

permit me to supply it from documents accessible to every member of the Church.

1. As to what "the Church had to do" with the present scheme of the Trustees. The General Assembly of 1877 unanimously resolved as follows with reference to Queen's:—"The Assembly recognize the desirableness of having an additional professor in Theology in this Institution, so soon as the state of the finances shall admit, and recommend the friends of the College to exercise all possible liberality in the way of increasing the endowment, so that such appointment may be made without unnecessary delay." Some months after that was passed, the Board learned that the grant of £550 stig., given annually by the Colonial Committee, and which was the only kind of endowment that the Divinity Faculty of Queen's possessed, would probably soon be withdrawn, and that therefore fully \$70,000 instead of the \$30,000 contemplated by the Assembly of 1877 would be needed; and that at least \$50,000 more were needed for additional buildings, and for the Arts Faculty; and they therefore placed before their friends the present noble scheme. With reference to it the General Assembly of 1878 unanimously resolved as follows. "The Assembly express their sincere gratification with the success which has attended the efforts to increase the endowment of Queen's College, and recommend to the friends of the College the completion of the whole so successfully begun." If there are differences of opinion in the Church on the subject, it is strange that no expression was given to them on the floor of the Assembly.)

2. With reference to the appointment of lecturers or professors, I would refer "Dubius" to the resolutions accompanying the basis of Union. One of these is that Queen's University and Colleges to be brought by legislation (and that has been done) into relations to the United Church, similar to those which it held to the Kirk before the Union, and is to preserve its corporate existence, government, and functions, on terms and conditions like to those under which it existed prior to Union. Now, the old Kirk Synod never had any ambition to appoint professors and lecturers directly. They acted on the well known legal phrase, "he who does a thing by means of another, does it himself." They believed that to appoint such officers by means of a judiciously selected Board was a more excellent way. Their way, too, is the one that all the historic Protestant Churches of Europe have acted on for centuries; that the Church of Scotland and the Church of England, and the great Presbyterian Churches of the United States follow; and that gave to the Church such Professors of Divinity as Hill, Chalmers, Crawford, Flint, the Alexanders, Hodges, etc., At the same time it should be known that during the Union negotiations, the representatives of the Kirk declared that they were not inalienably wedded to their old way, and that they were quite willing to allow the General Assembly to appoint all the Professors of Queen's. Their offer was declined; and hence we have in the United Church a variety in the administration of our Institutions. Many think this variety an unmixed blessing to the Church for various reasons; but it is of little consequence what their opinion is. We have to do with the facts of the case, and to keep scrupulous good faith with one another. Only an enemy to the Union would propose or insinuate any infringement on the terms on which the Churches united.

3. "Dubius" asks whether the Trustees may appoint any one they please to teach our students. They may not. The Trustees themselves must be ministers or members of our Church; they act under the same restrictions as the General Assembly must act in making appointments; and the teachers in all our Divinity Halls are alike subject to the authority of our regular Church Courts.

4. "Dubius" also wants to know if ministers can leave their own fields of labour to lecture without the Church having any say in the matter. If "Dubius" is a Presbyterian, he ought to know that no minister can leave his field of labour without the Church having a say in the matter. All the lecturers that have been appointed are members of Presbyteries; and if in any case the Presbytery thinks that such work is inconsistent with discharge of congregational work it can say so, and stop it summarily. And with regard to the cost, I am informed that not one dollar of it is charged to the ordinary income of the Institution, but to the expense account of the Endowment fund.

With regard to the question of lectureships on its merits, that is, whether it is wise to appoint lecturers occasionally who are distinguished for knowledge of special subjects, and who bring into our Divinity Halls minds fresh from actual parochial work, I have not a word to say, except that I cordially agree with what has been editorially expressed in the CANADA PRESBYTERIAN. The question, however, is one for fair discussion.

COVENANT-KEEPER.

#### THE CHURCH'S LACK OF FUNDS.

The present state of the finances of our Church is a question that is enlisting the anxious concern of those who are interested in her work. And it would, perhaps, not be out of place if a meeting were called of her leading members, to confer together in brotherly counsel, on the causes that lie at the root of this state of things. The cry of commercial depression does not very much, if at all, apply to the situation. A glance at the contributions per member shows that that cannot be the cause of our present pinched condition: although some may use it as an excuse for doing less than they are able; but so far as explaining present deficiencies and necessities that is not sufficient. For as one notable fact, more money has been expended on building churches during these years of depression than at any former period. The cause is evidently a deeper one and a sadder one not commercial depression, but spiritual depression. Without going abroad to seek any other reasons, this, it seems to not a few, is sufficient to explain the unhappy state of things that exists. No doubt some of the money lavished on extravagant churches has been withdrawn from more necessary objects of expenditure in connection with the Church. And some of the money employed in building up a University may also have been withdrawn from more necessitous objects, and objects more in harmony with the Church's mission. It will be said, perhaps, in answer to this, that those who give most liberally to these purposes also give most liberally to other schemes of the Church. That may be so. But none the less will it be found that contributing to these objects will be given as a reason for not coming to the help of the Church in her present straits. However this may be, even these drafts on the resources of the people, do not explain the constant stringency prevailing in the various schemes. As has been said, the real cause lies deeper, and all the more, on this account, does it demand the prayerful consideration of the Church.

No one, who knows the state of our membership, can say that we are undertaking too much. We are not taking up in any of the schemes more than is demanded of us. We are not, indeed, coming up to what is demanded of us, in our Home Mission field especially. We may be in error in running so blindly into debt. Many think we are. But would the Church prefer it to be said publicly that she was bankrupt—that she had no funds to carry out her mission in the land, as other Churches are doing. Our members, while they grumble, would not like this to be said. To hear it said, "the Presbyterian Church cannot support her colleges, cannot sustain her missions, cannot enlarge her borders, and yet she has as rich a membership as any Church in the land. The Presbyterian Church has failed in carrying out what she attempted." No, we would not like this said. But if things do not change for the better, either this result will have to be faced, or an ever increasing burden of miserable debt.

If then it be true that this condition of things arises from a low state of spiritual life, we are brought to face the question as to the reason for this. Our ministers are sound in the faith. They preach with faithfulness. They labour devotedly from one end of the land to the other. No cases of clerical delinquency occupy the church courts. And yet the sign of spiritual life which a full treasury affords is not found; and this is the best sign of vital godliness among the people. Without this, pious forms and pious talk are simply vanity. It would perhaps be presumptuous to suggest any explanation of this state of things, but even at the risk of this imputation may it not be said, that, even where there is orthodoxy and fervour in the pulpit, men's religion may lose itself in phraseology.

There may be moderatism that is evangelical in its terminology, as well as moderatism that is anti-evangelical. There may be a departing from the fundamental truths of the Gospel, a losing hold of them,

even while there is what may be called sound preaching.

There may be preaching about the Gospel that is interesting, but yet is not fitted to awaken men's consciences. Ministers know from painful experience, that the hardest kind of field to labour in, is where the people have had interesting and good preaching, but where no direct assault has been made on men's hearts by pressing home, as Paul did on Felix, the truths of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come. Perhaps a more simple and direct appeal to men's hearts, through the doctrines of our faith, such as all successful preachers have employed, would reach the souls that are encrusted with covetousness, and that are doing out their unwilling cents, where copious dollars should flow into the church's treasury. This suggested explanation, however, may not be accepted may not be correct. Another may be named that is worthy of consideration. That is the stream of irreligious, irreverent writing, that in newspapers and other periodicals is pouring in upon the minds of the people. This is producing undoubtedly bad effects on the rising generation. Their fathers were not so exposed to this. And we will feel the consequences of this more and more unless we endeavour to counteract it. Again, some think a spurious evangelism another cause of depressed spiritual life. It may be so, but it would be well for the Church to consider that spurious evangelism is often the issue of a dead church. It arises in the absence of a pure evangelism. Plymouthism should be denounced, but if the Church does not welcome earnest, living, active converts to the faith, they will seek a home elsewhere. Again we suggest that the whole question is worthy of being a subject of conference in every Presbytery of the Church. An assessment of so many cents a member will not keep the chariot moving.

PRESBYTER.

#### A SUGGESTION.

MR. EDITOR,—Permit me to make a suggestion regarding the study of Scripture in connection with the International Sabbath School Lessons. Many have felt that it would be desirable, that the portions of Scripture between the lessons, could be read by the scholars, as well as the passages particularly selected, and thus that a more intelligent acquaintance with God's Word should be obtained. It is also desirable to secure that the scholars should have read the lesson before coming to the Sabbath School. Both these ends can be secured in a very simple way. If our Public School Trustees and teachers would take the necessary steps, the children might during each week read in the Day School the portions of Scripture intervening between the lessons of the preceding and following Sabbath, and the lessons for the latter Sabbath. As all denominations are using the International scheme, and the work of the Day School consists merely in reading intelligently the text of Scripture, while any exposition or application would be reserved for the Sabbath Schools, our whole community would thus be able to co-operate in making the youth of our country acquainted with God's revealed will, while there would be no room for fear of proselytizing or sectarian teaching. The course proposed is practicable, and it remains to be seen whether Christian parents feel the importance of the subject sufficiently to adopt it.

JOHN LAING.

Dundas, Dec. 31, 1878.

#### PRESBYTERIAN HISTORY;

MR. EDITOR, Some errors and omissions occurred in the publication of my last article which seem to require prompt correction. Rev. Charles Jones was never connected with the United Synod, but was ordained by the Niagara Presbytery of Upper Canada, and his name should have appeared with the names of the other survivors of that body. Besides Messrs. McMillan and Rogers, Rev. Samuel Porter, of Barrie is a surviving member of the United Synod, although his membership began but a short time before the union which occurred in 1840. I may add, as an historical fact, that Mr. Porter, after that union, cast his lot with the Secession or United Presbyterian Church in Canada.

I regret these errors, especially because the value of my historical researches and contributions will depend almost entirely upon their accuracy. You will please, therefore, excuse the statement that the responsibility for errors or omissions, in this case, does not rest with me.

H. S. MCCOLLUM.

St. Catharines, Jan. 4th, 1879.