

lutely nothing comes in, then certainly we have nothing to give, unless we made an offering from something already in our possession, but if people will only settle it to give systematically, God will be quite sure to see to it that they will always have something to give. This is almost universal testimony. Have you ever tried it? It is not God's purpose to distress anyone, so there is no excuse for those who have only a little.

The beauty of this plan is that all stand alike in responsibility, and all will share alike in blessing.

Some people think it would be easier to give a tenth if they had a large amount of money; this is not true to fact, for more people give a tenth when they are poor than when they become rich. One dollar looks a whole lot smaller than ten.

If there were no rule for proportionate giving, then all would be left to mere caprice, to convenience, or emotion, or impression. If we felt like giving we might, if not, we would do otherwise. If we liked the preacher we would help support him, if we did not like him, we would help to starve him out. If the church program met with our approval we would give to it, if not we would keep our money. Could God be charged with instituting no better system than that? No! Honest giving calls for a definite plan, a definite proportion, and this is donated because God says so, and is not dictated by sentiment, nor personal likes and dislikes. Sometimes an outside evangelist may work on the people's emotions until they have a spell of astounding liberality, while the more practical and emotionless regular church expenses are left to languish and suffer.

An instance known where in a few weeks an evangelist was given as much as the faithful pastor received for the year, and he had to go in debt at the store, to provide entertainment for the evangelist and his wife. This was not because the people were intentionally mean nor partial, but just the result of a lack of system, and an example of spasmodic giving.

If there was no more regulation about the keeping of the Sabbath, than is usual in the matter of money, what a mix up of time there would be.

Some would want to keep Monday, some would want to keep Tuesday, some would want to choose another day. Some would want to give only an hour or two out of the week and others would want all the time to themselves. How could we run Sunday services? How could we tell what the people were going to do? There is just such a mix up in finances because people do not take God's method and follow it. No one can forecast what people are going to do, and the church cannot confidently depend upon them. God never intended that finances should go "loose ends" in the church any more than He did on the Lord's day.

IV. The text teaches to Avoid Drives and Begging. "That there be no gatherings when I come." What glorious relief? What a boon! What an excellent reason for adopting a system! Think of it, no more teasing, no more monotonous drives, no more coaxing for a little money. No more need of bean suppers and pie socials. Every one's offering brought into the storehouse, the local church, on every Lord's day, and the treasurer pays the bills as the needs arise. What a relief from having to harp on money. The preacher would be paid a regular amount and release him from feeling as though he were an object of charity, and give him an idea of what he could depend upon, and lift a great burden from his shoulders.

God will bless and honor the church that is liberal, and the liberal church will be made fat with

spiritual blessings. One man says, "Preaching on giving will never save a soul." You are mistaken brother, it may; for souls are saved in a church that God blesses, and God cannot bless indifference in money matters.

When this whole text is carried out in detail, there will be no lack of finances for even our smaller churches, and there will be money to spare from the local church, for missions and other denominational enterprises.

Shall we not all at once adopt Paul's method of raising finances? Can we improve on his plan?
H. C. MULLEN

THE ATTITUDE OF A PASTOR TOWARD HIS FORMER CHURCH AND

J. F. Woods

This is a very delicate subject and one that needs prayerful consideration. There are those who seem to misunderstand the meaning of the word pastor. Webster's definition is: "A minister of the Gospel who has charge of a church and congregation, whose duty is to watch the people of his charge, and instruct them in the sacred doctrines of the Christian religion."

After God had told Moses he should go up on Mount Abarim to see the land of Canaan before he die, Moses besought the Lord to put a man over the congregation. (Numbers 27:15-17). There is no responsibility greater than that of a pastor; he is supposed to look after his people and guard them as a shepherd cares for his flock and herds.

"I will give you pastors according to mine heart, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding"—Jer. 3:15. "And he gave, some, apostles; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers"—Eph. 4:11.

You will see by the above Scriptures that pastors are appointed of God. Also notice again Webster's definition, that a pastor is one who has charge, whose duty is to watch over people of his charge, not that of the one he has previously served. When a pastor has resigned, or is removed from a pastorate, his responsibility ceases for that congregation, as it is no longer his charge. Webster says, "A pastorate is the office or jurisdiction of a pastor." If a pastor has been removed or has resigned, he no longer has that office or jurisdiction; therefore, he should take his hands off.

Often pastors have stated in their written resignation, and have said publicly, that God had shown them that the work over the charge that they were serving was finished; and then after they had renounced a claim to the charge, they have tried to dictate how it should be run, what their successor should preach, who should be put in office, etc. By so doing they made it hard for the new pastor to win the hearts of his people. It is inconsistent for a former pastor to say that God told him his work at that place was finished and still try to keep his hands on the work there and excuse himself by saying he still had the interest of the church at heart. Either he was mistaken about his work being finished or else he is filled with bigotry.

Before leaving a charge, a pastor should see that all financial obligations are taken care of, including his own salary and house rent. It is unfair to expect his successor to raise his back salary and house rent, expecting him to do what he was unable to do while he was the pastor.

If it is at all possible a pastor, in resigning a work, should move away from that com-

munity, but if compelled to stay he should take his place as a lay-member of the church and be careful not to use his influence in any way that would hurt the influence of the new pastor. He should also discourage his wife and members of his family from using their influence with their friends either by verbal or written communication in any way that would interfere with the work of the pastor that now has charge. He and his family should do as little correspondence as possible with members of his former congregation. The attitude which his family takes goes far to make or ruin the work of the new pastor.

It makes a former pastor look very small if he tries to start an undercurrent in favor of his return by frequently visiting his former charge in the absence of the present pastor and talking of what good times they used to have when he was there, how he longed for some of those old times, that he does not have them where he is, or to visit among the members and not call on the pastor when he is in town. A former pastor should avoid, if possible, returning to his former charge to preach funerals or to perform wedding ceremonies, for by so doing he is weakening the prestige of the present pastor.

When a former pastor continues to reside in the same community where he labored he will be confronted with the embarrassing condition of having some of his former parishioners bring their church and family troubles to him and asking his advice. They will also insist on his continuing his calls as he did when he was their pastor. This he should discourage as much as possible by telling them he is no longer their pastor. A pastor needs co-operation and cannot succeed without it. No former pastor should encourage sympathy seekers and those who want to be the preacher's pets by allowing them to write their grievances to him and by replying in such a way as to depreciate the work of their pastor. Paul seems to have endeavored to impress upon those with whom he labored that Timothy was just as deserving as he was. "Now if Timotheus come, see that he may be with you without fear for he worketh the work of the Lord, as I also do."—I. Cor. 16:10.

Should one who has left a charge receive letters from his former members telling him they were sending him their tithe, or a part of their tithe, he should return it at once, telling them he was no longer their pastor and reminding them that they had agreed, when they took the church covenant upon becoming members of the church, that they would support it with their means. It is dishonest for a former pastor to encourage people to continue to support him at the expense of their own pastor. He should at all times remember the Golden Rule by doing and saying nothing he would not have said or done if he were in the new pastor's place. "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy strength, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these."—Mark 12:30, 31.—Sel.

The Quarterly Meeting for District No. 2 is still open for invitation. Any church desiring the Quarterly, please write to W. B. Logan, 17 Dale St., Amherst.

W. B. LOGAN, Sec.