

to proceed immediately to complete the work inside and outside, including three coats of good paint. In cases in which a single contract could be made for the entire work, this should be done, as, generally speaking, the multiplicity of contracts is found to mean a large additional outlay. But when this cannot be done, the piece-meal system, the plan of "little by little," should be adopted, and a grand result would soon be insensibly accomplished. A good plan should invariably be secured, and a pleasant site if possible. Great pains should be expended on the cellar, and none but persons who understand building them should be allowed to have anything to do with the erection. We have several congregations in our eye who could readily provide themselves with manses. Why do they not do so? Why do they not make a beginning? It is cruel on their part not to do so. It is very unwise in a financial point of view. It is more unwise in a social point of view. It requires something like the faith of Abraham, on the part of a minister or his wife, or intended wife, "to go out not knowing whither" they are going, or in what way they or their families can be accommodated, and if Abraham's faith was not very common in his day, we can hardly expect it to be very prevalent in ours. This is the age of reason, rather than the age of faith. The manse provided and occupied, would at once become a centre of all good influences. It would elevate the taste as well as the religion of the community. It would soon be associated with tender and endearing memories which would gather around, and which would be worth more than gold or silver to the congregation, while successive occupants of the manses would feel that their reverend and honored predecessors who had fallen asleep in the work of the ministry might now be regarded as mingling with the great "cloud of witnesses" by whom the Christian steward should feel himself ever surrounded. Which of our congregations will begin the good work? There is no time like the present. What individuals will take the lead? Who will invite a few public spirited persons to meet at his house on an early evening to confer on the matter? Who will offer to collect or to subscribe, or both? Who will give a suitable site? Let us have an early answer to these inquiries."

REV. C. H. SPURGEON ON PRESBYTERIANISM.

Presbyterians who have admired the Sermons of this justly celebrated preacher, will be glad to learn his views with regard to the Presbyterian system of Church government. At a social meeting in the Presbyterian Church, Clapham, London, he is reported as saying that it was "quite refreshing to pass by the elegant front of the building, which exhibited such an advance upon the ancient architecture that they were wont to see connected with chapels, without the adoption of the foolish style of Gothic architecture which was being adopted for some dissenting places of worship. So long as it was not Gothic, he did not care what it was. Happy was he that such a chapel as that I had been erected in Clapham. They used to call it "the parish of all the saints;" but there was no Presbyterian Church; now there would be all the Churches; and he hoped that "all the saints" would be saints indeed. The opening of such a place seemed to him to be a theme of great gratitude, and of gratitude without alloy. What if the Scotch had been always coming south—and always would? We needed the Scotch people; we wanted some of their sound divinity, strength of mind, stern logic, once more. He rejoiced that this was a Presbyterian Church; *he was a Presbyterian himself. Seriously and solemnly, he believed Presbyterianism to be the government Scripture had ordained.* He was not an Independent, and he objected altogether to be classed with the Independents. He was Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Independent, but rather more Presbyterian than Independent. It might be well that Churches should be separate and distinct;