

*Lord's day*, is most scriptural ;—in fact, I have been astonished to find a practice so plainly enjoined by the Apostle Paul, in 1 Corinthians, xvi. 2, so much neglected in the English Church.

2. Is the principle of such weekly offerings made "by the Word of God" perpetually binding upon Christians in general?

*I do not believe that the instructions which Paul in the above passage gives to the Christians in Corinth were of local force. I believe that they embody a principle of universal application.*

3. Can the principle or practice of such weekly offerings be regarded as at all Popish, or as involving the principle or justification by works?

The idea, by whomsoever promulgated, that *this practice in our Church savours of Popery*, or gives any countenance to the heresy of justification by works, is eminently absurd. The practice is, and has been for ages gone by, universal in Scotland; and I will venture to say there are no people in the world less likely to adopt either principles or practices of Popery than we here on the north side of the border.

4. Ought there to be any religious service opened to any class of persons, however poor, without giving them the means of coincidentally offering something, however little, in God's service?

Not only do we collect *voluntary offerings at every public meeting for worship on the Lord's Day*, but on week-days at prayer meetings, whether these be held in the schoolroom or the Church.

5. Is there any objection to the substitution of such voluntary offerings for pew rents in payment of the Clergy?

In some of the Churches we have pew rents, in many of them none; and so far from objecting to the substitution of voluntary offerings for these, we would much prefer the voluntary offerings if they would serve the purpose. We would say that *pew rents should not be attempted wherever an attempt is making to evangelise a heathen district of any of our large towns.*

6. Does the experience or practice in Scotland lead to the belief that such offerings might in many cases produce a reliable income for the clergyman, as large or larger than is produced by merely rented pews?

*Were voluntary offerings universal in your English Churches, as they should be, you could raise an immense revenue for the glory of God, and the service of the Church.* In my congregation alone, where we collect voluntarily at both forenoon and at afternoon worship, we receive about £500 annually of voluntary offerings, and this besides raising about as much from pew rents, and about £1,100 for a fund out of which all the ministers of the Free Church receive an equal share. That fund which congregations give to according to their ability, amounts to about £100,000 a year. The income of the Free Church, all voluntary, is about £300,000 annually; and if we in our poor country,—poor as compared with England,—raise such a sum as that from our share of the population, amounting to about 1,000,000, what might the Church of England do, did she put forth her vast resources? Including one thing and another—I mean stipend and the value of a manse and garden—none of our ministers have under £150 a year. *Unendowed as we now are by the State, we are better off than very many of the clergymen of the Church of England. That shows what can be done through the voluntary offerings of the people.*

7. Is the principle of gathering new congregations together in suitable buildings, free and open to all comers, and defraying the expense of such public worship out of the free will offerings of the people, rich and poor, so worshipping together, a means of Church extension specially adapted to the present state of the English Church?

These I have already said would form a mighty means of Church extension in connection with the Church of England. *In them she has a rich mine, which she should work for the elevation of the lowest classes, and the salvation of our country.*