

Temple lodges, and associations of all sorts, to do this and find time for study and careful preparation for the pulpit be acquainted with all modern research and interested in all public questions, in short to have sound views on these and a thousand other matters and so to express them that nobody will be offended. These he would be told are some of the things expected of this class of men.

He can imagine such a stranger concluding that every provision would be made for the support of so laborious a class of men. He would naturally discourse something as follows. You tell me these men are not inspired and therefore have to meditate upon the problems before them like others, they must study, must gather wisdom laboriously—they must I perceive give all their time to the work. I conclude then that each congregation will give an ample competence to its own minister and provide for his support in old age when he retires from active work. What would be his astonishment on hearing in reply that save in city churches the income is about that of a stone mason or skilled artisan, and that no provision is made for old age—that while clerks, light-house keepers and officials in all public departments whose whole time is given to the public service have under all civilized governments a provision provided for old age the Christian Church has not yet attained to this wise arrangement.

The result of all this is that the Church is left to complain of the difficulty we have in persuading ministers to remain in this country. One after another they wonder away and the walls of our Zion are left desolate. Who is to blame for this. The usual answer is that it is owing to the poverty of our people or their want of liberality. A little reflection will soon show the fallacy of this. If there is no fund from which underpaid or aged and infirm ministers can be assisted

whose fault is it. The blame may properly lie between all parties, but clearly the clergy as the recognized leaders of the church are not free from responsibility. It is true they may have often spoken of such a scheme, but no scheme can go forward without efficient organization, and whose duty is it to propose such a scheme to set the machine in motion, to impress public opinion with its importance, to argue down opposition. The laity can not give time and thought to it. Let the clergy to whom the people look for guidance take the work in hand. True, as a rule the clergy shrink from such a task. Craving for money is a disagreeable work at best, even when interested motives are out of the question, and most of them prefer to suffer in silence rather than speak out. Our own opinion is that in this they greatly err. Set a reasonable scheme before our people and they will respond as they have always done heartily and liberally. Let each kirk session courageously take it up—they need not be afraid of grumbling. True some will grumble, but that is a healthy sign, rather than otherwise. It is a sign they feel it right to give, but find it hard to do so—their liberality will improve under judicious pressure.

We understand that the Rev. C. Dunn has prepared a scheme which promises to meet this want in a large measure. He proposes to raise annually a sum of money to be invested until the amount reaches, say, sixteen thousand dollars. In time the revenue from this fund will amount to in round numbers a thousand dollars a year. This would be used in supplementing weak charges; and in the event of any minister retiring from active duty through ill health or old age he might have a small allowance given him annually from this fund. There is nothing new or revolutionary in the scheme. The temporalities fund of the kirk in old Canada, the Sustentation