

the order of seniority. This represents the sustentation principle in the scheme.

2nd. That the Synod of 1870 shall proceed to the immediate creation of a Home Missionary Board, separate and distinct from the Temporalities' Board, and which shall be under Presbyterian and Synodical control. This Board will be charged with the formation of a supplementary fund to be annually contributed by the congregations, the specific object of which shall be to aid all those congregations, and only those, who, in the judgment of their several Presbyteries, are unable to provide for the adequate support of ordinances.

It will be suggested that the Home Missionary Board shall consist of the moderator and clerk of Synod, *ex officio*, one minister and one layman from each Presbytery, and a certain number of additional members to be elected by the Synod. That the chairman of this Board shall be elected by the Synod, and that ultimately, such chairman should devote his whole time and labour to the superintending of the Church's Home Missionary operations, and to the general management of the Fund. Provision will also be made for an annual meeting of the Board during the sitting of the Synod in each year, to receive reports and statements from the Temporalities' Board and from the Presbyteries, to ascertain the amount of money that may be required for carrying out the above mentioned proposals, and to make such general arrangements for the collecting and disbursing of funds as may be requisite and necessary, and also to elect from among themselves an Executive Committee for the transaction of business during the year. It were premature to speculate on the details of such a scheme as this. We have said enough to foreshadow the chief features of it, and whether we have apprehended the full scope of the Committee's intentions, or not, what has been stated may suffice to introduce the subject to public notice, and we may add that we shall be glad to make room in our columns, more especially if they come in a condensed form, for any remarks that the perusal of this may suggest. We are free to state that our own opinion of the general scheme is favourable. There is conservatism in reverting to the original intention of paying the £50 in full, and, besides, there is honesty in it. Why should we perpetuate the delusion that a minister is receiving that sum when he is not? Or why give a congregation credit for contributing \$50 a year to the Home Mission Fund that does not?

And it is well known that one-half of the congregations are now in that false position, and that the \$50 in too many cases comes out of the minister's pocket. A few individuals might at the first find themselves at a comparative disadvantage, but, in the long run, it is evident that they would better their position, for their ultimately coming upon the Temporalities' Fund for an annual allowance of 25 per cent more than they are now receiving would be as certain as the existence of the Fund. And it admits of easy demonstration that they would not have to wait very long.

Although we did not mention this fact in its proper connection, there can be no doubt that every minister who from age or infirmity obtained leave of the Synod to retire from active duties would at once be placed on the Temporalities' Fund, and that of itself would be a valuable consideration. And then, there is something in the principle of granting aid to weak congregations, who, of themselves, are unable to support christian ordinances that commends itself. Nor can it be doubted that under a system of this kind a much larger amount of annual contributions would be secured than at present. Presbyteries would undoubtedly be led to feel that their influence and active co-operation was needed, and it would become, more than it has been, a point of honour with them, and individual ministers to make sure that all congregation under their supervision discharged their relative duties to one another and to the Church. And this, too, must be considered, that the claims of those who might be at the first most inconvenienced by the change would be certain to receive the first consideration of the Mission Board. But why waste words about a prospective advantage to individual ministers and the Church that is self evident, so much so, that any man who has half an eye can see it; even the man who has not been accustomed to look beyond his nose must see it. To doubt that the Church would contribute \$8,000 a year, or whatever the sum shall be that may be required to inaugurate and carry on such a scheme, would imply either a grave misapprehension of the importance of the work in hand, very gross mis-management, or, a very low estimate of the willingness or ability of our people to contribute. In any plan that may be devised it is of great importance that there should be laid before the Synod from year to year a definite estimate of the sum required for that year, and that thus there should be pre-