

## APPENDIX VI — (Acts, Article 91)

### REPORT TO GENERAL SYNOD OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTACT WITH THE ORTHODOX PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

#### I. REPORT

September 6th, 1977

To General Synod, 1977, of the  
Canadian Reformed Churches  
Coaldale, Alberta

Esteemed Brethren:

The General Synod of Toronto 1974, appointed a new Committee for Contact with the Orthodox Presbyterian Church with the mandate:

- a. to continue the contact with the Orthodox Presbyterian Church;
- b. to study the forthcoming answer on our letter of March 1972, and continue the discussion with the Committee of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church on existing divergencies;
- c. to discuss and evaluate the relationships of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church with other Churches, as the Reformed Presbyterian Church (Evangelical Synod) and the Christian Reformed Church;
- d. to inform the Churches from time to time about the progress made (e.g., by press releases of combined committee meetings);
- e. to report on all its activities to the next General Synod.

Complying with the mandate, this Committee submits to you the following report.

- sub a. The secretary contacted the Chairman of the Committee for Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, inquiring about a reply to the letter the previous Committee sent in March 1972.
- sub b. The Committee met on June 12, 1975 to discuss the mandate, and subsequent meetings were held on September 9, 1976, October 22, 1976, August 18, 1977, and August 23, 1977. In April 1976 the Committee received a letter from the Committee for Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, dated April 14, 1976, being a reply to our letter of March 1972. Copy of this letter is sent herewith.
- sub c. The Secretary wrote a letter to the Orthodox Presbyterian Church Committee for Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations on July 2, 1975 requesting information concerning the relationship between the Orthodox Presbyterian Church and the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Evangelical Synod and the Christian Reformed Church.

Due to the departure of the convener, and the illness of the Vice-Chairman, no meetings were held for several months. As a consequence of this situation, the Committee still is in the process of "studying the answer to our letter of March 1972." It must report that it is not able to complete its full mandate in time for the opening of Synod 1977.

The Committee has dealt with certain sections of the submission by the Committee for Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, mainly with the doctrinal contents listed as A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4, and A-5, in our letter of March 1972. As the convening of Synod is only a few months away at date of this writing, the Committee decided in its meeting of August 23, 1977, to submit to Synod a draft reply concerning those sections, rather than communicate with the Orthodox Presbyterian Church so short before Synod. These draft replies to sections A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4, and A-5, are enclosed herewith.

In as far as the sections B and C are concerned, dealing with Church Government and fraternal relations, the Committee has not been able to study the replies to the remarks made in the letter of March 1972.

In its meeting of August 18, 1977, the Committee instructed the secretary to ask Synod 1977 for directives as to the disposition of the records, minutes, and correspond-

ence, etc. Also the files of the various previous committees appointed for contact with the Orthodox Presbyterian Church which are in his possession.

Lastly, in its meeting of August 23, 1977, the Committee decided to propose to Synod to send a letter of thanks and appreciation to the Rev. G. Van Rongen in recognition of the thorough and in-depth study he made of these matters and his guidance and inspiration to the members of the Committee in this work. His detailed analysis of the questions and problems had a stimulating effect on the work of the Committee, even after he had left.

With brotherly greetings,  
Mr. J. Boot  
Rev. P. Kingma  
Rev. M. Werkman  
Mr. W. Wildeboer

## II. ENCLOSURE

Letter dated April 14, 1976, of Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church to our Committee for Contact with the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

Committee for Contact with the  
Orthodox Presbyterian Church,  
c/o Mr. W. Wildeboer,  
296 Gardenvue Drive,  
Burlington, Ontario

April 14, 1976

Dear Brethren:

The Forty-first General Assembly (1974) of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church referred your letter of March 6, 1974, to this committee for a reply. We hope that this letter will serve to strengthen the existing contact between our denominations.

Your letter of March 6, 1974, asks us to supplement the letter of our Fortieth General Assembly (1973) with comments on the doctrinal matters and matters of church polity raised in your earlier letter of March, 1972. We understand these to be the points A-1 through A-5, and B-1 through B-3 printed on pp. 103-107 of the Acts of the General Synod, Toronto, 1974. The following comments and observations are not intended to be an elaborate defense of the particular formulations of the Westminster standards or those of the other subordinate standards of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, but rather a clarification of the positions stated therein with some indication of points of contact with the Three Forms of Unity maintained by the Canadian Reformed Churches.

A-1 does not question the legitimacy of a distinction between the church visible and the church invisible as such but calls attention to the dangers inherent in the distinction. The Heidelberg Catechism (Qu. and Ans. 54) speaks of "a church chosen to everlasting life," "out of the whole human race," "from the beginning to the end of the world." In terms of Qu. and Ans. 52, this chosen church appears to be composed of chosen individuals. We discern here the beginning of a definition of the church in terms of the doctrine of election. The Canons of Dordt, First Head, Article 7, present, in effect, a more elaborate description of this church, speaking of "a certain number of persons" who were "chosen, from the whole human race." The Westminster Confession in Chapter XXV, written after the Synod of Dordt, reflects the doctrinal development of the Reformed community by defining the church, in part, in terms of election. Since the identity of the elect is known only to God, this church is, to the human eye, invisible.

Although it can be argued that viewing the church from the perspective of election does tend to depreciate the authentic churchly character of the church visible, and may even lead to complacency with the existence of a diversity of geographically overlapping denominations within the one church of Jesus Christ, we would simply point out that the position of the Westminster standards does not differ radically from that of the Forms of Unity. We would respectfully suggest that the covenantal understanding of church with its focus on the church as visible, in the Canadian Reformed Churches today, re-

flects more precisely the perspective of the Heidelberg Catechism than the Canons of Dordt, while the Westminster formulation reflects both Dordt (church as invisible) and the earlier Reformation (church as visible).

We would further point out that the Westminster Confession, Chapter XXV, Sections 4 and 5, does distinguish between the true church and the false church ("no churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan"). Two of what the Belgic Confession (Article 29) calls the marks of the church are mentioned in Section 4, but with attention to the need for purity in all phases of public worship; and the third, discipline, receives special attention in that a whole chapter is devoted to it (Chapter XXX, Of Church Censures). The Westminster Confession does differ from the Belgic Confession in that account is taken of degrees of purity within the church as visible. This reflects a more complicated ecclesiastical situation than existed at the time of the writing of the Belgic Confession when the difference between Lutheran and Reformed confessional groupings was barely beginning to receive institutional form. For the Belgic Confession the false church was pre-eminently the Church of Rome and the true church was the Church of the Reformation. Although the Belgic Confession states expressly that the true church and the false church "are easily known and distinguished from each other," your Synod has experienced considerable difficulty in discerning the lines of the true church in the United States. This bafflement arises from an ecclesiastical complexity to which the Westminster Confession addresses itself in terms of degrees of purity without propounding a doctrine of the pluriformity of the church. Neither the Belgic Confession nor the Scottish Confession of 1560 faced this complexity.

Concerning A-2, your letter signalizes a characteristic difference between the Heidelberg Catechism and the Westminster Confession respecting the definition of saving faith. The Heidelberg Catechism, following Calvin, defines saving faith in terms of assurance and thus makes assurance of the essence of saving faith. Historically this definition set the Reformed position in the clearest way over against the Roman system which could offer its faithful no assurance and even regarded assurance as dangerous to their spiritual health. The Westminster Confession follows a different line, but one which goes back at least as far as Bucer, in terms of which saving faith is defined as entrustment to Christ in order to be saved after the pattern of Acts 16:31 where the faith enjoined could hardly be assurance that one is already saved. This active faith does carry with it, however, a basic element of assurance as a reflex to which the Westminster Confession refers when it says that believers are "never utterly destitute of that seed of God, and life of faith, that love of Christ and the brethren, that sincerity of heart, and conscience of duty, out of which, by the operation of the Spirit, this assurance may, in due time, be revived, and by the which, in the mean time, they are supported from utter despair," Chapter XVIII, Section 4. What the Westminster Confession says of the lack of full assurance runs parallel to what is found in the Canons of Dordt, Fifth Head, Article 11, which says "that believers in this life have to struggle with various carnal doubts, and that under grievous temptations they are not always sensible of this full assurance of faith and certainty of persevering." It would appear to us no more difficult to reconcile the teaching of the Westminster Confession with the Heidelberg Catechism than to reconcile the Canons of Dordt with the Heidelberg Catechism.

We recognize, as you have pointed out, the dangers of subjectivism and mysticism; but if a confessional basis for these errors can be found in the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, it can also be found in the Canons of Dordt; and as you are aware, this subjectivism and mysticism are found not only among Presbyterians oriented to the Westminster standards, but also among Reformed people in The Netherlands and on the North American continent oriented to the Three Forms of Unity. We appreciate the testimony which the Canadian Reformed Churches have borne to the fact that the hope and joy of the believer is rooted and grounded in Jesus Christ and His promises, and not in his own personal experience.

The response to your observations on the covenant of grace under A-3 is analogous to the response to A-1. There is dual emphasis in the Westminster Confession in its preservation of a conception of the covenant as made with believers and their children coupled with a perspective on the covenant, again arising from the impetus given by the forms of the Canons of Dordt on the doctrine of election, which defines the covenant as made with Christ and in him with the elect. Parallel to these conceptions is the distinction between the church as visible and the church as invisible.

We would point out, however, that the first paragraph of A-3 does not contrast the posi-

tion of the Westminster Confession with the language of the Three Forms, and cannot do so because there is no doctrine of the covenant in the Three Forms except by implication. Such a doctrine can be elaborated only in terms of the literature surrounding these documents, but this literature has no confessional standing in your denomination. From our perspective, the failure of the Three Forms to give formal attention to the doctrine of the covenant is a serious deficiency, but one which can be accounted for historically as can the dual emphasis of the Westminster doctrine. We would view as ironic a criticism of the Westminster Confession for its failure to state unambiguously a doctrine which is nevertheless there, while the same doctrine is not at all defined in the Three Forms.

You have rightly pointed to the error of a doctrine of presumptive regeneration of the children of the covenant. In addition we would point to the error of a doctrine of presumptive nonregeneration of the children of the covenant which feeds the subjectivism and mysticism signalized in A-2. Together with you, we would seek to avoid this misappropriation of the doctrine of election by proper attention to the doctrine of the covenant of grace which is made with believers and their seed.

With respect to A-4, we would point out that the Larger Catechism in Answer 50 does not seek to give a confessionally binding interpretation of a clause in the Apostles' Creed, but rather elaborates its understanding of what is involved in Christ's humiliation after his death by reference to this historic document. Apparently you are able to recognize as scriptural what is said of Christ's humiliation in the first part of the answer, and we can only express as the opinion of this committee that the Orthodox Presbyterian Church would not want to label as unscriptural the doctrine that "my Lord Jesus Christ, by his inexpressible anguish, pains, terrors, and hellish agonies, in which he was plunged during all his sufferings, but especially on the cross, hath delivered me from the anguish and torments of hell." We would hope that the interpretation of a disputed clause from an ancient creed which has no confessional standing in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church would not become a significant point of disunity between the Canadian Reformed Churches and the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

The answer to your question in A-5 concerning the place of Question and Answer 99 of the Larger Catechism is to be found in terms of the dual function of catechetical documents. These documents serve in the first place to give instruction in the Christian faith. The instruction of the Heidelberg Catechism is given in the first and second persons, a factor which accounts, in part, for the personal tone and warmth of the document. For the same reason, the Catechism serves well also as a confession of faith. The Westminster catechisms give instruction in the Christian faith more objectively, and although they supplement the Confession as confessional documents, they are not usually used in the preaching in Presbyterian churches as the Heidelberg Catechism is used in the preaching in Reformed churches. If the Larger Catechism is viewed pre-eminently as instruction rather than as confession, the appropriateness of Question and Answer 99 is more readily apparent. Further study would reveal that the principles stated in Answer 99 are employed without being stated, in the explanation of the commandments in the Heidelberg Catechism.

The vagueness of your difficulties respecting Questions and Answers 102-148 on the law of God makes it impossible for us to respond in detail, but also suggests that you do not find in these answers insuperable differences between our denominations. What we have, rather, are areas for further discussion as together we seek to discuss the will of God and flee the lawlessness which is sin.

We can understand from the perspective of the Heidelberg Catechism the difficulty you would experience with the explanation of the Fourth Commandment in the Westminster standards. From our side it is not readily apparent how the necessity for maintaining schools or for contribution to the relief of the poor can be inferred or deduced from the Fourth Commandment. Nevertheless, the addition in Answer 103 of the phrase "especially on the sabbath" in the Dutch translation of the Heidelberg Catechism prepared from the original German, suggests a movement in the direction of the kind of Sabbath observance practiced among large segments of the Reformed community in The Netherlands and in North America, as well as among Scottish, Irish, and American Presbyterians, and documented in the Westminster catechisms.

From the perspective of the Westminster standards, we do not regard the redemptive significance attached to the Fourth Commandment as exhausting its significance, or the mediatorial accomplishment of Christ as bringing to an end its redemptive significance.

The recurring Sabbath teaches us to look forward to the consummation of redemption and the inauguration of the eternal Sabbath of which the people of God have a foretaste in this life but which is yet in its fullness outstanding. The shift from a seventh day to a first day Sabbath is accounted for in terms of the progress of the history of redemption.

With respect to the matters of church government referred to in B-1, we do not want to suppress the characteristic differences between the Presbyterian and continental Reformed conceptions nor do we want to absolutize these differences so as to make fraternal relations impossible and virtually eliminate the possibility of a more unified conception. We would offer for your consideration the "Amended Version of the Form of Government" which will be proposed to the forthcoming General Assembly. This version speaks of the local church and its session, the regional church and its presbytery, and the whole church and its general assembly. This language is not intended to say that one expression of the church is more authentically church than some other, but rather seeks to recognize that the church comes to expression on various levels, a conception which you acknowledge in the paragraph B-1 with reference to Matthew 16:18 and Acts 9:31. We would suggest that the local church in your conception corresponds more nearly to the regional church in the proposed Amended Version. This is more readily apparent if the local church in your conception is thought of as rather large, or as a parish (gemeente) which meets in a number of locations (wijkgemeenten). The consistory would then correspond to the presbytery. The local church in our conception would correspond more nearly to a wijkgemeente in your conception.

Through long-established usage, Presbyterians ordinarily employ spacial terminology metaphorically to indicate the relation of the various judicatories to one another. This is customary among your churches as well. Our characteristically vertical dimension in distinction from your characteristically horizontal dimension may unfortunately suggest to you a hierarchical ordering which is, however, foreign to our form of government in the genius of its conception. The kind of supervision authorized does not, in our judgment, differ materially from the kind of supervision exercised by the broader assemblies among your churches. Our denomination owes its origin, in part, to the misuse of power and the unconstitutional assumption of dictatorial power on the part of the higher judicatories of the former Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and has made us especially jealous to guard "the liberties guaranteed to the individual congregations under the constitution" (Form of Government, chapter X, Section 7). For this reason, in part, there is less uniformity in practice across the Orthodox Presbyterian denomination than characterizes the Canadian Reformed Churches.

It is our impression, in fact, that the General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church exercises less authority over the affairs of the presbyteries and congregations than is true of the Canadian Reformed synods. The Assembly can govern its own affairs; it can offer advice to the presbyteries and sessions; and it can adjudicate disciplinary cases referred to it by other judicatories or originating in its own midst. The Assembly cannot, however, make decisions which are settled and binding upon the churches (Cf. the Church Order of Dordt, Article 31) unless these decisions are in the form of constitutional amendments and have received the approval of the presbyteries.

With respect to B-2, paragraphs 1 and 2, it is not clear to us that the rule exercised by the elders in our higher judicatories differs in principle from the rule exercised by elders in your classes and synod. The operative principle here is that the elders do not derive their authority from the consent of the governed but from the King and Head of the Church and they exercise this authority in the church at the various levels of its manifestation.

The matter of the membership of pastors in local congregations mentioned in paragraph 3, is under discussion in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. The proposed Amended Version of the Form of Government, Chapter VI, Section 4, retains the historic Presbyterian practice while making provision for a pastor's fellowship in a local congregation. The pastor's membership in a presbytery, and the power of the presbytery to ordain, install, remove, and judge ministers can be understood in terms of the analogy between the presbytery in our system and the consistory in your system described above in the discussion of B-1.

The clause in the Form of Government, Chapter IV, respecting the priority of the office of the ministry does not appear in the Amended Version being proposed to the General Assembly.

The rationale for allowing ministers to labor in other than Orthodox Presbyterian

churches can be understood in the light of the Orthodox Presbyterian concept of fraternal relations to be discussed at a later point in this letter.

The concern expressed in B-3 fails to take account of the declaration of the Westminster Confession, Chapter XXXI, Section 2, (Orthodox Presbyterian version) which states that the decrees and determinations of the various judicatories must be "consonant to the Word of God" if they are to be received with reverence and submission. The principle expressed here is identical with that in the quotation from Article 31 of your Church Order.

Question 2 and 3 of your letter of March 6, 1974, together with the concerns of C-1, 2, and D in your letter of March, 1972 can be dealt with for the sake of convenience in terms of a broad perspective on the church and the significance of interchurch relations.

Article 29 of the Belgic Confession analyzes the ecclesiastical situation by means of a simple distinction between the true church and the false church, and concludes by saying that these two churches are easily known and distinguished from each other. The false church is spoken of as one; there is no pluriformity of the false church. Nevertheless, Article 29 speaks of this united false church as expressing itself in a diversity of organizational structures called sects, but structures which appropriate to themselves the name of church. Similarly, there is no pluriformity of the true church taught in Article 29; but it would not seem to be wholly incompatible with the language of the document to envision the unified true church as expressing itself in a diversity of organizational structures, some of which may be geographically overlapping, and all of which could legitimately lay claim to the name of church. Such a conception would amount to a doctrine of pluriformity only if the diversity were absolutized so that the various denominations were seen as so many diverse flowers in the bouquet of the one church. Unity would then be understood as an attribute only of the church as invisible; and visible unity would be viewed as suppression of the richness and beauty of the church.

Without acceding to a doctrine of the pluriformity of the church, and with the organic visible unity of the church as the goal toward which we are striving, the Orthodox Presbyterian Church does acknowledge the existence of geographically overlapping true churches.

The diversity has appeared in some instances through providential circumstances as when, for example, persons of diverse ethnic background come together to live in one country taking their familiar ecclesiastical structures with them. It is perpetuated when no efforts are made in the direction of organizational unity in spite of similarity, if not identity, in matters of doctrine and practice. Lack of unity then becomes an evidence of the impurity in the church visible.

Diversity and disunity appear and are also perpetuated when churches recognize one another as visible manifestations of the body of Christ but are not able to effect union without compromise on substantial matters of principle or without incorporation of error into the organized body. The Westminster Confession, Chapter XXV, Sections 4 and 5, states that "this catholic Church hath been sometimes more, sometimes less visible," and that "the present churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error." What is said of "particular churches" is true not only of local congregations but also of regional and national churches of all denominations within the true church. A denomination may find itself maintaining a separate existence without regarding that separation as ultimately desirable or without consigning other denominations to the false church.

The Westminster Confession acknowledges not simply a true church and a false church, but also degrees of purity within the true church. There are degrees of discipline with respect to members of the church. For example, a member may be suspended from the privilege of the Lord's table without being excommunicated from the body. The Westminster Confession speaks of churches which have degenerated to the point of being no longer churches of Christ. By implication there are other churches that have degenerated but not to that point. There may be other churches, once degenerate, but later experiencing spiritual renewal. Conditions may warrant a separation analogous to suspension from the Lord's table, but with a view to the ultimate restoration of unity. Just as a simple distinction between membership in good standing and excommunication does not adequately meet the needs of judicial discipline, so also a simple distinction between the true church and the false church does not meet the needs of a complex ecclesiastical situation.

From this perspective it becomes clearer why the Orthodox Presbyterian Church prefers "fraternal relations" to "ecclesiastical correspondence." Fraternal relations do

not require us to say as do the implications of the Canadian Reformed Rules for Correspondence, that if the churches were geographically overlapping, they would be one denomination. The Orthodox Presbyterian Church can enter into fraternal relations with geographically overlapping denominations which may be thought of as more or less pure, but nevertheless as true manifestations of the body of Christ. Such relations have to be regarded not as an end in themselves, but as a first step in the direction of organic unity; they enable us to bring to expression in a preliminary but visible way the unity of the body of Christ. Since the Rules for Correspondence imply denominational unity, they have no meaning for churches which overlap geographically; and in our judgment the degree of involvement required in the affairs of churches at a geographical distance from one another is such as to render the Rules impractical. Geographically separate or nationally distinct churches cannot conveniently act as one denomination, nor does the unity of the visible church require this degree of uniformity. (cf. Rules 3 and 5 of the Rules for Correspondence.)

The concept of fraternal relations has enabled the Orthodox Presbyterian Church to engage in a general way in the kind of contact envisioned in Rules 1 and 2 of the Rules for Correspondence (Rule 3 implies a degree of supervision over local congregations which our General Assembly does not have), and has therefore served the interchurch and ecumenical interests of the denomination well. The seriousness with which these relations are regarded is evidenced in the determination to sever fraternal relations with the Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland (Synodaal). Geographical and linguistic barriers prevented us from exercising the measure of discipline implied by the fraternal relationship in view of the obvious and widespread doctrinal declension in that denomination, and we could not conscientiously maintain the appearance of doctrinal harmony.

In addition to fraternal relations on a one-to-one basis, avenues for ecumenical contact are open to the Orthodox Presbyterian Church through the newly established North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council as well as through the Reformed Ecumenical Synod. Membership in these organizations implies a kind of fellowship which is analogous to that implied by fraternal relationships. For this reason the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, as well as other denominations, have raised within the Reformed Ecumenical Synod questions concerning the continued membership of the Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland (Synodaal), and questions concerning simultaneous membership in both the World Council and the Reformed Ecumenical Synod. But the visible unity of the church requires not only the negative discipline mentioned in the first of the Rules for Correspondence, but also the positive discipline of strengthening the things that remain and encouraging brothers in the ways of covenant faithfulness.

Respecting the observation in C-2, paragraph 2, we call your attention to an action of the Reformed Ecumenical Synod (Sydney, 1972, Acts, Article 123), supported by the delegates of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, rescinding the "Declaration of 1946." This action was requested by the Christelijke Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland.

We do not presume to have answered all of your questions concerning the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, or to have provided you with answers that are satisfactory in every respect. We would affirm of ourselves as well as of the Canadian Reformed Churches that "the purest churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error." We do not ask you to approve of, or compromise with what you find to be contrary to the Word of God, but to continue to exhort us to be what our Lord would have us be. Our errors and failures may be such as to prevent you from entering into a relation of correspondence with us as you have conceived of this relation traditionally. Yet we would ask whether you are really prepared to say of us, on the other hand, in terms of our witness over nearly forty years and our current testimony in our nation and in the world: that we ascribe more power and authority to ourselves and to our ordinances than to the Word of God, and will not submit ourselves to the yoke of Christ; that we do not administer the sacraments as appointed by Christ in His Word, but add to them and take from them; that we rely more upon men than upon Christ; and that we persecute those who live holily according to the Word of God. Our experience with you in previous discussion leads us to believe that while you are not altogether convinced that we are identical in doctrine and polity, you are much less convinced that we are nothing more than a sect of the false church.

The question therefore becomes: How can we visibly be the one true church that we together are under these circumstances? The answer we suggest is a fraternal relationship which would begin to realize the goals of negative discipline embraced in Rule 1 of

your Rules for Correspondence as well as of positive discipline by means of the kind of activity described in Rule 2. We would invite you to consider a relation of this kind and if it is not found to be satisfactory, to offer an alternative proposal for our consideration.

We continue to rejoice in your loyalty to Christ and in the steadfastness of your testimony to the integrity of the Reformed faith. May the King and Head of the Church continue to bless your labor in his service as you seek to disciple the Canadian nation by baptism in the name of the triune God and instruction in all that Christ has commanded.

**Fraternally yours,  
The Committee on Ecumenicity and  
Interchurch Relations  
"LeRoy B. Oliver"  
LeRoy B. Oliver  
Chairman**