

garded as a great treat and holiday, and it is becoming *fashionable*, beyond, if not within our borders, for congregations to encourage their faithful pastors to go on furlough, by handing them a purse to meet their travelling expenses.

Fourthly, Each congregation should consider its capability and grade itself, shewing some laudable ambition in taking up its position. Those of moderate size and means should determine to meet the expenditure of their own representatives. Unless this is honestly aimed at by the largest number, there will be a grand collapse. Then the weaker congregations should enter the competition, with an earnest effort not to become to any great extent a drag on the fund, and lastly the stronger congregations must come out strong in the matter and do their part handsomely.

Lastly, The subject must be considered at once, and means adopted speedily to raise the required funds. There should be no debt. There can be no debt allowed. A debt for a Union Celebration would be a disgrace to the Church which would tolerate it.

† Then shall we cast our contributions into a common fund? We answer yes. But Mr. A. replies, My congregation may put in \$50 and the result of a proportionate dividend may leave me only \$25, and my expenses may be \$35. Best so—if you have a charge which can give \$50, you can spare the expenditure of \$10, much better than Mr. B. whose name is next on the roll, and whose people can give but \$20, could bear the loss of \$15. If you must grasp your expenses in full, as a first step in the transaction you go against the recommendation of Synod and in direct opposition to the Free Church Sustentation fund, so much lauded in fine speeches to the people. Let us practise what we preach.

The preceding suggestions have no further weight than their own reasonableness. We only are responsible for them. No directions have been given by Synod beyond the following:

“Congregations are requested to manifest special liberality in their collections

for the Synod Fund, next year, as the demands on that fund will necessarily be greatly increased.”

JEDAIAH THE SON OF HARUMAPH.

In the tenth verse of the third chapter of Nehemiah, it is said that Jedaiah repaired the wall of Jerusalem “even over against his house.” The Jews had returned from captivity, and had, after many vexatious hindrances, rebuilt the temple and to a partial extent the city. But as yet they had no wall,—had no even permission to erect one,—and were exposed to unfriendly visits from neighbors who watched with a jealous eye every movement of the returned exiles. Help, however, was at hand. God prompted Nehemiah to ask permission of the King of Persia to join his brethren at Jerusalem and to give him authority to construct a wall around the exposed city. Liberty was granted, for God can turn the hearts of kings in whatever way He pleases. On reaching the city and witnessing its distressful condition, he summoned the rulers, informed them of his object, and besought them to aid him to the utmost. Their response was prompt and unanimous. With one voice they said, “Let us rise up and build.” The work, however, was arduous. While in some places the wall simply needed repairing, in others it had to be built anew. Then, no sooner did the enemies of the Jews hear of the intention than they manifested determined opposition. One time they ridiculed, at another they threatened. But the builders were not deterred. Although they were compelled to work day and night, with a sword in one hand and a trowel in the other, nothing could induce them to pause, and at the end of fifty-two days they saw the labour crowned with success. The narrative is exceedingly instructive. Whether we consider the unanimity of the builders, or their method, or their vigour, or their heartiness, we are reminded that we should work thus to promote the welfare of the Church of which it is said, “The Lord hath chosen Zion, He hath desired for His habitation.”

The conduct of several of the builders