

remittances to him for the schemes to which they contribute. The probability is that a larger amount has been contributed than has been reported to your committee.

As the mere mention of large sums may have a mis-leading effect, your committee presents, for the consideration of the Assembly, the following as the average rate of contribution per member for the Schemes of the Church in the various Presbyteries:—

Montreal, \$2 92; Ottawa, \$0 89; Brockville, \$0 78; Kingston, \$1 20; Cobourg, \$0 67; Ontario, \$1 09; Toronto, \$1 40; Simcoe, \$0 68; Hamilton, \$1 01; Paris, \$0 65½; Guelph, \$0 67½; London, \$0 99; Chatham, \$0 68; Stratford, \$0 65; Huron, \$0 63; Owen Sound, \$0 22½; Durham, \$0 32.— Total average for the Church, \$1 00.

Surely the inequalities in the above comparison cannot be wholly accounted for by the poverty or smallness of the fields embraced by the various Presbyteries. It is believed that the difference is to a considerable extent due to the interest which both ministers and people take in the work of the Church. So long as both minister and people are satisfied with a mere nominal contribution to the great Schemes of the Church, so long must these Schemes languish and suffer.

Your Committee present the following particulars for consideration. In one Presbytery, out of a total contribution of over \$10,000, three congregations give over \$9,000. In another Presbytery, the largest contributing congregation is in the United States. In still another, one congregation gives one-third of the whole amount contributed. Three congregations in another Presbytery give three-fifths of the whole amount; the amount of the contributions being \$3,470. In another Presbytery one congregation gives about one-third of the whole amount. This Presbytery has some fifteen or sixteen congregations. The same congregation gives nearly seven-sixteenths of the amount reported as contributed to the College Fund. In one Presbytery with nine settled charges, the total amount given to the College Fund is \$53 03, being nearly, not quite, at the rate of \$6 00 for each congregation.

These cases are mentioned, not as exhausting the anomalies which exist in connection with the subject of contribution to our Church Schemes, but as examples of a state of things which is altogether too general. It is not an uncommon thing for congregations to give small sums, as it appears to your Committee, to fill up the columns before the name of the congregation, so that these may not be entire blanks. In some cases almost nothing is given for the general work of the Church. For example, it is found that one congregation paying over \$1,000 00 a year as salary to the minister, gives just \$6 00 to the Schemes of the Church. Your Committee submits that the amount contributed by many of our congregations is not in harmony with the privileges they enjoy, nor yet with the duty which they owe to the cause of Christ.

6. SUMMARY.

Summing up the Financial Statements, your Committee finds that the following sums have been contributed:—

For strictly Congregational purposes	\$398,891 39½
For the Schemes of the Church.....	45,572 18½
Other Benevolent Objects.....	13,323 69
	<hr/>
Total.....	457,787 27
1869-70.....	421,788 05

Total increase\$ 35,999 22

7. RECOMMENDATIONS.

In conclusion, your Committee would beg leave to submit the following recommendations:—