

their contributions for missionary objects. The number of congregations giving a stipend of \$1,000 or more is *nineteen*. Will it be credited that, according to the last returns, there are ten of these congregations whose ministers receive an aggregate stipend of \$12,000 (an average of \$1,200,) but whose contributions to the missions of the church, (Home, Foreign, and French Canadian,) amount to a trifle over \$650? or that there is *one* of the *nineteen* that contributed *more* for these missions than is contributed by the whole *ten*? or that there are *thirteen* whose united contributions to the missions of the church only exceed the smallest stipend (\$1,000)?

We will not be understood as insinuating that these congregations give too much to their ministers. Not one of them, we believe, does any thing of the kind. But it is difficult to conceive of any explanation that would satisfy the church that the facts above referred to do not indicate a sad want of interest in her missions. Might not some of these congregations be expected to do even *more* for the extension of the kingdom of Christ than for the support of ordinances among themselves? This is done by many congregations in other churches, but not, so far as we know, by any congregation of the Canada Presbyterian Church.

We are persuaded that our congregations generally will not do anything like their duty in this matter, until means are employed to lead them to make the missions of the church a distinct object of their interest. This is secured by the formation of a missionary association, the formation of which amounts just to the same thing as a formal resolution on the part of a congregation to make the extension of the kingdom of Christ the object of their distinct and increased interest, and to indicate their interest by systematic and sustained effort.

It is on *this* ground that we urge the formation of congregational associations. It is a mistake to think that the advantage of an association lies chiefly or merely in the fact that people generally give more liberally when their individual contributions are marked on paper, than when they are given in such a way that no one can know the amount of them. There is, we admit, something in this, yet it does not appear reasonable to object to associations on this ground, as we believe some do. For, although a person ought to contribute as much in the one way as the other, it would be far from right to say that his giving more when personally waited on for his contributions, is to be ascribed entirely to the operation of an inferior principle that should not be encouraged or allowed. This would be to exclude the influence of good example in the matter of *giving*—an influence on which we are more or less dependent in every thing. If we are to “consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works”—and this we are to do as individual Christians—others must see our good works.

But, passing from this, we hold that the great advantage of a missionary association lies in the fact that it secures for the cause of missions its proper place in the interests of the people. When a congregation resolve upon the formation of a missionary association, they simply resolve that, not having hitherto taken the interest in missions, and made the effort in their behalf which they ought to have done, or at least ought now to do, the extension of the kingdom