Homes there are, and many of them in our land where plenty reigns, but the religion that presides there is of the get-and-keep-all-you-can order. Others there are, yea, not a few, occupied by those who are willingly "poor, yet making many rich," glorious for their self denials and numerous economies. Call there when you please, there is always gold in the open purse for the cause of God, always food and a kind word for God's poor. Worldlings often ask in astonishment, why is it that "giving does not impoverish," why a cruse of oi lis never empty? We would simply answer by telling them an old saying we have often heard in Glasgow when a boy. "David Dale gives away his money by shovelfuls, and God just shovels it back again."

Of such systematic givers the church of Christ has had not a few; and in the present day are not the names of a Lennox, a Stuart, a John Henderson, household words. Often there may have been the one noble sum given for some specific object; often there may have been the death-bed bequest, truly princely, but for the time and circumstances under which it was bequeathed. But leaving these occasional offerings to their own praise or contempt, what is needed, especially in our day, is the steady stream of liberality flowing from every God-prospered labourer.

We have heard of congregations in enlightened Canada proposing that every member should give alike for the support of gospel ordinances. Yes, yonder wealthy man coolly proposing to give as little as that poor widow, or that poverty stricken labourer. True it is, wonders will never cease. We had really thought socialism, communism, and all the other members of that revolution family, dead. In truth, it were easier for that wealthy member to give one hundred dollars than for that poor widow to give one, and should he give them, he will have his reward, his name will be heralded in every newspaper as one of the liberal of the earth; as for her and her modest gift, probably none may ever know of her sacrifice, unless the eye of him who saw the widow casting her two mites, her all, into the temple treasury.

Wherever you find men who give from principle, as God hath prospered, you never find them giving impulsively, no, nor grudgingly; but, on the other hand, you always find them giving, giving as a privilege, giving with a cheerful liberality, which the church as a whole is slow either to realize or to follow. Here then we have the duty of all having any income, rich and poor, young and old, ministers and people, to have a stated season to consecrate their little or their much to the church and charities of the age, as God hath prospered.

But should this utterance from the backwoods carry no moral weight with it to our more refined and civilized brethren, then hear you may the more eloquent and manly utterance of Arnot of Glasgow, in h "Laws from heaven for life on earth." "To devote a portion of our substance directly to the worship of God and the good of man is a duty strictly binding and plainly enjoined in the Scriptures. It is not a thing that a man may do or not do as he pleases. God will not have the dregs that are squeezed out by pressure poured into his treasury. He loveth a cheerful giver. He can work without our wealth, but he does not work without our willing service. The silver and the gold are his already. What he claims and cares for is the cheert ness of the giver's heart."