

in human law, or in earthly economy, shows that the plan is not man's but God's.

I think you have shown clearly in your reply, that the degree of crime makes no difference as to *guilt*, for God has said "There is no difference, for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God," (Rom. iii. 23), and, "He that offendeth in one point is guilty of all," (James ii. 10).

The difficulty with "A Presbyterian," seems to be, that in the case of an innocent person suffering in the place of a criminal, the guilty one remains a criminal still; and the word has gone forth, "The soul that sinneth *it* shall die." The sovereign may pardon, and the criminal *escape* punishment, but he remains guilty still. Now, we surely learn in God's word, that *He* does more than this,—more than merely pardon the sinner, so that he shall escape punishment; that would clearly not be justice, and He declares at this time His righteousness, that He might be *just*, and the *justifier* of him who believeth in Jesus (Rom. iii. 26). Truly Christ the innocent One, did suffer and die in the room of the guilty, but there is more than that, for "We thus judge, that if one died for all, *then were all dead*" (2 Cor. v. 14), so that God looks upon us as having died in our substitute. "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed." He that is dead is freed (margin, justified) from sin. "Now if *we* be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him" (Rom. vi. 6-8). From these and many other passages, we see, by faith, that the believer has died with Christ, but if that were all, where would we be? "If Christ be not raised . . . ye are yet in your sins" (1 Cor. 15-17), so He was not only delivered for our offences, but raised again for our justification. To go back and follow the analogy, as far as possible; suppose the criminal himself should die for his crime; as you say, the law would be satisfied, it could claim no more: now suppose it were possible to give that dead man a new life, a blameless, perfect life; and I think we have a figure of what God has done for us who believe in Jesus, as we see in the second of Ephesians, "You hath He quickened who *were dead*." The man who has been executed is not called a murderer, but we say he *was* a murderer. So of us "we who *were dead*." Now, we are risen with Christ in a *justified state*, and we are told in Rom. 6-11 to reckon ourselves to be dead to sin, but alive unto God. I think in Israel crossing the Red Sea, and the Jordan, we get a beautiful figure of it. God provided a way for them to go safely across, without injury or pain; just as in Christ our Substitute, we have died, and are risen.

With regard to the question "How does His keeping of that law, and His obedience, answer for my breaches of it?" Is Gal. iii. 13 not a satisfactory answer? "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law (not by keeping it, but) being made a curse for us." A READER.

LETTER FROM REV. K. F. JUNOR, MISSIONARY TO FORMOSA.

MR. EDITOR,—I intended to have written before this time, but have been laid up by a most severe cold. I have been prevented from doing anything I proposed to myself, save some necessary business. Confinement has, however, given me perfect rest. The goodness of the Lord to us all in our journey was extreme, and we look upon it as the answer to the many prayers we know have ascended for us. Strange to say, the journey overland, usually tiresome, was to us the most pleasant we ever experienced. The weather was delightful. The company in our car was of the same character. We were as one family from Chicago to San Francisco. We reached here on Thursday night, without a single mishap. From Chicago to Omaha, 503 miles, there is not much of interest. After leaving Omaha we felt we were really entering upon our great journey. Here we first had the solemn feeling of stepping away from everything behind, perhaps forever. Here, too, we felt and spoke of what was to come. From Omaha we began to ascend the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains. There is nothing to be seen in this ascent but a wide-stretching prairie on every side—a prairie which is in many parts only a vast desert covered with scrubby sage. When you reach Sherman, the summit of the Mountains on this line, and 8242 feet above the sea, you have no perception of having been travelling upward so rapidly as 8,000 feet in 550 miles from Omaha. Leaving Sherman, which is a city of three saloons for its sum and substance,

you gradually descend the western slope of the Mountains. Only after leaving Ogden, a city of 3,000, do you meet any scenery, and then not till the next morning (for you leave Ogden in the evening). Before dusk you catch a glimpse of Salt Lake in passing its northern point. Salt Lake City is only thirty-seven miles south. Now of course you are in Utah, and hence you enter upon the first fine scenery in running through the wonderful pass down the western slope of the Mountains. Not, however, till you begin to cross the Sierra Nevadas do you come upon the really remarkable scenery of the journey. Here it is beyond all description grand. The train twists through curving canons, through which you look up, sometimes 2000 feet, to overhanging temples of rock standing out on the brows of the mighty hills. As you twist and turn the way closes up behind, and there seems no way out, ahead. In descending from the Sierras into the valley of the Sacramento, the scenery is touched with greater beauty. Hitherto all has been grandeur in mighty masses of rocky hills—no trees or foliage. Now the valleys and the hills are green. Then comes the valley of the dirty Sacramento, the most beautiful and fertile valley I have ever seen. Here the almond blossoms on the trees and the carpeting of flowers among the grass and grain makes a scene gorgeous beyond description. Then comes Oakland, the Brooklyn of the West, and the terminus of the Central Pacific. The ferry-boat crossing over to San Francisco is large and crowded, and after a sail of eight miles we land in the great city, grown in twenty-eight years to nearly 300,000 inhabitants. San Francisco is as godless as it is great. Everywhere is gaunt and flaunting atheism. Hotels splendid and prosperous, and more of them than in any other city four times its size. Everybody lives in the hotels. The great question now agitating the city is the "Chinese." The "Workingman's Party" has been formed. It is godless, blasphemous, communistic, revolutionary. Its representatives so far have been invariably elected in municipal and senatorial halls. They were nominated by the leader of the party, a Dennis Kearny, who invariably performs such kindly office with a hempen halter in his hand and a threat accompanied by a blasphemous oath that hanging will be the fate of the man who proves traitor. The great motto of this party changes as times change. First it was "Drive out the rich aristocrats;" now it is "The Chinese must go." This party is armed and drilled, and threatens to burn the city, which is of wood, if they cannot gain their object. So great is the alarm that life as well as property is becoming unsafe. Capital is withdrawing, building is stopped, and more and more are being thrown out of employment. Before many weeks a great crisis will be upon this city, and no man can forecast the end. I send you an extract from the last speech of the leader of the above party—a man who can elect whomsoever he pleases for Mayor, Assemblyman, Senator, or any office he pleases, so great is his power.

For the present I must stop; hoping I have not trespassed too long upon your time, and that what I have written may be useful. Having been confined to the house, I have so far not sufficient information to speak of what the Church is doing in this great field. Only let me say in conclusion that my heart rejoices in this land at the recollection of the *spirit* I found almost universal in our own dear Church in Canada in my journeying for three months through her congregations. The thought that the sense of Christ's great desire—the bringing in of all people—is taking a deeper hold on all the Churches, but especially on our Canadian Church, is one that gives courage and hope. I pray that it may grow, and that nothing may stay the spirit of conquest for Christ in this struggle until as a flood it shall overflow in the Church, burying all differences and absorbing all streams of lesser purpose.

Before you get this we will, God willing, be on the great Pacific, on the Steamship "City of Pekin." Wego forth greatly strengthened by the knowledge of many prayers from many faithful hearts and in the sure confidence of our kind Father's watchful care and love.

San Francisco, March 28th, 1878.

WIDOWS' AND ORPHANS' FUND.

MR. EDITOR,—Mr. Irvine's letter respecting the application of Mrs. — to be put on the Widows' and Orphans' Fund, and the decision of the General Assembly on the same, leads me to express my views on the whole subject, hoping that you will be so kind

as to give them space in the columns of your much-esteemed paper. With respect to this particular case, I am really surprised at the application, and at the decision of the Assembly thereon. The Assembly's action seems to me to be in contradiction with its own rules, and fitted to lead ministers of the Church not to connect themselves with the Fund. If the widows or orphans of ministers (not connected with the fund, and who have been in the ministry longer than four years), by applying to the General Assembly, and by paying arrears, it may be, with interest, are permitted to enjoy the benefits of the fund as well as those who have paid in their yearly rates, it is enough to encourage ministers not to connect themselves with the fund at all. It may be their wives and families will never need aid from that source. The former may die before them, and the latter become of age before their fathers die, and thus manage to escape paying into the fund. But if the wives should happen to survive their husbands, or the children to be under age at the time of their father's death, then the Assembly would make it all right for them. By paying arrears, which arrears could be deducted from the first year's grant, they would be entitled to the benefits of the fund. There is worldly wisdom and policy in the matter. But there is another thing connected with this application (and this would be true of all such applications) into which the General Assembly, I fear, did not inquire as they ought, perhaps, to have done, viz., this: Was the widow needing that aid she applied for and is receiving and to receive? Had she or has she means of support of her own? Now, Mr. Irvine seems to have heard or to know personally that she has; and I for one am inclined to believe the same. Had she been a poor widow, with a family, unable to do anything for her support, which, it seems, is not true of her in any case, and had the scheme for widows and orphans been based on a different principle, then we might have approved of the Assembly's action. But as it is, we regard this case, and all similar cases, as an injustice to those who pay into the fund, especially to congregations. And this leads me to say a few words on what I regard as the unjust, if not the unscriptural, principle on which the scheme of our Church for the widows and orphans of ministers is founded and worked. I believe in the wisdom and desirability of such a scheme amongst us ministers. I would even like to see it include all the members and adherents of the Church, as many as would join and pay into the fund. It would be something like the practice of primitive Christians. But as only ministers' widows and orphans are permitted to enter into the benefits of the scheme, I do not see in virtue of what principle or right we are asking and expecting our congregations to contribute to it. I have an idea of the reasons which some of the brethren would give, but I think their reasons weak and answerable. Would it not look more like equity, if ministers alone were asked and expected to contribute to that scheme? They could well afford to double their rates, as their families only are to reap the benefit, and if aid out of this fund was to be given only to those widows and orphans who are really in need, who have no means of support of their own, as I think ought to be done, there would be sufficient to relieve their wants and minister to their comfort. I do not mean by this that if members and congregations of our Church, of their own accord and unsolicited, were willingly to contribute their mite, it should be declined. No; it should be received with thanks. But I never yet asked my congregation to take up a collection on behalf of that scheme without feeling that I was doing what I regard as unjust.

But there is another thing connected with the scheme of which I do not approve, viz., that each minister's widow or orphan is entitled to receive from the fund (and they are always certain to avail themselves of this right, for which I do not blame them, since the General Assembly gives it to them) an equal amount, whether it be needed or not. Now, if only ministers were contributing to the funds of that scheme it would not be so bad. But, I ask, is it fair, is it right, to ask and take money from congregations, many of whose members are poor, needing aid themselves, to give to widows and orphans of ministers, many of whom are in good circumstances, or at least well able to do something for a living? I could name not a few of such. I cannot see the justice of that. We might complain if we were asked to contribute to such a scheme without expecting to receive any benefits from it. Are we doing for our congregations what we ask them to do for us in this respect? Many of our people, and I