of the proportion being divided between the dioceses entitled to send more than one representative in the proportion of two to four, it was going to be in the proportion of one to five or six, or two to twelve.

Rev. Canon O'Meara supported the proposition. If the synod was going to be worth anything it meant that in the case of dioceses with between 10 and 25 clergy their funds from the great centres were going to be largely increased.

Mr. Justice Hannington said it was a misapprehension to say that any diocese would be disfranchised. There was no layman of any means in the eastern part of Canada who would not, if required, contribute his \$30 or \$40 to the support of the weaker dioceses, especially if the payment was spread over a period of four or five years.

The Bishop of Algoma said he would withdraw his opposition; the laity represented by the speaker would come to their assistance.

Bishop Sweatman was prepared to vote for the amendment in spite of the radical change which made it bear heavily upon the diocese of Toronto. One of the reasons for the latter was that the diocese embraced 42 or 43 missions, which were as poor and unable to contribute anything towards this fund as any mission in the North-west. "It is no use," added his lordship, "talking about diocesan disability, because we are all in the same boat."

The resolution was amended to meet the wishes of Mr. Justice Hannington, and was then adopted as follows:

"For the expenses of the synod, including the necessary travelling expenses of the members, there shall be an annual assessment of the dioceses proportioned to the number of licensed clergymen, and only dioceses having less than 10 clergymen being exempt. Provided, however, that the expenses of any member of the synod not attending during the whole session of the synod shall only be paid pro rata, and such proportionate part thereof as his attendance bears to the time the whole synod is in session; and that a standing committee shall be appointed who shall fix and determine the amount to be paid at any time to be determined hereafter; such committee, however, to have a discretionary power to allow a greater proportion in case of absence from illness or other good cause arising during the sitting of the synod."

On motion of the Rev. Canon Pentreath, seconded by Rev. Canon O'Meara, it was resolved:

"That a committee be appointed, to report tomorrow, to consider ways and means for the payment of the expenses of delegates for the first general synod, and that the delegates from each diocese be requested to hand into that committee an approximate estimate of their expenses."

Rev. Provost Body moved the addition of the following clause to the constitution:

"Every canon passed by the general synod dealing with matters of doctrine, worship and discipline shall be formally made known to the provincial synod prior to the affirmation of such canon by the general synod."

Rev. Provost Body observed that his object was to accomplish two things by the motion. First, to prevent any feeling of uneasiness throughout the great body of the Church as to the method to be pursued by the general synod in dealing with these most important matters of doctrine, worship and discipline. It would be a great satisfaction to members of the Church throughout the Dominion to know that in their constitution they deliberately stated that they did not intend to finally pass any measure dealing with these matters until they had received the fullest consideration at the hands of the provincial synods.

Dr. Walkem was glad that the words "for their consideration" had been left out. They had appeared in the motion when it was presented on Saturday.

Rev. Dr. Langtry saw no reason for sending down to provincial synods enactments that they cannot deal with.

Bishop Sweatman pointed out that these bodies would not pass on these enactments; it was merely to promulgate the mind of the synod.

The Metropolitan of Rupert's Land understood

that provincial synods would have the right to affirm such canons, but not to reject them.

Mr. J. A. Worrell, Q.C., would certainly withdraw his support in that case.

Rev. Provost Body stated that the motion was copied from the American canons. It was with the aim of making known the mind of the Church, not to present the canons for the consideration of the provincial synods, which could take action in their own sphere.

Dr. Langtry was opposed to the motion. It hampered the action of this synod by delay, it led to complication, it interfered with the power of this synod by inviting the division they were here to avoid. They were too conservative. The motion would turn the synod into a mere shell, a mere sham.

Bishop Sweatman had been misled by the omission of the words "for their consideration"; all he had understood from the motion was that the canons should be promulgated. He opposed submitting canons to the provincial synod, and would like to know the reasons for omitting the words.

Provost Body explained that the phrase "for their consideration" had been objected to because it instructed provincial synods as to what they should do.

Dr. Walkem, Q.C., pointed out the advantage that the general synod would not take positive action until it heard from provincial synods.

Chancellor Bethune urged that they were treading on very dangerous ground. It might block the purposes for which they were assembled. They could never get a canon passed. It would take a canon 10 years to go through this course. They might as well tear up the constitution.

The Bishop of Athabasca thought that they should know and receive the sense of provincial synods. The chief business of this synod would be before them so long a time that they could form mature opinions on it.

Mr. A. H. Campbell pointed out the advantage that the provincial synods can instruct their delegates to the general synod.

Bishop Sullivan believed that the synod was more than a mere governing body; it was the highest educative body of the Church. They should not shut up the mind of the supreme legislative body of the Church in a mere canon. This motion provides a method of keeping the body of the Church informed. It will require not ten years, but five. There was no danger, as there was no desire of blocking legislation.

The house rose at 12 o'clock to allow time for the Joint Committee of the house to meet to strike standing committees.

(To be continued.)

Home & Foreign Church News

FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENTS.

FREDERICTON.

St. Stephen's.—A celebration of Holy Communion at 7.30 a.m. was the opening service of the Clerical Conference, which met at St. Stephen's on Wednesday and Thursday, Sept. 27th and 28th. The service was held in Christ Church, Rev. O. S. Newnam, rector, in the school room of which parish all the regular meetings were held. Venerable Archdeacon Brigstocke was celebrant, Rev. J. W. Millidge read the epistle, and Rev. H. M. Spike was gospeller. Hymn 157 was sung as a processional, and hymn 182 for a recessional. The first regular meeting of the conference was opened in the Sunday school room adjoining the church, at 9.30 a.m., the Ven. Archdeacon presiding. After the opening prayers the Archdeacon gave a short address dwelling upon the object of the conference and the benefits that it was hoped would be derived by all the clergy directly and by their several parishes indirectly.

The first paper on the programme was read by the Rev. O. S. Newnam, on "The Church in relation to voluntary organizations." After the reading of the paper a discussion ensued which was taken part in by nearly all the brethren who were present.

The second paper was on "Church music," written by Rev. Finlow Alexander, sub-deacon, and read by Rev. C. W. McCully, vicar of Fredericton. This paper was also discussed at some length.

Upon re-assembling for the afternoon session, Rev. Canon Roberts read his paper on "A systematic rule of life and work for the Clergy." A discussion of the subject ensued.

The Rev. E. Sibbald, not being present, the subject upon which he was to read a paper was taken up and discussed in conference, viz., "How to retain the interest of young men in the Church."

At 7.30 p.m. there was evensong in Christ Church. The prayers were said by Rev. R. W. Hudgell. Rev. H. E. Dibblee read the 1st lesson. The 2nd lesson was read by Rev. Canon Roberts. An impressive and practical sermon was preached by Rev. C. P.