

garments. A sword is stuck through it and blood is dropping from it. But let the description of these suffice.

We do not deny that good may, in many ways, be done by means of statuary and painting. But we object to the use already referred to which the Church of Rome makes of these arts. It is "evil, only evil, and that continually."

A certain writer says that many of the painters of his day wore their hair like Raphael, but in his opinion, it would have been better if they had tried to paint like Him. An infinitely better way of honoring Christ than by showing respect to images of Him, is to believe on Him, walk in His footsteps, and labor for the advancement of His cause. The best way to honor the saints, is to follow them in so far as they followed Christ.

In my next, I shall consider his Grace's answer to the question, "Does not the Catholic Church suppress the second commandment, 'Thou shalt not make unto thyself any graven thing or image.'" Following his reasoning as Whately does Hume's against the credibility of miracles, I shall prove that there is only one commandment, "Thou shalt not steal." T. F.

Metis, Que.

SUBSTITUTION.

MR. EDITOR,—Will you kindly insert the following in your paper for the purpose of drawing forth a reply from some Theologian of our Church. I beg first to explain that it is not penned in any controversial spirit, or for the purpose of raising diverse views and opinions, but merely presented by an earnest enquirer for the purpose of knowing what is the orthodox mind of the Church on the subject. I hope some one of the lights of the Church will respond in the spirit of the writer. Further, I should take it kindly if any respondent would follow it up in the line in which I present it, namely, by earthly analogies. The illustrations commonly made use of in the pulpit in explaining the doctrine of Christ's substitution are two.

First. That of the debtor and his surety:—

A owes B, C comes forward and says I will take A's place, and become responsible to you, B, for A's indebtedness, if you will let A go free. B agrees to this, he is satisfied, and A goes free. B is satisfied, the law is satisfied; B by virtue of the contract cannot pursue A for the debt. The absolute and unconditional agreement voluntarily entered into can always be pleaded in A's behalf and prevail; and if C in addition pays the debt, the claim is then extinguished. All human law and justice admits the strength of this, and all human reason is satisfied.

Man's liability to God's law and justice is presented in the light of a debt. Christ comes forward as man's substitute, is accepted as such, and pays the debt. Man goes free. So far I think the analogy is perfect.

Second. A is drafted to fight in the army, B who is in every respect as good a man for the purpose and a subject of the state, but not liable to service, goes forward and voluntarily offers himself, is accepted, and A goes free. This also is by the universal sense of mankind admitted a good substitution. Here again I admit an earthly analogy to Christ's substitution for us.

I now enter upon a region where I cannot find the earthly analogy, and where my difficulties begin.

A commits a crime against human law—say murder. There is no provision in human law or in earthly economy for substitution.

Earth as well as heaven says, "The soul that sinneth it shall die." The murderer must suffer the penalty in his own person; no substitute can atone for his crime, and no substitute can undo what has been done. Substitution and atonement in the other cases will answer perfectly; here, according to all human reason and earthly analogy, they must fail.

I know the pulpit orator goes back to ancient times and produces the well-known anecdote of the one friend dying, that the other may go free. If true, the incidents are very exceptional. And I am not aware that there was or is in the code of any civilized nation, ancient or modern, any provision whereby the death or punishment of an innocent individual in room of a guilty one, was admitted as satisfaction for crime.

Even if there were, would it according to the nature of things, be a satisfaction for a crime committed. Laws are made for the punishment of the guilty, not of the innocent. How, then, can the substitution of an innocent person in room of the guilty, satisfy that

law. The murderer is a murderer still, and no earthly substitute can wipe out the stain or undo the crime—the consequence is there still.

Earthly law then admits of no substitute for the commission of crime. The earthly criminal must suffer for his own crimes in his own person. But, it will be said, the Sovereign can pardon. Yes, the Sovereign may exercise the prerogative of pardon, and the criminal thus *escape* the punishment. But for all that he is guilty still.

Cain, with the brand on his forehead, went through the world and has come down through all the ages a murderer still. A monument of a broken law unsatisfied.

Has man like a criminal broken God's holy law? Then it is said the soul that sinneth it shall die. How then can Christ, an innocent one, be a satisfaction in his own person (I prefer the use of the word satisfaction here) to that broken law?

How does his keeping of that law and His obedience answer for my criminal breaches of it. I am a criminal still, notwithstanding his innocence, according to all our earthly analogies.

I leave the question here. Can it be brought down to our reason, or is it one of these deep questions like the Trinity that has to be received by faith? I am, yours, etc., A PRESBYTERIAN.

THE GRANT TO METIS.

MR. EDITOR,—Mr. Wright, the late Convener of the Quebec Presbytery's Home Mission Committee, in your last issue, reaffirms the statement that the Home Mission Committee refused a grant to Metis. I regret that Mr. Wright did not see fit to attend the meeting of the Committee, which has been in session in Toronto for the last few days, when the matter was fully discussed. It would have been more satisfactory to himself to have heard the opinion of the Committee, and would have rendered all further public correspondence unnecessary. This the Committee had a right to expect, inasmuch as the Clerk of the Quebec Presbytery, in a communication of date March 21st, says: "The former representative of the Presbytery at the Home Mission Board has been communicated with, and has given assurance that he will either be present at the approaching meeting of the Committee, and explain matters, or else communicate with the Board thereanent."

Mr. Wright gives extracts from minutes of the Home Mission Committee, in order to throw the *onus* of withdrawing the grant upon the Committee. To make the statement complete, it should have been added by Mr. Wright, that when in October, 1876, the grant was removed for six months, the Committee—had it strictly obeyed the instructions of Assembly—would have refused it. The station was contributing at a rate far below the minimum, and the Presbytery had taken no steps, so far as could be learned, to bring them up to the requirements of the Assembly. In these circumstances, no course was open to the Committee, unless it disregarded the instructions of the Assembly, but to allow the grant to lapse.

At the meetings of Committee held April and October, 1877, the representative of the Quebec Presbytery could give no definite information as to what should be done with Metis, beyond this, that the Presbytery felt that some change was necessary, and that probably the best thing that could be done was to withhold the grant. If Mr. Wright at the latter meeting "urged that the grant should be restored, and also the loss for the previous six months," I can only say that the recollection of members of Committee is precisely the reverse. Further, if a letter was mailed to the Secretary, it never came into my hands, and it never came before the Committee. Every one knows that the minutes of the Committee only record *decisions*, and not the statements made by the representatives of Presbyteries, or the reasons that lead them to advise the giving or withdrawing of grants. If, however, the attempt is persisted in to represent the Home Mission Committee as alone responsible for withdrawing the Metis grant, it need not surprise anyone if the statements made in Committee are given to the Church at large. This, I need hardly say, will not be for edification or the good of all concerned.

The Committee have agreed to give the grant for the current six months to Mr. Fenwick, and also to pay the amount for the past six months, in the hope that the Presbytery will take action and endeavor to increase the contributions of the station. Whatever

be the misunderstanding between the Committee and the Presbytery's representative, I cannot but feel that Mr. Fenwick has cause to complain of uncourteous treatment, when he states "that he has never yet received from the Presbytery any official notice that the grant to Metis was stopped." I am, sir, yours truly,

WILLIAM COCHRANE.

Brantford, March 29th, 1878.

REMUNERATION OF PROBATIONERS.

MR. EDITOR,—Your last issue contains a communication on the above subject from Dr. Cochrane, in which he gives extracts from a communication received from a probationer, complaining of the open violation of the law of the Church made for the protection of the probationers. We thus get a glimpse of the hardships that many of them are forced to endure, because men, although professing to be Christians, and to be guided by the principles of Christianity, yet lack common honesty, inasmuch as they "withhold the hire of the laborer." The Church should watch with a vigilant eye over the interest of her probationers, and see that what she has ordained as a fitting remuneration for their services, shall be honestly paid to them. They are placed in such a position that they dare not complain lest wrong motives should be attributed to them, and the cause they desire to advance should suffer thereby. Their chances of a call to a vacant charge would be diminished, were it to become known that they were such "pestilent fellows," that they would not hold their peace when being cheated out of their just rights by the professed God-fearing members of the Church. It aggravates the evil when we consider that the party thus defrauded may not be the only sufferer, as it is often the case that there is a wife and large family entirely dependent for support upon the pittance that is left, after travelling expenses have been paid; which the above correspondent estimates at one half of what he receives. A large and influential committee was appointed by the last General Assembly, to devise the best mode of raising the salaries of all settled ministers to a minimum of \$800, that sum I presume, being thought the lowest upon which a minister can live decently. If that is so, in the name of common sense, how do these movers in this matter justify themselves, in allowing many of those unsettled ministers, and their families, to struggle on in a state bordering on destitution, as they cannot have more than from \$200 to \$300 left to live upon after paying travelling expenses, when by a little exertion on their part, in seeing that the laws of the Church are put in force, in letter and spirit, they could protect that class of our ministers who are peculiarly under their care, from the rapacity of men, who evidently are not much troubled with a conscience. Did they do so, much suffering would be prevented. It may here be said, Why do not probationers apply to the Presbytery for redress when the law of the Church has not been complied with? It has been done, but without effect. Not long ago a case of this kind was brought before the Chatham Presbytery, in which a church now giving \$1,500 to their minister, refused to give more than \$8 per Sabbath to the probationer supplying them. Here then was a clear violation of both the letter and the spirit of the law of the Church, yet that learned and reverend Court, snubbed the applicant for redress, by passing a resolution to the effect that the rich church of St. Andrew's, Chatham, had paid all the law allowed. No wonder then, in the face of such a decision, that Dr. Cochrane is led to exclaim that he can see no remedy for this wrong done to probationers, "unless the consciences of congregations are reached." Now there appears to be some analogy between civil corporations and churches. I have somewhere seen it stated that corporations had neither souls to be saved, nor bodies that could be kicked. Experience tells us that churches have no conscience that can be pricked. We must then look somewhere else for a remedy. At the risk of being charged with presumption for attempting to grapple with a subject that puzzles the capacious mind of Dr. Cochrane, I will venture to say, that the remedy is neither hard to find nor difficult of application. The Church has already declared what the poorest churches shall pay their probationers. All that she has got to do is to apply and enforce the same rule for the rich as for the poor churches. If a church paying \$500 salary, pay \$8 for supply, how much shall another paying a salary of \$1,500 pay? Any school-boy that can work proportion can soon ascertain this, and any Church