

Our Contributors.

A GOOD WAY TO RAISE MONEY.

BY KNOXIAN

In an address to ministers and students of divinity delivered some years ago Dr. Parker said: "If we had to pay for our words, we should use fewer of them." Undoubtedly we should. A cent each on all words over and above those actually needed would cut down some sermons and speeches until there would scarcely be anything of them left. If the orators at an average convention had to pay a small sum for each superfluous word they would go home bankrupts. A tariff on useless words would shorten up meetings of church courts or send some of the members into insolvency. Sessions of Parliament would be wound up in a few weeks if the members had to pay for verbiage at telegram rates. The oratorical end of tea meetings would be cut off if the orators had to pay a mill for every ten useless words. What a blessing a high tariff on verbosity would be.

Look at the matter from another point of view. Supposing the tariff failed to check the verbosity, what then? Just this: money would flow copiously into the church and the state treasury. A Session of Parliament three or four months long would produce thousands for revenue purposes. A general election would bring enough money into the strong-box of the country to build post-offices and custom houses and bridges, and make many other improvements. In fact the revenue from election verbosity taxed at a fair figure might perhaps build a railroad. We respectfully suggest this source of revenue to the attention of the Hon. George Eulas Foster, minister of Finance for this Dominion. A tax on verbosity might be a better thing for the country than a tax on the necessities or even on the luxuries of life.

How would it do to make an attempt to raise money for the schemes of the church by levying a tax of a cent on every useless word spoken at meetings of the church courts. Might there not be enough raised in this way in most Presbyteries to pay the clerk's salary and other running expenses. Who has not known Presbyteries in which, were this plan of raising revenue carried out, one member would have to pay the whole bill. The brother who speaks on every matter, especially those about which he is densely ignorant, might be compelled to pay the whole expenses of the court and then the Presbytery fund might go to missionary purposes or theological education.

By adopting the same plan at meetings of Synod and Assembly the expenses of these courts might be saved and the Synod and Assembly funds given to Augmentation. We respectfully suggest this idea to Mr. Macdonnell.

A cent a word on useless talk at tea meetings if paid to the pastor would help him mightily. Let us suppose that the oratorical part of the meeting lasts two hours and that the tap is running all the time. A tea meeting parson who has no ideas can easily speak a hundred words in a minute. That is six thousand words an hour or twelve thousand words in two hours. At a cent a word the revenue would be one hundred and twenty dollars. By a tremendous stretch of the imagination let us suppose that half the words are useful. There would then be the tidy little sum of sixty dollars for the pastor. That sum would put sixty good books into his library. Now just think of that and say if a tax on tea meeting verbosity would not be a good thing.

How would this plan work on sermons especially on the "one word more," "lastly," "finally," part of sermons. A New York clergyman, writing in one of the magazines, says that many sermons are five minutes too long and gives this happy illustration. "We may be glad to sail with an agreeable friend up to the very head waters of the Hudson, but it does not necessarily follow that we care to prolong our voyage though the Erie Canal." Supposing a

preacher has taken us up the Hudson in good style and then seems likely to take us into the shallow canal of reckless exhortation how would it do to say to him. "Brother keep out of that canal or pay a cent a word of toll."

IS ORDINATION NECESSARY? *

In the practical work of the Home Mission Field, greater difficulties are experienced in supplying stations with the sacraments of the Gospel than with the preaching of the Word of the Gospel. This paper is an attempt to remove some of these difficulties, and, as the present is developed from the past, it recalls certain theories and practices of this church in the past, and compares with these the theories and practices of the present in the same line of subjects. This is done in order to make manifest the fact that some of the difficulties experienced have resulted

FROM UNEQUAL DEVELOPMENT in correlated lines of theory and unequal development in correlated lines of practice; that, in equal development, these difficulties would be removed; and that, from the very nature of the case, equal development is a necessity.

The practice of the early Scottish Church with regard to the establishment and promotion of the true religion of the Gospel, was all based on the supreme importance in the Gospel ministry of the function of preaching. The preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments were indeed necessarily connected in such sense that no one could any more preach the Gospel lawfully than he could administer the Sacraments lawfully without ordination, yet to the preaching of the Word was attached such significance that the qualifications for preaching were regarded as the sole qualifications for the administration of the Sacraments. The whole action of the church in connection with the ministry was founded on this.

The theory of the church set forth, shortly, was as follows: The preaching of the Gospel is the supreme function of the ministry, and, inseparably connected with it, is that of the administration of the Sacraments. Both of these belong to the ministry alone. Ordination is the solemn setting apart to these functions, and to the office of the ministry over one particular flock in some particular place. In proof of these allegations I appeal to the 1st and 2nd Books of Discipline, whose language, on this subject, should be carefully noted. Book I., Chaps. I. to IV.; Book IV., Chap. IV., Sec. 7; Book II., Chap. V., Sec. 6.

Under such a theory and practice it is quite evident that license was not intended to mark, and

DID NOT MARK, ANY SEPARATION between the function of preaching and that of administration of the sacraments. License was clearly instituted simply as a device whereby the theory regarding the functions of the ministry, and the theory of ordination as over one particular flock in some particular place, could be put into actuality. It was a plan to bring the man and the flock together, so that ordination might follow, in order to minister both Word and Sacraments. License was thus the act which gave immediate eligibility to a call, and no such thing could exist as license without immediate eligibility. The very purpose for which license existed at all was to give eligibility, not to give authority to preach the Gospel. In proof of which I cite the 10th Act of Assembly, 1691. "Probationers are not to be esteemed by themselves or others to preach by virtue of any pastoral office, but only to make way for their being called into a pastoral office."—Pardovan's collections, title IV.

"Let it also be noted that the action of the early church with regard to readers, was strictly in the direct line of this theory and practice. Readers were simply readers, not preachers of the Word as our catechists are. As soon as they became the equivalent

* A paper read at the last regular meeting of the Presbytery of Montreal, by the Rev. James Fraser, B.A., Cushing, Quebec.

of our catechists they were given authority to preach the Gospel and administer the Sacraments, by being ordained as ministers. —See 1. Book of Discipline, chapter v.

Turning now to our own church in the present; some change (not much) in theory has taken place, considerable change in practice—though some of that change in practice is not apparent at first sight because of old names being retained. With regard to our present theory let it be remarked first, that the only point of departure is in respect to the preaching of the Word. Whatever the various causes which have brought it about this church no longer hold that

ORDINATION IS NECESSARY

to the preaching of the Word. It is true she requires, and rightly, for the sake of order, that all whom she employs to preach the Gospel shall hold a certain relationship to the church through the Presbyteries, but ordination is not now regarded as a necessity to the preaching of the Word under the charge of the Presbytery.

Secondly, this church holds that her ministers should be ordained, solemnly set apart, not only for the administration of the Sacraments, but also of the Word. She maintains, however, that in addition to the other qualifications, her ministry should be composed of men of a certain education, which the church provides, or the equivalent of which the church accepts. In this there is very little divergence from the ancient view, only a slight advance with regard to education.

Thirdly, in keeping with the view of the early Scottish church, this church holds that to the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ the administration of His Sacraments is united. In keeping with the view of the early church, this church does not hold that higher gifts are needed for the administration of the Sacraments than for that of the Word; nor that the administration of the Sacraments is a higher function than the administration of the Word of the Gospel. She holds to the supreme importance of the preaching of the Word, even in organized congregations and churches.

Adverting now to the present practice of the church, and comparing that practice with the three theories just mentioned, as held by this church, we find in the line of the first view a class of unordained workers in the mission field called Catechists, Student Catechists, and Licentiates. In the line of the second view just mentioned as held by this church, we have a class of

ORDAINED WORKERS IN THE MISSION FIELD

and congregations, composed of men called ordained missionaries and pastors or ministers. Both classes, the unordained, comprising catechists, student-catechists and licentiates, and the ordained, comprising pastors and ordained missionaries, all under the charge of the church. But we find that a distinction in function exists between these two classes. The unordained are dispensators of the Word alone, the ordained are dispensators of both the Word and Sacraments, and we find that this distinction in function is clearly not in the line, but contrary to the third view just mentioned as held by this church.

Now, the design and efforts of the church to secure an educated ministry, though not the only factor in the case, has carried immense weight in influencing and shaping this practice of the church, as between the functions of the ordained and non-ordained workers. Not that the design and effort to secure an educated ministry are not to be commended. But if this church deems it needful that her ordained ministry should be an educated ministry, that view and purpose should be set forth so clearly in her practice and order, as not to contradict, but run in the line of her view regarding the relative importance of the functions of administration of the Word and of the Sacraments. Manifestly, a glaring inconsistency is exhibited by a church, which, holding to the truth that the gifts needful for the function of preaching are the sufficient and

only qualification for the administration of the sacraments, and that the preaching of the Word is not a lower function than the administration of the sacraments, yet makes the distinction between her ordained and non-ordained administrators of the Word to lie in this, that the ordained preacher of Word can administer the sacraments while the non-ordained preacher of the Word cannot administer the sacraments. Her practice contravenes her view of the truth, and it creates not merely a fictitious, but grossly erroneous distinction between the functions, and between the gifts needed for the functions. As an example of what may proceed from attempts to work along that line, take one act of the legislation of the 17th Assembly, Kingston, 1891: "That the application from the Presbytery, of Halifax, for leave to ordain the student-catechists sent to Labrador be granted in so far as the one at present in the field is concerned, leave being given to license and ordain Mr. Simon Fraser, but that he complete his theological course before

BEING ELIGIBLE FOR A CALL."

Now, first, we have here the ordinary appointment of the Catechist, *i. e.*, authority to administer the Word but not the Sacraments. Next, on account of the need of the field for the administration of the Sacraments, we have ordination, and in this ordination a regular Presbyterial License, the significance of which is deliberately abstracted, it gives no immediate eligibility to a call; and then the ordination itself, which is not settlement and is not meant to be settlement. The old names of license and ordination, and the old order first license then ordination are retained, but they are mere names without body. It is like an attempt to confine new wine in old bottles with the usual result. The theory is spilled and the forms spoiled.

Hence we conclude that since this church holds unchanged the view, that for the furtherance of the true religion of the Gospel and of the life inculcated by the Gospel, to the preaching of the Word

IS NECESSARILY UNITED

the administration of the Sacraments; that the Sacraments do not need higher, but the same gifts for their administration as the preaching of the Word; that the administration of the Sacraments is not a higher function in the church than the preaching of the Word; and that ordination confers no special gift or grace to fit for the administration of the Sacraments any more than for the preaching of the Word,—so it follows, logically and necessarily, that if ordination is not necessary to the preaching of the Word of the Gospel, neither is it necessary to the administration of the Sacraments of the Gospel.

It follows, also, that if, in the order of development from the past, permission is granted to Presbyteries now to employ Catechists to preach the Gospel without ordination, that permission involves and carries in itself permission to employ these same Catechists to administer, without ordination, the Sacraments of the Gospel; that such employment both as to time and place is to be determined and regulated by the Presbytery, after the same manner as with respect to the preaching; and that such employment to administer the Sacraments of the Gospel, neither contains nor declares any more right of eligibility to a call or settlement in a pastoral charge than employment, under the charge of the Presbytery, to preach the Word of the Gospel now does.

If under this condition, the present idea generally entertained of License, that its object is to give authorization to preach the Gospel, will have to be given up, so much the better, for that was never meant to be its real object; and if under this condition, the name will have to be changed from "license to preach the Gospel" to "license to accept a call" or "license to settlement," so much the better, for that will remove all possibility of mistake as to its signification and use. License, however,