

Mr. King agree in pressing the claims of the Supplemental Fund on the support of the Church as a matter of equity, is evidence that neither holds this principle as here stated. But to pass over statements of this kind, and to come to what Mr. McLeod appears to consider a point of great importance. He claims—and in this "Watchman" appears to agree with him—that under the Sustentation Scheme the pastor is the servant of the whole Church, while by the Supplemental one he is made the servant of the congregation into the charge of which he has been inducted; and that the difference between these two things is so great that the pastor is degraded under the latter, and made nothing better than a hireling. Now, there is surely some misapprehension here. Mr. McLeod will admit that in the Presbyterian Church the congregation calls the minister, and that the call is not simply, as in the Methodist Church, an invitation which a congregation may or may not address to the person whose services it desires to secure for a limited period—it is in ordinary circumstances indispensable as furnishing the ground on which the Church proceeds in inducting the minister into the pastoral charge. He will further admit that a minister so called and inducted sustains a special relation to the congregation whose call he has accepted, giving it a claim for the time being on his service which no other congregation of the body possesses. He serves it first and most. He serves the whole Church chiefly through his service of it. It has a claim on his time and thought and sympathy which the general body even does not possess. Mr. McLeod will surely not claim that a minister is humiliated in becoming the servant of a congregation in this sense—the only scriptural one—of the word, at least the sense in which the Apostle uses it when writing to the Corinthians; he says, "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." Everything, in truth, depends on the motive. Let this or "for Jesus' sake," be present, and the most highly gifted is only honoured in being the servant, not of a congregation only, but of its humblest member. All this is, or should be, axiomatic among Christian people. Well, then, does the mere fact of the minister receiving his salary directly from the congregation entirely change, as Mr. McLeod appears to think, the character of the relationship, making the congregation his master, placing him "under it," laying him under obligation to give "obedience" to it, and converting him into a hireling? Surely not. If the receipt of salary directly from the congregation make the person receiving it more its servant and less the servant of the whole Church, then it will follow that the minister of the smallest Lowland and Highland congregation in the Free Church of Scotland, and who receives his whole income from the Sustentation Fund, is more truly the servant of the whole Church than the minister of St. George's, Edinburgh, whose congregation contributes indeed thousands to the Sustentation Fund, but who himself receives the greater part of his salary, not from the Fund, but directly from the congregation itself, thus furnishing a new and surprising application of the words, "The first shall be last, and the last first."

I had intended to say something on the letter of "Watchman," but this communication is long enough, and almost all the points in "Watchman's" letter have been met by anticipation, either in this or in former letters. Besides, I have little hope that by anything I could write, the slightest impression could be made on one who, in the face of all that has been written and spoken, could pen a sentence at once so groundless and so offensive as: "The Supplemental Scheme denies the right of the minister to receive any support from the Church, *excepting in the form of charity*, to relieve actual want." But without entering on any detailed criticism of "Watchman's" points of difference and of resemblance, of advantage and of disadvantage, between the two Schemes, I would venture to ask an explanation of two statements: First, "the Sustentation Scheme," it is said, "proceeds upon the principle that the Church owes as *liberal* a support to the minister who has charge of a weak congregation as she does to the minister who has charge of the wealthiest;" and again, "in the matter of support, it places all her ministers upon an *equal footing* before the Church." Will "Watchman" show the consistency of this statement with the restriction of the support in the case of aid receiving

congregations, to the equal dividend, and the permission extended to aid-giving congregations to supplement this equal dividend by any amount they choose?

Second, "the Supplemental Scheme" recognises and treats the ministers who are aided by it "as paupers." A preacher labouring in a Mission Fund derives a part of his income from the Home Mission Fund. "Watchman" will probably not be so lavish in the use of his degrading epithet as to apply it to such a labourer. The preacher in the course of time receives a call to labour as settled pastor in this field, not yet strong enough to be self-supporting. Will "Watchman" explain how the aid which was given to the field before, as a matter of equity, and without any degradation of the labourer, becomes an act of charity, and makes the labourer what I shrink from writing, now that he serves it in the capacity of an ordained minister?

JOHN M. KING.

Toronto, Feb. 25th, 1882.

CHURCH BUILDING FUND FOR MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST.

MR. EDITOR,—There will be general if not universal satisfaction at the auspicious commencement at Winnipeg, by Mr. Robertson, of the proposed Fund to aid in the erection of churches and manse in the North-West. It is just possible that it would have been wise to confine the effort to the first of these objects, leaving the manse to be subsequently provided. However, it is probable that church building will stand first in point of time, as it unquestionably does in importance. In this movement the whole Church is interested, and all must desire that it will be conducted in the way which gives promise of the greatest and best results.

According to the published rules of the Fund—not yet, however, sanctioned by the General Assembly—all sums contributed will be invested, and only the interest used, unless special request to the contrary is made by the donors. This means, as I understand it, that the projectors of the movement, who to a certain extent represent the Church, determine to advise the investment plan, and to act on it, except where subscribers request their donations to be used otherwise.

The sincerest desire for the accomplishment of the object constrains to the respectful submission of the question, whether the end sought would not be more fully attained by applying funds contributed *more directly*? In other words, is it wise at such a juncture, when demands for places of worship are so clamant, and from so many quarters, to lay away money and use only the interest? It will not be denied nor questioned, that the next five or ten years will call for aid with special urgency, and to meet the demand will tax to the utmost the energies and liberality of our people without as well as within this great western territory; and the question comes up and should be well considered, is it wise for us to divert from the supply of *immediate and urgent need*, the Christian liberality of our people so far as to accept only the interest?

In Winnipeg, where, most appropriately, the subscription has been opened, the sum of \$24,000 was soon put down, and is likely to be increased. Now, the \$24,000 at five per cent. will give \$1,200 per annum, and at six per cent. \$1,440—a sum which could aid only three churches each year, at the rate of about \$500 each, or five at \$300. If the sum subscribed, however, were placed unreservedly at the disposal of the Committee, and urgent cases should exist, the Committee could give \$600 each to eight churches per year, or to forty in five years, and the same sum to five or six more from interest accruing during the five years current, making forty-five and nearly forty-six in all against fifteen. The same principle applies to the use of \$50,000 or \$100,000, which, however, might be made to cover a much longer time.

It will, of course, be replied, "But then your money, at the expiration of the years referred to, will be exhausted." True, but it will have served its end effectually. It will have helped in weakness, helped into strength, scores of charges whose duty, pleasure and profit it will then be to carry on the work by aiding their struggling brethren in the newer and poorer districts.

The interest plan assumes that the Church in the North-West has no *special* need of these buildings now, beyond what it will have one hundred or a

thousand years hence. It proposes to give the same help now, and centuries hence, when our help may not be needed. In fact, by confining ourselves to the interest plan, we say, as it seems to me, that we have little faith in the future of our Church in the North-West, and in the expansive power of the Gospel. We act as though we did not expect Christian men out there to acquire wealth, and to consecrate it to the extension of the Lord's cause. Our thousands are wanted now very specially, and will be wanted in the near future with equal urgency, but we instruct our men of wealth to place restrictions on the Committee, so that only a fraction of what they have given can be expended when the case is most clamant. Is this wise? Is it necessary?

If the whole hundred thousand should be used, will it not have been used to good purpose? Will there not be then strong churches in the Far West, and a new race of merchant princes, and wealthy land cultivators, and *live men* east and west, who will raise another hundred thousand if it should be required?

"But the money has been subscribed on these terms." True, but if the subscribers had been asked to place their subscriptions at the disposal of the Committee without the restriction of Rule Fifth, it is probable that three-fourths of them would have consented, and given just as cheerfully; and the subscribers are not so numerous but that their wishes could be ascertained, and their concurrence given if another course were deemed preferable.

Of course, those who wish that only the interest of their donation should be used, should have their instructions carried out; but what seems to me undesirable is that the Church should in effect say, "We *advise* you to *restrict* us. We will invest your money and bind ourselves to use nothing but interest, unless you make special request to the contrary." I would reverse it, and say, if you wish your money invested, say so; but if we are not so instructed, it will be at the disposal of the Committee, to be used as they see best for the furtherance of the great objects contemplated.

The consideration of the one point raised by this letter is respectfully requested. The request is submitted with some hesitation and diffidence, because but a small portion of the fund to be raised will come from this part of the Church. Still, the first thousand was offered a year ago from a gentleman in the extreme East, a member of the congregation of Rev. L. G. McNeill, of St. John's, Newfoundland, and it is for the interest of all that the wisest and best course should be pursued.

P. G. MCGREGOR.

Halifax, February 14th.

AT the annual entertainment of Chalmers Church, Richmond, Quebec, recently held, the pastor, Rev. F. M. Dewey, presided, and the Rev. James Black, of Montreal, delivered a lecture on "Crotchets and Fallacies" to an appreciative audience.

THE annual meeting of the congregation of Willis Church, Clinton, was held on the 31st ult. After devotional exercises, Mr. A. Matheson was appointed chairman, and Mr. Mallock secretary. The annual report showed the finances to be in a very satisfactory condition. Messrs M. McTaggart, Wm. Craig and Charles Avery were re-elected as trustees, and Messrs Menzies and Turnbull as auditors. Mr. McTaggart was also appointed treasurer. The salary of the Rev. A. Stewart was raised \$100 per year, making it \$1,100 with manse. After a lengthy discussion on the new church question, it was decided to build; but it was agreed to defer the choice of a site until the 14th inst.—COM.

IN the last annual report of the Barrie Presbyterian congregation Board of Managers the following statement appears: "They cannot refrain from saying that they consider the congregation in a healthier state now than it ever was before; certainly it is so financially, although from the large emigration to the North-West it is numerically smaller. For unanimity of feeling, regularity of contributions, and liberality without pressure or special effort of any kind, we have reached a higher average than we have ever done before." During the year the congregation contributed \$306 for the Schemes of the Church, for which also the Sabbath school raised \$110; and \$101 for other purposes, making a total income for the year of \$2,924 81. Under the able and efficient pastorate of the Rev. J. Leiper, a still larger measure of prosperity may be confidently anticipated.—COM.