

some point distinctly defined, and some issue clearly formed; that we can reply to understandingly. We are not yet fully satisfied what it is that he is opposed to. At some times he rather appears to be at war with all missions; then he appears to be offended with the Christian Missionary Society in Cincinnati. We have invited him to define distinctly what it is that he is at issue with. But as yet he has not stated precisely where the difficulty lies. Nor need he spend any more time, or space, in telling us how well *he loves us*. We have not doubted that he feels right towards us. He is kind enough, and we are not so young and sensitive, that he need to give us a lump of sugar, every now and then, to keep us in a good humor. We need no lengthy controversy. A few plain matters will settle the whole affair:

1. Is he in favor of the missionary work?
2. Is he in favor of missions in any form? or does he think that every man should do what he can, in his individual congregation, without any concert of action?
3. Should we, or can we, in any way, in harmony with the New Testament, call a man and send him to a certain mission?
4. Does he believe in the co-operation of churches, in calling, sending and sustaining missionaries in any field, home or foreign?
5. If he does, will he give us an outline how it is to be done? If we are not doing right, we wish to be shown how we shall do right.

It is the easiest thing a man ever did to declaim against unscriptural societies and all that. But this is simply assumption. What are we doing that is wrong? Is it wrong for brethren and churches to co-operate and send Bro. Barclay to Jerusalem, and Bro. Beardslee to Jamaica? Is it wrong for brethren and churches in a State to call and send missionaries to destitute portions of the State? or why cannot our brother co-operate with us?

But we must close, as we are simply hastily sketching a few words before being off to a missionary meeting, as an apology for not replying to the Banner.—B. Franklin.

It is refreshing to listen once more to the 'Christian Review,' although the satisfaction is at a discount arising from the perceptible signs of a full retreat.

Either a better memory to preserve the remembrance of promises, or greater circumspection in making promises, would be nearly as useful at the missionary head quarters as a touch of reformation in mission matters. Only last January, our friend the 'Review' promised to serve up to the community anything we would write on the subject of the new society, if we so desired, provided we published what he had to offer. More recently, both in a private line and in print, the devoted Franklin promised to reply to our scrutiny of his article that appeared in May. We allude to these promises, but we have other busi-