

minds are burdened with a multiplicity of cares inseparable from a city life. This consideration is certainly not brought forward in disparagement of the abilities, intelligence or acquirements of the members of the city sessions. If it were, the mere statement would be its own best refutation. But setting that consideration aside as scarcely bearing on the point under discussion, the real question at issue is whether the plan proposed would give a fair representation. It will scarcely, we think, be denied, that on many subjects there is apt to be a diversity of opinion between city and country congregations. The discussions which arise in the Synod between those who hold opposite views are absolutely necessary to arriving at a decision which will be generally accepted by the Church. How can these arise if the eldership is represented merely by one portion of the Kirk Sessions, for the whole tendency of the proposal is to throw the whole deliberative and executive power into the hands of the members of city charges. That this will be the result can scarcely be doubtful. What, then, would be the effect? We complain now, and not unjustly in many cases, that there is no general and hearty interest shown in the work of the Church, and that we are lapsing into something akin to congregationalism, instead of preserving our own form of church government. Would the fact of the country charges being represented by deputy tend to remedy this evil? Would the decisions of Synod be more heartily acquiesced in, and its injunctions be more faithfully carried out, when members of city Kirk Sessions only were present to join in the discussions of the subjects to which they relate? We greatly doubt it. Yet these are questions which should be seriously considered before the proposal is again brought forward.

We have devoted some space to this suggestion as it is one which has not now for the first time been proposed for the consideration of the members of Synod, and there is in it so much that is specious, that its evil effects are apt to be overlooked. It need not be concealed that there is a difficulty in finding a remedy for the present unsatisfactory state of the representation in the Church courts. There is one point, however, to which we formerly called attention and to which we would again refer. It is manifestly too much to expect, that besides giving their time, which at the season of the year during which the Synod meets, is most valuable to farmers, the

Elders should also pay their own expenses to attend the meetings of the Church courts. Not unfrequently also other expenses have to be incurred before business can be left for a week or ten days. The congregations are, it would appear plain, as much interested in being represented as the Elders, and should feel it their duty to bear the cost of their expenses to the Church courts. We believe the subject only requires to be brought before the adherents of our Church to meet with a ready response. In the United States a fund is specially collected for the purpose, to which all congregations contribute, and from this the expenses of Ministers and Elders are paid. By this means those congregations at a distance from the place of meeting are not unduly taxed, the average being struck and an assessment levied proportionate to the ability of different charges. Such a scheme might fairly be advocated. Were the difficulty arising from this cause removed, we might appeal more earnestly and with greater effect to the sessions connected with the Synod to send a representative, and if that could be effected, the gain would be immense. A more lively interest would be aroused and greater activity imparted to all our efforts. That the people have only to be appealed to, fairly and honestly, for any proper object to secure the needed result, has been so well proved lately that there is no need to enlarge on that point.

---

It is unfortunate that we should have to admit that the French Mission Scheme of our Church does not seem to be popular with many of our Congregations. Our grounds for such a conclusion are found chiefly in the fact that, out of about one hundred and twenty-five, only fifty are reported to have contributed anything to its support. Has the French Mission been a failure? or is it that our people do not see its necessity? Have they no confidence in those who carry it on? or are they so burdened with other claims on their Christian liberality, that they really cannot afford to keep up this branch of the Evangelization of the world?

To ascertain whether we have failed of success, we have to compare our work among the French to that of other missions in other lands. Those who are familiar with the history of East Indian Missions, may remember how many years elapsed, how many thousands were spent, how