

and a resolution adopted looking toward the division of the Fund into two parts, an Annuitant Fund, supported by the ministers on an actuarial basis, and an Auxiliary Fund, supported by circuit contributions and administered much as we administer the Canadian Fund. The Conference appointed a Commission with instruction to seek further actuarial advice, and other information. The Commission held its first meeting in March, 1905. The actuaries consulted do not agree on the necessity of an actuarial reserve for the Auxiliary Fund. Mr. T. A. Coghlan, President of the Institute of Actuaries of New South Wales, and Government Statistician, takes the position that an actuarial reserve is not necessary for a superannuation fund. He says: "There are two ways of looking at the Fund, from a strictly actuarial standpoint, and from the standpoint of the Church as a living body. I am disposed to think that the proper view is the non-actuarial one." Speaking of the New South Wales Government railway superannuation scheme, Mr. Coghlan says: "As you can well understand, with railway commissioners representing the Government, it would not be necessary for them to accumulate a fund to meet a superannuation scheme. It would simply mean that the railway commissioners would have to look for a permanent increase in their wages bill."

Among other questions he was asked the following:—

QUESTION. The English Methodist Church has an Auxiliary Fund for making provision for retired ministers, etc. Its sources of income are various, but it is principally dependent upon an annual collection from its church members. This is to some extent unreliable. If the element of uncertainty were removed by the substitution of a fixed and reliable contribution from the respective congregations, and an assured income thus secured to the Fund, would you regard this as an undesirable system of finance, or as one justified by the character and constitution of the Church itself?

ANSWER. I would not consider it an undesirable system of finance. I do not consider that either in the case of a nation or a progressive church, that it is necessary that the provision made for its servants or ministers should be other than an annual one. In an ordinary life assurance society there is always the contingency to be faced of a large reduction in members, and such a society must be prepared to stand the test of showing assets equivalent to its liabilities. The State is in an entirely different position, and so also is a living and progressive church. In these cases of State and Church, the annual provision made for those in its service is based on the assumption of its living for ever.

Your Commission would also suggest that there is a