

absence of his Lord so much; but when he was alone and despondent it was a thought that was ever before him. And then it was that the Master came to him. He was terrible, it is true, to look at. From His mouth there went a two-edged sword; His countenance was as the sun shining in his strength. Before Him, John fell down as one dead. Such was the Saviour to John, and such some day He will be to all of His disciples. There is something wonderful in the hold that this Son of the living God can take upon the soul. In the darkest hour He comes to speak. He left not John alone in Patmos; he leaves not His disciples alone now in their troubles. Angels came to comfort Him in His troubles, and He now comes to comfort those who entrusted their souls to Him.

John was frightened when he saw his Master in the new and terrible glory which surrounded Him. But the hand was there to steady the fear; the voice was there to reassure. "He laid His right hand upon me, saying, Fear not." There He stood among seven bright lamps, or candlesticks, which encircled Him in a flood of light. These represented the seven Churches of Asia, to which He was about to send His famous messages. His right hand was held on high. In it He held a corona of seven stars which glittered in the light. These represented the angels or bishops of the Churches. He held them very dear to Him. They were like stars in His right hand.

Such is He in the Churches to-day; Himself their missionary, for He sends Himself to them. They are all very dear to Him. The messages He sent to those Churches in Asia He sends now to us. In them we see what He thought of the Churches in the early days of apostolic missionary work. What shall be His verdict upon all the Churches when their work comes to be delivered up to Him? This should be the question of great moment to each individual, for it is by individuals that the different Churches of the Lord Jesus are made up.

SHALL MISSIONARY MONEYS BE DESIGNATED BY THE DONORS?

THE "OTHER SIDE," BY MISS OSLER, TORONTO.



WHEN a difficult case is argued in a court of law, we find that both judge and counsel quote precedents, the one to justify the judgment he gives, the other for convincing argument.

Let us see how precedent bears upon this question. Roman Catholics, we know, largely designate their offerings; some special saint, some favourite shrine, some particular charity receives its portion, and the giver is commended. With scarcely an exception, all other Christian bodies,

so far as I have been able to ascertain, designate their gifts, more or less. Our sister auxiliary in the States, the diocesan branches of the Canadian W.A., the contributors to the great missionary societies at home all designate, nor have I heard their right to do so questioned by anyone. It is left for the Toronto Auxiliary with (may I say) hyper-sensitive conscience to raise the question: "Are we doing as we ought in this matter?" If wrong in us, it must be wrong in others; are we prepared to cast a slur upon millions of our fellow Christians, who, without a shadow of scruple, designate their money?

Let us turn from precedent to analogy and see what we can gather. How do we act in family gifts? Do we, as a rule, send a sum of money for the heads of the household to lay out at their discretion for the other members? Not often. Do we feel guilty when the godchild, the namesake, the relative with whom we are most in sympathy, is dealt with more liberally than the rest? I think not. Our family gifts are designated, and our preferences largely rule.

What of our city charities? Do we hand over our offerings to a general board to be apportioned among hospitals and homes, guilds and relief societies as the board may direct? Nothing of the kind; we designate.

Then, as to special offerings for parochial purposes, the Sunday-school, the church debt, the choir; do we ever designate? Of course we do, and what is more, I never heard yet of any rector feeling it his duty to refuse such gifts on the ground that everything should go to the General Expense Fund to be administered by the financial officers of the Church who best know the parochial needs. So we see that analogy helps our argument.

Now let us view the question in the light of practical results. We have heard special appeals at our Board meetings, and our first feeling has been: "How I wish this could be taken up at once." Perhaps we ourselves can spare nothing more, but lo! the appeal has touched others more blessed with means, and one and another contributes until the sum required is raised, not without a blessed self-denial on the part of the givers. Can we suppose that an appeal for missions in general would elicit such a response? Try it and see. The sum required is too large, too vague, and in giving generally we cannot feel, in the same comfortable way, that we have accomplished a definite good. We like to know where our gifts are going and to what purpose; our sympathies are strongly roused when we are in direct touch with the missions we are helping, and any hard and strict rule against the designation of money would undoubtedly lessen the total subscriptions. Moreover, I doubt if any board or any majority has the right to make such a rule. It certainly would not be carried by a standing vote; the

* See CANADIAN CHURCH MAGAZINE AND MISSION NEWS, September, 1892, page 216.