

RELIGIOUS

And Bible Society, Missionary, and Sabbath School Advocate.

E. McLEOD, Editor.

VOL. II.—NO. 19.

SAINT JOHN, NEW

INTELLIGENCER,

Missionary, and Sabbath School Advocate.

G. W. DAY, Printer

WHOLE NO. 71

THE RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCER,
Is Published at St. John, N. B., every FRIDAY,
for the General Conference of Free C. Baptists
of New Brunswick.

TERMS:
ONE DOLLAR A YEAR IN ADVANCE.
B. J. UNDERHILL,
D. W. CLARK,
WILLIAM PETERS,
JAMES SLIPP, JUNR.,
All Communications and Business Letters should be directed
(post paid) to the Editor.

The object of this paper is to do good. Its price—ONE DOLLAR A YEAR IN ADVANCE—is so low that scarcely a family in our country need be without it. We will supply (on proper representation) to the poor, who are unable to pay for it, a limited number of copies gratis.

All communications for this paper must be accompanied with the real name of the author, in order to receive attention.

G. W. DAY, PRINTER.

The Ministry—What must be done?

BY REV. D. M. GRAHAM.

"But when he (the Saviour) saw the multitude, he was moved with compassion on them, because they fainted, and scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd. Then saith he unto his disciples the harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few. Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that he will send forth laborers into his harvest."

No one can doubt the Saviour's willingness to do all in his power according to his chosen way of working to save the perished and scattered multitudes, yet, as he looks upon them in deep compassion, he does not, never did, and never will, propose to save them in any way but that which Paul calls "the foolishness of preaching." When he sees the perishing harvest he at once proposes as the remedy more laborers. What farmer does not approve the plan? It is so much gained, then, when we feel our need of preachers. So far we feel as Christ feels and as he would have us feel. As we shall soon see, this feeling itself is the only way to the remedy.

Christ as deeply as he felt for the harvest that was as peculiarly his harvest, as any moral field could be, and one, therefore, for which he felt as deeply as he can ever feel; for any, was not in such a strait as to propose that men should thrust themselves into his harvest. He yet claimed the field as his own, and his own the right to thrust laborers into it. He does not give men liberty to rush into it of their own accord. But far is he from proposing idleness or indifference as the remedy.

"The laborers are few; pray ye therefore that the Lord of the harvest will send forth laborers." Yes, a limitation to Christ's power of working in the kingdom of his own grace! He weeps over the rich harvest as he sees it returning to the earth. He will not send angels to reap it, neither will he raise the dead to do that work. But stranger still, he will not thrust men into the field without the prayers of "his disciples"—of his church. "PRAY YE" is the only condition upon which he will send forth laborers.

Yes, a limitation of the Saviour's work in the kingdom of his own grace, we repeat. The church is his body, the medium through which he works in the kingdom of his grace. When the church feels for the perishing multitudes as he feels, he can work—his body then obeys his will—he then answers the prayers of the church; he can then reach the hearts and affections of those whom he desires to send forth as laborers, for he can then show them, through his willing body, how he feels, and how he weeps over the perishing harvest fields. The church in a condition to pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers into the harvest is in a condition to work—is indeed working, is indeed blessed in its works. Of course those whom Christ would send forth as laborers must first be converted. Conversion is one stage of the revelation of Christ to the heart of the future minister. If he continues to look to Christ more, Christ unfolds to him his feelings, thoughts, and purposes—this both directly, and through members of the body.

The feeling, then, that we cannot live without ministers is a good way toward supplying the demand. The moment we approximate the compassion which Christ feels for the perishing, and with him feel that the only way to save the harvest is to have more laborers—more ministers—that moment we pray in some measure that the Lord of the harvest will send forth laborers into the harvest, and so far as we really and truly thus pray, we fulfil the condition upon which Christ will send forth more laborers.

We here arrive at a very important practical conclusion. God calls men to the ministry in answer to the prayers of the Church. I mean by this he gives them the inward call in answer to the prayers of the church—for in such a call I verily believe, as I do that Christ said "pray ye the Lord of the harvest that he will send forth laborers into his harvest." This call will be clear and distinct when prayer is much and earnest. When the church like Christ weeps over the precious grain returning to the earth for want of harvesters, men will hear a call so distinctly that they cannot do justice to their own impressions, nor adequately unfold those impressions only as they speak a voice ringing in their ears, "Go plead my law—Go preach my gospel." "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel," contains no mystery for them.

On the other hand, when the church ceases to sympathize with Christ, that is, when it ceases to sympathize in any proper sense to pray him that he will send forth laborers into his harvest, God in the same ratio as prayer ceases, ceases to call

men to the ministry. Or if he does call it is so faintly and indistinctly that men reason away the call. They can hear mammon's call loud and clear, and so they can ambition's voice, but the "woe is me," at first faint, becomes fainter, till men can without a blush say they heard no call. Do you ask why God does not call louder? Do you say he cares little for the harvest? Do you say that his arm is short that he cannot save? Do you say that he is capricious, because he will not call unless the church first call upon him? The answer to all this wisdom, if it seems to be wisdom, is simply this: The church is the body of Christ. Through that body he designs to show his emotions; through it, to think; in it to act. If that body is paralyzed, if the organs of speech in that body refuse their utterance, how shall men hear the call of God to the ministry? You may as well say a man in the nightmare does not try to lift up his voice, as to say God does not want to call men to the work of the ministry. He has his own way of calling, and on what condition he calls he has revealed to us. We by our obedience refuse to let him speak; we by our want of prayer paralyze the organ through which he wishes to speak—through which he is trying to speak, if with reverence we may so express the truth.

Men fight for the privilege of reading the Bible, which for love or money they cannot be induced to read. Peace—men fight for peace. Men who set the possible attainments in holiness in this life highest, most violate holiness in unholy warfare to maintain the truth. So it is with reference to the doctrine of a divine call to the ministry. Who more strenuously maintain that doctrine than we as a denomination, and yet where in the wide world can a people be found who more abuse that doctrine in practice? Do we treat the minister as a divinely called ambassador in proportion to the zeal with which we contend for his divine call? Do we treat him more than others as one upon whom God has so heavily laid the responsibility of winning souls to Christ, that he has only time to cry to his fellow men, "Flee ye from the city of destruction." Do we more than others see to it to remove every hindrance out of his way, that he may run the glorious course to which we maintain God has called him. Strangely enough this doctrine of the divine call to the ministry some have used as a reason for throwing every hindrance in the way of the minister—to leave him to serve tables—to impose every possible tax upon his time—to put in his way every obstacle to his holy mission. God is not mocked; he is not to be so easily cheated; he can see covetousness and indifference to the interests of his holy cause through this assumed garb of extra holiness.

Again, if we believe God alone has a right to call a minister to his holy work, we ought most of all not only to take the best possible care of one in whom we recognize that call, but ought to be most anxious to co-operate with him in divine things. By so doing, we should be most eager to gather the rich and ripe harvest, and by our earnestness in that work, we should come to pray with an earnestness for more laborers that would move heaven and earth. If God alone calls to the ministry, we ought constantly to importune him to send forth more laborers into his harvest—to importune him to give the call to thousands. If God alone calls men to the work of the ministry, who ought to be more anxious than we to search out those in whom this call has taken place? We ought to be at least as anxious as Egyptian priests to find a new Apis when the old one was dead, and when found, we ought to rejoice as much as they, nor be less careful to cherish and prepare him for his divine mission. But who have taken less pains to search out, encourage, and discipline such? Has not our whole course savored more of the doctrine that the ministerial gift is the most vulgar and least precious of all the gifts of God? God is not mocked. He easily sees through every cloak with which we attempt to cover our sins. Let his name be praised that there are so many tokens of repentance especially as manifested in the increasing pains taken to find and cherish it.

If men by any measure so treat the minister as that they come to regard his lot as a hard and useless one, they are the last to pray God to call their own sons to the ministry. If they mistrust God's calling them to his work, they will add their own clamor to that of Mammon and Ambition, as if to change the voice of God. When Christians are not in a state of mind to pray God to call their own sons to the work of the ministry, let them be assured their prayer for God to send the sons of others into the harvest is only an abomination in the sight of God. In this particular how grievously do Christians sin against God. You ask among the members of your church, if you are a pastor, this and that father, this and that mother, if prayer is made in each case, that their sons may be called into the ministry, if you find many that do not pray right the other way you may count your lot a peculiarly happy one. Be assured you are among a people whose God is in a peculiar sense the Lord.

What then must be done? Pray as Christ commands, that the Lord of the harvest may send forth laborers into his harvest.—Morning Star.

Missionary Tactics.

BY A MISSIONARY.

We propose to consider further, in the present article, some defects in the system of means which the Church has employed for the conversion of the world to Christ.

There has been, we apprehend, a great lack of genuine self-denial, on the part of the great body of professed Christians. They have only given what they could spare without serious inconvenience.

While they have often incurred heavy liabilities to extend their business operations, add to their real estate, or build and furnish a princely dwelling, they have made the very fact of their being thus unwarrantably involved, an excuse for giving "mites" grudgingly; or, perhaps, offered it as a reason for not giving at all. They are in debt, and likely to be as long as they live. But they sadly overlook the chief item of their indebtedness—the debt of love and gratitude they owe their dying Lord, for the hopes and blessings of the Gospel. They pay but meager instalments on this claim, and seem to have little fear of soon being called to give an account of their stewardship.

"I can give so much," said one at a missionary meeting, "to the cause this year, and not feel it." "Then double it, brother, and feel it," said another; "it will do you good to feel it." The Church might "double" her contributions of men and means and "not feel it." She ought to increase them TENFOLD, and then she would just begin to "feel it." I fear the mass of professed Christians have yet to learn their first lesson in the school of self-denial. When have they ever denied themselves the comforts of life, to aid in saving a perishing world? When have their houses, wardrobes, or tables been more scantily furnished on account of what they have given to the cause of mission? Let such facts as the following (and they are but a few among a multitude that might be cited) indicate:

A believer of excellent religious character, in almost every particular, declined contributing to a benevolent object, because he could not afford it. Scarcely a week passed by, before he entertained a social gathering at his house, with a variety of viands, at an expense, probably, of not less than ten dollars. Another, who could only give twenty-five cents to a worthy object, spread a banquet on the following evening, for a large company of invited guests, at an expense of at least fifteen dollars. An agent called on a wealthy Christian for aid; but he refused, on the ground that his present outlays were so large that he could not afford it. He was building a splendid house, at an expense of seventy thousand dollars, including the preparation and adornment of the grounds. By dint of perseverance however, the agent induced him to give one dollar.

If, from any cause, there is a pressure in the money-market, or they have fallen short of their expected income, how many lessen the amount of their contributions, or perhaps excuse themselves from giving at all. Instead of curtailing their expenses, that they may be able to respond to the calls of a sin-stricken world, they stint God's offering first, and treat the great interest of his kingdom as secondary. On the other hand, if unusually prospered, how seldom are their gifts unusually large! How few in the Church are willing to deny themselves the use of tobacco, for the sake of increasing their donations for benevolent purposes; and yet, I believe double the amount is expended by professed Christians for that narcotic that they give to send the Gospel to the heathen. Is appetite their god, or not?

There is a very unequal and unjust division of personal labor and sacrifice in the present mode of managing missionary operations. Those who go forth as the servants and representatives of the Church, are expected to sacrifice every earthly comfort, besides devoting themselves "a living (I had almost said a dying) sacrifice" to the cause. They must bid adieu to home, friends, and native land—isolate themselves from intelligent, refined society—tear their children from their embrace, and send them amongst strangers to be educated, unless they choose to bring them up amid the pollutions of heathenism. As a general rule, they are barely allowed a salary sufficient to meet their actual expenses, when eked out by the strictest economy; and sometimes (I blush to write it) not even that. Although missionaries are generally looked upon as preeminently good men, yet they are the very last to be treated with a generous and ample support. The fear seems to be, that they would become worldly-minded, and lose their missionary spirit, if placed in comfortable circumstances. But if the means for procuring the comforts and conveniences of life would prove such a snare to the toiling missionary, is there no danger that Christians at home surrounded with luxuries as well as comforts, should "wax fat and kick," like Jeshurun of old? And would not larger and more frequent drafts upon the treasury of the Church have a tendency to reduce that dangerous plethora that now cripples its efforts and renders it so sadly ineffectual?

At present, little or no provision is made by our Missionary Boards for supporting the widows, or educating the children of deceased missionaries. Nor are the missionaries themselves, when compelled by ill-health to abandon the field and give up the work, allowed to "retire on half pay," as the State very humanely allows those soldiers to do, who are disabled in its service. There are no missionary hospitals for the sick and wounded, where they may go and be healed at the expense of the Church. After they have spent their best energies, and wasted the vigor of manhood in exhausting labors in an ungenial climate, they and their families are often left dependent on the charity of friends for a subsistence when they return worn out to their native land. Now, if such trials and sacrifices were needful, I am sure no missionary of the right stamp would shrink from meeting them, or complain because of them. As it is, few complain, while very many suffer. But are such sacrifices necessary, and ought they to be required? I answer unhesitatingly, "No!" If the great body of the Church would do their duty, there

would be no need that a few should bear such a crushing burden, while so many of their brethren never lift a finger to lighten it. I fear the divine injunction, "Bear ye one another's burdens," is sadly overlooked and forgotten in its application to the lone, far-off missionary. He is expected to bear not only his own burden, but that of the churches whom he represents. He constitutes the embodiment of their sacrifices. For church-members and officers of Missionary Boards to own houses and lands, bank and railroad stock, and amass wealth, is considered no disparagement to Christian character. For them to surround themselves with the luxuries and elegancies of refined and fashionable society, is not thought incompatible with being the followers of Him "who though rich, yet for our sakes became poor." But if it were known to the churches at home that some of their missionaries had contrived, while engaged in the work, to lay up a few hundred dollars for the education of their children, or their own sustenance, when so toil-worn as to be unfit for actual service, all confidence would be lost in their Christian character and missionary spirit, and the Church would cease to contribute for their support. It seems to me but simple justice, that the churches should furnish their missionaries with every needful comfort, to lessen their trials and encourage them in their work, and also meet the expense of educating their children. I would not have those on a foreign field eased, while those on the home-field are burdened; but I would have more of that blessed equality, of which Paul speaks to the Corinthians, (2 Cor. 8: 13, 14.) Will not those who read, ponder and pray over these things?—American Missionary.

A Solemn Address to Christless souls.

All Christless persons are out of the love of God! God has no love of complacency towards unconverted souls. He sees nothing amiable in them—nothing for which he can possibly love them. The righteous God loveth righteousness—it is his very nature to do so—he cannot but love it wherever he sees it. But there is no righteousness in Christless persons; there is not so much as one white spot in their whole garments. Therefore it is impossible God can love them. He must change his nature and become another God before he can love an unconverted soul. You object to this, that 'God so loved the world as to give his Son,' and that Christ showed great tenderness to sinners. Ah, yes! This is quite true. God loves the Christless with a love of infinite pity. If you saw a man lying bleeding, and wounded, and dying, your heart would flow out with sympathy all at once—you would love him with the love of pity. But if you found out that he was a wicked, abandoned man, you could not esteem him; your love of pity would continue—yea, it would be greater than before—but you could not have any love of esteem for him. Just so with God: he saw the whole world lying in wickedness, and every imagination of man's heart only evil continually. The heart of God flowed out in pity. 'God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son.' 'He is not willing that any should perish.' 'God willeth all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth.'

Learn, then, O Christless soul, exactly where you stand with regard to God. (1.) He has no love or esteem for you. He never had, and he never will have till he sees you in Christ. You see many things in yourself that you admire, and think God will also admire. Perhaps you pray a little in secret, and read the Word. Perhaps you feel some flowing of affection in hearing preaching, and you think all the time that God will look at that and approve it. But learn here that God sees nothing good in it—nothing worthy of his love. If you are out of Christ, you are all filthy in the sight of God, and your righteousness are as filthy rags. Perhaps you are amiable, good-natured, kind, hospitable; your friends love and admire you, and you think God must admire you also. But learn here that God sees nothing to admire in you. He knows you are wretched and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked. You do nothing out of regard for him. (2.) You are under his wrath. God cannot be indifferent to you—if you are out of his love, you must be under his wrath, God is angry with you every day. The wrath of God abides upon you! If you go a journey, the wrath of God hangs over you all the way! If you sit down to your meals, the wrath of God is close by you! If you sleep, it rests over you all the night long! At any moment it may crush you into hell! It may be to-day or to-morrow, or some day next week. Whenever God cuts the thread of life, the wrath that is upon you will do its office. O, dear souls, how can you remain thus? Flee, O flee from the wrath to come! (3.) God has infinite pity for you. His pity is as infinite as his wrath. He has no pleasure in your dying. He would rather that you would turn. He has provided blood enough in Christ to blot out your sin, and raiment enough to cover your nakedness. The more he is angry with you, the more does he pity you. Christ strives most after Jerusalem sinners. The more you have provoked him, the more ready is he to cover you under his wings. Turn, sinner! Turn! God will not always wait—my Spirit shall not always strive! 'Give glory to the Lord your God before he cause darkness, and before your feet stumble upon the dark mountains, and when ye look for light, he turn into the shadow of death, and make it gross darkness.'—McChesney's MS. in British Messenger.

At Acadia, Mo., on the 17th ult, the lightning struck the high school, and four boys asleep in the building were burned to death.

Dr. Baird's Lecture on Russia.

Rev. Dr. Baird delivered a lecture on "Russia" before the Springler Institute, Monday evening, 2d inst. Although the weather was most unfavourable, the lecture-room was crowded. The lecture took two hours and a quarter in its delivery, and was delivered in an easy conversational style. Dr. Baird commenced by giving a description of the country, and then proceeded to review its early history. The Russians, he said, were civilized by Constantinople, and it was only natural that they should regard it with a kind of veneration. The sympathies of the people are therefore enlisted in this war, on account of that portion of the Greek Church which is still under the dominion of the Turk. For many centuries they looked upon it from the North as the most wonderful city in the world—and so it is continued Mr. Baird, a remarkable city. They knew nothing of London and Paris, and the Western portions of Europe, and they cared as little about it. No person can comprehend this feeling on their part, unless they know that to it the Russians are principally indebted for their civilization. The city of Moscow was founded in the twelfth century, by George who was one of the ruling sovereigns, known in his day as Paramount Princes. He also built the Kremlin, which was a fortified enclosure for the defence of the Paramount Prince against his turbulent subjects.

Moscow, however, is not the only city that possesses a Kremlin, as almost all the principal cities of the empire have one, with the exception of St. Petersburg; and Peter the Great would not admit of it there, as it was his object to make his capital a European city. In the twelfth century the Tartars invaded Russia, and formed three kingdoms, the most powerful of which was established in the Crimea. In the fourteenth century the Poles commenced their wars with the Russians, and succeeded in conquering the whole of the Western side of their country as far as Moscow. The Russians, however, survived the effects of this invasion, and Ivan the Third succeeded in regaining the lands that had been taken by the Tartars, driving them out of his dominions.

During his reign, an attempt was made by some of his subjects to establish a republic, but it was suppressed, and its leaders almost exterminated. Ivan the Fourth, his grandson, was the last of the descendants of Rurik. It was only in the reign of Michael Romanoff, the founder of the reigning dynasty, that the title of Czar was given to the sovereign. This title is not the same as Caesar, as is generally supposed, but has its origin away back, back as far as the days of Belshazzar and Nebuchadnezzar, the last syllable in their names signifying prince. In the Russian, however, it is spelled Zsar. The son of Michael was Alexis, who was the father of Peter the Great; and Peter the Great reigned thirty six years, having ascended the throne in 1689, the same year in which Mary and William ascended the English throne.

The lecturer did not consider him such a great man as people generally supposed; and he thought the Emperor Nicholas was right in saying that his grandmother had done more for Russia than ever he did. He believed also that coming in contact with the Swedes was the making of the Russians; but he thought that Peter the Great would never have succeeded against them, had it not been for the foolishness of Charles.

Dr. Baird here gave a description of the military schools at St. Peter, which he visited in 1840, with the Archduke Michael. He was, he said, considerably surprised at the discipline which prevailed in them. Among the various departments of these institutions, he was particularly struck with a scene which was enacted in the bedroom. Here he saw about two hundred youths, about fourteen years of age, dressed in their uniforms, armed with muskets, and each standing at the foot of his bed. At the tap of a drum they laid down their arms; at another tap they took off their hats; at another, their coats; at another, their shoes; at another, their vests; and how much farther they went I shan't tell you. (Laughter.) The process of dressing was also regulated by the tap of the drum in the same manner. The three partitions of Poland took place in the reign of Catherine the Great, and it was also she who obtained complete possession of the Crimea, which came under her dominion in 1783, the last year of revolution. It was here that the Emperor Alexander spent his last days, dying of a bilious fever, and not, as it was suspected, by poisoning. He left the crown to Nicholas, having some years before his death caused Constantine to resign all pretensions in his favor. Still, Constantine, after his death, was regarded by Nicholas as the rightful ruler, and he testified his willingness to take the oath of allegiance to him. This, however, he declined, and informed Nicholas of a written resignation of his rights, which he had signed, in compliance with the earnest demand of Alexander. The present Emperor is thirty-seven years of age, and not quite so tall as his father, but somewhat stouter. He is of a naturally amiable disposition, and possesses good talents, although not possessed of as much energy as Nicholas. He speaks English perfectly, as do also all his brothers and sisters. He received his first lessons in that language from a Scotch woman, whose rather broad pronunciation was corrected by an English woman, who was his next teacher. His marriage took place in 1841, and his wife is a most interesting woman, who does the highest credit to his choice. She is from the western part of Germany. Before her marriage it was necessary that she should spend several months in the family of the Czar, and become a member of the Greek Church. Dr. Baird believed that