

more money in the country than in Manitoban new settlements, but there is far less religious interest.

OUR DUTY.

From these hasty jottings surely our people can see that the Columbian missionaries must be sustained and reinforced. Our success already is regarded by outsiders as remarkable. My admiration for the Columbians was of course heightened by the warmth with which they received the request of the Synod of Manitoba to raise this year the sum of \$150 for the Manitoba College. The amount was allocated to the several congregations in a few minutes by Mr. John C. Brown, an elder from New Westminster, and postmaster of that place, who has been Mr. Jamieson's right hand man during all these years. I shall continue my notes on the other Presbyteries of our Synod. Meanwhile most pleasant recollections tend to bind me here on the prairies to the Province so aptly called a "sea of mountains." **GEORGE BRYCE.**

Winnipeg, Sept. 22, 1887.

THE ANNUAL COLLECTION.

MR. EDITOR,—One of the most important acts of last General Assembly was the appointment of a Committee on Systematic Beneficence. The work of that committee is arduous. The majority of Christians, and presumably Presbyterians, must surely be anything but systematic in their beneficence if the Lord's money is expended by them as Josiah Strong asserts, viz., ninety-six and one-half per cent. for the secular interest, two and one-half per cent. for religious privileges for themselves and families, fifteen-sixteenths of one per cent. for benevolent purposes at home, one-sixteenth of one per cent. for the evangelization of benighted nations.

The annual collection for the various Schemes is unhappily still deeply rooted in the affections of many congregations. The Assembly must still appoint dates for the collection where no missionary association exists. There are 361 out of 775 congregations that have no such association. The plan of annual collections which are as often as not brought on at dates which vary widely in the same congregation is soon seen to be unscriptural, and hence irrational.

1. *Unscriptural.*—1 Cor. xvi. 1 refers to a collection. Was this collection the passing of a plate before those who happened to be present on a certain specified day? The next verse answers: "Upon the first day of the week [Sabbath] let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no collections when I come."

2. *Irrational.*—If we consider the greatness of the work we do when we contribute, especially for Home or Foreign Missions, it is absurd, nay, sinful, to think of it only once a year, and in many cases a day or an hour or five minutes before we do it. The conquest of a world for Christ demands of the Christian soldier constant thought. If thought, then provision as we may be able. During the interval between two annual collections for Foreign Missions 30,000,000 of the heathen die, and for them practically little is done. The second of the two collections is too late for them.

Supposing in any case money is scarce when the collection comes, then the people lose the opportunity, unless, as is most rare, they bring afterward. When they have in hand afterward, some other collection comes and hides the past. The Assembly appoints one every month from July to March.

3. *Results Prove its Inherent Badness.*—A whole Presbytery is found to have given nine and nine-elevenths cents per member for Foreign Missions, as the result of a year's supposed effort. Congregations are found with the following averages for the same cause: Twenty cents, nine cents, three and two-fifths cents, two cents. The congregation of Z gave \$16 as annual collection for Foreign Missions, and \$20 as collection at evening worship to pay a debt of \$15 on a small Home Mission church. A wet Sabbath in X resulted in \$5 for the heathen, while a good Sabbath the year previous gave them \$12, and one year elapsed before the people did anything to make up for the damage. At the close of a missionary meeting that people, led by the pastor, adopted the envelope system, and abolished the iniquity of an annual collection. Would that all missionary meetings had the same practical result!

Is it not high time that the children of light should become as wise as the children of the world? The publican collects his toll in small sums, but very

often, and his patron agrees to the plan, and hence the gigantic liquor bill of Canada. The user of tobacco is content to spend his money systematically, and, when startled by the figures of his luxury, remarks with truth that he never feels it. In 1880, says Dr. Strong, 10,000,000 people in the United States paid \$900,000,000 for drink, and the same number of professed Christians gave \$5,500,000 for missions. Of course many of the Christians gave nothing, and the majority of the remainder by annual collection.

The congregation of N in 1883 gave nine cents per member for Foreign Missions; this year they are giving \$2 per member. How? By a general promise and performance of so much per day or per week, brought to Church on Sabbath. Is this congregation abler than the rest? Assuredly not; only more rational and willing. How can this mode of working become more general among us? By the appointment of a Committee on Systematic Beneficence? Hardly, but by every pastor considering himself, by virtue of his shepherdhood, bound to promote the objects of such a committee in his own charge. "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold. Them also I must bring."

EVANGELISTIC WORK.

MR. EDITOR,—The Revs. Messrs. Crossley and Hunter, who desire no higher designation than that of evangelists, have for some time been pursuing their labours of love in the counties of Kent and Essex, and very recently have visited the town of Blenheim. The success of their work here has been so marked as to enable any observer to decide in favour of the value of their services. The two are very happily matched: the one laying open the truth in short and earnest addresses, while the other by his endearing appeals is the instrument of awakening in many minds the effectual conviction which calls forth the Pentecostal cry, "What shall we do?" It is very generally conceded that the convictions lodged in the soul have resulted, in many cases, in true and lasting conversion and consecration to God. Mr. Crossley is an accomplished singer, and the sweet melody which falls on the soul of the great assembly seems to promote in no small degree the success of their work. They desire union meetings where more than one denomination is to be found, and they generally obtain them too—dealing fairly with all parties. I do not believe it possible that any city or town can have the benefit of their ministrations, and yet regret their advent. They leave Blenheim, after three weeks' work, moved to its lowest depths, and many of the people have been "turned to the Lord their God." A great and strong wind seems to have rent the mountains, and broken in pieces the rocks, while the fragments, detached and scattered, now await the gathering up that "nothing may be lost." The whole town rejoices in the results of the visit.

Blenheim, October 6, 1887. A. W. WADDELL.

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY.

MR. EDITOR,—I was present at the meeting held in this city last week in the interest of Queen's University Endowment Fund, and if you will kindly permit me to do so I would like to say a few words about it to your readers.

What most impressed me about the proceedings was the entire absence of acrimonious reference to the embittered controversies and issues of the past. The admirable opening address by his Honour, Sir Alexander Campbell, the equally felicitous paper dictated by Rev. Principal Grant from his sick bed, and the short but appropriate speeches by Rev. Principal Caven, Rev. D. J. Macdonnell and Rev. G. M. Milligan, were all free from objectionable features from the point of view alike of Knox College and of the University of Toronto. The friends and supporters of Queen's having entered on this canvass for funds without saying a harsh word against either of the above institutions, I venture to appeal to the friends of each of them to say a good word for Queen's whenever and wherever they can do so with good effect.

I was deeply impressed also with the manner in which the cause of Queen's College was pleaded from the point of view of higher education. The spirit of Professor Watson's address left nothing to be desired on this side of the case. Queen's has done good

work, is now doing good work, and will continue to do good work if she is efficiently endowed. She wants more teachers, a larger library, more extensive accommodation and more elaborate apparatus. She wants friends to enable her to specialize courses as other universities are doing and are compelled to do. The cause of higher education in Ontario—and all Canada for that matter—would suffer incalculably by the disappearance of Queen's. It will suffer only less by any paralysis due to want of means.

In conclusion let me say as an alumnus of the Provincial University, that what the Provincial University needs is not the failure or disappearance of rivals, but their enhanced efficiency. The University of Toronto will shortly receive an additional income of some \$20,000 a year as the result of the university legislation of last session. The amount of good this appropriation will do depends entirely on the use to which it is put. The greatest danger arises not from competition but from stagnation, and the more efficient Queen's becomes the more effective it will be in stimulating the Provincial University to do good work. From this point of view I hail with pleasure the prospect of a new Baptist Arts College in Toronto on the foundation laid by the late Senator McMaster, and also the approaching establishment of a Methodist Arts College on the University grounds. No one need refrain, therefore, through fear of injuring the University of Toronto, from giving whatever financial aid to Queen's he may otherwise feel disposed to give.

Toronto, Oct. 7, 1887. WILLIAM HOUSTON.

OLD TRUTHS NEWLY TOLD.

How many readers of THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN see the *Standard*, the new organ of Henry George? Those who do not miss a good deal, whether they sympathize with Henry George's theories or not. In an age, when many shrewd practical men seem drifting away from Christianity altogether, and when the gulf between the rich and the poor seems to be growing more and more impassable, it is refreshing to read such addresses as are weekly reported in that paper—addresses spoken to crowded audiences of workingmen in the city of New York, by such speakers as Dr. Pentecost and the great-hearted Dr. McGlynn—an American Père Hyacinthe—who has sacrificed his ecclesiastical prospects that he might preach, according to his conscience, the old truths of the Sermon on the Mount. It is this and no wild socialism that he and others are preaching to the crowds Sunday after Sunday, and that the crowds, too, listen to, even as the common people did long ago, when the "Galilean Gospel" was first preached. It is an instance also of the uniting power of the great practical verities of Christianity that Dr. McGlynn has been listened to with earnest and sympathetic attention by an assembly of Methodist ministers, as he explained the platform of the Anti-Poverty Society. Has not the Church allowed questions theoretical too much to interfere with her practical unity? and has she been as faithful in her "message to men of wealth" as she has been?

IS THANKSGIVING DAY TOO LONG DEFERRED?

MR. EDITOR,—I see in a late issue there is an article about the day of Thanksgiving being so late in the season. Now instead of its being late, the great majority of us farmers consider it, if anything, too early, because few of us have the fall ploughing as far forward as we would like, and the roots should be taken up by that time. The article refers to the weather and bad roads, but surely if any have reason to complain of the weather and bad roads it is the farmers. The month of October is too busy a time for the farmers to lose a day's ploughing and taking up roots. I and a good many farmers whom I have spoken to consider that it would be well if the Legislature would pass an enactment fixing Thanksgiving Day some time in the end of November or the beginning of December. The harvest would then be over, the roots taken up and the fall ploughing about finished. Moreover, by fixing the time all persons would be aware of it, and make preparations accordingly. I think the opinion of the farmers on the subject should have the most weight, and if it is to be changed at all it should be later, not earlier in the season.

ARATOR.

Bankside, Agincourt, Sept. 22, 1887.