

ing in the name of the alumni of Knox College as he has, for I too am one of them, loyal and true to the interest of our *alma mater*, taxing my pocket as well as employing my pen in her behalf. He can therefore feel assured of my sincerity he never widely he may differ with me in opinion. When in my first letter I spoke of "dulness" and "spiritless delivery" as the cause of the failure of a large percentage of those who do fail in the ministry, I was referring not to Knox College students exclusively, but to that whole class wherever trained. I frankly admit that the dullest and poorest preachers I have ever listened to were men trained on the other side of the Atlantic, but some of the best I have ever heard were trained there also. That Knox College has a good record, no man in his senses will deny; but to hold that improvement is not to be thought of, is simply absurd. And as regards finances, does your correspondent know that the current revenue of the College was a few years ago in arrears to the amount of thirteen thousand dollars? Last year another thousand dollars of arrears accumulated, making a total of \$14,477.85, as the report of the Board to the Assembly shows. The special effort of the Assembly's Committee has accomplished something to remove this debt, but how much I do not as yet know. A little enthusiasm in behalf of the institution is all that is needed, and to awaken such enthusiasm we must adopt rational measures. We must comply with the conditions of evoking enthusiasm. See what a succession of well managed public meetings has done for Queen's College. Let us lay the conditions for something similar in behalf of Knox College. The current expenses, I firmly believe, might be largely increased, and yet far more easily secured than at present. CLERICUS.

#### THE REGULATIONS OF THE AGED AND INFIRM MINISTERS' FUND.

At the last meeting of the General Assembly there was read an overture from the Synod of the Maritime Provinces craving the Assembly to change the third regulation relating to the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund so that every minister allowed by the Assembly to retire shall receive an annuity of \$200.

The third regulation is as follows: "When the minister is allowed by the Assembly to retire after ten years' service he shall receive \$100 a year, and \$10 a year for each additional year up to forty years' service, if the state of the funds permits."

It was agreed that the overture be referred to the committee on the Funds for Aged and Infirm Ministers, to be reported on by them at the next General Assembly.

The overture no doubt will receive careful consideration from the committees to which it has been referred. It seems to me that there are various reasons for making the change asked for. Some of these reasons it may not perhaps be out of place to mention.

1. The church is bound to support those who give themselves up to its service, not only whilst they are able to work but when they become disabled. Under the Old Testament the infirm Levites were to be supported as well as the active Levites. According to the New Testament those who preach the Gospel are to live on it. At present we give a disabled minister who has laboured in our church ten years \$100 a year to live upon. Is this a sufficient sum? Can any minister, married or single, live upon it? It is neither justice nor mercy to give a disabled minister only \$100 a year.

2. The disproportion between what we give young disabled ministers and old disabled ministers is entirely too large. A man who has laboured ten years gets \$100, whilst a man who has laboured forty years gets \$400. The object of this fund it must be remembered is not to reward men for their services, but to support those who are laid aside from active service. A man who is able to work should get nothing out of it. If it takes \$400 a year to support an aged minister how is a young minister to live on \$100 a year?

3. A young disabled minister as a general rule is worse off than an old disabled minister. A minister who has laboured only ten years can have no money laid by. It takes a large sum to buy books and fit one out for his work. A young disabled minister will in all probability have a wife and two or three small children to support. An old minister is likely to have a house of his own and may perhaps have a few hundred dollars in the bank. He may also have sons

who will be able to support him. And he is not likely to have helpless children to provide for.

4. It would be a great encouragement to young men to study for the ministry to know that, if their health should fail before they had served the Church very long as ministers, they would not be cast off but be properly cared for. Now a young man could live some way on \$200 a year; it would however be impossible for him to live on \$100 a year.

5. Our Church could without difficulty give every disabled minister a retiring allowance of \$200 a year. Let all our ministers take a proper interest in the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, let them explain to their people the nature of the fund and show them the necessity and duty of supporting it, and let them take up a collection every year for it, and we will, I have no doubt, get all the money that will be absolutely needed. It is the law of God that His ministers should be properly supported, and He will if His messengers do their duty in explaining this law, in line the hearts of His people to see it carried out.

6. It would be in the interest of all our ministers that the change asked for by the Synod of the Maritime Provinces should be made. According to the present rule a minister who becomes disabled, after labouring twenty years in the service of the Church, receives a retiring allowance of \$100 for the first ten years' service, and \$100 for the second ten years' service "if the state of the Fund permits." He will thus, should the Fund be in a flourishing condition, receive \$200 a year. He is sure, however, of only \$100. The state of the fund may not permit that he should get the other \$100. Should all our ministers, young and old, be sure that in case their health broke down they would receive an annuity of \$200, they would take a deeper interest in the Fund than they do take, and as a consequence, more money would come in to the Fund. Thus even the oldest minister upon the Fund would be better off. They would have more reason to expect a good annuity than they have now.

Let me now say a few words as to the mode in which I think the change asked for could be effected. I am not arguing in favour of giving those who have laboured a long time in our Church and those who have laboured only a few years exactly the same; what I want is that all our ministers who become utterly disabled should receive at least \$200 a year, but I must enter into details. My plan then would be as follows:—(1.) I would have the case of a minister permitted to retire after less than ten years' service made the subject of special consideration. I would thus leave the second part of the third regulation as it stands. (2.) I would give every minister permitted to retire after labouring between ten and twenty years in the Church \$200. To the minister who had laboured ten years and to the minister who laboured twenty years I would give the same amount. (3.) To every minister permitted to retire after labouring in the Church more than twenty years I would give first of all as a certainty \$200 a year, and then \$10 a year for every year that he had served the Church over twenty years, up to forty years' service, should the state of the Fund permit. Thus a minister who had laboured in our Church forty years would be sure of \$200 a year, and something more, and might perhaps get \$400 a year.

A. MCL. SINCLAIR.

#### "THE COMING MAN AND THE CHURCH"

MR. EDITOR,—In glancing over the contents of the last number of the CANADA PRESBYTERIAN I was struck with some of the views enunciated in your editorial headed "The Coming Man and the Church," and I acknowledge that, as an old-fashioned Presbyterian, I read the article with very considerable alarm. It has been the glory of the Presbyterian Church that the great doctrines of the Gospel have been conserved and set forth with fidelity, and it has been always my belief that in our pulpits these doctrines have been clearly set forth. Of course there may be differences of style and manner and degrees of clearness and fullness with which the doctrines of grace are set forth by different ministers; but I have been under the impression that in substance the Gospel as set forth in the Word of God, and especially in the epistles of the Apostle Paul, has been and is proclaimed in our pulpits. Now you are of opinion that not only the manner, but the *matter* also of much of our religious teaching militates against its general acceptance. You think that the Gospel is made unnecessarily nauseous

to men; that "the Gospel is not in itself unwelcome." And you go on to say "let Christ be portrayed to men in suitable colours, let Him be made to appear to them as He is, and they will not turn away from Him." I presume a good many of your readers will be reminded by these words of a story which is told of the two eminent Edinburgh ministers who were colleagues viz., Principal Robertson and Dr. Erskine. It is needless to say that Dr. Robertson was a minister of the Moderate type and Dr. Erskine of the Evangelical. The story is that Dr. Robertson had one forenoon preached a sermon on the beauty and excellence of virtue, in the course of which he declared that if virtue should appear in all her beauty personified on earth, all men could recognize her, and would fall down and do her homage. Dr. Erskine in the afternoon adverted to this statement and said: "We have been told that if virtue were to appear on earth, all men would fall down and do her homage. But, my friends, virtue did appear personified, virtue so immaculate that even an enemy could find no fault, but instead of all men falling down to do homage the cry was raised 'Away with Him, away with Him, Crucify Him, crucify Him!'"

Nearly nineteen centuries ago the world saw not a mere representation of Christ in suitable colours, but Christ Himself in all His Divine grace and beauty, going about doing good, speaking as never man spake, and they did turn away from Him. "He came unto His own and His own received Him not." Is human nature changed? Is the opposition of the carnal heart to God and to His truth taken away? Has the cross ceased to be to the natural man foolishness? No doubt Divine grace is all powerful, and is still able to make men willing and obedient. But the recommendation to try to make the Gospel more palatable by altering the *matter* of our Presbyterian preaching is, in my humble opinion, unwise and dangerous. Ministers should seek, no doubt, to speak the truth in love, and to set forth God's goodness as well as His holiness and justice. The Church should indeed go to the people, but not with a diluted Gospel, not for the purpose of prophesying smooth things. It should go with the Gospel in its fulness, declaring the whole counsel of God, seeking to win men by a declaration of the Love of God and to persuade them also by the terrors of the Lord. The old Gospel, old but still fresh and new, not yet antiquated, will still prove by the Divine blessing, "the power of God and the wisdom of God unto salvation." Another Gospel is not needed. SENEX.

#### HOME-BRED MINISTERS.

MR. EDITOR, After the downsetting which your correspondent "L" gave to the editor of the "Record" in your last issue, it would, perhaps, be cruel to pile the agony higher on the devoted head of that gentleman. Yet there are points raised in the dashing sentences in the *March* number of the "Record" worthy of greater attention than has been bestowed upon them by either "L" or the redoubtable editor, who is at least, entitled to the credit of being very outspoken. But it must be confessed that, though he is accustomed to call a spade a spade, and we generally see what he is driving at, the article in question is somewhat mixed. Readers of one set of proclivities will likely take one meaning out of it, while others differently disposed, will find in it the very opposite sense. Your correspondent "L" it seems to me, is quite justified in the view he has taken of it.

The editor of the "Record" propounds a series of queries bearing on the subject of his article. I will refer to only the *first* and *third*.

1st. Have we the talent in the country equal to the requirements of the Church? I am sure that the talent of the country ought to be as adequate for the requirements of the Church, as for those of agriculture, law, medicine, commerce or legislation, in respect of which, it will be conceded, there is no failure. Nor has native talent failed in the pulpit. I am prepared to match, for instance, not to speak of others, the principals of our five colleges, Cook, Caven, MacVicar, Grant and Macknight against any five principals that Scotland can show, even though Caird, Tulloch and Rainey be thrown into the scale. The men I have named are indeed not all of native growth, but it is in Canada they have acquired their intellectual stature, which shows at least that their environments in this country have not hindered them from going to greatness. Then we too have contributed our quota to