

look from the worshippers in the Church below to the worshippers in the Church above, lo! they "stood before the throne."

From these scriptures, then, the evidence is clear and conclusive that posture in prayer varies according to circumstances. When individuals or families are about to partake of their customary meals, the better and more becoming, because the Bible way, is to *sit* and devoutly bow the head while God's blessing is being asked on the bounties He has provided, and I have hitherto failed to find any other way, either prescribed or practised, in the Word of God. From the same source it is no less evident that when the Christian enters into his closet, or the Christian household surrounds the family altar, they are there reverently to *kneel* and *bow* down, and with longing desire and loving heart seek from the Father of mercies the supply of all that is wanting and the removal of all that is wrong. In the same way it is seen that *standing* is the posture in public worship commended, if not commanded, in the Word of God. While this has been for ages the uniform practice in our Church, and in this way God has been honoured and man has been blessed, yet in our day a growing few in the Church, weary of use and wont, are beginning to question if this be the proper mode, and recommend and practise sitting instead. To such, permit me in all simplicity to say, that I have yet to learn that such a posture in public prayer is even once mentioned, far less sanctioned, by the Word of God. Many, on the other hand out of our Church, hold alike in heart and habit that instead of either of these modes, kneeling is not only the better but the *only* becoming posture in public prayer, and while not a few of such arrogate to themselves a superior sanctity because they follow this mode, it might puzzle them to shew where Scripture either gives sanction or support, to such a mode, for I am yet unaware of a *single instance* in the Word of God where a congregation in the Church below, or the congregation in the Church above, is found as a congregation kneeling in prayer to God. Since the Lord looketh not on the outward appearance, let none mistake a supple knee for a sanctified heart, or expect that He will accept the homage of the one for the adoration of the other. Above all then, let it be the aim and endeavour of everyone, by creed and by conduct, to claim kindred with those "which worship God in the spirit and have no confidence in the flesh." Thus, then, to *sit* and seek God's blessing at the customary meal, to *kneel* and seek God's blessing in the closet or at the family altar, and to *stand* and sing the praise and seek the blessing of God "in the great congregation," appear to be the postures presented and practised in Scripture, alike in the public and private worship of God.

A GENERAL SUSTENTATION FUND.

REMARKS ON MR. McLEOD'S LETTER.

Mr. McLeod does not attempt to assail the main positions of my letter. In reply to his objection, that a supplementing fund would not evoke the liberality necessary to make it a success, I shewed that under such a scheme the United Presbyterian Church had raised the stipends of her ministers to a higher level than that of the Free Church; that while both aimed at £200 as a minimum, the Free Church had only reached it in one year (1878), and then only by special donations at the time of the Assembly, while the United Presbyterian Church has maintained it ever since 1876; that the number of congregations entitled to the higher allowance was much larger in the latter than in the former; that the standard of giving among aid-receiving congregations was much higher, and that thus under the principle of self-support had been more largely developed in her than in her larger sister; and that at the same time she was doing more for Foreign Missions than any of the Churches in Scotland—all this, though her members were of a poorer class. I may add, that looking at the whole contributions of the two Churches, we find that in the Free Church the amount contributed for Sustentation Fund and ministers' supplements together, is at the rate of about 14s. per member. In the United Presbyterian Church the amount contributed for ministers' stipends and augmentation is at the rate of 16s. 2d.

All this I may now regard as unassailable. But Mr. McLeod raises some small objections to the United Presbyterian scheme. He says that up till 1874 that Church had only one fund, and he professes

to describe how they then established a second fund called the Surplus Fund, and how since that they have had two committees, the Augmentation and the Surplus, both of which have issued loud appeals, etc. Now, all this is simply the baseless fabric of a vision. *They have not two such funds, nor two such committees.* The Surplus Fund is simply that part of the Augmentation Fund which remains over, after supplementing congregations paying stipends less than £160 up to that amount. It is administered by the same committee, and is divided among all congregations paying less than £200, according to the liberality manifested as indicated by the rate of giving per member. This is the same plan that has been in operation in the Free Church since 1867, and I may say was adopted from them. I may remark, in passing, that a measure, which in the experience of both these Churches has been found to work so well, might be worthy the consideration of our committee. But the point at present is that upon the pure imagination of "two sets of machinery," Mr. McLeod grounds a whole argument against the suitability of the plan to our condition. So far from the United Presbyterian Church having two committees, one committee not only manages this, but also the Home Evangelization Fund.

His second objection is, that the United Presbyterian scheme depends on the liberal gifts of the wealthy. I have already answered this by shewing that it does not depend upon these nearly to the extent that the Free Church Sustentation does. I just add one or two facts. Four congregations of the Free Church give £10,100 to the Sustentation Fund; the four congregations of the United Presbyterian Church, giving the largest amount to the Augmentation Fund, only give £3,200, including donations of the kind referred to. Further, the Free Church Sustentation Fund received last year, in donations and legacies, £9755, and in the year previous, £13,552. The amount received for the United Presbyterian Augmentation Fund from these sources last year was only £1,200.

The third objection is, that the United Presbyterian Church, as a whole, has not taken much interest in the measure, and that many congregations do not contribute to it at all. This would certainly be a strange phenomenon, that a poor Church should take little interest in such a measure, and yet be able by it to raise the stipends of its ministers to a higher level than that of the Free Church. But on this he is as ill informed as on the other points. A glance at their treasurer's lists shews that among congregational contributions blanks in the column for Augmentation Fund are extremely rare; that there is no fund, unless it be the Foreign Mission Fund, which is more generally supported; and further, that the liberality is fairly diffused over the whole Church.

The other matters in Mr. McLeod's letter have been already considered, except that at the close he informs us that the Committee have agreed to propose that congregations, instead of forwarding the amount to be contributed by them to the Central Fund, may pay it direct to their minister. This I deem sensible, but it is relinquishing the essential feature of a sustentation fund, and bringing it so nearly to the plan of a supplementing scheme that it would require a man with a scale capable of marking very minute distances, to describe the difference. When this is generally adopted, as we may be certain it would be in a short time by the bulk of our congregations, we would have simply a supplementing scheme under the name of sustentation. If this is what is desired, I for one am not disposed to dispute about a name.

GEO. PATTERSON.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE OF THE LATE W. T. ROOT.

It is our sad duty to note the death of one of our most energetic and useful elders, W. T. Root, of Erskine Church, Ingersoll. Unexpectedly to all his friends, the Master called him thence on the 15th of November last. He was in his place at both diets of worship the previous Sabbath. It may be of interest to his numerous friends in the Canadian Church to have presented the following items of Mr. Root's life.

He was born in the year of our Lord 1817, at Romulus, N.Y. He was one of a large family of sons, all of whom were the subjects of believing, parental prayer, and careful home instruction in all the distinctive features of the Presbyterian Church and the

common salvation. At the age of twenty one he made a public profession of faith in the Lord Jesus, during a time of religious awakening in Weedsford, N.Y. These circumstances gave tone and character to his views and aspirations as to a living Church, and her duty to wait on the Lord for the outpouring of His Holy Spirit. In 1845 he became one of the original members of the Second Presbyterian Church, Syracuse, and continued an active member for four years, and removed to the city of Auburn, where he manifested the same interest in the cause of Christ for ten years, in a consistent and useful life. In 1859 he united with the Presbyterian Church in Geneva, N.Y., from which he was transferred to Erskine Church, Ingersoll, into whose welfare he threw all his energies. In 1876 he was by the unanimous vote of the membership of this congregation called to the eldership, and, notwithstanding the unanimity of the call, he hesitated to accept—not from want of interest in this work, but from a deep sense of the responsibilities of the office, but after much private conference and prayerful consideration he accepted the call, and was ordained to the work of the eldership on May 28th, 1876.

The subject of this notice was a man, physically well developed, and firmly knit together, and in his bearing was conspicuous among his fellow-men. He had a vigorous and well-furnished mind; he was in the deepest sympathy with everything that tended to elevate humanity, honour God's laws, and promote the interests of the Christian Church. The temperance cause and Sabbath observance had his heartiest support. His faithful discharge of the duties of his office, and in his own district, was appreciated by all, young and old. He had the fullest confidence of his brethren in the session, and was for three successive years representative elder to the Presbytery of Paris and the Synod of Hamilton and London. He received the appointment of representative of the Paris Presbytery to the last three meetings of the General Assembly at Hamilton, Ottawa and Montreal. The influence he exerted at home in church work was felt and recognized in these higher and wider spheres of ecclesiastical duties; whether in the routine work of committees, or the more difficult part of debate on the floor of the Church courts, or the still more delicate work of preparing new measures of progress and interest, he was equally at home, and equally secured the approbation of his brethren, even when there were differences of judgment as to the methods of reaching the same ends. A senior member of the Presbytery of Paris, writing to the pastor of Erskine Church in connection with Mr. Root's death, says: "He was, beyond all comparison, the noblest elder we had in the Presbytery, and indeed he had few equals in the whole Church. The more I knew him the more I loved him; fearless and sincere in all his activities, with indomitable perseverance and large ideas of church life. We will all miss him; to you, as a pastor, the loss is, humanly speaking, irreparable. May God raise up someone to help us in his stead and give the sorrowing needful strength." J. McE.

THAT was a good prayer of the old deacon:—"Lord make us willing to run on little errands for Thee."

AT a recent meeting of the Board of Directors of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of the Northwest, at Chicago, Ill., the Hon. Cyrus H. McCormick paid over as a new and unconditional gift the sum of \$75,000, making, with previous gifts, a total sum of more than \$200,000, presented by him to that institution. Mr. McCormick also pledges himself to give \$5,000 for every like sum presented by any person after a fund of \$50,000 has been raised from other sources.

OKRIKA is a town of 10,000 inhabitants, forty miles from Bonny, in the Igbo country, at the mouths of the Niger. A mission agent never visited it until recently. Bishop Crowther, of the Church Missionary Society, hearing that the people there had built a church and were holding Christian worship, sent Archdeacon Crowther to inquire and report the facts. The Archdeacon found the church as represented, and that Christian worship was held in it every Sunday, a schoolboy from Brass Mission reading the service and a congregation of *five hundred persons* in attendance. The people desired a regular teacher and offered to contribute to his support. In this remarkable manner is the Niger district being Christianized.