

the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." And the children of Israel could not look on the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; and chap. iv. 6 "For God hath shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." Now, I hope that if Mr. "M. T." considers these passages as twisted doctrine, he will show me their true meaning—a meaning that Christ would wish me to know and live.

Another statement is made, that no member of Christ's mystical body can be glorified before another. Then what about the Mount of Transfiguration? In what way did Moses and Elias appear? Was it in glory or was it not (Luke ix. 31)? Now, if the souls of believers do not pass immediately into glory at death, Mr. Moffat and the Catechism are not only wrong, but Matthew Henry, Thomas Scott, John Brown, Alexander McLeod, Robert Shaw, Benedict Pictet, and all the Westminster Assembly of divines are all wrong; and so also all the ministers that I have ever heard, either in the old country or in Canada. Who is right? One point more. The Christadelphian opinion at issue is, body and soul remain insensible in the grave. The Catechism, 37th, teaches, the souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory. The 38th "At the resurrection, believers being raised up in glory, shall be openly acknowledged and acquitted in the day of judgment, and made perfectly blessed," etc. And now Mr. "M. T." coolly states: "I know that the Confession and Catechism say so, but it requires considerable twisting of Scripture, I think, to make it teach that." If Mr. "M. T." is a member of the Presbyterian Church, does he hold a conscious hereafter? or if a minister, where is his new paradise of rest and blessedness?

Sir, you will, no doubt, think my letter too long, but it is as short as I could possibly make it to meet the article of Mr. "M. T." JAS. NESBITT.

Warkton, Feb. 9th, 1882.

SUSTENTATION VS. SUPPLEMENT.

MR. EDITOR,—I do not propose to be diverted from what I wish to say about the two Schemes by the remarks of my friend Mr. King, and if I do not answer his statements, it will lead them to have their unbroken influence on the minds of your readers. Two of his statements I will refer to in a way that I trust will be satisfactory. He quotes from my letter the words, "It has been adopted by no Church in the world but one (the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland), after deliberate examination." Then goes on to say, "it (the Supplemental Scheme) is in operation in the large majority of Christian Churches on both sides of the Atlantic." This is a very large assertion; and it is one in direct contradiction to what Mr. King stated in his former letter. For when I had spoken of his Scheme as one that had been "rejected by the English, Irish, and Australian Presbyterian Churches on the most intimate knowledge of it," this he said can only "apply to the Scheme in its general principles, not certainly to its details, which are different from those of any Church known to the writer." Now, it would be advisable for Mr. King to show why he has been compelled to invent an entirely new mode of procedure in his Scheme—a mode different from that of any Church known to him; and that while the "Supplemental Scheme is in operation in the large majority of Christian Churches on both sides of the Atlantic," no mode in which it is operated is applicable to our Church here. Is there no Surplus Fund in these Churches similar to Mr. King's? Is the present Supplemental Scheme entirely and exclusively a new invention or discovery of Mr. King's in its details? He says they are found in "no Church known to him," yet the "Supplemental Scheme is in operation in the majority of Christian Churches." I cannot understand these statements. I assert again, that the Scheme proposed by Mr. King is the Scheme in use in the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland, and I think he will find details as to the administration of his Scheme, marvellously like his own, both in the United Presbyterian and Free Churches of Scotland.

Now, in the second place, Mr. King "regrets to find in my letters an attempt to prejudice the fair consideration of the Supplemental Scheme, by connecting it exclusively with one Scottish Church." Now, I would simply say in answer to this, I make no attempt to prejudice the fair consideration of the Scheme. I

have no desire to do this, any more than Mr. King has, but I have the liberty of expressing my conviction as he has, and all I state is, that the Scheme of Mr. King is the Scheme now in use in the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland, so far as I can make out. I do not say that to prejudice the fair consideration of the Scheme; I say it as a matter of fact, and I say that the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland has done and is doing a noble work in that and other lands. It might be well to copy much from that Church, but may we not respectfully question the virtue of the Supplemental Scheme and Surplus Fund? I think I might as well say, that Mr. King manifests what looks like an attempt to prejudice the fair consideration of the Scheme by disconnecting it from "any Church known to him," and persuading us that his Scheme is a new thing in the earth. Let us look how this Fund works in Scotland. "Another fact has operated powerfully in the same direction," says a writer in the "United Presbyterian Magazine," that is, in the direction of a decrease in membership, "the institution of the Surplus Fund, from which payments are made in proportion to the average giving of the congregations receiving aid."

That is the statement the writer goes on to expound. Now, is it not well to pause before adopting such a Scheme, which admittedly tends to retard the progress of the Church—a Scheme copied very closely as to its details by Mr. King, so far as I can gather?

One other fact from the same article, which I referred to before. This Scheme has, I believe, crippled the United Presbyterian Church in the work of Church extension. It has not stimulated the formation of new charges, so that that Church has not increased the number of their charges, as the other Scottish Churches have. Now, all I say is, that such facts should make us pause before accepting a Scheme to which such effects may be justly ascribed. As to Mr. King's statement that his Scheme is in operation in the American Churches, I would question it very much. He has said its details were not in use in "any Church known to him." But let me close with the following words from a paper read before the Pan Presbyterian Council at Philadelphia. "The Sustentation Scheme of the Presbyterian Church of the United States was bright with promise for a time, but our large new territory, operated by the Board of Home Missions, presents great and peculiar difficulties, and it will require time and experience to bring it into successful operation in this country. But it so greatly stimulated our new organizations to contribute to the general benevolent operations of the Church, as well as to self-support, that we cherish the hope that its most excellent features may be soon so improved as to be made applicable to new as well as old Mission fields." I hope Mr. King will give me credit for the same zeal for the good of the Church as he is actuated by, and not think I wish to prejudice the question under discussion any more than he does himself. Of course the Assembly will take its own course, but it will better do so the more the subject is ventilated. The details of his Scheme, Mr. King says, requires a good deal of attention. Certainly they do, since they are found in "no Church known to him." But, with all deference, again I submit that principles are more important than details. If, however, the Church thinks otherwise, and bows its neck to a yoke that will not help it in the prosecution of its work, and a yoke the details of whose construction are not found in "any Church known to Mr. King," he no doubt will be satisfied, and I and others of like mind on the subject will, however much dissatisfied, loyally submit.

D. D. McLEOD.

MR. EDITOR,—THE PRESBYTERIAN of February 17th contains another letter on the Sustentation Fund from Mr. D. D. McLeod, and a letter from Mr. P. McF. McLeod, endorsing the views therein expressed, and making additional statements in the same direction. That of February 24th contains a letter on the same subject from "Watchman." With your permission, I would ask the attention of your readers to some of the statements contained in these communications, with the view of still further ventilating the important question now before the Church.

I have had to call attention to the want of accuracy of statement, even on important points, by which the previous communications of Mr. D. D. McLeod were marked, and their value in assisting us to a wise settlement of the problem not a little impaired. I

regret to find the same feature reappearing in this third letter. Even on a matter so simple and so easily verified as that of the number of your correspondent's letters in exposition of the Assembly's Committee's Supplemental Scheme, Mr. McLeod has made an incorrect statement. "Mr. King," he says, "has written three (at least) long letters to expound his Scheme." In point of fact, the letters written with this view, which were long, perhaps too long, were two. The third letter written by me, as any one can see, was called forth by Mr. McLeod's first letter, and was simply an attempt to consider and controvert his objections to the Scheme. The point, indeed, is of no consequence, except as an illustration of a certain looseness of statement which marks in a greater or less degree all these communications, and by which their value is necessarily much lessened. Mr. McLeod gives us in this last letter a bold and striking picture of the transformation which the Sustentation Fund once inaugurated is to work, or rather has already in imagination wrought. We are asked to listen to the "unanimous voice of thanksgiving," which rises from a grateful Church "that so wise and sufficient a solution of the great problem has been adopted, and that the Supplemental Fund has been given a final and respectful quietus." It is impossible, even for one so wedded to the Fund which has received its quietus as your correspondent, to withhold a certain degree of homage from the ideal which is sketched. One is sorry to find that so fair a picture is indebted for almost all of reality which it appears to possess to a skilful use of the present and perfect tenses. So far from the state of things portrayed in it being in harmony with that contemplated by the Sustentation Scheme now before the Church, it is, in its most important features, its direct antithesis. "The whole Church," it is said, "in its ministry, stands shoulder to shoulder on the same just and equal platform." This is said while the first article of the Scheme shuts out altogether from the platform a number variously estimated at from a seventh to a tenth of the settled ministry of the Church, and other articles contemplate as at least possible additions to the ministerial income, which in some cases would exceed four times the amount of the common dividend. Then again, "The broad shield of the Church has been thrown over all her congregations; a common bond of union has been constituted, and an ample salary secured for all her pastors." The salary spoken of in another part of the letter, as secured by the Sustentation Scheme, is \$750. It requires some courage to speak of it as *ample* for all pastors, when, as any one may know, it would require more than half the amount to pay the house rent and taxes of ministers in Montreal, Toronto, and other cities.

I notice only one other statement of Mr. McLeod. "The Scheme of Mr. King"—why of Mr. King?—"is, in fact, no improvement at all upon our present state of things." It is true that, by separating the Fund from the Home Mission Fund, it gives the matter of the adequate support of the ministry a distinctness and a prominence which it has not at present; and that by making the aid given dependent, within certain well defined limits, on the liberality of those receiving it, it incorporates a principle, the adoption of which by the Free Church of Scotland enables it at once to do what it had for years vainly tried—make the equal dividend £200 or thereabouts. Such being the case, Mr. McLeod expects too much when he asks his readers to believe, on his unsupported assertion, that it "is no improvement at all upon our present state of things." I hope Mr. McLeod, in the further communications which he promises, will condescend to give us reasons for the views which he presents, otherwise it will be difficult to escape the feeling that in dealing with the question he is disposed to substitute boldness of assertion for force of argument, and to lean on iteration of statement rather than on accuracy. It must be obvious to every one that on a matter of this kind—one so wide and complicated as the financial arrangements of a large Church—accuracy is essential, and any speaking or writing is of value only as it keeps closely by the facts of the case.

In Mr. P. McLeod's communication there are several statements which, I am sure, he would admit need qualification, as, for example, "Both Mr. King and Dr. Caven laid down the principle that the duty of supporting the minister rests *entirely* with the congregation calling him." The fact that Dr. Caven and