5 05 05

EK TO WEEK.

s on Questions of Public terest.

en observed and frequently aperfect reports of Church aily press of this country. how frequently the trivial on of a really great question oon, while the sober and s will be passed over in a es. This is a great pity, for d to the contrary, we are ublic demands to-day more in journalism. There is who cannot distinguish be-1 more perfect efforts of the nat they want, and the pity take the trouble to make at headquarters. One is ng the quality and form of ought by the public in the e serene air of infallibility ime on such occasions. Let il be in session, and let the ssion be of vital interest to esented therein, yet no one iliar as he may be with the presumably able to report

That task can only be y some one belonging to the ialists who can tell without subject or public, the very eir readers are hungering. ese artists merely guess at They have no special means required and certainly are ian an intelligent reader, to st to the public. The pro-Synod or conference are not efit of those whose sole inr stocks but for the benefit he great body of men and behind that Synod or conhese we claim a reasonable de to inform them of what have done. We are perchurches have much to depress handles their acts and

y be some conceivable exerfect handling of Church ily press, but what defence

can be made for similar offences on the part of official organs of the Church itself? We have frequently called for a fuller account of the proceedings of the Board of Management in its official organ, but so far we have had to be content with the chronicling of dry resolutions. One cannot imagine a body of intelligent men meeting twice a year to consider the problems concerning the expansion of the Church without differings regarding the course to pursue. The public would like to be informed of the reasons which impel men to this or that action, when so much depends upon it. In our opinion it pays to take the public into our confidence. If we are doing the right thing we have no need to fear the consequences. We would venture to make a similar criticism of the Woman's Auxiliary. The triennial meeting of that organization was recently held in Toronto. Representatives from all parts of the Dominion were there, and presumably important business was transacted. In the official magazine a list of resolutions is given which represents the results of the convention, but no attempt is made to convey any adequate conception of the deliberations to the twenty odd thousand members of the auxiliary who were not there. We do not suggest a detailed report of what each speaker said, but there ought to be a gathering up of the pertinent points made for or against the important proposals before the convention. The effect of that meeting ought to be reproduced in some degree to every reader of the "Leaflet." Space should be provided for such an object, and the results would more than justify the effort. We are quite clear on this point; men and women of the Church want plain, straightforward, authentic information. The enthusiasm that comes of knowledge is ten-fold more effective than that which is stirred by

picturesque declamation.

We notice in a late issue of one of the C.M.S. publications in England an appeal from Archdeacon Lloyd, of Lloydminster, for a sum of money for the partial' maintenance of five new missionaries, lay and clerical, in his vicinity. We understand that the Bishop of New Westminster is now in England soliciting money for his diocese, and the Bishop of Algoma has, we understand, lately returned from a similar mission. We mention these instances which have come under our notice to call attention to a situation that needs consideration. We do notofor a moment desire to cast any reproach on the men who are promoting their work in England. They are but following a long-established precedent, and are in no way to blame for the necessities that face them. How long, we wonder, will the necessity exist for Canadian clergy and Canadian Bishops to appear before the people of England with hat in hand pleading for the generosity of those people to supplement our efforts? It is perfeetly plain that Churchmen in the British Isles. have some responsibility for the religious care of the thousands of emigrants that leave their shores annually. These men leave behind them their churches and endowments and come to a new country where they have to begin to erect churches for themselves or perhaps worship for years in a school house. They who stay behind must support men and women going to the front; that may be taken for granted. But what we wish to ask the men who stand at the head of the Canadian Church is this, is there not a more dignified business-like and effective way of handling this problem than the one now pursued? Does it minister to our own self-respect to have a missionary Bishop every now and then pack his valise and make for England to advocate in person the necessities of his own diocese? Can it be agreeable to English people to have a contingent of clergy swoop down upon them from the ends of the earth, each with a plea of heartweighing poverty? Now we know something of

CANADIAN CHURCHMAN

this method in Eastern Canada. Not long ago the men of Montreal and Toronto knew very well what it was to have Bishops and clergy from the West enter their offices and solicit money. To-day all this is done away with by the General Missionary Society. "Spectator" ventures to ask the Church in Canada if another step may not be taken whereby these men will be relieved of the necessity and humiliation, both to themselves and our country, of soliciting in person, support for our missionary maintenance and expansion?

In discussing the question we have just raised it would seem to us that there ought to be one supreme authority in this country through which all missionary support should come. So far as missionary solicitation in Canada is concerned, all is centred in M.S.C.C., but this society does not pretend to control the contributions from England. Several missionary societies in the British Isles are contributing largely to our Western work, and then there are those individual appeals of which we have spoken. Would it not be wiser for the General Missionary Society of Canada to take upon itself the responsibility of raising the entire sum requisite for our Canadian work? The English Missionary Societies instead of dealing directly with our missions would entrust their contributions to M.S.C.C. The claims of the Canadian Church for assistance from England would be presented by M.S.C.C. instead of by individual Bishops and clergy. We would then have unity and co-ordintion where now it seems to us things are done in a haphazard way. Energy under the present method is dissipated, and contributions are confused. This is but a rough suggestion of what is in our mind, and we give it to the public in the hope that it may set men thinking to some purpose.

SPECTATOR.

THE GENERAL SYNOD.

By Rev. T. G. Wallace, M.A, Oakville.

The triennial meeting of the General Synod is one of the most important events in the life of the Church of England in Canada; its importance can scarcely be over-rated. The vast area and the various interests represented in that body make it an interesting subject of study. There one comes in contact with the governing minds of the Canadian Church, and the leading problems with which that Church has to grapple problems that by their very newness and freshness are more interesting, more inspiring, though perhaps less intricate, than those of older lands. To the Englishman there are many points of contrast—the free air, the independent spirit, the touch perhaps of immaturity, the selfassertiveness of youth, struggling to make itself felt, yet toned and moderated by that traditional ecclesiastical conservatism which is characteristic of ancient Churches possessing the glory and heritage of a great past. Yet the Synod, taken as a whole, is suggestive of strengththe strength of a young giant beginning to realize his own powers. In such a body history is being made before our very eyes.

"The Synod," said one of the leading dailies, "16 certainly a distinguished and able-looking body." It certainly also is a most representative body. Its members come forth from the east and the west and centre of this extensive land—men from the city, men from the prairie, and ment from the mountain region, journeying by railway, steamship, buggy, canoe, and horseback; men of every conceivable profession—judges, barristers. Members of Parliament, solidiers, journalists, doctors, farmers, business men, tradesmen, men of many and varied interests, of many and varied types of character, sitting side by side deliberating for the benefit

of that institution which stands for all that is best in the life of the Dominion.

The formation of the General Synod is a tribute to the adaptability of the Canadian Church, an adaptability to conditions most necessary to the success of any organization. The Church of England in its past history developed the parochial system, a system which the experience of many generations has proved to be a most advantageous plan of conducting Church work; and the independence of the parish is one of the watchwords of Anglican ecclesiastical politics, and one of the safeguards of Anglican progress. Yet it sometimes seems as if attention had been bestowed on the parish—the unit—at the expense of the Church as a whole. In practice the English Church is far too parochial, and parochialism, the narrow parochialism that prevails, must tend to become a grave source of weakness. The parochial system is good, but the parish is only a part of a whole; and, whilst the whole exists for the benefit of the part, the part also exists for the benefit of the whole. The modern tendency is towards concentration, towards centralization of authority. It was in obedience to this impulse that the General Synod arose. The Canadian Church inherited the independent parish. In process of time parishes were grouped around common diocesan centres; these Diocesan Synods, feeling the need for combination, drew together in Provincial Synods; and the arch of organization was completed when the General Synod was formed. And it is a curious fact that the General Synod had not long been called into being when, in obedience to what seemed to be a common impulse, the Missionary Society of the Church was constituted—a society which includes the whole Church, every baptized member of it-a society which pre-eminently represents that spirit in the Church which is unselfish, expansive, and non, or rather extra, parochial. But the General Synod is not merely a sign of adaptability; it is also a sign of the consolidation of Canada and the Canadian Church. No country can be confederated by mere Act of Parliament. The Act for the Confederation of the Dominion of Canada was only the beginning of a process. The Canadian Pacific Railway was a step in that process; the formation of the General Synod was another step. These amongst others are steps towards making the inhabitants of this wide Dominion a single entity, towards asserting the individuality of Canada, or Canada's nationhood. We need more of the national idea in Canada, and the Church should assist in developing it, and moulding it upon right lines. It is not opposed to Imperialism; on the contrary, it is an Imperial asset. The Church of England is, of course, Catholic-Catholic first and above all things, and woe to the Church of England if it be not true to its heritage, and preserve unimpaired the faith once delivered to the saints: to this the national idea must be subordinate. But differences of climate, of temperament, of racial traits, and all that goes to make up national characteristics exist as facts, and it would be unwise to ignore them. They are permitted, we cannot but believe, in the providence of God, for some wise purpose, and for the sake of them the Catholic Church must become national. The genius of Anglicanism permits the national interpretation, or perhaps the better word would be adaptation, of Christianity. Our past has been insular; our fathers carried freedom in their hearts, and spurned all Continental despotism, whether ecclesiastical or secular. The English Church has no place for that which the Archbishop of Armagh in one of his happy and striking phrases has called "The iron drill of the Italian ecclesiastical barrack-yard." The Church. true to its ultimate ideal of the unification of the English-speaking people, and, indeed, finally of all mankind, on the basis of the teaching of Jesus Christ, must not for the time being overlook its more immediate work, the drawing to-