

work of evangelization in cities, where a large class of neglected people calls for Christian sympathy and effort. The Venerable Dr. Charles Hodge speaks very plainly on this point:—

“It is with great reluctance that we are constrained to acknowledge that the Presbyterian Church in this country is, not the Church for the poor. It is not meant that they are excluded, nor that we fail entirely to reach them. But it is true that our system does not make adequate provision for their instruction. In purely agricultural districts, where the poor hardly exist as a class, this evil is not felt; but in all our larger towns and cities it is great and apparent. Great efforts are, indeed, made to accomplish the object by means of city missions and chapels. But these means are inadequate. A very small part of the poor, much smaller than is our proportion, belong to the Presbyterian Church. We as a Church are not doing, and never have done, what we were bound to do in order to preach the Gospel to the poor. We are not disposed to refer this neglect to any special want of intelligence, or zeal in the ministry or members of our Church. The evil is to be referred to our system. The Presbyterians early adopted in this country, and have always adhered to the principle, that, as a general rule, a minister should look for his support to the particular congregation to which he preaches. We have, indeed, never been unmindful of the wants of those who were not able to sustain the Gospel by their own resources. Our Church from the beginning has laboured in the field of domestic missions, and made systematic efforts to aid feeble congregations in the support of their pastors. The error complained of is not in the Board of Missions, either in its principle or operations. It is in the Church itself. *The error is that no general provision has been made for the support of the preachers of the Gospel.* Every minister has been left to depend on those to whom he preached. The inevitable consequence of this system is, that those who are unwilling or unable to support the Gospel are left in ignorance. Had those who went before us acted on this principle, we should be without the Gospel to this day.”

Much of the above statement is applicable to our Church in Canada as well as to that in the United States. The poor are welcome to our churches, doubtless, but little exertion is put forth to gather them in. A Presbyterian Mission Church does wonders if it brings into its fold all the nominal Presbyterians in its neighbourhood. As for the unconverted, they may be unconverted still. Our ministers, we are told, decline to labour in a home field that is not self-supporting, while they have no objections to the work of foreign missions, which must be engaged in altogether at the expense of the Church. To preach Christ to perishing sinners is as truly noble work in Toronto and Montreal as in the Red River and British Columbia, and the Church is as much bound to provide for the one as for the other.

In regard to ascertaining the state of religion in congregations, that steps may be taken to improve it, it may be well to enquire to what extent we as a Church may imitate the Church of the Lower Provinces. Its various Presbyteries meet by regular rotation in all the churches within their bounds, and proceed at once to the visitation of the congregations which assemble there. When it is not convenient for the Presbytery to meet in both congregations of a double charge, or in small and out of the way localities, Committees of Presbytery are appointed to visit and report. In this way the fullest information is obtained as to the general state of the various congregations, and the publication of minutes, such as the fol-