

country, but that these latter will not accept them unless accompanied by four books of a secular character. Now, would the Bible society be justified in appropriating its funds to the purchase of books, say of history, travels, science and fiction, so that one of each of these should be presented with every copy of the Bible? Would the subscribers to such a society be satisfied that their money should be thus employed? I trow not.

3. "*We could get no government grant unless our schools were efficient.*"

Very true; but if only *religious* instruction is given, the expenses would be so greatly reduced that the government grant would not be needed, while we should have the consciousness of properly applying the contributions received. Several of the missionaries speak with satisfaction of the large grant which they are able to obtain, but if the case were expressed in plain language I fancy it would be something like this: "We have diligently taught arithmetic, grammar, history, geography, drawing, etc., and have gained an excellent report and a large grant, *and all with money subscribed for preaching the Gospel.*" Whether this is a fair ground for congratulation I leave subscribers to judge.

4. "*In our high schools we give such a superior education as is calculated to prepare the pupils for future usefulness in the missions.*"

Exactly so; but how many of those pupils actually engage in missionary work? Is it not a very small proportion indeed? The plan adopted securs very much like beginning at the wrong end. We educate a large number of pupils with the hope of getting a few Christian teachers, but ought we not rather first to select truly Christian youths and girls and then educate them? The school teaching, viewed from a missionary standpoint, must, I think, in honesty be confessed to have proved a *lamentable failure*. In India we have been teaching children for seventy years or more, and it may fairly be questioned whether one child in a hundred whom we have taught has grown up a real Christian. We have labored hard to give a good education, and we have turned out tens of thousands of semi-heathen, semi-infidels, and semi-Christians.

Dealing simply with his own Board, the Church Missionary Society, Mr. Watkins carefully estimates the cost of educating children incurred by the Board on the foreign field. He makes this a total of £59,514, and concludes:

If this estimate be anywhere near correct, we have *more than one fifth of the total expenditure* of the society for 1890 going for education, that total being £247,500. I venture to ask, Is this enormous amount of money well spent? Is it right to appropriate to such a purpose one fifth of the funds annually collected? If it be so, then by all means let us have an addition to the name of the society. Let it be called "the Church Missionary and Educational Society," and then subscribers will have a clear idea of the two separate objects to which they are contributing.

The chief disadvantage would be that probably the funds would be considerably diminished. I fear that many a hard-begged half crown would be either entirely withheld or obtained with even more difficulty than at present if the contributor realized that sixpence of it would go "to teach the poor heathen" arithmetic and geography.

The missionary societies of modern times have gradually become immense educational agencies, and in this respect, whether right or wrong, they certainly differ greatly from the primitive missions. The great apos-