27. Coldstream..... 100
(in case of settlement.)

PRESBYTERY OF HALIFAX.

28. Annapolis.....$200 as last year.

As to this case the Committee think it right to state that the Minister was settled on the promise of a grant of $200, and were it withdrawn or even materially reduced, the Presbyterian interest could not be sustained there at all in present circumstances. It should be remembered further that the Congregation consists only of 28 families and that the average rate of contribution per family as given in the Statistics of last year is 81.50 or deducting a special sum raised for Church building, the average still remains over 17.00 which is a very high one.

29. Kempt and W.....$120 as last year.
30. Lawrencetown..... 120 " "
31. Musquodoboit H.... 100 " "
(in case of settlement.)

PRESBYTERY OF LUNENBURG AND YARMOUTH.

32. Clyde River.....$120 as last year.
33. Mahone Bay..... 120 " "

There are thus 33 congregations which your Committee recommend should receive grants in aid, involving an expenditure of $3300,00. The number last year was 35, making a decrease of two. The congregations of Salmon River, River Charlo, Grand River and St. Ann's have been dropped from the list—while Baillie and Cow Bay have been added. The amount asked for last year was $3480.00, while this year it is 3300—there being a decrease here as well. It should be remembered, and it is true, that the whole amount asked for this year will not probably be required as some of the grants recommended are for congregations at present vacant, but making the necessary allowance for this, it is not probable that taking all things into account a less sum than $3300.00 will be required for the present year.

The question therefore arises, what means your Committee propose, or hope to propose, for meeting this large proposed expenditure, especially as in the first of June last as brought out by the Report of the Auditing Committee—the Fund was 456.19 in debt. Taking this into account the prospect at first sight appears discouraging, but a reference to the past will perhaps put matters in a better light. At the same period last year, the Fund was in debt to a still larger amount $592.23, but by authorizing the Committe to draw upon the Funds of the Home Mission Board which were in a flourishing, condition to the extent of $600.00, all its liabilities were met. The Committee would recommend the same course to be adopted this year. The tide of liberality toward this Scheme is plainly rising throughout the Church. The amount raised for the year ending June 1871, was $2825.30, and for the year ending June 1870, $2362.94; showing an increase of $462.36, while the funds of the Home Mission Board are in as prosperous condition as they were a year ago. Your Committee therefore see no reason to doubt that by taking the course recommended above the grants they propose can be made. And they feel the same confidence in making this recommendation for these two reasons. 1st. It is really Home Mission work which this Committee is doing. 2nd. There can be little question that some of the congregregations at least contribute to the Home Mission with a full understanding that a part of its funds are devoted to the purposes of this Committee.

It should not however be forgotten that $500 of the amount contributed for the year ending June 1871, was a grant from the Colonel Committee of the Free Church of Scotland. This matter came up last year and the Committee suggested to Synod that without making a formal request, Prof. McKnight should be asked to lay the whole state of our Home Mission field before the Free Church Colonial Committee. This suggestion was adopted and accordingly Prof. McKnight kindly undertook this duty, but through some misunderstanding asked that the grant should be continued for another two years only, while the intention of the Committee was that no time should be specified when the grant should cease. As the case stands the grant ceases before the end of the present year; and the Committee feel themselves to be in a difficulty as to the matter. This last application was the second one of the kind, and this being so, it is rather a delicate matter to go back again, while there can be no question that the grant seems likely to be needed for some years to come. Your Committee therefore would bring this to the notice of Synod, suggesting however that the Secretary be authorized to correspond again with the Free Church Committee.

The Synod will remember that a few years ago they laid down the rule that all the congregations receiving supplements should contribute to all the Schemes of the Church. This rule has never been very strictly observed, and the Committe find on looking over the Statistical Returns that a considerable number of the congregations in question had failed to carry out this injunction. The Committee would recommend that in future, Presbyteries be enjoined to see that this rule is strictly carried out, and that in all applications for Supplement they state distinctly that this has been done.

The Committee would further suggest whether it might not be advisable in order