

the employment of student labor is receiving more attention at the hands of the Board than it ought? How far is it good to engage unproven labor, as much of student labor necessarily is, in work which really requires unusual caution and presents peculiar difficulties demanding experience to cope with? and whether the remuneration given for it is out of proportion to that paid ordained and permanent pastors?

Your Board does not shun fair criticism in what it has done in this matter, as it does not in any other part of its policy or in any one of its measures or acts. We give you the facts: ordained men are scarce, that is, men who are prepared to brave the trials involved in connection with new fields. A large number of students are in course of instruction at both of our Colleges, who ought to have the benefit of field work. In many instances most excellent and satisfactory work has been done both in working up new fields and in resuscitating old ones, by students who have in some cases, not only labored during the summer, but have kept hold during the winter, while at College, either going themselves regularly or at intervals and returning for a second summer.

The basis of remuneration to students, which this Board has sought to make good, has been at the rate of \$4.00 per Lord's Day for winter, and \$30 per month for the five and four month terms, and \$50 for the two month term, clear of expenses. When a student remains out for a year, he receives the same rate as during summer, save in exceptional cases where living is higher, as in Port Arthur. Should any objection be taken to student labor, on the ground that it is not continued throughout the year, and that consequently we lose as much in winter as we gain in summer, we wish it understood that we do not send a student to any place for the summer where we have not the purpose and prospect of continuing the work. For the past this has not been merely a theory, but an accomplished fact, except where we had reason to postpone helping the field towards securing a laborer.

Your Board desires to express a deeper confidence than ever before in the plan of working our fields through Associational Boards. We believe that the brethren on these Boards are realizing that their position is not complimentary or ornamental; that a great deal of the hard work of Missions—if Mission work is ever to be done right—must be done by them. It has taken time and will take more for them to understand exactly how much is expected of them, to learn their business—for no greater mistake can be made than to conceive that Missions can be run without thought and educated attention—and to get the Churches to understand the utility and beneficence of an arrangement which puts their concerns not into the hands of a foreign power, viz.: the General Board, but into the hands of brethren at their door and in their midst, who can and do understand their necessities and capabilities far better than a General Board could learn in a lifetime. It must be the duty of your new Board to consider how more and more the work can be safely entrusted to these Associational Boards without impairing the integrity and unity of the Society. On the one hand we have to avoid the danger of having the