

liberality of the Church in a degree sufficient to make it a success.

This was the experience of the English Presbyterian Church and is now the complaint of other denominations who have tried such a plan on a large scale, so that many of these denominations in England are coming nearer and nearer to the idea of a sustentation fund. Now we believe that these are really solid objections, and they do not exhaust the list; and we further believe that no such formidable objections can be urged against a sustentation fund. But what is the plan of such a fund as we propose? Here it is. All the settled charges in our Church would be divided into two classes—aid-receiving and aid-giving. The aid-receiving would send in all their revenue to the treasurer of the sustentation fund, except what was required for payment of caretaker and other necessary expenses connected with the church building, and they would receive back the equal dividend whatever that might be; but to prevent congregations leaning unjustly on the fund, care would be taken to secure that an equitable rate per member was contributed by such congregations before they were allowed to benefit by the fund. Aid-giving congregations would send into the treasurer of the Sustentation fund the proceeds of their associations or collections *plus* the amount of the equal dividend. The equal dividend would come back to them and what was contributed above that amount would go to the help of the weaker congregations. So that under the working of this fund when a call is given to a minister by an aid-receiving congregation they will have to satisfy the Presbytery as to what they are able to pay into the fund, and when an aid-giving congregation calls, they will promise their minister the equal dividend, and whatever supplement they may be willing to add to that sum. Now let us look at some of the advantages of this plan. It will raise the *status* of our ministers throughout the whole Dominion and will tend to encourage men of higher intellectual powers and higher social position to offer for the ministry. It will put an end to arrears of stipend, and only those who have suffered from irregular payments can understand the advantages of receiving the quarter's salary on the quarter day. It will make it possible for our ministers to speak freely to their people about giving, without incurring the reproach of self-seeking. A minister can well say to his people why should you be a burden to the Church when he could not say, why do you starve me? It will give a new impetus to our Home Mission work, as it will free that committee from the work of supplementing weak charges and set Dr. Cochrane free to devote his splendid energies to the work of providing the gospel to our new Provinces and the back settlements, and lastly, though we have not anything like exhausted its advantages, it will effectually check the tendency to Congregationalism which

has been growing upon us as a Church and unite the whole body by the close and lasting bond of mutual helpfulness. But is such a scheme practicable in our Church? We have no doubt that it is. We have some 252 congregations which now give their ministers less than \$750 per annum. To secure an equal dividend of \$750 all over the Church would require a total contribution of \$28,000; but last year we contributed \$18,000 to supplement weak charges, so that an additional \$10,000 would be all that is required. But even this sum may turn out to be sufficient for an equal dividend of \$300 if, as we have no doubt would be case, many congregations who are now only paying a stipend of \$600 or \$700 would at once rise up to the amount of the equal dividend rather than be a burden on the fund. There are at least 300 congregations which would be aid-giving, and there would be no difficulty in asking these to bear the burden of the \$10,000, as through the working of this fund they themselves would be benefited while helping forward the whole Church. We are aware that there would be great difficulties to overcome in carrying out this work, but it cannot be doubted that it would give our Church the very first place among the Protestant denominations of this country and enable her to do her work with an efficiency and success which would amply repay the trouble and the cost.

P. McF. MACLEOD.

## The Preacher's Power.

**A** preacher's power does not lie in his brain so much as in his heart. Let one preacher be distinguished for the greatness of his intellect, and another for the largeness of his heart, and it will be found that the latter is the more successful soul-winner. The philosophy of this fact is apparent. The heart is chiefly concerned with the question of religion. It is the heart that is estranged from God, which is the citadel of hostility to the Gospel, and which it is the aim of preaching to win. Love alone can charm away its hostility to the gospel. A Brahmin once gave remarkable expression to this truth when he said of a missionary who was singularly affectionate, "I am afraid to see much of that man. There is something so winning about him that if I were to be much with him I am sure I should become a Christian." What, then, should preachers do? Neglect intellectual culture? By no means. A grand intellect commands respect. Let it be set on fire by divine love; it wins men to God. What preachers need therefore, is, not less intellectual culture, but more love—more love for God and man.—*Zion's Herald.*