

been formed in many of our congregations. Some of the oldest and ablest of them are, to this very day, satisfied with "*an annual collection*;" while others do not give even that. We put the most charitable construction on the neglect of those congregations, when we ascribe it to the want of a scheme; and now that this is supplied, we trust that they will make up for their past inaction by the promptitude and energy of their present movements. We wonder how any Christian man, or any Christian congregation, can think that they discharge their duty to a cause so sacred, by an annual collection! Are there any of our people who content themselves with an *annual prayer* for the Missionary cause? Have we not been taught by our Lord to pray for it *every day*? And what consistency is there between this and collecting for it *once a year*? What are prayers, so supported by practice, worth? An annual collection as the only source of Missionary revenue, is obsolete, years ago, in all active and earnest Churches. Years ago, it has been condemned by our own Synod.

Let it now be universally superseded by the Missionary Society, and see how much more productive it will prove.

What does the annual collection produce? We strike a high average when we say £3. Now, assuming that there are 100 members in the congregation, how much is this from each of them, on an average? Not 7½d. in the year, or somewhere about *one half-penny* in the month! Suppose now that a Missionary Society were organized, would wealthy or well-to-do people offer the Collectors a half-penny a month? \$1 or \$2 would be liker the thing in some cases, and in others 50 or 25 cents. But let us take the very low average of 7½d. each, per month, what would that same congregation raise in the year? £37 10s., instead of £3 as before; and this without the help of the *adherents*, whose collection was included in the latter sum trifling as it is. What a gain to the Missions of our Church! And no loss to the congregation. Loss! Their enlarged liberality would, in many ways, return into their own bosoms, besides all the good that it would do to others.

III. ADOPTION OF THE SCHEME, THE CONDITION OF RECEIVING SUPPLEMENT.

The design of the scheme being to set *all* to work, and to keep them *always* at work, the co-operation even of the supplemented congregations is stipulated as the condition of their participating in its fruits. Is it said that what these congregations raise for Missions, will just be so much withheld from their own support? This does not by any means follow. But let us suppose that it did, and that a supplemented congregation raises £5 a year for the Mission fund, and receives £20 out of it, the question is, Would it not be as well that that congregation should appropriate these £5 to its own purposes, and take only £15 out of the Mission fund? We answer emphatically, No! It is better, better for itself, and better for the Church, that it should *give* as well as take, than that it should take only, without giving. Congregations need *training* as well as individuals, and they should be trained, *from the very first*, to Missionary work; and surely the lesson "*freely to give*" for the spread of the Gospel, can, with all the better grace, and all the greater effect, be inculcated on them, that they are, themselves, at the same time, "*freely receiving*" for its support.

Missionary Societies in supplemented congregations may not raise a great deal. But "*who hath despised the day of small things?*" saith the Lord. If He hath not, why should we? Despise it! No! Let us rather hail it as the precursor of a coming day of great things, when these *supplemented* shall become *supplementing* congregations, and attain a degree of strength, activity, and zeal, that they never could have reached without the reflex influence of a Missionary Society among them. For it is a great mistake to suppose, and a specious fallacy to say, that contributing for Missions will hurt the ordinary income of any congregation, however weak. Facts demonstrate the very reverse. The statistics of our own Church put it beyond a doubt. Look into them, and you will see that those congregations which give most to Missions, are the most generous also in the support of their own ministers; and that the smallest stipends uniformly go along with the lowest amount of Missionary contributions. Look again into these statistics, and you will see some old and able congregations giving much less to their ministers than others that have been but recently form-