

economical arrangement takes £300 per annum.

Besides, we have something to say about the general plan of proceeding in this business. It appears to us, that owing to the unpopularity of the office of District Chairmen, in the capacity of travelling Elders, and to the existence of great doubtfulness as to their utility at all, it has been the plan of the rulers of our Church to lessen the burden of the maintenance of Chairmen of Districts on the several Circuits.

About two years ago, the services of the Chairmen of Districts were so appreciated, that the office was abolished. At the last Conference it was revived. This doing and undoing speaks as little in favour of the unchangeableness of the Institutions of Methodism as of the wisdom of its present managers.

Notwithstanding the restoration of the office, neither its popularity nor utility has been improved by a two year's suspension; and, to render it palatable, *economy* is practiced, which in relation to the pecuniary burden on the Circuits, may be sufficiently made out; but, if it is not robbing Peter to pay Paul we are not able to describe it. The pecuniary burden on the people is increased by £150 per annum. The office of Missionary agent is abolished, as not being necessary, and £150 per annum saved, but the cost of two Missionary Agents is substituted, to make the office of Chairmen of Districts palatable to the people. At the same time the Chairmen must be paid somehow, to the amount that the several Circuits are eased.

We believe that there is no duty more important, on the Members of a Church, than to enquire, till they are fully satisfied, as to the appropriation of their contributions; and there is nothing that will have a tendency to raise the leading Members of the Conference in the esteem of the Members of the Church, than candid explanations when required, and the greatest publicity in general of the whole management of the finances entrusted to them. To leave things to be sought out is painful, if not suspicious.

It, therefore, ought to be a subject of enquiry, whether £50 per annum, out of the Missionary fund, is the actual expense of the deputations. If it is, why should it not be charged as travelling expenses, incidental to holding Missionary Meetings? If it is, why should it be made an annual charge, when it is incurred only in a period of a few weeks in each year? If it is, why should we find additional payments for the same purposes, as published in the Missionary Report for last year? We there find several payments for expenses of attending Missionary Meetings, amounting to £24.

It cannot fail to be observed, that the office of Chairman is a privileged office.

They are the rulers of the Conference—they govern the Church in their respective Districts—they know little of the hardships of a Missionary life—and if their respective Circuits cannot pay their salaries, the Missionary fund is available for them; while the junior Preachers and Missionaries are practising self-denial, by travelling from shanty to shanty in the wilderness, without privileges,

without sympathising friends, and without a friend to resort to in time of need.

But we have not only to complain of an encroachment on the Missionary fund, made to pay the salaries of Chairmen of Districts, but of several other misappropriations, which, in our opinion, cannot be defended. The Missionary Agent is still paid for the last year, out of the Mission funds, £168 14s., notwithstanding the *economy* of giving the Chairmen of Districts £300 for the performance of the same duties. A deficiency in the President's salary is, also, made up out of the same fund. This, last year, was £22 2s. 9d. An appropriation out of the same is made to the Contingent fund of £54. For special services, to the President and another, £23. And for a Physician's bill, to Mr McNab, £15, though he was paid the full amount of his salary besides. All these items ought to be explained, and we trust they will be.

It is too serious a matter to see out of the gross amount of the Missionary collection for the year, of £2,000, nearly £500, or one-fourth, appropriated to other purposes than the Missionary work. We ask the Members of the Church, who contribute the money, if such was their intention in subscribing? and we ask the Preachers, who conduct the Missionary Meetings, and plead the necessities of the Indians and destitute settlers, and the obligations of those better provided with the privileges of the Gospel, whether the misappropriation is not a breach of trust and faith.

Nor is this all we have to say on this subject. There is an entire departure from the Constitution of the Missionary Society. We ask, when was the General Meeting of the Society called? what number of Lay-men were present when the five Lay managers were chosen? The Constitution requires that these officers should be annually chosen by the Society, and that every contributor of £1 is a member, and, consequently, has a vote for the appointment of officers. In the absence of better information, we strongly suspect, that this whole business has been usurped by the same leading members of Conference who control the other affairs of the Church.

We feel it our duty, before closing this subject, to criticize the last Missionary Report, in reference to its financial statement.

We do not hesitate to pronounce it a fallacious statement.

The Report shows a balance in the Treasurers hands, at the commencement of last year's account, and the same balance within £10 at the close of that account.

This has a fictitious appearance. It is equal to, and, consequently, in agreement with, having no balance in hand at all; for it is evident, that it has never been touched all the year through.

It is notorious, that at the close of the last Conference, that several of the Missionaries could not leave Toronto, for their respective Stations, because the Treasurer had not so much as £10 in hand! Where was the balance of £60 then?

Beside, by another admission in the same Report, the balance is stated to be only £453, that it was reduced to this to meet connexional

demands in England. The same Report states, that the sum of £302 was paid out of the balance of £760, and that it never came into the hands of the Treasurer, and still remains due to the Society. What is the use of this unnecessary confusion? when a plain statement might be made, which we believe to be nearly this:—That a balance being due from the British Missionary Committee to the Canada Missionary Society, and a debt for books being due from the Canada book concern to the British book concern, the former has been retained in payment of the latter, without the consent of the Treasurer of the Missionary Society. This alone solves the mystery of having paid this sum, and of never having received it, and of its being still due, and proves that the balance of £760 is fictitious. May we ask if this £302 has been repaid to the Missionary fund by the book concern?

Till this question is answered, we have the admission of the Treasurer of the Missionary Society, that £300 of the Missionary money has been appropriated to discharge a debt of the book establishment!

There is another item equally contradictory, or equally mysterious. The sum of £135 is stated to have been debited to the Treasurer, in a former Report, but never received; consequently, the Treasurer takes a credit for that amount in the last Report. What sort of a cash account must it be, to enter £135 that was never received? This shows the want of Auditors, chosen by the Members of the Church. We doubt whether the Lay-members of the Board of Management have performed their duty!

Our readers will think that we have been too severe in this article, against the Clerical managers of the Mission fund, but we have only performed a duty, though a painful one, nor have we fully performed it. We may yet have occasion to make further exposures, but we forbear. We hope we have said enough to awaken attention, and we find the spirit of enquiry spreading among the Members of the Church in every part of the Province. Even those who may not have made up their minds to go entirely with us, for a Lay-representation, will agree with us that the people have a right to see to the way in which their contributions are appropriated—that just and true accounts ought to be published—that there should be no confusion, or mystification—and no appropriation out of one fund, for other purposes, than those for which it is contributed.

We believe, notwithstanding, that these results will not be obtained without Lay-representation; and that, in the present article, we have materially added to the evidence in favour of it.

The Counsellor of Education, Von Turk, in his report asserts, that in Prussia, amongst 15,000 schoolmasters, are 12,000 who—*scholastic*—do not amount to 100 thalers per annum. In the Hanoverian States, the annual income of 436 schoolmasters is not quite 26 thalers each: 786 have an income per annum of 51 thalers, and there are 1,477 whose income amounts to 75 thalers. In the district of the Altmärk there are at this very day many who are called "wandering schoolmasters," who have no fixed schoolhouse, and who are obliged to instruct their young scholars at intervals, at the residences of the parents and friends of the children. The schoolmaster in general takes his meals with the family in whose house school is fixed.—*Hamburg Paper.*