

"will a man rob God?" One word about "the small change" in our Church collections—the cents, and even half-cents. We have always regarded the change in the currency of the country with no friendly eye. If we can be brought to count in dollars and cents, it will be some time hence. One thing, at least, is certain, and perhaps that, in a measure, explains our dislike: the Schemes of the Church have *lost* by the change. Formerly we might at least count upon halfpence or "coppers," for farthings were *fortunately* very scarce. Now, however, if we can judge from Church collections, a great number of half-cents must have been coined, and they are sure to find their way into "the plate," as if they were carefully laid up and kept for the special purpose. Yet there is nothing so bad, but that it might have been worse, and we ought to feel thankful that the half-cent has not been subdivided; for if it had, who can doubt but many among us would be generous enough to give the Church the full benefit of the sub-division? A story is told of a popular and well known Scotch divine who announced a collection for some special purpose and expected a liberal one. He was disappointed, as such persons often are. After sermon he passed some pointed remarks on the miserable amount collected, and expressed his surprise that ladies and gentlemen would *soil their gloves* by handling pence and putting them into "the plate," when they could get plenty of pure silver and gold and paper money for the same purpose. What would the Dr. have said if his lot had been cast in a land of half-cents?

The above remarks do not, of course, apply in all cases. We have among us individuals as generous in proportion to their means as any Church or country can produce. All honor to such; they bring a blessing on themselves and upon others. We have also congregations that do their part well; but the best of us, we are convinced, could easily do more, and the worst more than *fourfold* what they do at present. We hope that such a result shall yet be witnessed.

With reference to the relative importance of our Schemes, we consider them all equally important in their own place, for they are all *equally necessary* to the prosperity of the Church. In a piece of machinery properly constructed, there is no unnecessary wheel or part. Remove the smallest wheel from a clock, and it *stops*; and remove the largest, and but the same thing happens. So, also, if *any* of our present Schemes, which the Synod wisely reduced to the smallest number possible, be discontinued or but feebly supported, the whole machinery of the Church is thrown into disorder, and her progress speedily arrested. It would be well to keep this in view when each stated collection is made throughout our congregations.

There are two of our Schemes upon which we would wish to say a few words,—the first of them Synodical and under the direction of

the whole Synod—the other Presbyterian, but supported by each Presbytery; we mean "the *Monthly Record*" and "the Lay Association." The latter of these is known in the Halifax Presbytery under the name of "the Home Mission Seneme," and is vigorously and efficiently supported. The former receives a certain amount of support from *each* Presbytery, but that amount of support to which we think it entitled from *neither*. And we certainly think that no other Scheme is more important, or serves a better purpose, than

(1.) THE MONTHLY RECORD.

The loss of our *Record*, if it were discontinued, could not be easily estimated. It would involve, among other disadvantages, the following:—

(a)—The loss, to our people, of excellent reading matter, at a cheap rate. Each No. contains a good sound sermon, and other excellent reading matter. Should the *Record* be discontinued, we do not know where they could get the same amount of interesting and instructive information at the same cost.

(b)—The loss of the *Record* would stop the channel of communication between our people and our Church Courts. The great body of our people would then be ignorant of all matters transacted at Presbytery and Synod. Such ignorance would soon beget indifference to our Schemes, and they would consequently languish, and become less and less liberally supported.

(c)—By losing our *Record*, we would lose our means of acknowledging all monies received for the different Schemes, and, consequently, all power of comparing what the different congregations are doing in their common work. That healthy rivalry which now exists, and which we hope is constantly growing, would then necessarily be impossible.

(d)—The loss of the *Record* would be, to the young men and women of our Church, the loss of a Teacher eminently suited for training them to become intelligent and useful members of the Church of Christ and the Kirk of Scotland. We are very hopeful as to the future of those who, in youth, are constant readers of the *Record*. That father who brings his Church paper into his family is doing much to make his children walk in his own footsteps. His children read the paper and become interested in all the Schemes of the Church. They form, betimes, a strong attachment to that Church, and in after life are prepared, by their youthful training, to take their places as active and intelligent Church members. No family should be contented without the *Record*; every father in our Church should strive to place it within the reach of one and all of his children who can read its pages, and sure we are he will never regret the act.

(e)—The loss of the *Record*, through our indifference, would not only be a *loss*, but a