

doubtful. Presumably this question has already been answered to the satisfaction of the Churches which have resolved to go forward with the effort; yet it may not be entirely useless briefly to state reasons why the Churches should heartily address themselves to the work placed before their liberality by their governing bodies.

As a preliminary question, we may ask whether the raising of Century Funds so large as those proposed is a practicable thing? Not to refer to Churches in other countries, can the Methodist Church of Canada and the Presbyterian Church in Canada each raise in two years a fund of \$1,000,000, while their ordinary annual revenue shall not suffer in any department of it? An affirmative reply may, I think, be given without hesitation. A large proportion of the wealth of the country is in the hands of the members and adherents of the Churches. But a small proportion, indeed, belongs to the limited number who have no church connection. The sum aimed at by the Churches named, to be raised in two years, is less than half of the annual income of either; and none will affirm that these or any other branches of the Church, in Canada or elsewhere, are giving for the cause of Christ to their utmost ability. It appears to be established that the percentage of giving in the Churches which do best is much below one-tenth—probably not over one-sixteenth part—of the revenue of their members. Whether the obligation of the tithe is still binding or not we do not here discuss; but since many Church members give the tenth or more of their income, and are not straitened thereby, it cannot possibly be shown that the Church is unable to improve on the present rate of liberality. If the question, then, is whether the

Churches have resources sufficient to provide the sums specified, there can be no doubt respecting the answer. The disposition to give must exist on the part of the people, and proper means for eliciting their liberality must be employed, but the adequacy of their resources is beyond dispute.

In giving direct answer to the question touching the propriety and wisdom of the proposal to create a Commemorative Fund, let the following considerations receive attention:

1. The objects to be promoted by the fund are proper and necessary. What are they? Missions home and foreign, theological education, the support of aged and infirm ministers and of widows and orphans of ministers, and the liquidation of heavy congregational debts and debts on other church property; these at least are the principal objects which will benefit by the fund. It is not proposed, so far as we are aware, to endow the ordinary mission work, which, in all the strength of its claims, should make it appeal to the Churches all the time; but in respect to mission buildings of various kinds, working balances for mission funds, etc., the great cause of missions will receive full recognition. The educational work of the Church and its charitable schemes are very properly maintained, in part, at least, by endowment; and part of the fund will be devoted to these purposes. That these are worthy objects the Churches have long ago determined, and neither their necessity nor the wisdom of promoting them by an increased liberality is open to doubt. To oppose any of these objects were to proclaim oneself out of sympathy with the life and aims of the Church of Christ. There may be special reasons why this or that individual, this or that congrega-