

answer this question in the affirmative, would be followed by very serious consequences, indeed; and yet to proceed on the opposite principle would require very cautious and discriminating measures. One or other course, however, would have to be pursued, and whatever general plan of missionary operations may be determined on, ought to involve a Synodical decision on this point also.

For my part, I believe, it would be exceedingly short sighted and suicidal policy to nourish stations till, in order to further progress, a pastor ought to be settled in them, and then leave them and such pastor altogether to their own resources. The evils of such a course could easily be specified, if your space allowed. Fully persuaded that our Synod could never adopt such a policy, we should then have two departments of *Home Missionary labour*:—1st. Congregations and stations with settled pastors, but not able, fully, to support ordinances among themselves; and 2nd. Missionary stations not organized into congregations at all, but necessitous and inviting fields for evangelistic effort. How is this work to be overtaken in the most efficient manner? To leave it to individual presbyteries would seem to be attended with very serious and very apparent drawbacks; in as much as in those presbyteries where there is most evangelistic work to be done, there will generally be found least pecuniary ability. In such presbyteries a very considerable number of the congregations would require help themselves, and could be expected to do almost nothing for others. It would scarcely do for a minister to urge very strongly the claims of neighbouring stations when his own scanty stipend was but very irregularly paid. Some of the wealthiest presbyteries in the body, on the other hand, have really no mission fields at all, within their borders; and in some of those presbyteries, which might almost be called Mission Presbyteries, I see the doctrine is mooted, that every congregation, supplied with a pastor, must support him in full, or he may starve. Whatever individual ministers or presbyteries may think, right sure am I, that such is not the feeling of the Church in general. Yet I cannot see but what it will come to that if each presbytery is limited to its own resources. I am very far, indeed, from wishing to see the work taken out of the hands of the presbyteries, and would oppose any proposal to hand over such work to any committee, either Synodical, or such as Mr. Kemp proposes. But here is a difficulty which meets us at the very beginning; presbyteries with a superabundance of work but a very limited amount of money; others with a considerable degree of money power, but little or no missionary work to be done within their limits. How is this to be equalized? I would respectfully ask brethren in favour of separate presbyteries doing all their own work, both ordinary and extraordinary. I have never seen how it is proposed to obviate the injury to both parties, and “I should like to know.”

With your leave I shall, in a subsequent communication, notice some of the drawbacks attendant upon a *central Fund*, especially as administered by the late U. P. Church of this province; and if possible, make a few remarks on Mr. Kemp's scheme, which seems to be, substantially, the establishment of five or six central funds, instead of one. In the meantime,

I am, &c.,

X. Y. Z.

---

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—Several communications, some of them received at too late a date, must be deferred.

*Philok*, who sent us a communication some time ago, did not send his name. His card must have dropped out.

In answer to a correspondent from the country, we beg to say that the word rendered “Bishop” means simply “overseer.” It is often applied to Elders in the New Testament. The New Testament Bishops were not “Lord Bishops.”