

by Rome (such as for a man that killeth father or mother, wife or sister, *tor 6d.*; or a priest that keeps a concubine, *tor 6d.*—thus Popery sets aside the law of God), and to its encouragement of idolatry in the worship of saints' images and relics.

Thus in the office of the mass, before consecration, the priest says that he makes the oblation "in honour of the blessed Mary ever virgin, the blessed John the Baptist, the holy apostles Peter and Paul, and of all the saints." What is this but idolatry? Did our Lord indeed suffer and die in honour of sinful mortals, instead of for His own glory and that of the Father? The followers of Rome are taught to worship the Virgin Mary and other saints. They pray to them for deliverance from the troubles of life. Against this, Paul warns Christians in *1 Tim. iv.*, where he describes the followers of this Apostasy as "giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons." The term demon refers to deified men, worshipped by the heathen and by the Israelites during their many apostasies, when they became idolaters (*1 Cor. x. 20; Psa. cvi. 35-38*). The heathen said that in honouring those as substitutes, they honoured the supreme God, and that these inferior deities interceded for them with Jupiter the great God (Lucian). This is the same argument used by Romanists. The heathen said that they worshipped not the images but the deities they represented. The Roman Catechism, one of the standards of Rome, says that images are to be in the churches, "not merely for instruction, but that they may be worshipped" (*Stillingfleet's Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome*). In *2 Thes.* we are told that the head of the Papacy exalts himself above all that is called God, by dispensing with the law of God, and by setting himself above that law. The Pope has assumed to himself and received from his followers "many names of blasphemy." The Canon law calls him "Our Lord God the Pope." The Pope accepted this saying of Cardinal Bellarmine (one of the most eminent authorities of Rome); "If the Pope should command the practice of vice and forbid the practice of virtue, the Church were bound to believe vice to be good and virtue to be wicked." In a council held in the Pope's palace, in the time of Leo X. these words were spoken; "On the Pope is all manner of power, as well of heaven as of earth." Yet our Saviour says: "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth." Is not the Pope then the Antichrist?

To be concluded.

THE AGED AND INFIRM MINISTERS' FUND.

MR. EDITOR,—There is no fund of our Church in which so little interest is felt. Why is it needed at all? Because the salaries of most of our ministers have not been adequate to meet the expenses of their position, and at the same time to enable them to lay up anything for old age or retirement. Many of them have devoted their hearts and lives—their whole time and strength to the service of the Church—after a long and expensive education, and then often received scarcely enough to pay current expenses. Some even of the hardest and most successful workers who freely gave more than a year to the mission field organizing or supplying many stations, gathering together groups of people, travelling thousands of miles on foot or on horseback, along the worst of roads, preaching often six or eight times a week, and expounding from house to house incessantly, content with the poorest accommodation—many of these groups now large congregations—and yet some of these men have not had their current expenses paid, but often having to eke out their salaries from private means until these were exhausted while helping to pay for several new churches for the benefit of our Presbyterian cause.

Some of these gave a fourth of their small salary of \$400 (the common salary in the olden time) to this object while their health was broken down by overworking. In some cases they have had to spend some thousands of dollars of private means, besides many years of excessive toil and care in the service of the Church, and have nothing left for old age but poverty and privation. And then, after all this toil and sacrifice, all that is provided for them is \$200 a year, besides any retiring allowance they may receive from their congregations. Is it right that such a state of things should be allowed by the wealthy members of

our Church? Has not the King of Zion laid the duty of advancing His cause equally upon all His people? Why, then, should ministers be expected to make all the sacrifices? Should not all Christians realize that all they have belongs to Christ and should be used in such a way as shall best promote His glory? The Great Head of the Church made ample provision for His servants under the old dispensation, and He commands His people to sustain the Gospel ministry as well (*Luke x. 7; 1 Cor. ix. 14; Gal. vi. 6; 1 Tim. v. 18*). Some writers think that this should be equal to three times the average salary of their people in order to meet the expenses of their position.

Some say that they will receive what they could make in business. The writer knows one minister who for a time was led to engage in business, and although he could not realize \$1,000 a year as a minister in a city, last year he made about \$5,000 in secular business, and there are others who could do as well.

When they devoted themselves to the work of the ministry they did not expect wealth, but they had a right to expect that their expenses would be met, and that they would be enabled to lay up a modest competence for old age. But in many cases this has not been realized. Nearly forty years ago regulations were made by the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund Committee that at least \$10 for a year of service should be paid to ministers on the fund; that is, after forty years of service or more each annuitant should receive \$400 per annum. Even \$400 would not do more than pay house rent for a very cheap house with fuel and water rate in a city; and those accustomed most of their lives to a town or city life would have to live in a country district in order to live at all. But what should we say of an aged minister having to depend on the amount now paid, namely, \$200 a year? Let educated men, who spend their thousands, imagine if they can the misery thus caused. That justice demands that at least such a provision should be made for aged ministers as was contemplated by the committee becomes more evident when we consider the generous provision made by the civil service for the servants of the public, they being generally allowed about half their ample salary when superannuated. Even Toronto policemen, who require very little education, after twenty years' service are entitled to one-half their salary, or from \$300 to \$500 per annum. Now, in order to insure that small annuity of \$10 per year of service, we require a fund of at least \$100,000 besides the yearly collections from the congregations and the yearly rates from ministers for such a fund would only yield about \$5,000 a year; whereas we now need \$12,000 a year to pay even the \$200 a year, with fifty-eight ministers now on the fund and more being added every year. At present there is a deficiency of nearly \$2,000, which unless made up, even that small sum cannot be paid. The American Presbyterian Church (North), with a constituency of scarcely eight times that of ours, has resolved to raise \$1,000,000 for this object, and one gentleman left \$2,000 to the fund in the Eastern Provinces, thus setting a noble example to our rich men in the West.

The General Assembly at Hamilton, in 1886, resolved to appeal to our people to raise \$100,000 capital by contributions, chiefly from our wealthy members. But the endowment of several colleges stood in the way and the matter was not pushed forward. Now that the endowment of the colleges is safe, we trust there will be no more delay in carrying out this most pressing need of the Church. There need be no difficulty for our Church to raise this proposed capital if our wealthy men take the lead, and contribute as God has prospered them (*Luke xi. 41; 1 Cor. xvi. 22; 1 Tim. vi. 18*). The greater part of this should be raised by the wealthy so as not to interfere with the yearly contributions to this and the other funds. Now twenty of our wealthy men, each giving \$5,000, would provide the fund, or 100 \$1,000 each, or 500 men \$200 each. Surely there are 500 of our wealthy members that would contribute \$200 each, to be paid in four or five years, paying interest on the whole till paid up. Our wealthy members often leave large amounts to relatives already well off. Should not such persons dedicate portions of their means to the service of Him who gave them the power to get wealth, in order to make this necessary provision for His servants with whom He identifies Himself? (*Deut. viii. 18; Matt. xxv. 40*) The General Assembly last year

made a most singular change on the proportion of annuity to be paid. Instead of \$10 per year, up to forty years, it was resolved to ask \$15 per year, for the first ten years, and only \$5 per year after that. I have no objection to \$15 per year, for the first ten years, but upon what principle should we then grant only \$5 per year to those that have borne the burden and heat of the day? It is certainly setting aside all idea of justice: for those who have laboured over forty years are the men who have laid the foundations of our Church, while enduring toil and privations not known now, and receiving only \$400 or \$500 a year for many years, besides making sacrifices of private means which has rendered it possible for younger men to receive much larger salaries, while not doing half the work that these veterans did. We are told that the Church does not look to past service, but to present needs. Then I ask, Has all sense of justice been banished from the minds and consciences of our ministers and elders? What does God describe as the first characteristic of His accepted worshippers but that they do justly? (*Micah vi. 8*.) If such an unchristian principle as "were adopted by our Church, I would lose all hope of the divine blessing returning on us as a Church. Beware lest the cries of the aged servants of Christ, who have laid the foundations of our Church, come into the ears of the Lord, and He send a curse and not a blessing, because of grievous injustice. What will be the result if this injustice be not removed? That the servants of Christ will have their old age embittered by privation and sorrow, after having spent their lives and their whole strength in doing the work of the Church. Some of these, with their sensitive feelings increased by their education and prominent positions for many years, where they were wont to provide help for others, would rather die than be dependent on the cold charities of the world or private aid. Some of these men might have made money had they gone into speculation with their private means; but they feared that their usefulness would be impaired thereby, and were more anxious to promote the divine glory and to avoid everything that would injure the cause of God, than to make money for themselves. And are they to be allowed to suffer because of their conscientiousness? And as to present needs, if no proper provision be made for ministers in old age, their energies will be greatly weakened and their power to do good greatly hindered by anxiety how to meet the many claims upon them while in the work. Let the capital of at least \$100,000 be raised soon, and let the aged ministers receive the annuity of \$10 per year of service, as agreed upon many years ago, even if the ministers' yearly rate to the fund has to be raised. Let all the members of our Church give a tenth on an average (*Gen. xxviii. 22; 2 Chron. xxxi. 41*)—and all our funds will flourish. The divine blessing need not be expected by professing Christians who fail to do their duty to the servants of Christ. He has promised His special blessing to those who honour Him by properly sustaining His servants (*Isaiah xxxii. 8; Prov. xi. 24, 25; Matt. iii. 10; 2 Cor. viii. 9*). If then we are to look for the blessing of the King of Zion on our Church and people and for the success we desire, let the means be taken to put this fund in a proper position. It may be said that some are on the fund who do not need it, or who should never have been in the ministry. But that is no just reason that those who have been both faithful and successful labourers should be deprived of their rights. JUSTICE.

POLITICS AND POLICY.

MR. EDITOR,—Some time since you had a short leading article about the Church and politics,—“Should the Church Interfere in Political and Semi-political Matters?” Something depends on the definition of “political”, or, if you like, on what we are to understand by “interference.” The Church should not certainly “as a corporate body” go “into the political arena.” Nor should ministers, as such, instruct their people to vote for this or that candidate. With politics, understood as a strife between parties, the less the Church has to do the better. But there is a way in which the Church can, and I think should, interfere in politics much more than it does. Some might think it a very long, roundabout, indirect way. Indeed, I am afraid there is a somewhat widespread impression to that effect. But the road by which you will most certainly get there is the shortest always.