





999813.

D-161

SEP 10 1955

A REVIEW OF THE STATE AND PROGRESS

OF THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,

SINCE THE UNION IN 1861.

BY THE REV. ALEX. F. KEMP, M. A., WINDSOR, C. W.

IT is now upwards of five years since the Free Church and the United Presbyterian Church were induced, on terms agreeable to both, to unite together, and form one organization under the name of *The Canada Presbyterian Church*. This event was hailed with almost universal joy; and sanguine expectations were entertained by its friends as to the beneficial results that would follow. That the Union in itself was a good measure, few will deny, and that it was a step in the right direction, seems obvious. The two Churches occupied the same field, embraced in their membership the same class of persons, were identical in their order, worship, and discipline, held the same doctrinal standards, and only differed on certain matters of opinion as to the relation of the Church of Christ to the Governments of the world. The wonder with many was, not that a Union had been effected, but that it should have been so long delayed, and so difficult to accomplish. Both interest and duty seemed to impel towards Union. Neither of the Churches were very strong in numbers or in wealth. Both found their resources inadequate to overtake the field of mission labour which lay before them. What therefore could be more natural than that they should unite their forces into one, for their mutual edification and the more vigorous and effective prosecution of their Christian work?

This was accordingly done in Montreal in June 1861, under conditions most auspicious and promising. The two streams of Church life then became one, and prepared themselves to sweep on in greater volume than before, through the generations to come.

It may, at this time, after an experience of so many years, be both expedient and profitable to take a friendly review of the position of the United Church, and to ascertain what has been the effect of the Union, and what the Church's progress in those departments especially upon which its character and position mainly depend; viz., its *Ministry*, its *Membership*, and its *Finances*. These may be regarded as the barometers which,

by their increase or decrease, gauge with certainty the Church's growth or decay, rise or fall, in this progressive world.

Thanks to our pains taking Statistical Committees, and to the wisdom of our Synod, there have been accumulating from year to year, statistics sufficiently accurate and complete, to enable us to institute a comparison between corresponding periods of the Church's history, *before* and *after* the Union.

From these statistics we have prepared, and now present to the Church, certain comparative tables, embracing periods as favorable for comparisons as can be selected, and for which the published statistics are as complete and reliable as can be expected. These periods are, from 1855 to 1859, before the Union, and from 1862 to 1866, after it. We thus take four years before and four years after the Union, and compare the statistics of the two periods together. In the department of the Ministry the statistics are perfect, being taken in every case from the Synod's Rolls. In those, however, of the Membership and Finances, the data are not quite so reliable; but yet as a good deal of pains was taken with the reports of these years, their figures may be regarded as a fair approximation to the actual facts.

Having made these explanations, we would now draw attention to the information which the statistics of the Free Church and the United Presbyterian Church, for the years 1855 to 1859, on the one hand, and the Canada Presbyterian Church for the years 1862 to 1866, on the other, afford.

I. THE MINISTRY.—1. From the published records of the Free Church we find there were—

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Ministers on the Roll in 1855,..... | 104 |
| “ “ “ 1859,..... | 143 |
| Increase in four years, | 39 |
| Average increase per annum,..... | 3.75 |
| | or 9.40 per cent. |

2. From the published records of the U. P. Church we find there were—

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Ministers on the Roll in 1855, | 50 |
| “ “ “ 1859, | 66 |
| Increase in four years, | 16 |
| Average increase per annum, | 4 |
| or 8 per cent. | |

The average annual increase for the two Churches will thus be 8.87 per cent.

3. In the Canada Presbyterian Church, on the other hand, there were—

| | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| Ministers on the Roll in 1862, | 231 |
| “ “ “ 1866, | 248 |
| Increase in four years, | 17 |
| Average increase per annum, | 4.25 |
| or, 1.85 per cent. | |

In these tables we have the notable fact brought out, that, while the 104 ministers of the Free Church increased by 39, and the 50 of the U. P. Church, by 16, between the years 1855 and 1859, the Canada Presbyterian Church, with its 231 Ministers, increased by only 17, between the years 1862 and 1866. Or, again, that while the two Churches, *before* the Union, increased at the average rate of 8.87 per cent. per annum, the C. P. Church, *after* the Union, increased by only 1.85; being a difference of 7 per cent. in favor of the former, or of 8.55 in favor of the Free Church. We thus see that had the C. P. Church, *after* the Union, increased at the same rate as the two Churches out of which it was formed did *before* the Union, we should have had 80 additional Ministers instead of only 17 added to our numbers.

Allowance must however be made for the deaths that have occurred in the C. P. Church during the past four years. Of these there was the unusual number of 15 in all; whereas in the period previous to the Union there were only 5 in both churches. This gives a difference of 10, or an average of 2 per annum, or 90 per cent. to be reckoned to the C. P. Church; which if added to the actual per-centage of increase makes, it 2.75 per cent.; still leaving a difference of 6.12 per cent. in favor of the Church before the Union.

As regards demissions, we find that while in the four years from 1856 to 1859 they amounted to 44, or 11 per annum, in the four years from 1861 to 1866 they only amounted to 32 or 8 per annum. These figures are found in the published reports of Presbyteries.

Again in the matter of receptions and licensures there were 21 of the former and 28 of the latter in the two churches before the Union, against 12 and 36 in the C. P. Church after the Union. Taking the two together, it would appear that the additions to the ministry were about the same in both periods, being 49 in the one and 48 in the other.

Of ordinations, translations, and inductions, classed under the general name of settlement, there were in all in the two churches before the Union 116, and in the C. P. Church after the Union only 98, notwithstanding its greater proportion of strength, and its, at least, equal facilities.

These figures give collateral confirmation of the conclusions drawn from the tables of statistics, and show that in the main they are a pretty fair representation of the condition of the Church.

II.—THE MEMBERSHIP.—1. In the Free Church there were—

| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Members reported in 1855, | 11,191 |
| “ “ “ 1859, | 16,485 |
| Increase in four years, | 5,294 |
| Average annual increase, | 1,323 |
| or 12 per cent. | |

2. In the U. P. Church there were—

| | |
|---------------------------------|-------|
| Members reported in 1855, | 6,288 |
| “ “ “ 1859, | 9,293 |
| Increase in four years, | 3,005 |
| Average annual increase, | 754 |
| or 12 per cent. | |

3. In the C. P. Church there were—

| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Members reported in 1862, | 30,256 |
| “ “ “ 1866, | 36,469 |
| Increase in four years, | 6,213 |
| Average annual increase, | 1,553 |
| or 5 per cent. | |

On comparing these tables it would appear that the 10,000 of the Free Church increased nearly as much in four years as the 30,000 of the C. P. Church; and that while the *two* Churches, before the Union, increased each on an average at the rate of 12 per cent. per annum, the *one* Church, after the Union, increased only at the annual rate of 5 per cent., being a difference of 7 per cent. in favor of the former. We also find that had the C. P. Church, after the Union, increased at the same rate as the two Churches of which it was composed did separately before the Union, we should have had an addition to our membership of 14,520 during the past four years, instead of only 6,213.

III.—THE FINANCES.—In this department we shall confine attention to the stipend account, as being the largest and most complete item of the statistical returns, and at the same time the best test of the Church's outward prosperity.

| | |
|---|--------|
| 1. In the Free Church we find that the— | |
| Stipend acct. amounted in 1855, to \$45,878 | |
| “ “ “ 1859, to 64,857 | |
| Increase in four years, | 18,979 |
| Average annual increase, | 4,745 |
| or 10.20 per cent. | |

| | |
|--|----------|
| 2. In the U. P. Church we find that the— | |
| Stipend acc't amounted in 1855, to | \$20,553 |
| “ “ “ “ 1859, to | 31,215 |
| Increase in four years, | 10,662 |
| Average annual increase, | 2,665 |
| or of 13 per cent. | |

The average annual increase for the two Churches, for the four years between 1855 and 1859, will thus be 11.60 per cent.

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 3. In the C. P. Church we find that the— | |
| Stipend acct. amounted in 1862, to | \$101,599 |
| “ “ “ “ 1866, to | 129,711 |
| Increase in four years, | 28,112 |
| Average annual increase, | 7,028 |
| or about 7 per cent. | |

On comparing these tables we find, that while in the four years between 1855 and 1859, the rate of increase in the Free Church was 10.20 per cent. per annum, and of the U. P. Church 13 per cent., in the C. P. Church it was only 7 per cent. for the period between 1862 and 1866; being a difference of 3.20 in favor of the Free Church, and of 6 in favor of the U. P. Church before the Union; or taking the average increase of the two Churches at 11.60 per cent., the difference in their favor will amount to 4.60 per cent. per annum. If, further, the rate of increase had been the same after the Union, as it was before it, we should have had an increase in our income at this date of \$47,000 instead of only \$28,000.

In looking over these tables, we cannot but note the remarkable similarity in the rates of increase in the two Churches respectively, before the Union. In the membership the rate is exactly the same. In the Ministry there is a difference of 1.40 per cent. per annum in favor of the Free Church; and in Finances of 3 per cent. in favor of the U. P. Church. From this item, however, is to be deducted supplementary aid to Congregations from the Mother Church in Scotland up to the year 1857, and apparently included in the returns of stipend, amounting, probably, to at least \$500 per annum. On the whole the two tables are remarkably alike, and indicate an almost equal rate of progress.

These are certainly not the results that before the Union the sanguine friends of that measure anticipated from their labors. On the contrary it was supposed that the Union of the Churches would largely conduce to the increase of the United Church's life and progress. Here, however, is a decided re-action,—a manifest loss of power—and that, too, not by stages, but at one leap. The year 1861—the year of the Union—marks the period of the Church's arrested growth. That for a year or two before and after the Union, there should be a measure of inactivity in the work of Church extension, might reasonably be expected and allowed, but that this inactivity should continue from year to year, with no apparent hope of improvement, is not a very agreeable fact to contemplate.

It may therefore well be asked, Why it is that our rate of progress since the Union, has not kept pace with our rate before it? Why this sudden and marked arrest in the increase of our Ministry, our Membership, and our Revenue?

There has not been to any great extent an amalgamation of congregations to account for this decay. Of this there have only occurred a few instances over the whole Church. We have only heard of four, and if there be more, they cannot at the utmost appreciably affect the results which the statistics yield.

Again as to the condition of the country during the periods compared. There does not appear to be any material difference. If anything, the period between 1862 and 1866 is the more prosperous of the two. This we would infer from the fact: First, that the sum of \$4,000 of arrears and additions has been paid on account of stipend, over and above what was promised. Second, that on looking over the public statistics of immigration we find, that while in the four years from 1855 to 1859, the accessions to our population from Scotland, the home of Presbyterianism, were 8,229; that, in the four years from 1861 to 1865 amounted to 12,453,—being a difference of 4,224, or an average of upwards of 1,000 per annum. To this we might also safely add an additional 100 per annum for Presbyterians from the north of Ireland. These figures make our diminished increase, since the Union, all the more striking, and constrain us to look within the Church itself for the causes of its decay.

If it be here asked; Has the Union itself had anything to do with this arrest on our progress? What shall we answer?

Here we touch on tender ground; and yet in truth we cannot overlook the question. As a friend and advocate of the Union, we may be permitted to discuss it without being charged with prejudice or hostility. What, after all, if our Union, for which we so ardently labored and prayed, should, like the meeting of the opposing waves of the ocean, have counteracted each the enthusiasm of the other, and produced an inauspicious repose? Can this have been the case? That each Church before the Union had its own fine enthusiasm—and that each labored with a generous emulation to overtake the mission work of the country, is manifest. Each was animated with a special *esprit du corps*, and was zealous for the maintenance of that principle of the Divine Word of which it was a special representative. Each had a history which it regarded as honorable, and cherished with devotion. It had a life springing out of its own past, which it loved. Such minor motives, as well as the major one of preaching the gospel to every creature under heaven, animated each Church in prosecuting its mission in this country, and may to a large extent account for its special progress.

That the Union has made an alteration in these respects cannot be doubted. Each Church has been in some measure detached from its old moorings—from its own past. While prin-

ciple may not have been compromised in the Union, it may yet be feared that our special feelings and enthusiasm have been arrested and subdued. We may think that we carry with us, into the United Church, all that we had and were in our separate state, but we do not. Our separate enthusiasms were diverse; the one cannot fully sympathize with the other, and must be abated to the level of the other; each to each, in all our public procedure. We may, it is true, in our private and social meetings, keep our old fires burning, or fan them into a fitful blaze; but when we come to act with each other, the feelings must be toned down into a common chord. As yet our United Church has no history no contentings, no martyrs, no heroes, no special principles to represent. It is new-born, and has no past. Its fortune has yet to be carved out of the unshaped future; its special enthusiasm has yet to be created.

The results of our Union, so far, may be teaching us, by experience, that Union is not always strength, and that the half sometimes exceeds the whole. The conclusion may be forcing itself on us, that the United powers of two moral forces are not always equal to the sum of both in separation; and that the true way of uniting the Church of Christ in its several *nominalities*, is not by at once incorporating, but by gradually harmonising its several parts. We are sure that a perfected harmony will result in a unity; but it will not always happen that a unity will be harmonious, or will impart to the United whole a more vigorous life.

While we so write, would we advocate a reversion to the past? No! We cannot go back. The deed is done; we must make the best of it. It may come out all right in the end. The present generation, with its special feelings, sympathies, and affections, will pass away, and a new race of men will arise, to whom our history and our work will become a curious antiquity, and who knowing only the Church of the Union, will love it as we have loved the churches of our fathers, and will, on the solid foundations which we have laid, build up a grander Temple to the Lord than ever we could have done each by itself alone, or ever can do united into one.

There may, however, be other causes at work to which may in part be attributed our decay. It may be that in our new ecclesiastical arrangements errors have been committed, that have worked disastrously for our interests. That this has been the case we have no doubt. If we look to the new organization of our Presbyteries and to our Home Mission and Collegiate operations, we shall find there enough of folly to account for much of the stagnation which we now have to deplore in the Church.

To see the bearing of these things on the Church, it will be necessary to survey the plans pursued, in carrying on the Mission work of the Church, before and after the Union, in the respective bodies.

In the Free Church, before the Union, the Home Mission was carried on almost exclusively by the Presbyteries, within their own bounds,

without the intervention of extraneous or overseeing Committees. All that the Synod's Committee had then to do, was to allocate the Preachers and Missionaries to the several Presbyteries as they were required. The Presbyteries, in fact, chose their own supplies twice a year, and were responsible for their employment and payment. The Presbyteries were thus able to adapt their supplies to the special wants of the vacant charges and Mission Stations under their care. Fixed charges were in this way soon supplied with pastors, and stations were nourished into Churches. Generally the Missionaries remained in one place from three to six months, and private arrangements always gave probationers an opportunity of being heard in vacant congregations. This plan was not a device of any one's wisdom, but grew spontaneously out of the position and necessities of the Church and country. No doubt there were certain persons of a mechanical turn of mind, who would fain have introduced quieter and more orderly devices, but these were always opposed. Presbyteries resisted any attempt at the invasion of their just liberties, and were able without molestation to carry on their mission work with energy and success. Under this system the Church flourished, and in its ministry, its members, and its income, it increased as the statistics show, at a most gratifying rate.

At the Union this system was almost entirely broken up, partly by the way in which the Presbyteries were re-arranged, and partly by the imposition on the Church of a centralized system of Home Mission operations.

Before the Union the Free Church Presbyteries were for the most part large, and embraced within them extensive fields of mission labor. At the Union they were re-arranged on no conceivable principle, but that of the local proximity of congregations. No regard whatever was had to the wants of the Home Missions. The Committee entrusted with this matter, and the Synod to whom they reported, seemed alike to act with a reckless inconsideration of consequences, in their determination to multiply Presbyteries, and to parcel out the land into fragments. The opinions and feelings of existing Presbyteries were wantonly voted down. This mincing system could only in one or two instances be arrested. Presbyteries had, *volens volens*, to suffer the amputation of important limbs of their territory, even in the face of urgent remonstrance. The Synod was impatient and the Committee pertinacious, and so the deadly work was done.

In both East and West the same policy was pursued. The flourishing Missionary Presbyteries of Montreal, Hamilton, Toronto and London, were cut up into pieces, in such a way as that the wealthy and strong parts had little or no Mission field, and the weak and feeble had the whole outlying work to themselves. What else but paralysis could be expected from such an arrangement of the Church's forces? The weak were put forward to do all the fighting, and the strong were entrenched far in the rear.

The U. P. section of the Church did not feel the change so much as the others, and to do them credit, did not probably see the effects that were likely to follow its adoption. Their own Presbyteries were always small, and had become accustomed to a central Mission scheme and a central fund. This Committee of theirs was originally instituted in the year 1847, for the purpose of applying the annual grant in aid of weak congregations sent from the mother Church in Scotland; and in 1849 it was more fully organized, and its powers extended. It then took charge of the annual grant from the U. P. Synod in Scotland, and the collections of the Church in Canada. Its special object was to effect "the gradual extinction of foreign aid, by increasing the Mission income and resources of the Church in the Province." It was invested with certain limited powers for this end, but was also enjoined to pay strict regard to the rights of Presbyteries, and to be extremely careful not to interfere with their perfect liberty of action. The objects the Committee contemplated were successfully accomplished. Sufficient funds were collected to replace the grants withdrawn by the Church at home. The Church so prospered under the aggressive energies of Presbyteries, unfettered by central machinery, of which they appeared ever to be jealous, that ere long it was fully able to sustain itself. In their case a central fund was found to be necessary for the distribution of the home grant, so long as it was given, and to supplying its want when it was withdrawn. Their Presbyteries, besides, were small,—the largest of them in 1851 not numbering more than nine ministers, and in 1857 not more than thirteen. In their condition a central fund could not well be avoided, and was the most feasible way of effecting the objects contemplated by the Synod. But this Committee never thought of embracing within its oversight the whole Mission field of the Church, or of taking this work out of the hands of the Presbyteries. Limited even as its powers were, it was regarded by one or two Presbyteries with a jealous eye, and its requisitions systematically neglected. The Presbyteries were the true efficient in their Mission work, and the Committee co-operated with them only in the distribution of the public funds of the Church.

At the Union of the two Churches two plans for carrying on the Home Mission work were proposed to the Synod. One was, that three or four contiguous Presbyteries should be united into Missionary or District Synods,—take the whole Mission field within their bounds under their joint care,—hold one or two united meetings annually,—and make such executive arrangements as might be deemed necessary.

It was argued that this plan, rendered necessary by the smallness of the Presbyteries, would secure local interest and liberality, and an intelligent and generous local superintendence; that destitute places would be more effectively supplied; that diverse operations to meet the diverse conditions of localities, would thus be possible; that our Mission work would thus be-

come thorough and effective; and that the usurpations of central Committees would thus be prevented. Also, that further centralization than these District Synods contemplated, would demand for its working a complicated, cumbersome, and costly machinery, which neither the Ministry nor the Church at large could bear, and would give rise to constant misunderstandings, obstructions and debates.

The other plan, which the Synod by a majority finally adopted, was that of a central Committee and a central fund; supplemented by a Committee for the circulation of probationers among the vacant charges. This Committee takes oversight of the Mission field; it is placed over Presbyteries; they are enjoined to *co-operate* with it, not it with them; they are humbly to attend to all its requisitions, and fill up all its schedules; to furnish it with elaborate statistics, and to become its clerks and correspondents. The Presbyteries, under this plan, can neither project, or carry on any new project of a Missionary kind, that requires the expenditure of money, without first conforming to a set of cumbrous rules, and waiting on the tardy decisions of the central gentleman at Toronto. This is the Bureaucratic scheme with which the Church has fettered the action and the liberty of its Presbyteries.

What is the result? Machinery, for one thing! complicated and heavy machinery! A machinery that is exhausting the strength and patience of the best men in the Church, withdrawing them from their proper ministerial work, and making them writers of letters and collectors of statistics, that harasses and frets congregations and stations. Another result is, wide-spread dissatisfaction; vacancies and stations, missionaries, preachers, and Presbyteries, all alike fretted and annoyed by its operations. The preachers of the Church refuse to submit themselves to the circulating Committee; the missionaries decline their appointments; and Presbyteries are perplexed. No wonder than our Mission work is stagnant. Truly we have retrograded from the simple to the complex,—the natural to the artificial,—the fruitful to the barren. Only this, we have got machinery!

It may be said that most of the defects of the system arise from the lack of missionaries and preachers; they cannot be obtained in adequate numbers to meet the urgent wants of the Church. Granting that this is a difficulty, yet it is no new one. It was felt as much before the Union as it has been since. The evil is of long standing, and does not affect the Church now for the first time. As great an evil as the short supply, is the method in which that supply is, under the present system, meted out and regulated. The Committee on circulation have an average number of demands, and an average list of supplies before them. Ignorant of the special character or wants of either, their work is simply to proportion, in an arithmetic way, the one to the other, without respect to persons or things. One is sent to this Presbytery, and another to that; now here and now there, for so many weeks, in

round succession, until the whole vacant field of the Church is pleasantly spotted over with weekly, or fortnightly, preaching. The result is, that no solid work is done, and little progress is made. Congregations are deeply grieved with the system; pastoral labor is almost totally neglected; the weary and the discouraged are not cherished or cheered. What else, under such a process, could be expected, than that our increase should be suddenly arrested.

Why cannot we get a larger supply than we have at present, of preachers and missionaries?—What is it that hinders? In the first place, Presbyteries, under the present system of things, have little or no interest in looking out for additional preachers and students. They know very little of the actual wants of the Church. The mission work is taken out of their hands, and relegated to Committees. That this has a tendency to cool their zeal for the extension of the Church and the increase of its ministry, who can doubt? Their responsibility in this matter is lessened by the intervention of a Committee, and by the subordinate *co-operative* position in which they are placed.

A second cause of the short supply of preachers, is the present condition of our Collegiate Institution. This College, which was the hope of the Church at one time, and for which a sum of at least \$42,000 has been spent on the buildings alone, has been for years gradually waning in public esteem. It is certainly not without honor in its past career. Among its Professors we can note such ripe and accomplished scholars and Christian gentlemen as King, Esson, Rintoul, and Young. Their teaching was of a high order, and in some instances the very best of its kind. They took a kind and paternal interest in the students, and gave them a relish for study which they never lost. The College has done good service to the Church, besides, in sending out a large number of zealous and able ministers, some of whom occupy with honor its most important pulpits, and who will favorably compare with the preachers of other countries and other Colleges. All this we most heartily say of the College. Yet, nevertheless, we must also say, that within the past few years it has fallen in public regard. Few of its present race of students have any great love for their *Alma Mater*. Many attend it because it is for them the only access to the Ministry, and many seek other pastures when opportunity offers. From the lips of few, if any of its late alumni, do we hear the language of commendation or affection. In the Church at large, among Ministers, Elders, and people, there is the same painful feeling of dissatisfaction. That this should hinder students from entering on a course of study for the Ministry is manifest. Why is this? it may be impartially asked. The answer is a matter of some delicacy, and yet it ought to be honestly and fearlessly given. All our Ministers know it. They speak of it familiarly in their private circles, and many of them are much exercised in mind and conscience about it. The time has come, we think, when the evil must be named. It is fretting the Church, be-

meaning us in our own eyes, and hindering our work. Impelled by a sense of duty we do now, as the only likely way of reaching the evil, say that the Reverend Principal of our College, by reason of his peculiar character and disposition, and the loose, irregular, and defective method of his teaching, is the bane of our College. It is reported, too, that from year to year it is getting worse; and so serious has the matter become, that a large number of the most intelligent of our students have, chiefly for this reason, gone to Princeton, U. S. So great is the damage that the state of the College is doing to the Church, that for the Church's sake it cannot be too plainly said, that the Principal has lost the confidence of the Church, and is seriously injuring its College, and retarding its progress.

Notwithstanding this condition of things, and the manifest short supply of preachers, we have to complain that the Synod has yet shown opposition to the institution of a new College in the Eastern part of the Province, where it is earnestly desired, and greatly needed. In many respects the East is widely different from the West, and requires, for the Church's maintenance and extension, special operations and means. Its Protestant population is widely scattered, and thinly sown among French and Catholic people. Toronto is far distant from many parts of it, and can only be reached by a long and expensive journey. Very soon it will be politically, as well as geographically distinct from the West. Its people are less Americanized than are those of Upper Canada. It has its own Schools of learning, and its own Universities, and a national feeling of its own. There are no more vigorous and liberal congregations anywhere to be found than in the East. Why, then, should any obstacle be placed in the way of its obtaining a College of its own? And why should not every facility be offered by the Church at large for this purpose? In affiliation with McGill University, a Theological Faculty in Montreal would, from indications already given, go far to double the number of our students.

We would, however, touch on another and last cause that hinders to some extent the increase of our Ministry, and the progress of the Church, namely, the greatly inadequate support provided for Ministers. This matter calls for special and serious attention. It may be safely said that at least three-fourths of our Ministers have barely enough to live on, and have besides the mortification of receiving what they do get, at uncertain times and in small amounts. Many cannot live upon the stipend they receive, and are compelled to eke out a living by other means. The families of many Ministers are frequently pinched for lack of adequate food and clothing; and their libraries are small, and seldom graced with a new book. The children of Ministers, who ought to be the most forward to embrace the ministry, are thus driven with dislike from the service of the Church, and the youth of our congregations, seeing the trials of their pastors, generally shrink from contemplating the office.

That we may see clearly how this matter

stands, let us turn to the statistics. There we find that the average stipend of each Minister in the Free Church was in 1855, \$441; in 1859, \$453; increase, \$12. In the U. P. Church it was, in 1855, \$411; in 1859, \$473; increase, \$62. In the Canada Presbyterian Church it was in 1862, \$453; in 1866, \$523; increase, \$70.

The average stipend at these dates would thus appear to have been, before the Union, \$444; after the Union, \$488, being an average increase since 1859 of \$44.

When, however, we look at this increase a little closely, we find that, small as it is, it arises not from an increased measure of liberality on the part of individual members of the Church, but from an increase in the membership of the several congregations, as the following will show.

There was in the Free Church an average membership to each Minister in 1855, of 107; in 1859, of 115; increase, 8. In the U. P. Church there was an average membership to each Minister in 1855, of 125; in 1859, of 140; increase, 15. In the Canada Pres. Church there was an average membership to each Minister in 1862, of 135; in 1866, of 147; increase, 12.

If, in like manner, we average these numbers before the Union, and after it, we find that up to 1859 the average membership to each Minister was 122, and up to 1866 it was 141; being an increase, since the Union, of 19. It would thus appear that the 19 additional members contributed the \$44 additional of stipend.

This will be more apparent by considering the items of the following tables: The average contribution per annum of each member to the stipend account in the Free Church was, in 1855, \$4.10; in 1859, \$3.93. In the U. P. Church it was, in 1855, \$3.30; in 1859, \$3.35. In the Canada Pres. Church it was, in 1862, \$3.36; in 1866, \$3.55.

If now again we average these amounts before and after the Union, we find that the average contribution for members up to 1859, was \$3.67; and up to 1866, \$3.35, a falling off in the latter period of 32 cents per member.

This table shows that there has been a diminution in individual liberality in the Church since the Union, and that the increase in the average stipend is solely due to the increase of the average membership to each Minister; yea, it is even less than by this rule it ought to have been; for 19 members at \$3.35 each, should have yielded \$67.75, whereas the average in-

crease of stipend to each Minister was only \$44.

There would thus appear to have been a decrease in individual liberality in the Church since the year 1855. Though our wealth and ability have been augmented to a large extent, our gifts for the preaching of the Gospel have yet declined. These things demand our serious attention. We need to be awakened out of a lethargy into which we have fallen, and to return to the zeal of our former life. The burdens on the Church in the matter of church building are not now so great as they were in former years, and nothing seems to hinder an increase in our individual contributions to the stipend account, of at least one-third more than we are contributing at present.

From this review of our condition as a Church, it will, we think, manifestly appear that the causes of our decay lie within ourselves; are of our own originating; and that consequently we have the remedies also within ourselves, and in our own hands. What, it may be asked, are the remedies for these things? We answer:

1. Let us put our Knox College in order, and make it a praise in the Church.
2. Let us establish a new College in the East, and give it our hearty support.
3. Let us give up or greatly modify our cumbersome centralized system of conducting our Home Mission work, and of supplying our vacancies.
4. Let us organize three or four District Synods, and intrust the oversight of the Home Mission work to them, within their respective bounds; and let the Preachers and Missionaries be distributed twice a year among them.
5. Let us take such steps as may be deemed wise to attract Ministers and Preachers to our Church, and to stir up our people to greater individual liberality in the matter of stipend.
6. Let it be felt that the burden of the Home Mission work should mainly and primarily rest on Presbyteries, and let there be no more cutting up of our country into Presbyterial fragments.

We commend these considerations to the Ministers, Elders and Members of the Canada Presbyterian Church. They are written in no factious spirit, nor with any evil intent. Our desire is to present the truth to the Church that she, seeing and knowing her actual condition, may arrest her declining career, and, putting forth a new energy, make up in the years to come more than the ground she has lost in the past.