

eyes might have it, but the nays would (many of them) simply send their special gifts to their chosen objects without paying them into the Auxiliary at all. I should, for one, and no board and no majority could prevent it. For if there is one thing which people resent more than another it is unauthorized, outside dictation as to the giving and spending of money.

But there are sweet souls among us who "seem to dwell above this earth;" pure, spiritual natures who judge with Christ-like eyes. God be thanked for them; they show us what His grace can accomplish; they are the salt of the earth. To such as these all that I have said is as dust in the balance. What to them is precedent, analogy, the opinion of many? What is expediency (*i.e.*, present practical result) compared with the eternal principles of right and wrong? These consecrated ones have the grand faith not only to say:

"Because right is right, to follow right,
Were wisdom, in the scorn of consequence,"

but to *act* in accordance with their faith. With conscience once convinced that undesignated gifts are more according to the will of God as being the higher, nobler, more self-effacing way, they are henceforth unmovable. Cannot God give the willing heart to offer, the wise mind to distribute? Shall His children refuse to follow His guidance because they want the light of earth's success upon their way?

There is something in this thoroughness, this whole-hearted, obedient trust that appeals to everyone. The veriest worldling can admire the Christian who, at all times, and under all circumstances, is nobly true to the high calling of God; we all thrill to the tone that vibrates in such words as these:

"They who have felt the Spirit of the Highest
Cannot confound, or doubt Him, or defy;
Yea, with one voice, O world, though thou deniest,
Stand thou on that side, for on this am I."

But let us not be carried away, even by a grand enthusiasm. We have higher arguments than any yet given; authority to which all must bow. As loyal Churchwomen let us turn first to our Book of Common Prayer; surely, next to the Bible itself, the greatest treasure-book we possess. We find three Rubrics on the subject of giving; the woman who is churched "must offer accustomed offerings;" the parishioners must "yearly, at Easter, pay all ecclesiastical duties accustomedly due." These Rubrics do not help us at all; but we find in the Offertory Rubric "the church-wardens shall receive the alms for the poor and other *devotions of the people*." Evidently, then, at one and the same collection there may be offerings for different purposes designated by the donors. We have all done this many a time, placing, it may be, one contribution for general expenses, another for missions, and, perhaps, a thankoffering devoted to some object

specially dear to us, on the same offertory plate. Our prayer-book sanctions it; have we done wrong?

But let us turn to the Word of God. Did men of old designate their offerings? And were they accepted and blessed by God? If we read the 35th chapter of Exodus we shall find the women bringing gifts for the Tabernacle; some the fine linen for the inner curtains, some the outer curtains of woven goats' hair, some jewels and gold. The men brought shittim-wood, rams' skins, and badger (or dugong) skins. The rulers offered precious stones for the ephod and breastplate, spices and oils for the lights and incense, and, when all was finished, we are told "they had done it as the Lord had commanded, and Moses blessed them."

In Leviticus ii. and iii., we find that the children of Israel might make free-will offerings of different kinds which were disposed of differently. The same principle ruled in the gifts for the building of the first and the second temple. Without doubt a large proportion of the Israelitish offerings were undesignated, such as the tithes for the general support of the priests and Levites, and the gold and silver for the treasury of the house of the Lord.

Let us turn to the Epistles and to the Acts of the Apostles. We remember that St. Paul's converts ministered to his needs when he was preaching in other lands, that the brethren were brought on their way to the church (*i.e.*, their travelling expenses were defrayed), that contributions were made "for the poor saints at Jerusalem," and that Dorcas made and gave coats and garments to the poor. What are these? Designated gifts, everyone of them. Let us not forget that the act that is blameworthy in detail, must be blameworthy also in the general principle, and that in giving to missions at all, or any other field for liberality, we are choosing for ourselves and designating our money.

Finally, let us humbly seek counsel from the highest authority of all, our blessed Lord Himself. He directs us as to the manner in which we shall give *alms*, in other words, food, clothing, or money to the poor. He blames those who withhold support from their parents, but this is a designated gift, made of a man's own free will, and according to the commandment of God. In two instances we find our Lord commending a giver; that of the widow who cast her mite into the general fund of the temple treasury, an undesignated offering; but what was the other instance? The woman who brake the precious box of alabaster and poured the costly ointment on His head, a designated offering. The disciples murmured, but we remember our Lord's royal prophetic commendation.

To sum up our argument, we have in designating money the sanction of precedent, analogy and practical result; of the prayer-book, the