

the same country. According to these each minister pays in a certain sum annually, or his Session for him, and his widow from the date of his death is entitled to receive a certain stipulated sum the remainder of her life, and his orphan children a similar sum till they reach a certain age, say sixteen years. It would be difficult to point out anywhere, institutions attended with more blessed results than these have been to an interesting and deserving class. What was our surprise and regret to find a writer in the *Witness* of some intelligence, and who does not appear to be actuated by malice either, holding the scheme up to odium by representing it as a scheme for money making like the Insurance companies of the day. Anything more unjust could not be conceived. It is true that these widows funds do resemblance Assuance Societies in one point, viz., that they assure a certain sum in return for certain payments. But that they bear any resemblance to them as money making institutions, is an assertion as untrue as it was possible for him to make. All the money paid, except what is necessary to pay expenses, and these are but trifling, go to the widows and orphans of ministers. Instead of this plan the writer proposes that they should be supported on charity. He may save himself the trouble of advocating such a scheme as this. We are not certain whether a single minister or minister's wife can be found in the Church who will befriend such a plan, but this we know that they must be few indeed, and we are ashamed that any member of our Church should openly advocate that this interesting class should be kept as a sort of decent paupers, rather than that they should be provided for in a way in which they will be free from all the humiliation of a state of dependance.

With the matters of public importance, there will doubtless also be matters involving personal and private interests, requiring prudence and forbearance. We observe that by an appeal, the whole question of the retaining in Church membership of the dealers in intoxicating liquors, will come up for discussion.

We trust that there will be a full attendance both of ministers and elders. We trust too that Sessions will see to forwarding contributions to all the schemes of the Church. And in view of the importance of the meeting, let every reader go to the fountain of all grace, supplicating that a large measure of that wisdom which is profitable to direct, may be given to all who at this time may be called to sit in judgment in reference to the affairs of our Zion.

DOES A DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE INVOLVE DISSOLUTION OF THOSE TIES OF AFFINITY WHICH OWED THEIR ORIGIN TO IT?

Marriage is a contract between a man and a woman which naturally terminates at the death of either of the parties, but may, in certain circumstances, terminate by a legal divorce. There are thus two modes in which the marriage relation may be dissolved—by divorce or by death.

Marriage has the effect of uniting the parties to each other's relatives by ties of kinship or quasi-kinship known by the name of affinity, as distinguished from consanguinity or blood relationship. A wife's sister is her husband's sister-in-law, and so on. Does this species of kinship, once formed by the fact of marriage, remain indissoluble? Or does the dissolution of marriage by divorce, or by the death of one of the parties, destroy all ties of affinity to which the marriage had given rise?