

adopted, and there was no expectation of difficulty. It was, therefore, a very unwelcome surprise to learn that the Synod of Montreal had passed a resolution declining to take any part in the working of the scheme, and protesting against it as contravening the basal principles of the General Synod.

It is a principle that the General Synod is not to interfere with any existing rights of a Diocese, but the constitution places within its jurisdiction the general missionary work of the Church. It is very obvious that in an extreme sense it would be impossible for a Provincial or General Synod to formulate any mission scheme, involving the raising of money, that would not interfere with a Diocese; but if no penalty is suggested for a neglect of the resolutions of the mission scheme, and if in fact the carrying out of them is left to the loyalty and co-operation of congregations and dioceses, the rights of dioceses do not seem to be interfered with in any constitutional sense—otherwise the constitution prescribes for the General Synod an impossible task.

The sections named in the resolution of the Synod of Montreal as chiefly contravening the principles upon which the General Synod was formed are Sections 7, 8, 10 and 13.

This is Section 7: "All funds raised in any Diocese for mission work beyond its borders shall be forwarded to and distributed by the Executive committee, and all particulars of all grants and gifts, which may be received within any Diocese from outside the Dominion, shall be communicated to the Executive committee." A later clause restricts the appropriation of funds by the Executive committee to funds not previously appropriated by the donors. This section, with the exception of a few verbal changes of no consequence, is taken from the scheme unanimously adopted by the Eastern committee at Montreal. I don't know the ground of the objection of the Synod of Montreal. Probably the clause is considered too inquisitorial, or is regarded as in some way limiting the action of Dioceses or other donors. The Mission Board of the American Church seems to receive and transmit a large amount of funds from donors for special purposes. Still donors will often prefer to send directly their own contributions, and in that case will simply ignore the clause, and that will be the end of the matter. It is customary, I believe, in the case of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Province of Canada to receive vouchers instead of the money. I am not very favorable to the first section of the clause for quite an opposite reason. It would tend to throw unnecessary work on the officers of the Executive committee, which might as well be done by the donors. The C. M. S., and latterly in a measure, the S. P. G., decline to receive special funds not in direct support of any work of the Society, and over which their committee have no control. But whatever the ground of objection of the Synod of Montreal, if any contributing of funds or giving information required by this clause would have been unsatisfactory to the Diocese of Montreal, it would surely have been better to have left the clause so far inoperative in its case than to endeavor to render abortive the main legislation of the last General Synod, and to throw the working of the mission scheme into confusion.

The 8th section arranges for the publication annually of the mission needs and resources of each Diocese, and for this purpose the 10th section provides for the supply of full information from the Bishop or Secretary of each Diocese through its own division, and the issuing of two annual appeals signed by the Bishops. These arrangements are natural and simple, and I do not understand why they are objected to. There is nothing asked which every Diocese should not gladly furnish, and which in fact might not largely be obtained from the yearly Diocesan reports. But if any Diocese does not wish to receive aid, and objects to give information, it can abstain. There is no penalty. Still, I trust Dioceses will have a truer sense of what is due to the General Synod of the Church, than to do this capriciously and without very good reason. Unfortunately, the history of the mission efforts of the Church tells us that the ignoring of the wishes of the Church by abstaining from carrying out its regulations is only too readily adopted. A late Pastoral of the Bishop of Georgia stated that 2,000 congregations in the American Church were said to pay no attention to the mission requirements of the General Convention.

The 13th section directs that the Executive committee inform each Diocese of the sum which it is expected will be granted to that Diocese, but this is only provisional, as it may be reduced, if necessary. This provision cannot but be very helpful. How it contravenes any basal principle is a puzzle. The Executive committee is only dealing with its own—that is with funds entrusted to it. It has been always a great disadvantage in our mission work that the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Province of Canada avoided responsibility by guaranteeing nothing. There may be some difficulty at first when the income is uncertain, but even then it would be well to have something to work up to, and at the most the grant may, according to the terms of it, be reduced if the necessary funds are not forthcoming. So I trust the Executive committee will, as far as possible, apportion what is necessary for the work which it feels should be undertaken. If our people do not furnish them with the funds, then the work must be reduced and any debts paid, but the funds needed are far more likely to come if a definite sum is put forth as necessary to fulfil obligations. The scheme of the General Synod may prove very defective and need in time to be amended, but I trust the Dioceses will give it a full trial and endeavor to make the best of it, till the General Synod, after sufficient experience, has the opportunity of reviewing it. It cannot but be very fatal not only to any united action of the Church, if Dioceses take up a position of isolation and opposition. The scheme provides for an Executive committee composed of the Bishops of the Upper House, and two clergymen and two laymen elected by each Diocesan Synod at each regular meeting thereof. It lies then with the Synod to elect two clergymen and two laymen.

Before passing from this subject, I desire to express my deep sense of the gracious hospitality shown by our church people and the congregations in Winnipeg to the members of the General Synod, and of the kindness and friendly interest of the City Council and other citizens. I believe the