

promote the cause, but, on the contrary, that it would produce results greatly to be deplored by all friends of the Society. The Directors, therefore, urge strongly that the bond uniting the London friends with the rest of the Province should become closer; and that the Society in the City of London should become a real, living, and fruitful Branch.

The Committee object to the claim that this Society has paid the Agents, and say, "On this we may be permitted to call attention to the fact that the free contributions of the Auxiliary to the General Fund far exceed the amount paid to those Agents, and that we are, therefore, in the same sense paying the Agents in other sections of the great field." This appears to the Board as not borne out by the facts of the case. In six years out of thirteen, the Society paid for agency in the London field more than it received. In 1874-5 it paid nearly \$300 more, so that of the \$663 which the London Auxiliary was credited with giving to the British and Foreign Bible Society in that year, nearly a half was in reality given by this Society. But even looking at the total sums yielded by the London field, they have been so small in proportion to the expense, that the Board is utterly at a loss to know in what sense the Committee of the London Auxiliary can imagine they have been "paying the agents in other sections of the great field." This has certainly not been done during the past year, for of the free contributions from Branches to the London Auxiliary, and subscriptions received in the city, amounting in all to \$982, \$763 were absorbed in paying the current expenses of the Auxiliary for the year, apart from \$258, paid for furniture and other special expenses out of a debt paid into the Auxiliary.

The Committee say they have devoted much consideration to the financial statistics furnished in the memorandum of this Board. They do not show the fallacy of any of these statistics, nor of the conclusions based upon them; but have forwarded a schedule to which they ask equal attention from the Board. The Directors have carefully considered the Schedule furnished by the Committee. It appears to shew that the present relationship between the Society and its Auxiliary is not radically wrong; but has been producing very satisfactory results, and the Directors feel that if the premises are granted the conclusion is most unanswerably proved. But they confess themselves at a loss to understand why in a comparison of the two fields 80 of the best Branches in one, and all the unproductive Branches in the other, should be excluded. Apparently the first are excluded because they are in cities or towns containing more than 5000 inhabitants. But when the Directors remember that the London field contains not a few such towns and villages, to say nothing of the City of London which is included, and that many Branches centered in smaller places have a large surrounding constituency, they suppose there must be some other reason for not counting eighty of their best Branches. Being unaware of the reason why unproductive Branches should not be counted, they included such Branches belonging to both fields in the statistics furnished in their Memorandum. It is evident, therefore, that the Schedule and the Memorandum are not dealing with the same things, and therefore it is not to be wondered at that they arrive at different results.

On Tuesday, the 20th November, the Deputation, consisting of the Right