

Assembly, and a decision on the point would have decided that case. And it was ungenerous, because the discussion had not been previously forced, but waived on more than one occasion, because brethren had stated their desire to have time to consider the question. All this is now past. Another case is before us. I do not know the reason why, at last Assembly, the Committee on Reception of Ministers, in dealing with the application from the Presbytery of Montreal for leave to receive Mr. Coubove as a minister, reported recommending that "the Assembly grant leave to receive him as a missionary." This virtual withdrawal of the application prevented a second vote being taken then; but on the case of Mr. Quinn coming up in June next, an opportunity will be afforded of settling the question finally. Personally, I am anxious to receive ex-priests who are called of God to the work of the ministry. I only ask that they, when applying, be treated either as ministers from evangelical churches—viz., received under our Act for the Reception of Ministers; or, if this cannot be done—as I think it cannot—that they be dealt with as our own loved and trusted Church members and inferior office-bearers are treated when they are honoured by being set apart to the work of the Christian ministry, viz., that they be regularly called and ordained.

Thanking you, sir, for the ample space afforded in your columns for bringing this matter before the Church,
JOHN LAING.

Dundas, Ont. January 31st, 1882

MR EDITOR, I have read with interest the communication of the Rev Mr Laing on this subject in your last issue, and also that of "X." The former casts important historical light on the question. In the latter, while generally agreeing with the views of "X," I think he should not have blended the reception of a minister or the licensing of a student with their ordination. Those necessarily precede and prepare for the latter by placing the individual in such a position that he is eligible to be ordained, but they form no part of it in the specific sense in which it is understood by the Church.

There is a form in which the matter may be presented, which to my mind is sufficiently conclusive, whatever it may be to others, which perhaps you will permit me to state. If ordination may be correctly described as the setting apart of a person found duly qualified for a specific purpose in connection with the service of God by a competent authority, then the ordination should be valid only to those who recognise that authority, and with respect only to the office in view at the time, with its purpose and duties.

Now, to begin with the authority that confers ordination on a Roman Catholic priest is not recognised as lawful nor scriptural by the Presbyterian Church, and surely it follows that its official acts cannot be recognised by us as valid. Then again, import and effect of ordination in the Romish Church are both quite different from what we hold them to be. It is not necessary to specify what these differences are, as your readers are no doubt acquainted with them, or at any rate will admit the fact. It follows from this that Romish ordination and Presbyterian ordination are two quite different things—so different as to be in most respects conflicting in their character and tendencies. How then can the one be taken for the other? Then still further, the functions and duties of a priest of Rome are so different from those of a Presbyterian minister that they can hardly be said even to resemble them. Now, though a man may be lawfully appointed to one position, as for instance a member of the medical profession, it does not surely follow that when he ceases to act in that capacity the same appointment should hold good for another and totally different position—for example, the practice of law. And then, finally, does not a man, in renouncing the Church of Rome and his position of priest therein, *ipso facto* renounce his ordination to the priesthood as well? No doubt, the Church of Rome holds that the grace of ordination does not lapse in such cases, but is valid for the individual during his life; but we don't hold their views of ordination, and we should not recognise and give effect to what we believe to be deadly error. J. A.

SUSTENTATION VS. SUPPLEMENT.

MR. EDITOR, The following analysis of the principles upon which the rival Schemes at present before the Church are based, was prepared for Pres-

bytery a little over a month ago; but Presbytery having postponed consideration of the remit till its next regular meeting, it is in the meantime submitted to the readers of your excellent weekly, in the hope that it may prove serviceable in the agitation at present going on regarding the above Scheme.

I.—POINTS OF RESEMBLANCE.

1. The object of both Schemes is to aid the weak charges of the Church.
- 2 Both Schemes propose to do so by making the strong help the weak.
- 3 Both Schemes aim only at partial results. Only such of the weak charges as come up to a certain minimum are to be helped. Mission Stations are entirely ignored.

II—POINTS OF DIFFERENCE.

1. The one Scheme proceeds upon the principle that the minister is the servant of the Church, that it is therefore the duty of the Church to provide an adequate support for each of her ministers; that each settled minister has a right to such support as the Church is able to provide, and should look to the Church for it, and not to the congregation.

The other proceeds upon the principle that in the matter of ministerial support each congregation should, as far as possible, be left to its own resources; that in this matter each congregation should be taught to become absolutely independent, and that the minister should look for support, not to the Church, but to the congregation over which he is settled. In other words, the one Scheme is Presbyterian, the other is purely Congregational.

2. The one Scheme proceeds upon the principle that the Church owes as liberal a support to the minister who has charge of a weak congregation as she does to the minister who has charge of the wealthiest, that in the matter of ministerial support the Church should proceed upon the well-known Presbyterian principle of the "equality of the clergy."

The other, being purely Congregational, recognises no such principle; but as the one Scheme teaches the minister to look for support *mainly to the Church* of which he is a servant, so this Scheme teaches him to look *mainly to the congregation* of which he is minister.

3. The one Scheme proceeds upon the principle that each congregation should surrender its principal revenue for the support of the cause at large, retaining only its surplus funds for its own use—to cast their "bread upon the waters," and it would return to them "after many days" (Ecc. xi. 1).

The other proceeds upon the principle that each congregation should retain its principal revenue for its own use, giving only its surplus funds for the support of the cause at large. "Keep the loaf, and give away the crumbs."

III.—WEAK POINTS.

The weak points of Sustentation are:

1. It does not practically succeed in securing for the general support of the ministry the whole revenues of the aid-giving congregations.
2. It does not reach all the weak charges, and reaches none of the Mission Stations.
3. It gives almost unlimited power over all the congregations of the Church to a Finance Committee.

The weak points of Supplement are:

1. Numbers 1 and 2 above.
2. It denies the right of the minister to receive any support from the Church, *excepting in the form of charity*, to relieve actual want. It is this that makes this Scheme so extremely offensive to all who are dependent upon it to any extent. It recognises and treats them as paupers.

IV.—ADVANTAGES OF SUSTENTATION OVER SUPPLEMENT.

1. It is more in harmony with the spirit of the Bible. When the manna was given to the children of Israel in the wilderness, they gathered "some more, some less," but it was dealt out to them on the principle of "the equal dividend," so that he that "gathered much had nothing over, and he that gathered little had no lack" (Ex xvi. 17, 18).

2. In the matter of support, it places all her ministers upon an equal footing before the Church. The other places the poorer ministers in a most humiliating position, treating them as paupers.

3. It is Presbyterian and scriptural in principle; the other is purely Congregational.

4. In taking the *direct* support of the ministry out of the hands of congregations, (1) it removes from the people the false and unscriptural principle which the other Scheme tends to develop, of giving "for the sake of the minister," and certainly appeals to the higher and more scriptural principle of giving "for the sake of the cause." (2) It in a great measure delivers ministers—and may we not also add weak congregations?—from the tyranny of purse-proud supporters. (3) It removes from ministers and Sessions the temptation to lower the standard of discipline in order to retain all their supporters. It is undeniable that under the present system discipline in many of our congregations exists only in name. (4) It enables ministers to give proper attention to the training of their people in the important matter of scriptural giving, which, under the present system (Supplement), is practically neglected, and must be neglected so long as ministers receive their support *direct* from their congregations. WATCHMAN.

10th February, 1882.

THE GOSPEL BY MARK.

SUGGESTIONS TO TEACHERS.

The great object before the mind of the teacher is the conversion and instruction of his scholars, and this is, in other words, teaching them to know Jesus Christ. The Gospel by Mark is our special guide this year. We shall commit ourselves to our evangelist, we shall try to learn about our Saviour as He is revealed to us in this book, and then to teach as we have learned. In the measure in which we succeed Jesus will be better known to us in His person, His character, His work. The conception which the inspired evangelist had of Christ we shall search for in his words. Thus we shall first seek to learn and then to communicate the teaching of the Spirit concerning Christ in this Gospel. But in order to do this it will be well to compare our Gospel with the others, for two reasons. First, to find what Mark has left out; and secondly, to see what he alone has given. Our attention may be drawn to very important truth by the character of the omissions, and, on the other hand, the elements with which Mark has enriched the Gospel narrative will be brought into due prominence. We shall see how some of the gems which his hand alone has gathered, glow with a lustre all their own, or blaze with a splendour almost overpowering. It may be as well to note here the order of the events as they are given by the different evangelists. No doubt some will be surprised at the apparent want of harmony in this. In some instances a careful study will remove difficulties or explain them, but in others they will remain after all has been done, so that the most careful student would find it impossible to give the exact sequence of journeyings and events. It is well to keep in mind that, except where it is expressly so stated, the evangelists do not lead us to expect that they will adhere strictly to the chronological order of the events. Their design was chiefly rather to give an account of such actions and teachings as came to them, supernaturally of course, but in another sense naturally, in accordance with a law of affinity; such events, such words as would convey a truthful illustration or expression of the life which they desired to set forth. The ruling principle with them was to produce, not simply a chronicle of circumstances set down in the order in which they took place. Such a history would have been comparatively valueless. John tells us that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written to tell all that Jesus did. Not one of the evangelists, then, proposes to give an account of all that Jesus did and said; this would have been impossible, and nothing could have been gained by any attempt of the kind; but, from among these events each of them has taken actions which are deeply typical and words which are powerfully expressive of the character and the life of the Lord, and it may be that the differences in the order or grouping of the events, however it came about, which are found in some places, was necessary to bring out the fulness and manifold significance of the works and the teachings as expressions of His life. The order is, in general, easily followed, and it may be that the places where the paths seem to diverge, where we need to stop and look for the way, searching carefully or painfully for the traces of His footsteps,—that these places are meant to remind us of what we are seeking, and that the knowledge of