

quaintances, among whom was a large number of ladies. The service was commenced by the Rev. James S. Black, Dr. Taylor's colleague and successor. The venerable Dr. Wilkes of the congregational Church, delivered a funeral address, and the very Rev. Dean Bond of St. George's Episcopal Church, closed the service with prayer. The following ministers acted as pall-bearers,—Dr. Douglas, (Methodist,) Mr. Wells, (American Presbyterians,) Mr. Denovan, (Baptist,) Mr. Dumoulin, (Episcopalian,) Mr. Stevenson, (Congregationalist,) and Mr. Baxter (Presbyterian.) The procession was headed by the protestant ministers of the city in a body, and, following them, the kirk-session and managers of Erskine Church and a very large number of the congregation and citizens from every Protestant denomination.

In the course of his remarks, Dr. Wilkes who, in connection with another branch of the Church, had been associated with Dr. Taylor in Christian work during these three and forty years, referred to the pleasant intercourse, and the unbroken friendship of those years and to the faithfulness and catholicity of his deceased brother. He spoke of him as one of the earliest promoters of the Temperance Reformation, and, along with himself, as the originator of a Ministerial Association which has continued to this day with the happiest results. Thirty-seven years ago, he was also one of those who formed the French Canadian Missionary Society, in which he took a life-long interest.

As a Biblical scholar, Dr. Taylor occupied high rank. In his knowledge of Greek and Hebrew he was, perhaps, unsurpassed in the Dominion. In his younger days he was a power on the platform, a skilful debater, and always a prominent member of the Church Courts. It is impossible to over-estimate the good influences that have accrued to the Presbyterianism of Canada, from so noble a life and so accomplished and learned a ministry.

On the sabbath following his death, appropriate funeral sermons were preached in Erskine Church, in the forenoon by the Rev. Dr. Gibson of Chicago,—Dr. Taylor's first colleague, and in the evening, by Mr. Black, the pastor of the congregation.

CHURCH MEMBERSHIP, DOES IT MEAN ANYTHING ?

CHAP. II. *Concerning Temporalities.*—Some of my readers may not understand what this long word means. They have heard of the Temporalities Board, but

perhaps they have vague ideas even as to what is meant by a Board. Let me explain :

It is a fact, though many excellent persons seem never to have grasped it, that a Church cannot—in the nature of things—exist or at any rate be kept in existence without money. Possibly this statement of the fact may be offensive to them, and less or more a shock to their piety. Is not the Church spiritual? Is it not a sin to think that the Holy Spirit is to be bought? Is not money the root of all evil? Such are the pertinent questions they put triumphantly, in reply. To all which we answer, that when we are spirit—only that and nothing more—in the land where they neither marry nor are given in marriage—we shall probably be in a position to discard money utterly. But, in the meantime, the heavenly citizen is also a citizen of earth and subject to its conditions. He might just as honestly undertake to keep house without an income, or conduct the government without an exchequer, as to keep up his church without money. He cannot build, repair, paint, light, heat, clean, ornament, nor insure the Lord's house without money. Pastor, assistant, bible women, city missionary, secretary, sexton, organist, choir, all involve a large expenditure. I am now speaking, mark, not of liberality, not of giving to others, giving for the sake of the heathen, or the poor, or the Church generally; but simply of giving to ourselves, of the ordinary revenue our Church must have, if it is to exist, and to which we must contribute if we are members, simply as we would pay any other debt. In one word, I am speaking of the Temporalities of the Church.

Very good. What then does Church-membership mean in this matter? What is the principle on which the members of the Church assess themselves to meet this ordinary expenditure?

First, let us consider the principle on which communities—with far less lofty pretensions than the Church—act. A city, say of five thousand families has to raise a revenue of \$200,000. Is that done by each family paying \$40 a year? Why