

glected the rite, and those not yet prepared for it might receive a little advice occasionally from the Bishop.

I wish in no way to speak disparagingly of the present House of Bishops—they all work nobly and untiringly, but it is impossible for one man to do the work of three, and do it well. I believe all our Diocesans would be glad to see a largely increased episcopate, but they want the dignity of the office kept up by a large stipend. The American Church has shewn us that her Bishops lose none of their dignity, because their salaries are small. Socially, they may not be such "heavy swells" but they are loved and respected and supported by their clergy and laity, and are not a whit behind the wealthiest English Bishop in spirituality.

Why should we have four or five or six thousand dollar Bishops, over six or seven or eight hundred dollar priest? Let each See have an endowment yielding \$1,000 or \$1,200 per annum, so that there will be no fear of the Bishop starving, and then leave the rest to the congregation; they will soon willingly support a Bishop whom they all know, who visits them frequently, is easily accessible to any who want advice, and is never in a hurry when he comes to a parish.

And how cheered would the country clergy be if their Bishop was a real father in God to them, sympathizing with their troubles, encouraging them in their work, advising them in difficulties, visiting wayward parishioners when necessary and understanding thoroughly all the ins and outs of the congregation.

Let us agitate for more Bishops, one for every forty clergy at least, and let us agitate until we get them.

And now I ask for information. Is there no way in which the present endowment funds of the various Sees could be divided, so that as each bishop dies, the four or five thousand dollars he gets may be used for two successors instead of one? I believe the late Metropolitan, during the last eleven years gave half his stipend to the coadjutor, and both these Bishops seemed none the worse for their comparatively small pay.

Let us all write and talk the matter up, so that by next Provincial Synod we shall be prepared for definite action.

PRESBYTER.

October 27, 1892.

CONSOLIDATION.

To the Editor of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN.

SIR,—The communication of a Delegate to the Provincial Synod in your issue of the 19th ult., drawing as it does the attention of the Church to suggested difficulties surrounding the completion of the scheme proposed for the union of the Church in British North America, will no doubt receive the careful consideration of those interested. I do not know that any suggestion of views differing from that writer's is needed; at the same time perhaps it may do no harm.

In the first place it seems apparent that the writer did not closely follow the debate on the subject in the Synod, else he must have heard the difficulties which he suggests met by several speakers, and in a way that seemed to have appreciation and influence evidenced by the large majorities with which the principal provisions of the scheme were carried. No great scheme of union, or any other measure of importance, is carried unanimously; people necessarily differ in such things, some are very sanguine and some quite the other way; some see no difficulties, and some, again, imagine that all new departures will end disastrously. Your correspondent would seem to be of the latter class. Your editorial remarks have answered a large part of his enquiries, but while your explanation to the first branch is literally correct, that there cannot be a "general assembly of all the Church in Canada" until each diocese comes in, because *all* will include each diocese, yet there can be a General Synod of the Church of British North

America, (which is the limit of the proposed union) initiated and carried on practically under the proposed constitution, even though some particular diocese does not immediately become a part thereof, or at present submit to its jurisdiction. The experience of the past practically proves this. The present Provincial Synod was formed, and well established, over several dioceses at present included and represented in it, though some dioceses came in much later than others, and one by one as their respective diocesan synods determined to send delegates thereto, by which action they became an integral part of the Provincial Synod; and the same is the history of the establishment of diocesan synods in Canada, as many of the parishes remained out, sending no delegates and thereby remained beyond the control of the diocesan synod for years after the synod was in full and complete power and organization, and as such had legislative and executive power over the parishes whose delegates attended, while it had none over those parishes not sending delegates.

While it is, no doubt, advisable that all the diocesan synods shall be represented at the first meeting in Toronto in September 1893, and thereby aid and counsel in the work of establishing a constitution for the government of the whole Church, yet it would be a sad thing if the absence of representatives of any one diocesan synod, whether of Canada or Newfoundland, should prevent the inauguration of the great work of Church unity and fellowship, towards which the establishment of a general Synod would seem to be so important a step. There seem to be no such conditions *precedent* to the establishment of a General Synod as your correspondent numbers A, B, C, D, and E, in his communication.

The non-acceptance by any of those dioceses, or the Provincial Synod, will affect only such dioceses as refuse to accept the scheme or send delegates. I do not wish to lessen the responsibility of the dioceses who decline to join the work of consolidation, but it seems best to put it just as it is. Under the scheme as now adopted by the Provincial Synod, the establishment of the General Synod does not impair its powers or jurisdiction, as that is expressly provided for, nor does it impair the rights or powers of the diocesan synods. That is, so far as the Provincial Synod can do it, also provided against. As to the latter there would seem to be no necessity for any such safeguard, for the General Synod has by the proposed constitution only power to deal with matters affecting the *general* interests of the Church, and neither the proposed synod nor the Provincial Synod can do aught to affect what are solely diocesan rights, powers or property. The Provincial Synod, as such, cannot delegate to the proposed General Synod any of the powers it has, to deal with the general matters or interests of the dioceses. It can propose and assent that some of the powers delegated to it may be dealt with in the General Synod, but before such proposition or assent is operative it must be confirmed by the diocesan synod. The Provincial Synod, as I understand it, has not attempted in its action on this scheme to interfere with any of the rights or powers of the diocesan synods.

On the subject of the change of constitution your remarks seem to be quite correct, and a sufficient explanation. The principles of the basis of union are generally defined in the scheme. The constitution will be based on these. Of this I imagine there will be no dispute and so far as it is consistent with the agreed basis no objection can be made to any necessary alteration of the constitution. If the General Synod should at any time seek, by change of constitution or otherwise, to assume a power not delegated to it, its action in that respect would be void. Of this however there would seem to be but the slightest probability.

The objection to the suspension of coercive legislation until confirmed by the diocesan synod seems quite untenable. The principle underlying the whole of the scheme of synods, great

or small, is that each diocese is in a sense a separate Church, a branch of the great Body. The General Synods or Councils, whether called synods, convocations, or conferences, are intended for counsel and advice, unless specially authorized beyond that. Powers of coercion, or otherwise, are only delegated, and are limited to the subjects and extent that the diocesan synods determine in that respect. Therefore there is nothing inconsistent or unusual in the provision referred to. Referring to the canon in Divorce mentioned by your correspondent it does not seem probable that the result will be practically as he says; but even if it were so, would it be more inconsistent or "incongruous" than what is sought to be done in the Provincial Synod? That is, to pass a canon on that very subject, which the Lambeth Conference would not adopt, and also directly contrary to the canons of our sister Church in the United States. The Provincial Synod is not proportionately as important a body in relation to the whole Church as one diocese would be in relation to the Church in British North America. It is easy to imagine difficulties though they may never arise or be practically realized.

As to the fourth objection, that the Provincial Synod will be "abandoned or that the General Synod will be a more parliament in its original sense, or a *debating society* and nothing more" it would seem as if this is thrown in as an "apple of discord" which was used to its utmost in the discussing in the Synod, and failed. Supposing that the General Synod will have no subject of general interest or importance to the Church to deal with that the Provincial Synod has not now, (which is undoubtedly not the case,) as well, nay, better, might your correspondent apply the term "debating society" to that august and wonderful council of the Church, the Lambeth Conference, as to the proposed synod. What coercive or legislative power had the Lambeth Conference? Yet it had a well recognized and wonderful influence. Did it not deal with subjects of general interest to the Church, and yet not coerce? But there are subjects of general interest to the Church of B.N.A. suggested to be dealt with by the General Synod in which the Provincial Synod have not power, within the ecclesiastical province of Canada, to legislate upon and carry into execution? No one who understands the subject admits that the Provincial Synod, and the General Synod, in the scheme proposed have "co-ordinate powers," and therefore it is useless to discuss the imaginary conflict. Beside this, one is a council or synod of the whole Church in B.N.A., and the other of only a portion.

I fear it must be admitted that the concluding paragraph of your correspondent's letter is ill-advised, and will fail in effecting any good. That any attempt should be made to excite a feeling of jealousy, as it were, in the minds of those advocating the maintenance of both synods is to be regretted. Why prophesy evil? Who knows as is there suggested that the General Synod will "gradually attain the pre-eminence" over the Provincial Synod? But if the will of God and the Church is that it should, who can complain? Why will the "Church grow impatient," as he says, "of the incongruity which the present scheme presents, of which there is admittedly no precedent?" What proof of incongruity have we? By a very large body of the Church it has not been deemed incongruous. And surely after the facts advanced in the argument at the Synod, especially by the Rev. Mr. Roper, there is abundant proof of such precedent for the course now suggested. But even if there were not such precedent the wisdom of the Church through her representatives can surely suggest and adopt what is deemed best for her guidance and government, and I trust, with the blessing of God, to bring it to a successful issue. Let us work, and in faith and prayer "*go forward*," and we need then have no fear of the result.

Yours truly,
ANOTHER DELEGATE.