BISHOP'S CHARGE FEATURE OF SYNOD YESTERDAY

His Lordship Made Stirring Reference to Position of Church Regarding Remarriage of Divorced Persons--Discussion on Withdrawal of Point duChene Church from Shediac Deanery.

There was a fairly large attendance of clerical and lay delegates at the annual meeting of the Anglican synod of the diocese of Fredericton, which opened in Trinity Sunday school room yesterday afternoon, at 2.30. The formal opening of the synod will take place this morning at 7.30 when the delegates will attend a corporate celebration of the holy communion in Trinity church, his lordship the Bishop of Fredericton, being the celebrant.

The feature of yesterday afternoon's meeting was the charge of his lordship in which he dealt with a number of matters which affect the denomination in particular. Chief among these was the attitude of the church toward the remarriage of one of the parties to a divorce, while the other is still living. The bishop pointed out in no uncertain terms that no priest of the Church of England is allowed to recognize such remarriage.

When the session opened the bishop presided and Archdeacon Newnham was appointed secretary.

The Bishop's Charge.

After calling the roll of the delegates his lordship delivered his charge an abstract of which is as follows:

His lordship in his charge to the synod dealt first with the deaths in the church during the year, referring in this connection to the passing of Rev. T. H. Cuthbert, of Newcastle; G. Sydney Smith, of this city and Miss Lucy V. Pickett, a loyal and worthy churchwoman. Miss Pickett founded in the diocese, the office of a missionary nurse and during her life carried it on. The continuance of the office might prove a difficult problem, but he left it in the hands of the synod.

He exhorted the synod to greater efforts in the line of missionary work which he described as the first duty of the church. The diocese had lost several of its missionaries during the year by removal, retirement and death. There were also several additions but on the whole the balance was against the diocese.

He then referred to his visit to England in search of missionaries and to his having secured several who would come to the province in the near future. At the present time the missionary situation was promising.

The Campbellton Fire.

In reference to the loss which the church had sustained in the Campbellton fire, his lordship spoke as follows:

The Church has met with a disastrous loss in the destruction of the growing town of Campbellton. The facts are so well known that I need not do more than merely mention them. Campbellton was one of the few places in the province of really rapid development, and the Church people there had not been slow to recognize their opportunity. By a vigorous effort within the past few years, the old church building had been enlarged, and put in perfect order, so that the parish was in posession of a really beautiful little place of worship. The rectory, too, had been thoroughly restored. All this work entailed the expenditure of a large sum of money, and there was still a debt upon the parish of more than a thousand dollars, when the fire came to sweep everything away. But, as you are aware, it was not the Church alone which suffered. The town itself was utterly destroyed, leaving some four or five thousand people to begin life again.

Under these distressing circumstances, I felt that the Church at large must come to their assistance, and that as soon as possible. Obviously, the first step was to guarantee the stipend of the rector for the time being, and, accordingly, after consulting with certain members of the Board of Missions, I instructed the treasurer to send the Rev. R. J. Coleman a cheque in full each month until further notice. This arrangement is, of course, subject to confirmation by the board, but I am confident that it will meet with their approval.

Share With Dalhousie.

Our resources are, however, limited, and I have thought it necessary, therefore, to ask the corporation of the Parish of Dalhousie, which is without a rector, to share with Campbellton for the time being the services of Mr. Coleman. This, I have reason to believe, they are willing to do—a generous action on their part which I know you will all heartily appreciate. I may add that I deemed it well that, for the first few months, at least, Mr. Coleman would devote himself altogether to the work at Campbellton. In addition to this, I have issued to the diocese an appeal for financial aid in the rebuilding of the church and rectory, and I trust that the response will be very hearty. I hope to be able to secure some assistance from outside sources, but I feel that we must first be able to show that the diocese has done its part. I have, however, to acknowledge with gratitude an offering from the Cathedral, Quebec, of $93.39, and one of $53.10 from the Parish of Port Hill Prince Edward Island.

An old friend of the diocese, the Rev. Dr. Sills, rector of Trinity church, Geneva, N. Y., has also sent $25.00 as an offering from his Sunday school. It is impossible to say what the result will be of the appeal to the diocese. So far about $600.00 has come in, an amount very far below what might be expected. A number of parishes have, as yet, made no returns, but some of them, I know, have the matter in hand. Fortunately for the Church at Campbellton, the buildings were fairly well insured. It has also been found possible to make a very favorable sale of the old church lot, a new one being purchased for a much smaller sum. The corporation is, therefore, in possession of a fairly large amount with which to face the future. It must, however, be remembered that the members of the congregation will naturally be able to subscribe very little, nor will the parish be in a position to bear the burden of a debt. It will be necessary, therefore, to assist them to the extent of several thousand dollars.

Continuing, His Lordship dealt at length with the question of memorials to deceased members and expressed the hope that resolutions of this character should be made brief and to the point, while there could be provision for any longer references in the journals of the synod. He submitted a statement of conditions in the cathedral church in Fredericton and pressed home to the synod the claims of King's College, Windsor, and the Rothesay Collegiate School for Boys.

One of the important matters to claim the attention of the synod, His Lordship said, was the question of removal from rectories by which plan it is suggested to change the existing regulations of the church to provide that in the case of assisted parishes and missions the bishop shall have the right of appointment or removal of incumbents. This change has already been put in force in the diocese of Nova Scotia and found to work well.

The Divorce Problem.

His Lordship then dealt with what was the most interesting and important matter in his charge—the question of marriage and divorce. On this point he said:—

I find myself reluctantly compelled to turn once more to the question of marriage and divorce. I say "reluctantly compelled," because I had hoped that, for some time, there would be no necessity for me to refer to the subject again in this particular and public manner. The experience of the past year, however, has led me to a contrary conclusion, and I now feel it necessary to put before you in the plainest possible manner certain fundamental facts in connection with the question. Hitherto, I have contented myself with stating with sufficient clearness the terms and meaning of the general synod canon on divorce.

My reason for so doing was that I wished to make it quite clear to all the members of the church that the re-marrage of a divorced person, during the lifetime of the other party to the former union, is not only repugnant to the church's sense of right and wrong, but is absolutely prohibited by canon law. There are, then, no conceivable circumstances which would justify a priest in performing such a ceremony. Such is the church's law, binding in its obligation upon all her members.

I do not propose to speak at any length in its defence. The circumstances of social life under which the canon was enacted are its apologies. It is impossible for any thoughtful man to read the signs of the times without recognizing the need of some bulwark to stem the rising time of immorality; and, in saying so, I am not thinking of Canada alone. Perhaps indeed, the need is less pressing here than elsewhere. Perhaps, without undue complacency, we may claim that the conditions under which we live are unusual in their stability and strength. However that may be, it remains indisputably true that, in respect of moral law and moral character, no nation stands alone.

Lowers Moral Standard.

Every lowering of moral standard makes itself felt—slowly felt, if you like, but inevitably felt—not in this land, or in that land alone, but in all the world. Innumerable factors combine to make that necessarily true. The intercommunication that is so characteristic of modern life; the improved and cheapened facilities of travel; the process by which literature of one nation becomes the literature of every other; the ever-growing power of the press; the appeal of the popular play to the world's dramatic instinct—all these things tend more and more to make moral standards not national but international.

Hence I say that the social circumstances under which this canon was enacted are its defence. Need I remind you of what those circumstances are? I do not desire to speak one exaggerated word. I do not want to paint a picture whose lines are not true to life. Yet who can look out upon the world's life, and fail to find signs of a serious moral declension where the question of marriage is concerned? More and more to this respect social life is becoming chaotic in its character. More and more the old landmarks of right and wrong are being removed. More and more the holy barriers of truth are breaking down. More and more marriage is becoming in the eyes of many a mere contract terminable at the will of either party and upon almost any pretext. More and more for the Scriptural idea of matrimony as an "honorable estate instituted of God," there is being substituted the sense of an earthly union existing only by the fluctuating sanction of a human law. In the face of these facts, is not the church bound to make her position plain? Holding the faith once for all delivered to the saints, is she not imperatively bound to enforce upon her members obedience to moral law?

Why Canon is Needed.

But, if, indeed, defence were needed it ought to be enough, I think, to look in three directions. Let me very briefly remind you of the message that comes to us from each. There is (1) the argument from Holy Scripture for an indissoluble marriage. I do not forget in so saying that there are scholars in the Church, who think that they see an exceptive clause in the language of our Lord in respect to this important subject, and in the strength of that exceptive clause, plead the right of remarriage for the innocent party in a divorce for adultry. One gladly recognizes the good faith with which that plea is made. Yet it remains indisputably true that the only passage,—nay, the solitary text,—that seems to sanction the remarriage of a divorced person even under these circumstances is subject to so many difficulties in the way of extraordinary variations, as to make it almost worthless for purposes of argument. I refer, of course, to St. Matthew 19, 9. Quite distinctly our Lord declares that for one specific cause a man may put away his wife, but, with the sole exception of this one very doubtful passage, nothing is said about his marrying another wife; whilst, on the contrary, in at least three of the Gospels, the adultery of such a second marriage is distinctly stated. From the standpoint of Holy Scripture, therefore, the case for the canon is very strong.

There is (2) the argument from the Prayer Book, and I need hardly remind you how completely that argument is in accord with the enactment of the canon. Nothing could be more emphatically plain than the terms in which a man and a woman, intending to take each other as husband and wife, are required to state that intention.

Plainly Stated.

Amongst other things, they are required to solemly declare that (a) they will "live together after God's ordinance in the holy state of matrimony;" (b) that, forsaking all other, the husband will keep only to the wife, and the wife only to the husband so long as they both shall live; (c) that the union shall be from that day forward, for better, for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health, till death do them part, according to God's holy ordinance.

Is there any doubt as to the meaning of that solemn statement? Do not its terms plainly imply these three things: First, that the estate of matrimony is an ordinance of God and independent of any human legislation, —certainly not in any sense the creature of a Act of Parliament. Secondly, that marriage is strictly an exclusive contract, admitting of no second partner during the lifetime of the first; Thirdly, that nothing but death can dissolve a Christian marriage? So straightforward are those statements, and so plain their implication, that the Church may well indignantly refuse to allow their repetition by any man or woman, whose partner of a former union is still alive.

(3) Add to this the argument from common sense, and enough has been said to amply justify the canon. Let me put to you these questions,—Does the loosening of the marriage tie make for morality or immorality? Will womanhood gain or lose in dignity with the dragging down of marriage from its life-long pedestal to the level of a merely temporary contract? Will the institution of the home be more secure or less secure with increased facilities for divorce? Will the State be stronger or weaker because of this destructive tendency? Will the world be a better or a worse place if this materalizing movement is not checked? I can safely leave these questions with you. Their answers are written large on the face of all human history.

Let me add to what I have said the words of an independent witness, and so far as defence of the canon is concerned, I have finished. I take them from an interesting article by an American writer in the Atlantic Monthly for July. "From the dawn of civilization until now, the family has been the social unit, and the foundation upon which the social structure has rested. The family has been the incarnation of the principle of order. The members of the family have been responsible to the head of the family, who has maintained discipline; and the head of the family has been responsible to the state. When Napoleon evolved the empire out of the chaos of the French revolution, this was the fundamental legal conception which he insisted upon having embodied in his code.

The Family Dissolved.

"The same conditions that have produced the monopoly have dissolved the family. Through divorce modern women assert, and practically exercise, the right of living with what men they please, as long as they please, and changing when they please repudiating all obligations to anyone but themselves. The result has been the dissolution of the family in the sense that parental authority has nearly ceased as a constraining force in society. But parental authority has always been the source of all authority, and the foundation upon which has rested the sanction of all coercive law. As the instinct of obedience is weakened by the decay of parental authority, so must the administration of the criminal law decay, and it has decayed until the president has told us that it is a disgrace to our civilization. And Mr. Taft spoke the truth. Perhaps there has never been a civilized society in the world which has manifested, save during some acute spasm, such lawlessness, when measured by contempt for the police and the magistrate, as American society today."

Perhaps we should not be prepared to make our own the very wording of this frank confession, for to some of us it would seem that the modern man must share with the modern woman the shame of this declension. But we can only bow our heads before the logic of the writer's stern analysis, for few thoughtful men will fail to find in the conjunction of those two unhappy facts—the decay of reverence for marriage as an ordinance of God, and the decay of reverence for law—something more than a mere coincidence. It is hardly possible to escape the conclusion that the one fact is the outcome of the other; and with that admission, it is not difficult to differentiate between the cause and the effect.

Permanent Relationship.

In the light of all that has been said, as Christians, as churchmen, and as men of common sense, we ought not to hesitate to accept that view of marriage which declares it to be a permanent relationship between one man and one woman, indissoluble by all else save death.

So far as the re-marriage of a divorced person is concerned, the canon is very clear. By the corporate action of the general synod, we have cut the Gordian knot of uncertainty and inconsistency by absolutely prohibiting any priest performing such a ceremony as that of which I have been speaking. So far as that prohibition goes, then, it leaves nothing to be desided. But, after all, it only goes a certain distance, and leaves altogether undefined the relationship to the church of those who disregard her law. It provides magnificent machinery of moral law, but it leaves unsolved the problem of domestic discipline. It was with this omission in mind that I spoke of the experience of the past year as leading me to a reconsideration of the subject.

Not once or twice, but several times since the last session of the synod, I have had to deal indirectly with situations in certain parishes, that involved the greatest difficulty; and, generally speaking, the difficulty was the outcome of the fact that the relationship to the church of those who are living in disregard of this particular canon has been left altogether undefined.

Stood By Resolution.

It will, perhaps, be remembered that at last year's synod, I was asked to state my position regarding the admission to the holy communion of those who, having been divorced, have contracted a second union contrary to the church's canon, and I replied that I could go no further than the Lambeth resolution of 1888. That resolution was to the following effect: "That recognizing the fact that there has always been a difference of opinion in the church on the question whether our Lord meant to forbid marriage to the innocent party in a divorce for adultery, the conference recommends that the clergy should not be instructed to refuse the sacraments or other privileges of the church to those, who under civil sanction, are thus married."

Now, I still stand by that resolution in shrinking from pronouncing excomunicate those, who, being entirely innocent themselves, have in perfect good faith entered into unions sanctioned by the State, and solemnized by the ministers of other Christian bodies. But I recognize more clearly than I did a year ago these things,—(1) the grave moral weakness in the Church involved by a grievous want of discipline,—and (2) the necessary limitations of the Lambeth resolution. In the light of those two facts, I do not hesitate to express my own conviction that there ought to be exercised much more careful discrimination in the matter of admitting to the Holy Communion those who are married contrary to the Church's canon. Let me try to show you what I mean by the necessary limitations of the Lambeth resolution. It is only intended to apply to one distinct class of people,—"the innocent party in a divorce for adultery." There you have two distinct and different limitations. It has reference only to a divorce for adultery. That is the first limitation, and, in view of the many light and trivial causes for which, in one part of the world or another, decrees of divorce are granted, it is of very great importance. Let it be remembered that the Church recognizes today, as she has always recognized, one ground only for divorce,—that is adultery. Legal separation she allows, but that is not divorce, and, thank God, the door is not shut upon the penitent. It follows, therefore, that the recommendation of the Lambeth resolution regarding the privileges of the Church applies only to those whose divorce was granted because of adultery. Under the terms of this resolution, no other case can be considered.

Only Innocent Party.

But there is another limitation,—very definite and clear. The resolution has reference only to the innocent party in such a suit. No indiscriminate extension of the Church's privileges is even contemplated. Such an extension, indeed, would be quite contrary to the spirit of the resolution. Before the privileges of the Church may be granted, therefore, to one, who, having been divorced, has married again, there must be reasonable certainty that he or she is the innocent party of the two,—a certainty not easy to arrive at in view of the many and notorious cases of collusion and other obscuring circumstances. Yet,—and here comes the difficulty,—an effort must be made to reach that certainty or there may be danger and degradation in the Church. Whose, then, shall be the responsibility of judging?

The parish priest, some will reply, and there is much to be said in support of that contention. But a moment's thought will suggest many reasons to the contrary. The pressure of public opinion is sometimes very strong, and not easy to resist. Local influences have their weight. There is sometimes danger of a divided parish. All these things have to be considered. Perhaps the best way of dealing with most of these difficulties is to follow the example of the Scottish Church, and refer all such cases to the bishop for his judgment. I hope to see the day when that course will be prescribed by canon, but, in the absence of some specific legislation dealing with the difficulty, I would counsel the clergy to refer to the bishop all cases of whose circumstances they are not sure. I do not suggest that the bishop's judgment is likely to be infallible but I believe that such a reference to authority will strengthen the hands of all of us in dealing with these difficulties by making it quite clear that there is in the Church such a thing as moral discipline.

Let me refer to one more most important point before I leave this subject. I have said that the canon on divorce provides magnificent machinery of moral law so far as the crucial question of re-marriage is concerned, but leaves unsolved the problem of domestic discipline. The failure of the canon consists in this—that it leaves undefined the relationship to the church of those who disregard the law. I have already illustrated the fact of this failure by reference to the holy communion. That relation involves, however, more questions than that of sacramental privileges.

What if a man who has come under the condemnation of this canon, should claim his right to serve as a vestryman in the church? For obvious reasons I put the question to you in this abstract form, but I feel bound to press for its consideration. Here is a perfectly clear law of the church. The fact that the law is addressed to the priest makes no difference at all. The church refuses to recognize the right of its members to contract such a union. It is contrary to law. The church cannot, of course, decide what shall be done, or what shall not be done beyond her borders, but undoubtedly, she has the power to legislate for herself, and in the exercise of that power, she has passed this canon on divorce. But here, let us say, is a man who marries, is divorced and marries again, whilst the other party to the former union is alive and he still remains by practice as well as by profession, a member of the church Quite clearly then, he has broken the church's law. It is true that the second marriage may have taken place previous to the enactment by the general synod of the canon on divorce, though I may remark in passing that there never was a time when the remarriage of a divorced person was not contrary to the teaching of the church. The contract may have been entered upon in perfectly good faith, so far as the man's own convictions were concerned. The ceremony may have been performed by an eminently respectable minister of another religious body, whose laws are not so stringent as our own, or under civil sanction by a duly qualified justice of the peace. It may have taken place in Canada or in the United States, or, for the matter of that, in Timbuctoo. These questions do not alter nor affect the fact that the second marriage is contrary to the church's canon law. Nor does the personal character of the man concerned call for the least consideration. There may have been no breath of scandal in the case, no question of collusion, no charge of immorality. It is quite conceivable that the circumstances of the case were such as to entitle the man to a great deal of sympathy.

Not to the Point.

But none of these things touch the point at issue, for they cannot weaken or invalidate the law, and the law is all that has to be considered. Whatever sanction the church might have given to the divorce decree, she can give no sanction at all to the second marriage. In the light then, of this single fact—that the man is living in defiance of the church's law—is it not clearly an improper thing for him to be elected to the office of a vestryman? Is it not an absolute anomaly for one whose life is an open contradiction of the church's canon to act as an official of the church? I cannot believe that any member of the synod will think otherwise.

I have put this matter before you as an abstract question for reasons, which you can all appreciate. But I do feel bound to say that it is more than an abstract question. The principle upon which I ask you to pronounce has been challenged in the Diocese, and the church must not hesitate to establish it beyond dispute. It only remains for me to indicate the direction in which the Synod should proceed. In Section 1 of the Church Act, there has been provided a way to meet the difficulty. The paragraph reads as follows: "The Bishop, Clergy and Laity, members of the Church of England in this Province, may meet, and in such manner and by such proceedings as they adopt . . . make regulations for enforcing discipline in the Church, for appointment, deposition, deprivation, or removal, of any person bearing office therein, of whatever order or degree, any rights of the Crown to the contrary notwithstanding, and for the convenient and orderly management of the property, affairs and interests of the Church, in matters relating to and affecting only the said Church, and the officers and members thereof, and not in any manner interfering with the rights, privileges, and interests of other religious communities, or of any person or persons not being a member or members of the said Church of England." It appears, therefore, that, by the Church Act, there is vested in this Synod full power to determine by the passing of a canon the qualifications of persons entitled to serve in the office of Churchwarden and Vestryman. In view of the most important principle at stake, I do not hesitate to urge the Synod to take that course. In my own judgement, the necessities of the case would be met by the enactment of a canon declaring that no person who has contracted a marriage disallowed by the law of the Church shall hereafter be eligible for nomination as a Churchwarden or Vestryman.

On motion of Archdeacon Forsyth the bishop's charge was referred to the standing committee of the synod.

Archdeacon Pentreath, of British Columbia, and Rev. C. W. Vernon, of Halifax, were then welcomed to the synod and invited to sit and participate.

The committee to nominate standing committees was then appointed as follows, there being one clerical and one lay member from each deanery in the riocese:

Chatham—Ven. Archdeacon Forsyth, F. E. Neales.

Fredericton—The Dean of Fredericton, F. St. J. Bliss.

Kingston—Rev. Canon Neales, Col. H. Montgomery Campbell.

Shediac—Rev. C. F. Wiggins, R. W. Hewson.

St. Andrews—Rev. H. I. Lynds, Hon. W. C. H. Grimmer.

St. John—Rev. Geo. F. Scovil, H. B. Schofield.

Woodstock—Rev. H. G. Allan, T. C. L. Ketchum.

Rev. Geo. F. Scovil was appointed by the bishop as assistant secretary of the synod.

Committee Reports.

The report of the synod committees which had been printed for the convenience of the delegates were then taken as read, to be discussed later.

A lengthy statement of the synod assessments for contingent fund was then read by the fund secretary, J. H. A. L. Fairweather. It showed that the rural churches were considerably in arrears on their assessments and consequently that there was a large proportion of the churches without lay representation in the synod. The assessment for the year was $617 and of this $363 had been paid. With the arrearages of previous years the total arrearage was $1745.

The bishop expressed some surprise that the arrearage was so large and said it would be interesting to know if the lay delegates of some of the churches remained away from the synod because they could not come or whether they preferred to absent themselves and save the amount of the assessment.

The rector of Canning said his church had been in arrears because there had been no regular service in the church. He offered to compromise the old indebtedness for $3 and pay the assessments in future.

Some of the clerical delegates expressed the opinion that it was a great discouragement to a clergyman in taking charge of a church which had been without regular service, to find it largely in debt for synod assessments and consequently barred from any representation at the synod by the laymen.

Solution Suggested.

Ven. Archdeacon Newnham thought a report had been presented at a previous meeting of the synod when this matter had been discussed and that the report had suggested some solution. He thought it was in the hands of Archdeacon Raymond and that it should be laid before the synod for consideration.

W. B. Wallace said if the ministers were put on the same footing as the laymen and barred from synod attendance until their churches had paid the assessment, it might have a good effect.

M. G. Teed said that one difficulty was that arrears had piled up in some of the churches for years and it was impossible to pay them. If they were wiped off and a fresh start made it would have a good effect and also increase the lay representation in the synod.

The bishop was inclined to agree with Mr. Teed and appointed Venerable Archdeacon Raymond and J. P. Burchill of Chatham as a committee to consider the matter and report on a scheme before synod rose.

Reports of synod committees which had been previously received were then taken up.

The report of the standing committee of the synod was adopted.

Mission Board Report.

Thereport of the Board of Missions was then taken up. On diocesan missions reports were received from Derby and Blackville, Douglas and Bright, Gladstone and Blissville, Point du Chene, Salisbury and Havelock, Stanley, St. Martins, St. Mary's and Springfield. They were adopted without discussion with the exception of Point du Chene.

The report from this mission was as follows:—

"This mission, which for a number of years has been attached to the parish of Shediac, has become vacant by the resignation of the rector of Shediac of that part of his work. The people are anxious for the services of the church to be continued but are not in a position to give any large amount towards the support of a resident clergyman.

The bishop thought that there should be an expression from the synod on this case. There had been some friction between the rector of Shediac and the people of Point du Chene and they had refused to accept his ministration. As the rector of Shediac had no desire to force himself on them, he had resigned. Unless the mission board was prepared to give $500 for the work there could be no regular service in Point du Chene. A peculiar feature of the case is that the rector of Shediac receives $800 per annum as revenue from the glebe lands all of which are located in the Point du Chene section of the parish, the people of which are not now receiving regular service. While there might be no legal obligation on the Parish of Shediac, there was, he thought, a very strong moral obligation to see that the people of Point due Chene received services regularly.

Rev. Mr. Sisson, of Moncton, said that when the people of Point du Chene took £200 and separated from the Parish of Shediac, as they did some years ago, they gave their rights in the glebe revenues for this sum.

J. Roy Campbell moved the adoption of the report with the exception of the portion referring to Point du Chene, which should be left over until tomorrow when Rev. Mr. Burt, rector of Shediac, will be in attendance, as will also Canon Smithers, who has made an investigation of the case.

T. B. Robinson moved that it be referred to the standing committee of the synod to report back.

Bishop Asks For Action.

The bishop said he was glad that the matter had been brought to the attention of the synod publicly, as he considered it a disgrace to the church that such conditions should exist. If the synod took no action in the case the board of missions would deal with it in another form. As a result of the withdrawal of the church from the work in Point du Chene, the other churches are very active, and are doing much whereas they formerly only existed through the help of the Anglican church in that field.

Mr. Robinson then changed his motion to read that the case should be referred to a committee and this passed.

The bishop appointed as the committee Canon Smithers, Canon Cowie, Rev. Mr. Sampson and T. B. Robinson.

The synod adjourned at 5.30 until this morning at 10 o'clock.

During the afternoon Rev. Allan Daniel, rector of Rothesay, gave notice of motion changing the date of the annual meeting of the Anglican churches in the diocese, from Easter week as at present, to the third week in January in each year and also that women should be allowed to vote at all parish meetings.

The Synod Service.

The synod service was held last evening in Trinity church and was attended by a fairly large congregation. The service which was fully choral, was very effective. Vested choir, lay readers and clergymen walked in the procession. The service was taken by Rev. E. B. Hooper, rector of St. Paul's, and the lessons were read by Ven. Archdeacon Newnham and Ven. Archdeacon Forsyth. The bishop preached from Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones and used the theme to express his hope for a quickening of the church life and activity.

This evening the service will be of a missionary character. The bishop will preside and addresses will be delivered by Archdeacon Pentreath and Miss Loretta Shaw, returned missionary from Japan.

MARRIAGES.

Higgins-Fidler.

Miss Christina Fidler and Carl Higgins, both of Chipman, were married yesterday afternoon at the residence of the officiating clergyman, Rev. Dr. McIntyre, 340 Main street. Immediately after the ceremony they left by the C.P.R. for their future home in Missoula, Montana.

Ballard-Mannering.

The residence of Thomas Mannering, Torryburn, was the scene of a pretty wedding yesterday morning, when his daughter, Winnifred L., was united in marriage to Hollis W. C. S. Ballard of Marblehead, Mass. The ceremony was performed by Rev. Wellington Camp, pastor of Leinster St. Baptist church in the presence of the relatives and immediate friends of the contracting parties. The bride was tastefully gowned in a navy blue travelling costume with hat to match. After the ceremony Mr. and Mrs. Ballard left on a trip to New York, at the conclusion of which they will reside in Newport, N. H. The bride was the recipient of many handsome gifts of cut glass and silver.

Uncooked Ripe Tomato Pickle.

Mix together in order named three pints peeled and chopped tomatoes, one cup chopped celery, four tablespoons each chopped onion, red pepper and salt, six tablespoons each sugar and mustard seed, half tea-spoon each grated nutmeg and two cups vinegar. Put in stone jar and cover. This will keep a year.

Pepper Hash.

Take one dozen green peppers and one dozen red peppers and add three large onions; chop fine. Cover with boiling water and let stand ten minutes, drain, cover again and let come to a boil. Then let stand again. Drain dry and add three tablespoonfuls of salt, two pints of vinegar and two cupfuls of granulated sugar. Cook 15 minutes. Pack in jars.

"CEETEE" UNDERWEAR
Look for the "sheep"
Always a perfect fit
"Ceetee" Underclothing makes you feel right. No irritation, will not wrinkle, sag or bind. Always comfortable.
Insist on "Ceetee." In all sizes for men, women and children.
The C. Turnbull Co. of Galt, Limited
Manufacturers—Est. 1859. 2906 Galt, Ontario

ST. JOHN STANDARD
No. 32.
Expires Oct. 7.

YOUNG LADIES' BERMUDA & NEW YORK CITY TOUR
GOOD FOR ONE VOTE

M.....

Address..... District.....

If presented at the St. John STANDARD and NEW STAR Office on or before the above date. Trim neatly for filing purposes

A Customer's Reasonable Wish is this Store's Pleasure.

DYKEMAN'S

Some Attractive Specials

Which we have placed on our counters in the different departments for quick disposal.

A LOT OF RUCHINGS.—Chiffon and Corded Ruchings, in white and colors, ONLY 10 CENTS A YARD.

STRAW WHISK HOLDERS, with places for running ribbon through, ONLY 7 CENTS EACH.

A LOT OF CASHMERE HOSE, in sizes 8 1-2, 9, 9 1-2, regular 40 cent quality, ON SALE AT 25 CENTS A PAIR.

ANOTHER LOT OF CASHMERE HOSE, ranging in size from 4 1-2 to 10 inch, are priced FROM 25 CENTS TO 45 CENTS, according to size. The regular price of these are from 38 to 65 cents a pair.

Both of these lots are a great bargain and people are taking advantage of this great offering.

A SPECIAL LOT OF BUREAU SCARFS, made of linen scrim, prettily braided in a neat design. Price, ONLY 25 CENTS EACH.

F. A. DYKEMAN & CO.,
59 CHARLOTTE ST.