

matter deeply at heart must fear for the effect of the following objection, which Canon Von Iffland offers to the scheme. He says that:

2. "The General Synod made a mistake in legislating (if it did legislate, it passed no Canon), in such terms as implied a merging of the D. and F.M.S. into the more comprehensive society, without recognizing the position of that organization as a creation of the Provincial Synod, actively engaged in its work, and unable, even willing, to pronounce sentence of dissolution upon itself." Was the General Synod then wrong in implying that the Provincial Synod of Canada which alone has power in the matter, would be willing to merge the D. and F.M.S. into the wider organization? It certainly would have been well had it been possible to consult the Provincial Synod of Canada before adopting the scheme, but this would mean a postponement of its adoption for at least six long years. A majority of the members of the General Synod were also members of the Provincial Synod, and yet I am not aware that a single one of them moved for the postponement of the matter. Surely it was but natural to assume that the Provincial Synod would be willing to do that which so large and influential a body of its members voted for almost unanimously. And when, in addition, we consider that the D. and F.M.S. had previously recommended its merging into the more comprehensive society, the General Synod had good reason to believe that there existed, not only a willingness, but a desire, on the part of the Church in Eastern Canada, to make the great missionary society of the Church co-extensive with the whole Dominion; and that no technical question, as to the order in which the matter should be brought before the several Synods, would be insisted on by any Synod to the deferring, for years, of so desirable an end. And further, when the Provincial Synod of Canada approved of the formation of the General Synod, it approved of section 5 of the "Basis of Constitution," which declares, "The General Missionary * * work of the Church" to be within the jurisdiction of the General Synod. The General Synod could not have been faithful to the trust committed to it by the Provincial and Diocesan Synods, unless it had not only assumed that they were willing that it should take immediate action, but further, that they had actually laid the responsibilities of the work upon its shoulders. In passing the General Synod Scheme, the thought of overlooking the Provincial Synod of Canada never occurred to the members of the General Synod, for the reason that it was well understood by all, that no action would be taken by the new organization, until the Provincial Synod had an opportunity of considering the scheme. And all were well aware that while the action contemplated the merging of the D. and F.M.S. into the new society, that practically it only meant the extension, in the only way possible, and under some new conditions, of the old society, so as to give representation to the Church in the West. Should the Provincial Synod at its next meeting, merge the D. and F.M.S. into the general society, the Church in Eastern Canada can elect, and in all probability will elect, to the Executive Com-

mittee, nearly all the members who have served on the old board for years. The new society will be compelled to take up all the work that the D. and F.M.S. has now on hand, and the only changes will be that some few new members will come on from the West, and the society will have a little more power under additional rules to vigorously prosecute the work. When we consider, therefore, the nature of the changes contemplated by the General Synod Scheme, the fact that the Provincial Synod had approved of the general missionary work of the Church being taken up by the General Synod, and that the D. and F.M.S. had recommended that it be merged in the new organization, and the fact that Provincial Synod could not have been further consulted without postponing action for at least six years, it would have been strange, indeed, had the General Synod not assumed a willingness on the part of the Provincial Synod of Canada, to heartily co-operate in the matter.

Thirdly, Canon Von Iffland says that the only duty assigned to the Eastern, Central and Western divisions of the board "is that of a post-office official to receive and forward reports." I do not know that these divisions of the board are essential parts of the machinery. Many members of the Committee of the General Synod, considered that the divisions would prove useful, inasmuch as they would be composed of the men most familiar with, and therefore best able to pronounce upon, the needs and resources of the missions of the dioceses within the respective divisions. It was also thought that it would be an advantage to have such divisions co-extensive with the Provincial Synods, as their members could meet without additional expense, when the Provincial Synods meet, and that many things might be adjusted between these divisions by correspondence, without the expense of calling the whole board together. That reports of needs and resources of the mission fields shall be submitted to them, surely implies that these divisions shall have the right to make recommendations on such reports, when forwarding them to the Executive Committee. It would not be wise for a general mission scheme to go too much into detail as to the duties of any part of its organization. Experience will determine what such duties should be; and if it is even found that the divisions of the board are unnecessary, they can be abolished without effecting any vital feature of the scheme. That such divisions are necessary, Canon Von Iffland implies when he suggests that each Ecclesiastical Province have an organization of its own. And he adds: "The three divisions could hold communion with each other, ascertain the existing needs, evoke, in their respective spheres, such support as could be provided, and mutually help one another in the great cause all have at heart." The present scheme provides for all that he suggests, and in addition, provides for the unity and solidarity of the great missionary work of the Church from ocean to ocean.

4. Again, Canon Von Iffland objects to the scheme because he considers that it contains the principal of "assessment." There is no assessment in the scheme, as the Canon admits a little farther on in his article, when he says "I do not mean that anything by way of compulsion is in-