

abroad far and wide through the official organ among the people ; and if he adds an extra dollar to what is usual, he is heralded as a particular saint. Is it not a cheap, short way of purchasing a godly name ?

Nor these things alone. A great society must have a great missionary, and both these greats call for another great—a great salary. And worse than all, or as bad as the worst, the zealous worldly men who have stock in the society, can not see why the missionary with a salary equal to his brother missionaries should fail to be as popular, and they demand that his dress, his official manners, and his preaching shall be popularized.

And yet, contradictory as it may seem, there is comparatively a trifling pittance collected from the brotherhood for evangelizing, notwithstanding the special flattery that awaits and awards those who contribute. Can I not say in truth that christian liberality is narrowed down, stagnated, and stunted into the veriest meagreness, only amounting to one degree above nothing, by this method of 'national' contributions ? Whereas a brother who is able to give and who ought to give from one hundred to five hundred dollars per year to herald forth the message of life, the appeals of the 'society' may peradventure extract from him twenty or thirty dollars every five or ten years ! While therefore the community of disciples, embracing a population of more than a million in America alone, ought to number its evangelists to foreign countries by the score, and evangelists in our own country by the hundred or the thousand, you and I are mortified on realizing that our 'foreign missionary societies' and our 'home missionary societies' have sustained only one laborer abroad for a few years, and have kept in the field not constantly but occasionally a dozen or fifteen workmen in what we call our home territory. And in my judgment, brother Loos—I speak frankly—it must be so while we operate through these cold calculating dollar and cent societies.

There are those—I have seen some of them and heard of others—who enter a caviling protest against the 'missionary society' because they are ill with the mammon leprosy. They determine not to give because they have no heart for it, and they create a convenient barrier between them and liberality by objecting to the *manner* of giving. If these gentlemen would give largely to the Lord in some other manner, their logic could be heard with some respect. As it is, neither brother Loos nor brother Oliphant can value either them or their reasoning. Were