

further, that if the sum that can be disposed of for this purpose should at any time be insufficient to give £100 a year, the whole sum be divided among the claimants, but the division shall not be continued after the allowance to each minister has fallen to £50.

Now, Sir, if there is meaning in words, the fund has come to that pass at which it ought to be discontinued. Does not the deliverance to the Synod say:—But the division shall not be continued after the allowance to each minister has fallen to £50. The allowance has fallen to £50 and below it, therefore, according to this deliverance the division ought to be stopped. But no—your Board continues that division, spending year by year all the money upon those who by chance have been long settled, and who, therefore, ought to be the best able to do without it, and depriving those lately settled, who, being young men and generally in poor congregations, can least afford to want it. I would not propose to discontinue the £100 to the privileged eleven, although I cannot conceive what better right they have to such a sum than those settled after them. But I distinctly assert that so long as the remainder of the Fund continues to be divided among the fortunate *twenty-one*, I have a right to my share, and if moral principle or the voice of the Synod do not give it to me, perhaps civil law may do me justice. If you would act according to the deliverances of our highest court, the Synod, the thought of appeal could never enter my mind; but if, for the sake of some, who, from your behaviour, are likely to be friends of your spoliation system, you cut and carve the money, then I shall do all in my power to prevent it.

It is true that at its last meeting the Synod did accept your report, and thereby seemed to sanction the system of continuing the allowances to a few, and cutting of the rest. But here the Synod was constitutionally at fault. If the acceptance of the report be held as sanctioning and giving authority to this plan, it is equivalent to changing what had been, up to that time, a standing rule of our Church. They changed a resolution come to—a law enacted in 1856. Such change they effected at one fell swoop, as, according to the constitution of our Church, can only be effected by submitting the proposed change as an overture to be passed by the Synod as such, and submitted to the several Presbyteries of the Church for their opinions. If any of the “*twenty-seven*” bear to be thus trampled on, the spirit of the fathers must have departed from the sons.

Were the division discontinued, as the Synod in 1856 distinctly declared it should be, the “*forty-eight*” clergymen might all be deprived for a year or two, but at the end of such time all would again become recipients. By your plan those now cut off are never likely again to participate. This, for certain, if the funds are allowed to continue under such management as the present; unless the congregations are foolish enough to invest still more

money in a Fund that has ever been a bone of contention—a Fund that has waddled through such a deal of mismanagement that it is next to a miracle it now exists—a Fund concerning the investment of which the managers have never given an account to those who trusted them—a Fund entirely *per se* in every feature. Great has been the speculation at times in public funds. But I dare assert that never in the management of any public trust were the directors so outrageously confident in their power of casting dust in the eyes of their shareholders, that year after year they should systematically refuse a full report. In no single report since the temporalities fund fell into the present management, has there been a statement of the sums invested, or of the rate of interest. I have tried to make something like an approximation to the rate at which your investments pay, and find that the average is somewhere about five per cent. per annum. If I am wrong, you have yourselves to blame, for the least you could have done was to have told us how you had invested the funds, and at what rate of interest. It seems as if you had forgotten that the fund belongs to us; that ever since the ministers so nobly instituted the Fund, every individual minister has a right, title, and interest in that Fund. Now, it is well known that eight per cent. has been offered to you for the money; equally well is it known that good safe investments can even now be had at eight per cent. Had this money been thus invested, something like \$15,000 more would have been in hand for the past year alone—a sum sufficient to pay three times the number of the poor unfortunates; while, in past years, at this rate, plenty would have accrued to have prevented you the necessity of “advancing.”

3rd. In your letter you speak of “a list of ministers indebted to the Fund with the sums due by them respectively.” If, in reading your letter, and reviewing your proceedings in reference to this Fund for years, I could have retained a shadow of an idea in favor of your business capabilities, that shadow would have been dispelled by this sentence. What? Do you really mean to make us refund the sums thus referred to, or to deduct them from the incomes we may in the future receive, if the fund should ever attain that position (of which I have little hope under its present management?) Was it ever heard of among business men, that one should borrow a sum and give it to his unwitting neighbor as his right, and a few days or years after meet him with the demand, “I borrowed that sum to pay you, I cannot refund it, you must.” Out upon the absurdity. None of the “*twenty-seven*” had a voice in the borrowing, yet you say, we have to refund! Let those who advised you to borrow, if any did, refund. I for one, and I believe many more, had no voice in the borrowing, for the system was begun before my arrival in the country. And I may state that if I had had the least idea of your system of