

been happily disappointed, and Mr. Kemp, who was one of the most impatient advocates of the measure, is the first who has printed a word of regret in reference to it. It is deeply to be lamented that he has allowed himself to utter sentiments calculated to arouse prejudices and to give rise to misconceptions. Here it can do little harm, but at a time when the subject of union occupies so much attention in the Presbyterian Churches throughout the world, his statements are most mischievous in their tendency. It is a matter of surprise that there has been such entire harmony in the United Church, and that so much has been done to consolidate the Church. It may be granted to Mr. Kemp that we have not received so many ministers from Britain as we might have done had we remained apart, but the Union itself is most harmonious, and its good results in the consolidation of the Church are more and more apparent from year to year.

Mr. Kemp deals very severely with the Central Fund, and the Home Mission Committee who manage it. He seems ignorant alike of the past history of the Home Mission operations, and the working of the present system. He speaks as though the Free Church had all along left the mission work to the Presbyteries, with the exception of the distribution of the missionaries. In 1844, a Home Mission Committee was appointed, the late Rev. A. Gale, Convenor. From the first this Committee exercised a general supervision of the whole field, and the legislation of the Synod from year to year tended more and more to centralisation. In 1847, a Central Synodical Fund was instituted, and the regulations for the Home Mission work were very similar to those by which our present Committee is guided. In 1848 the Committee were even authorised to determine the stationing of ministers after corresponding with Presbyteries.* In 1853 Mr. Gale was appointed Superintendent of Home Missions, with a salary. It was not till 1855, after Mr. Gale's death, that the work of the Synod's H. M. Committee, was reduced to the mere distribution of missionaries among the Presbyteries. In 1857, the Presbytery of Montreal overtook the Synod for the re-establishment of a Central Fund, and it was sent down to Presbyteries, but in view of the negotiations for union no action was taken. Immediately after the Union the subject of the Home Mission work occupied the attention of the Synod, and from the very first the Synod approved of a Central Fund. In 1864 a proposal was made to conduct it by Presbyteries, and in 1865 mission districts were proposed, but the Synod continued by overwhelming majorities to adhere to the principle of a Central Fund, and at length the present scheme being matured, the Synod in 1865 instituted that Fund, and appointed a committee to manage it. This history of the scheme will serve to correct some of Mr. Kemp's misstatements.

We come now to the comparative results of the two schemes. When the present Committee began operations, it found the Presbyteries, with scarcely an exception, deeply in debt:—Montreal, \$1500; London (including debt on Buxton Mission) \$1667; Toronto, \$300; Grey, \$350; Ottawa, \$321; Cobourg, \$100; Ontario, \$89; Kingston, \$91, together with other debts not included in these sums, amounting in all to upwards of \$5000. Missionaries were wearied out waiting for years for the payment of arrears due to them. This is the scheme under which Mr. Kemp speaks of the Church as flourishing. To the Central Committee Mr. Kemp traces in a large measure his alleged decay of the Church, and yet it had only been in operation one year up to the time when his statistics end. Surely it had nothing to do with the want of progress during the preceding three years. Since it has been in operation it has paid off \$4,000 of old debts, (Montreal Presbytery liquidating its own arrears,) besides meeting punctually all the current expenses of the mission work. Such facts outweigh a score of such pamphlets as the one under review.

Mr. Kemp accuses the Home Mission scheme of being "cumbrous," requiring elaborate statistics, "taking the best men of the Church from their own proper work, and making them collectors of statistics," &c., &c. What can be said to such assertions, save that Mr. Kemp evidently knows nothing about the scheme,

*Mr. Kemp's Digest.