

be said that this Supplemental Fund will tend to keep down, to a minimum, the contributions of the people, and that it accounts for their present low average of giving. This, to some extent, is undoubtedly the case; but still not to the extent it is sometimes imagined. In making this out there is one fact to be noted, namely; that the proportion of their members to each minister is less than ours—theirs being one hundred and thirty-six, and ours one hundred and fifty-three. If, then, these one hundred and thirty-six were to contribute at our rate per member (\$3.55), this would not yield more than \$483 of average stipend. At present the average is \$456, which is \$27, or about six-and-a-half per cent less than it would be if their members were to contribute at our rate. These \$27, or this six-and-a-half per cent, may therefore be regarded as representing the effect which the grants from the Temporalities Board has in diminishing the liberality of the people. Our rate of giving to stipend per member is six-and-a-half per cent higher than theirs, and is so, probably, because we have no endowments to impair our liberality. It may therefore be supposed that if they had no endowment they too would, most likely, give the six-and-a-half per cent more to stipend—the endowment, in other words, inflicts a loss of six-and-a-half per cent on stipend. But, on the other hand, the difference between \$483, the average stipend, if the Church of S. people contributed at our rate, and \$740, the average stipend of each minister at present, from all sources, will represent the advantage derived from the Supplemental Fund. This difference is \$257, or fully fifty per cent, more than even at our higher rate the people's contributions to stipend would amount to.

We thus see that the *disadvantage* of a Sustentation Fund, as illustrated in the case of the Church of Scotland in Canada, is represented by a diminution of average stipend contributed by the people, to the extent of six-and-a-half per cent; and the *advantage* of it is represented by an increase of total average stipend to the extent of over *fifty per cent*—six-and-a-half per cent represents the loss, and fifty per cent the gain. This is a fact worth considering.

Another point worth noting, in connection with these statistics, is that the rate of average membership to each charge, and of average stipend, bear a marked proportion to each other. The average membership of the Church of Scotland, in Canada, to each minister is one hundred and thirty-six, and the stipend is \$456; in the C. P. Church the like membership is one hundred and fifty-three, and the stipend \$545; in the U. P. Church in Scotland the membership is two hundred and eighty, and the stipend \$879. The average rate of giving per member varies little in either case; in the *first* it is \$3.35; in the *second* it is \$3.55; and in the *third* \$3.10; the average of the three being \$3.33.

Considering the other claims that are constantly being pressed on the attention of the people, such as missions, benevolence, and church building, it is doubtful if the rate of average contribution per member, for stipend, can be raised much if any higher than \$4. Were our churches to cease to be the churches of the people and of the poor, and to become the churches of the middle class and of the wealthy, we might then, as in the United States, expect a larger average rate of contribution, but being as they are, and as they ought largely to be, made up of the humbler ranks of life—a \$4 average rate per member is, probably, the maximum to which we can expect to attain.

The law pertaining to average stipend would thus seem to be this; that the ratio of average membership to each minister will determine the rate of average stipend. The true way, therefore, by which to increase stipend,