

of the late Dr. Lorimer, and Rev. Dr. Graham of Liverpool, was unanimously elected to fill the "Barbour Chair," which, since the last meeting, Dr. Patton of Chicago had declined to accept. The chief business was in connection with the Home and Foreign Missions of the Church. Mr. Bruce, in presenting the HOME MISSION report, said that, though not moving forward very rapidly, some progress had been made, but it was as yet with them rather a time for strengthening their stakes than lengthening their cords. Five new "enterprizes," including one at Cambridge, had been started during the year. Some people thought they were going too fast in London—that they were mad upon Church extension; but, unless they increased in London, they would disappear altogether. It was computed that at the present time there were four and a half millions of people in London; that the population was increasing so fast that in 1920 there would be nine millions of people, and, in 1950, seventeen millions! The finance committee complained of inadequate funds, although they had managed, "by the exercise of extreme caution," to keep out of debt. The number of SABBATH-SCHOOLS in 1879 was 380; teachers, 5747; scholars on the roll, 57,148. The northern Presbyteries are reported as using the Shorter Catechism more generally than the southern ones. The report on EVANGELISTIC WORKERS, recommended the employment of paid evangelists. (1) Of experienced pastors who have special aptitude for this kind of work. (2) Of unordained men with evangelistic gifts, who might even be authorized to dispense the sacraments. The report was remitted to Presbyteries. The FOREIGN MISSION report speaks of *seventeen* missionaries of this Church in China, 64 native evangelists, and 33 native students. The saddest event of the year was the death of Rev. Hugh Ritchie, the senior missionary in Formosa, who had fallen suddenly, after twelve years of heroic and successful labours. With like devotion, his widow deliberately requested permission to remain at her post. Dr. Morrison, the medical missionary in India, reported the conversion of a young Brahmin named Sheetot, who was now preaching the Gospel to his benighted countrymen with zeal and acceptance. The Synod held an enthusiastic missionary meeting in Exeter Hall.

WHETHER godly women shall be licensed to preach the Gospel is one of the irrepressible questions which the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States is just now called upon to discuss. Numbers of them do already preach. John Wesley it is alleged, sanctioned the principle; and well he might, for his own mother was said to have been a better preacher than he was himself.

It is quite true that the Bishop of Toronto,

withdrew from an engagement to speak at the Annual Meeting of the Bible Society, upon learning that the meeting was to be held in a Presbyterian church! It is said that the Bishop had no *personal* objections, and that the thing was done in deference to the feeling of a large portion of his clergy. The more's the pity. A change of place was proposed, but public sentiment was against it, and the meeting was held *without the Bishop*.

A Sustainment Fund.

AS the time is drawing near when the subject of a Sustainment Fund will be again before the Church to receive, I trust, the consideration its importance demands, I would ask space in your columns to answer some questions which have been put to me by many of the brethren who are likely to take part in the discussion which lies before us. The first of these questions is, "What is the difference between a supplemental fund and a sustainment fund, and why do you prefer the latter to the former?" I answer that the difference is fundamental. A supplementing scheme is the strong assisting the weak, simply as a matter of bounty, bestowing a gift which may be given or withheld as the givers think best. A sustainment fund is the strong helping the weak as a matter of debt, not considering their duty fulfilled towards the Church until their abundance has supplied the wants of the weak; and the weak not considering themselves degraded by receiving now, as they know that soon the position may be reversed, and their duty become the pleasanter one of giving rather than receiving. The supplementing scheme means giving to the poor as an act of benevolence, the sustainment scheme means upholding the equality of all the members of the household of faith, and the rights of the poor to the same spiritual food and the same pastoral care as the rich. The supplementing plan tends to the pauperising of the weak who are receiving assistance, and the domineering of the strong who are giving assistance. Whereas the sustainment fund tends to the strengthening of the weak, and to the prevention of tyranny on the part of the strong. The supplementing scheme promotes selfishness. There are always congregations who will do little or nothing for any such object as helping their poorer neighbours; the sustainment plan prevents selfishness by placing all the congregations under obligations to reach a certain standard of self support, and to take upon themselves responsibility for their neighbours in proportion to their means. Now, such being the