

REASONS AGAINST AUGMENTATION.

I. "It is a scheme to bolster up ministers that are not worth supporting. Let them, as do the lawyers, doctors, and all others, take what they are worth, and if they are not worth their support let them try something else. Why should they differ from others."

It is a not a scheme to help weak ministers but to help *weak congregations*. If all who are not in every respect first-class men were dropped out, and their places filled by Spurgeons, would these weak congregations be any stronger? Put all weak ministers out of the way and the weak congregations will still be left, some of them able to pay \$400, some \$500 or some of them more. So that the scheme is one to aid weak *congregations*, not weak ministers. It is exactly the same as with weak school sections. The government gives an additional grant to poor sections to enable them to keep a teacher, and then they get the best teacher they can. The church at large gives a grant to poor congregations to enable them to keep a minister, and then they get the best one they can.

II. "But if those weak congregations cannot keep a minister let them do without one until they are stronger."

That is not in accordance with the command, "Bear ye one anothers burdens and so fulfil the law of Christ," or "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." And no one with the spirit of Christ will urge such a reason.

Again, by leaving these weak stations they never get stronger, but weaker. The way to have them stronger is to build them up until they become self-supporting, able in turn to help others. In this way many of our congregations have been built up, and in our Synod they pass off the aided list at the rate of one each year.

Ten years ago a few people at Amherst were organized into a congregation. Through these years they have grown, aided by this Fund, and now they say, "Thank you for the past, we will support ourselves, we want no more." And thus we have to-day in that important centre a flourishing, self-supporting, congregation.

III. "But let ministers deny themselves and live on what they can get in these places until the congregation grows

stronger. Mechanics have often to live on less than even \$300."

It is impossible for a man to keep his home as his congregation and the public expect him to do, to keep himself as his congregation and the public expect him to do, to keep up horse and carriage, to buy books, to give to objects of charity, as he is expected to do, on the amounts that many weak congregations can raise. Let the same man be now a mechanic, again a minister, and he can live and meet the demands which his position makes upon him, more easily as a mechanic upon \$300 a year, than as a minister at double the amount. The writer has had some experience in both lines of life.

Again, if it were absolutely necessary, it could be done, and has been done, but it is neither necessary nor fair. The ministers and people in the stronger congregations have as much right to deny themselves to send the gospel to those that are weak as others have to carry it there. The obligation to deny self for Christ rests equally upon all.

IV. "But some are not worth the amount aimed at by the Augmentation Scheme."

If men are not worth calling, don't call them, let them try something else, but if a man is called to the charge of a congregation he should have a support that will enable him to fill the place to which he is called in the way that the church and the world expects him to do.

This scheme has met throughout the church with a general, generous and hearty support, and has done a noble work. We trust that no congregation will allow itself to be an exception to the rule.

AUGMENTATION IN LUNENBURG AND SHELBURNE.

To the Rev. E. A. McCurdy, Convenor of of Committee on Augmentation.

DEAR SIR,—As Convenor of Presbytery's Committee on Augmentation I submit the following statement:

1. That Presbytery of Lunenburg and Shelburne appointed a committee on Augmentation in terms of the Synod's Resolutions, viz.: Revs. Millar, Fraser, and Rossbore, and Messrs. Eisenhauer and Calder, ruling elders.

2. That said committee did not require to allocate the Presbytery's share of the