

means being, in short, a private endowment, such as Mr. Gladstone declared in dealing with the Irish Church, no Government was entitled to lay hands on, even when, as he conceived it, a great national crisis justified exceptional, if not violent, measures.

The Synod was called together in January, 1855, to consider what steps might be necessary to take advantage of the Commutation Act. The Imperial Act provided that only those should be entitled to life annuities whose names were on the roll of the Church Court to which they belonged on the 9th of May, 1853. Eleven ministers had been placed on the roll between that date and the meeting of Synod, for whom no provision had been made, and it was therefore considered right that in some way or other their cases should not be disregarded. The sum to which each minister on the roll on 9th May, 1853 was entitled, was six hundred dollars annually for life, or that sum capitalised, according to the probability of his life. The terms of the commutation were to be settled with Government by the Synod acting for each minister, but only on his granting a power of attorney in favour of the persons named by the Synod to act on its behalf and on behalf of all granting such power.

Steadfastly keeping in view the policy that had all along been adhered to by the Church, of having a permanent endowment, it was thought that the time had arrived when such a beginning might be made as would secure in process of time a fund of some magnitude. Proposals to this effect were made to the members present. After long and anxious consultation—after modifying and frequently remodelling the proposed resolutions having that end in view, so as to secure that the fund, if constituted, could never be diverted from those who continued to adhere to the connection with the Church of Scotland—a series of resolutions was agreed upon as the basis of the contract on which the individual ministers agreed to invest their commutation money, which, had they so determined they could have used for themselves and invested for their families. A circular was ordered to be sent to each minister, with a copy of the minutes containing the resolutions, so that, before signing the power of attorney, all might be able deliberately to read and reflect on the terms.

The third resolution is the key-note to the contract, and therefore the closest attention should be given to its terms which I give in full.

3. "That all ministers be, and are hereby entreated, (as to a measure by which, under Providence, not only their own present interests will be secured, but a permanent endowment for the maintenance and extension of religious ordinances in the Church), to grant such authority in the fullest manner, thankful to Almighty God that a way so easy lies open to them for conferring so important a benefit on the Church."

The terms of the contract itself, in consideration of which the ministers were asked to sign, were very precise. There were two fundamental principles laid down; one relating to the disposition of the interest of the fund; the other to the constitution of the fund itself, and the conditions on which alone any one was entitled to share in its benefits. The following are its clauses: By the powers of attorney, the Commissioners were authorised "to grant acquittance to Government . . . and to join all sums so obtained into one fund, which shall be held by them till the next meeting of Synod, by which all further regulations shall be made,

"The following, however, to be a fundamental principle, which it shall not be competent for the Synod at any time to alter, unless with the consent of the ministers granting such power and authority, that the interest of the Fund shall be devoted in the first instance, to the payment of £112 10s. each, and that the next claim to be settled, if the Fund shall admit, and as soon as it shall admit of it, to the £112 10s., be that of ministers now on the Synod's Roll and who have been put on the Synod's Roll since the 9th May, 1853."

The plain, unmistakable, only meaning which these words can bear is so clear, that it would be almost an insult to point it out, were it not that an attempt is made to give the words a totally different signification. The commuting ministers agreed by that clause to accept \$450 instead of \$600 annually, so as to help the eleven ministers settled from 9th May, 1853, till the meeting of Synod in January, 1855, and took a solemn agreement from the Synod that that sum would never be lessened except with their own consent. If the interest yielded more than would meet their annuities, which constituted a mortgage or privileged claim, then it was for the Synod to deal with the surplus as from time to time it might determine. With the annuities of the commuters the Synod could not deal, so long as they complied with the second fundamental principle. I give it also in full.

"And, also, that it shall be considered a fundamental principle that all persons who have a claim to such benefits shall be ministers of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, in connection with the Church of Scotland that they shall cease to have any claim on, or be entitled to, any share of said Commutation Fund whenever they shall cease to be ministers in connection with the said Church."

Let honourable business men characterise the conduct of men who could violate every obligation and yet seek to appropriate a fund so carefully hedged about. I wish to give the facts only, which form a strong enough condemnation, a condemnation which no words, however strong, could intensify.

Upon the terms I have cited, the commuting ministers gave the desired authority, and an Act, carefully prepared under the direction of the Synod, was passed by the Province of Canada, and assented to on the 24th July, 1858. The Act was a general Act for the whole Province, affecting the rights, privileges and property of residents of each section of the Province; the money by which the fund had been constituted had been derived by the donors from that section of the Province in which the charges of the individual ministers were situated. The interests, therefore, were clearly not local but general to the whole Province.

The preamble of the Act states that certain funds belonging to the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland are held in trust commissioners; that the funds so held in trust are for the encouragement and support of the ministers and missionaries of said Church, for the augmentation of their stipends and as a provision for those incapacitated. A corporation is created to hold these funds in trust subject to the conditions already quoted. The Board of Managers must be ministers and members in full communion with the said Church, and it is provided that in "the event of the death, removal from the Province, or leaving the communion of the said Church, of any member of the Board, the remaining members are authorised to choose a successor, with the required qualification, until the next meeting of Synod. The Board is also authorised to dispose of or vary the investments, but only for the purpose of re-investment, they having no power to alienate any of the funds. Finally, the

corporation could "hold their meetings at such place or places within this Province as they shall from time to time direct and appoint," and as a matter of fact the elections always take place in Ontario and Quebec, wherever the Synod is meeting, and meetings of the Board have not unfrequently been held in Upper Canada before, and in the same Province (now Ontario) after, Confederation.

If this is not a general Act, which cannot be repealed by a Local Legislature, what is a general Act of the old Province of Canada?

DOUGLAS BRYMNER.

## A LA MODE.

"Whatever is fashionable is becoming." This is the shibboleth of society, the dogma of feminine faith pertaining to dress. It is absolutely true that in the present day, as in the past, there is no other canon in dress but that stated. A woman in any class of society, when about to clothe herself, asks "What is everybody wearing?" and what they wear she must wear also. It would seem more natural to consider "Is it beautiful? is it becoming? and if it becomes others, will it become me?" Yes; but this would involve taste, culture and invention, whereas everything is simplified by the one sufficing answer to all objections,—"It is fashionable."

An admirer of the sex has said "A beautiful woman cannot be ill-dressed"; and certainly beauty has a wonderful effect in "carrying off" what is absurd or positively hideous, and even in getting a charm out of it. But it should be remembered that (if it is not treason to the sex to say so) all women are not beautiful, and, so far from "carrying off" or getting effects out of monstrosities in dress, they never get beyond looking ridiculous. The secret of good dressing is to set off natural charms to the best effect; the secret of fashionable dressing is to ignore natural charms altogether, and to put everybody on a level by insisting that all are well dressed if all are "in the mode." To borrow an illustration from male dress. There is nothing so hideous as a pair of trousers. They are literally bags, sometimes worn ample, sometimes worn tight, but, however worn, always inartistic. How, then, it is natural to ask, did men give up the becoming dress of centuries (with modifications) and agree to put their limbs into sacks? Simply because Fashion discovered that there were persons in very exalted stations indeed whose nether limbs were "perfect curiosities of littleness," and forthwith decreed that henceforward it should be the mode for everybody to cover up their legs, so that thin legs, crooked legs, knock-knees, and all the rest of the decrepit order of legs, should rank on an equality with the plump and shapely varieties. On a par with this was Fashion's edict, issued in the interest of an illustrious lady, that long dresses, hiding big feet, should henceforth be the order of the day, pretty feet being thus sacrificed for evermore.

The test of a pretty fashion is that it pleases even after the fashion of wearing it has passed away. Now, if we look through the long category of ladies' dresses for the last three hundred years, how many will fulfil this condition? In Elizabeth's time the unsightly farthingale meets our eyes. The women were, in fact, mere tubs absurdly hooped, and with the stomacher brought so low that the figure of the wearer was utterly lost. She did not seem to be a human being at all. Something nearer to the requirements of humanity was adopted in the reign of the Charleses; but decency was outraged by an exposure, so far as the upper part of the figure was concerned, the dress looking as if it had slipped off the shoulders, and was likely to slip off altogether. When we get down to Queen Anne's time, we find the hoops in again, not exactly like those which Elizabeth wore, but wide, flagging specimens, and as skirts were often worn short to show the feet, the result was absolute indecency. After this all kinds of absurdities had their day, and a climax was reached when, about the time of the French Revolution, what was called the Classic costume came in. Then we get dresses with the waists under the armpits, to be succeeded by dresses with waists as low as it was possible to get them; so that if you met a lady whom you had seen a year before, she seemed to have changed her figure, and it was difficult to believe that it was the same person. Since then the principle of extremes has ruled the mode. Sometimes amplitude has prevailed, to be succeeded by extreme tenuity, the sort of thing which is best illustrated by comparing the beauties which the late John Leech drew for *Punch* with those which M. Du Maurier is drawing for that periodical now.

With respect to the fashions of the present day, it is only the fact it is the fashion which leads us to tolerate much presented to us. In addition, women indulge in much that is inconsistent with their claims to equal intelligence with men. As some one has said, men may be inferior beings, but they don't wear "idiot fringes" hanging down into their eyes; they do not powder their noses, redden their cheeks, or cover their lips with paint like clowns. There is nothing which women do so terrible as "making up" their faces. The charms of youth and beauty are irresistible, but when these are outgrown, nothing compensates for them; and for a woman to try to repair the ravages of age, or to simulate attractions she does not possess, is terrible work. What can any man who is not an idiot think of a woman who whitens her face with powder, and who paints under her eyes to make them large and languishing. A poet speaks of a girl

Whose eyes burn dry all their tears, for fear  
They should ruin a painted blush.

What an idea this gives us of many queens of society! Imagine kissing a cheek with a "painted blush" on it, or saluting chaste lips from which the colour comes away at a touch. And the articles used are almost always deleterious; some are absolute poison. A recent case shows us that even violet powder is intensified with arsenic to such an extent that a child died through the powder being applied to its skin. As to ordinary "ruddle" and lip paste, the two are almost always injurious. Thus it happens that those foolish enough to indulge in these things have to keep on doing so, since their skin becomes parchment, their lips wither, and they grow absolutely hideous.

The absence of taste in dress is—as in this matter of the face-painting—supplemented by the sacrifice of health and comfort which Fashion exacts. How many years is it, since the physician proclaimed against small waists?