and silver are heavy metals, and the attraction of gravitation is bound to carry them down unless faith and love and consecration shall impart to them a heavenly gravitation. We never have been able to believe that money earned at church fairs, or ecclesiastical raffles, or vestry junketings has any upward tendency. And we are bound to warn those who devise such things for the aid and promotion of foreign missions, that though they raise a large amount thereby, they may fail to be credited with it in the "Book of Remembrance." We have such a growing sense of the importance of sanctified offerings in our missionary treasuries, and such a strong conviction of the tendencies now operating to check this kind of revenue, that we are led to consider some of the conditions of consecrated giving:

I. Gifts for the Lord's treasury should come from a living hand, and not from a dead hand. Legacies and bequese " stadly receive, as they are sent into our missionary treasuries, and we sincerely thank those who have left them to us. But we are sure, nevertheless, that this is not the best kind of giving. A Christian's obligation is first and before all to his own generation. Why, then, should he studiously arrange to bestow his largest contribution upon the generation following? Besides, post-mortem gifts lose vasily in that sympathetic value which is such a precious element in Christian charity. To extend help to lost men from the skeleton fingers of a corpse, when one might have given it from the warm hand of a living compassion, is a vast loss both to giver and receiver. Dr. Wayland used to complain of what he called "a long-tailed benevolence." Is it not better to lay hold of our generation with the grasp of a present and living sympathy, than to reach back to it, after we are gone, with the cold touch of a residuary bequest? Moreover, experience shows that the first is the only safe method of giving. By a strange irony of custom we call a man's legacy his "will." But, as the history of such instruments goes, it would be truer to say that a legacy is an ingenious contrivance for getting one's will defeated. What humiliating swindles are perpetrated on wealthy Christians by this last-will-and-testament device! We well remember a millionaire to whom we ministered in sickness-an orthodox Christian, who trusted in the blood of Christ, and dreaded, more than anything that could be named in his presence, that Unitarian denial that tramples on the atomment of the Son of God. But he was a bequeather instead of a giver; he made death his administrator; and Esquire Sepulchre so managed the estate that the bulk of it went to further what, during all his life he had most disfellowshipped and dreaded, and to defraud the missionary treasury of what he might and ought to have done for it. We recall another friend of evangelical missions whose large property, since his decease, has lent its entire support to a church of Free Thinkers. Such grotesque perversions of Christian funds must be the theme of infernal laughter among the dark spirits in perdition who are ever plotting to obstruct the work of the Gospel. The only remedy against ail this is for the Christian to be his own