

done and what are we *doing* for the "heathens at home?"

More of that spirit of giving which supports missionary work and strengthens the churches is wanted in our society at the present time. What a blessing it would be to the spreading of truth could our hearts be inspired with a judicious generosity towards those who require assistance to perform their mission to the extent of their legitimate desires. Private individuals have done their duty in this respect, but there are too many of us ready, were reference to be made to the society arranging any plan for making ministers freer to do their Master's service, to give a wise shake-headed allusion to a "hireling" ministry and "our testimonies." What we have lost and what we shall lose by being too close is too evident to be overlooked. I would not be misunderstood. Not for one moment do I advocate a paid ministry. Though there are arguments in its favor, on the whole I consider our testimony on that point sound, and it leaves our society rightfully and pre-eminently constituted that all may become workers in the sphere of practical Christianity. It is in the churches that ministers are paid for doing what would make the members better men and women by doing themselves; but dare we say, after all, that we as members do more for humanity around us and the cause of truth than they? Have we not settled down into close habits and shut out the warmth of our hearts towards others? Why do we not believe in a paid ministry? Is not the great reason that, besides leaving ministers free in a sense, it invites all members into active service? But where is the active service that is a service to any but ourselves? and a service largely for ourselves, cannot result in the highest good to ourselves. Our own greatest good and satisfaction comes from the spirit that delights in the good and happiness of others. We know this, but do not feel sufficiently our responsibility to always act upon it. It is not the ministers that should do all the work; the rest of us are the ones who should be doing, and if we don't, we need not say very much about those who, if they are not disposed to do so, are at least willing to pay some one who

will do it for them. A great many of us are willing to do neither one apparently, but I believe it is in a large number of instances apparent only.

The trouble is we have not been schooled to any work in the church; we are diffident and uncertain, and are at a loss to know what to do, even when willing to do something. Well, now, here is something to do. Here is a large meeting A, and there is a small meeting B. You may appoint a small committee from A to attend B perhaps every three months. Why don't you have a committee *every week* visit B till it is built up and the members and others take interest and courage? Why don't you impress upon everybody the duty of willingness, and appoint committee after committee, always including the younger members, even boys and girls perhaps, instead of always old members, and generally the same ones each time? Make a calculation, and divide up the members so that everybody will be on a committee, the young with the old, to go and visit meeting B. In this way every one will be actively, though silently it may be, engaged, and this begets interest, and all in a small measure become identified with a missionary spirit and recognized as a definite quantity in the church. Take turns in visiting until all the members have performed a part in the matter. Endeavor to dispel this modesty that seeks to leave to others to perform because they are thought to be more capable, and bring home privately, as well as publicly, the obligation to do something. What do we see all through Canada and the United States—families removed from the influence of meetings, admirers of the Society, yet predicting its decay if things are not so and so—they must do that and this and the other thing. Stop! what are *you* doing? What kind of duty, what kind of obligation, does your solicitude for the church and humanity suggest to *your* mind? Can you hold yourselves aloof, look complacently on, feel that you can never hold other views than the central ones of Friends, point out its mistakes, and quietly sit down with no feelings of obligation to the mother church that has nurtured you on those views? Modesty, diffi-