

TERMS, NOTICES, ETC.

The RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCER is issued every Wednesday, from the office of publication, York St., Fredericton.

Terms: \$1.50 a year, in advance.

If not paid in advance the price is \$2.00 a year.

New subscriptions may begin at any time the year.

When sending a subscription, whether new or a renewal, the sender should be careful to give the correct address of the subscriber.

If a subscriber wishes the address of his paper changed he should give first the address to which it is now sent, and then that to which he wishes it sent.

The date following the subscriber's name on the address label shows the time to which subscription is paid. It is changed, generally, within one week after a payment is made, and at latest within two weeks. Its change is the receipt for payment. If not changed within the last named time inquiry by card or letter should be sent to us.

When it is desired to discontinue the INTELLIGENCER, it is necessary to pay whatever is due, and notify us by letter or post card. Returning the paper is neither courteous nor sufficient.

Payment of subscriptions may be made to any Free Baptist minister in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and to any of our authorized agents as named in another column, as well as to the proprietor at Fredericton.

Items of religious news from every quarter are always welcome. Denominational news, as all other matter for publication, should be sent promptly.

Communications for publication should be written on only one side of the paper, and business matters and those for insertion should be written separately. Observance of this rule will prevent much copying and sometimes confusion and mistakes.

All communications, etc., should be addressed RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCER, Box 375, Fredericton, N. B.

Religious Intelligencer.

REV. JOSEPH McLEOD, D. D.,... EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1887.

—HOME FOR THE FALLEN. The effort to provide, in St. John, a home for fallen women, has been successful. It is expected that it will be opened about the first of May. It is an eminently christian work, and should have the sympathy, prayers, and aid of christians generally.

—DR. HOPPER. Rev. J. E. Hopper, D. D., who started for Florida, only went as far as Philadelphia where, by the advice of physicians, he tarried. He is undergoing a new treatment for bronchitis and consumption, and so far is making satisfactory progress. His paper—the Record—says,—“His cough has been reduced, and he has gained several pounds in flesh. He, however, rejoices with trembling, for his trouble has been one of long standing, and at other times hopes have been raised only to see them vanish.”

—PLEASE ANSWER. Within a few weeks we have sent statements of accounts to several hundreds of subscribers. From a good number we have had replies and remittances. They have our thanks for their promptness. We desire to hear from the others right away. Will they be kind enough to do us the favour of responding at once to the call made on them? Do not delay any longer.

—AN INVITATION. Mr. Moody is being urged by some of his friends to make an evangelistic tour of India. Recently he received a letter from an Englishman strongly urging him to go, and enclosing a cheque as an earnest of his intention to contribute to the expense of the undertaking. The character of the man, his interest in Mr. Moody, and his belief that such a tour would accomplish great good, may be understood from the fact that the cheque was for \$5,000. One who was present when the cheque was received, says Mr. Moody talked of the matter, as he coolly placed the bit of paper back in his vest pocket, as an illustration of the ease with which the Master controls treasure when the truth needs it. The size of this check did not surprise Mr. Moody, who believes that he needs only to wait for his Lord to provide for wants, be they large or small.

—GIFT OF A MILLION. Sir Geo. Stephen and Sir Donald Smith have offered the city of Montreal the gift of \$500,000 each for the erection and endowment of a Hospital for the accommodation of the sick poor of the city, for increasing the facilities for acquiring a medical education, and for the training of professional nurses. The offer was conveyed to the city council last week, and was, of course, accepted. The city is asked to provide the site, a detached section of Mount Royal Park being named as the most suitable place. In their letter to the Mayor Messrs. Stephen and Smith say:

The approaching celebration throughout the Empire of the fiftieth anniversary of the reign of Her Gracious Majesty has led us to think that the purpose above stated might be fittingly connected with the City of Montreal as one of the incidents among any memorials commemorating in a permanent form the beneficent reign of the Queen and the loyalty and affection with which the citizens regard their sovereign.

The Hospital is to be called “The Royal Victoria Hospital,” and is to be for the use of the sick without distinction of race or creed.

It is estimated the \$250,000 will erect the Hospital, and the balance, \$750,000, will be an endowment for its maintenance.

—PARNELL'S LETTER. The London Times created a sensation by its articles on “Parnellism and Crime.” It claimed to know that Parnell, instead of condemning the outrages and crimes committed in Ireland, really gave them approval. And in support of this view it published a fac-simile of a letter, signed by Parnell, addressed to Egan at the time of the murder of Lord Cavendish and Secretary Burke in Phoenix Park. Parnell had publicly denounced the murders, and the letter was intended to explain his public utterance and to pacify those who thought he was not in sympathy with their plan of murder. The letter says:—“I am not surprised at your friend's anger, but he and you should know that to denounce the murders was the only course open to us. To do that promptly was plainly our best policy, but you can tell him and all others concerned that though I regret the accident of Lord F. Cavendish's death I cannot refuse to admit that Burke got no more than his deserts. You are at liberty to show him this, and others whom you can trust also, but let not my address be known.”

Parnell indignantly denies the genuineness of the letter, and he and his friends are in a great state of indignant excitement. The Times takes the matter coolly, and invites Parnell to proceed against it. And this he, of course, will do.

—AN INSULT TO PROTESTANTS. That Quebec is thoroughly Roman Catholic is well known. And that but little regard is had for the wishes or feelings of its small protestant population has been often demonstrated. Just now there is before the Legislature of that Province what is known as “the Crucifix bill.” Here it is:

1. In all Her Majesty's courts of justice in the Province a crucifix shall be placed in a conspicuous place, opposite the witness box or the place where the witnesses stand during examination, and such crucifix shall be of the size determined by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

2. Every court, judge, magistrate, prothonotary, clerk, and other person entrusted with administering oaths shall, before a witness be allowed to swear and give his testimony, call upon him to lift his right hand in front of the crucifix and to place his left hand on the Book of the Evangelists, and to cause him to swear before the crucifix and upon the Holy Evangelists to tell the truth and the whole truth in the cause in which he is to be heard as a witness.

3. Every sheriff shall place or cause to be placed a crucifix in the manner above indicated in each and every of the court houses within the limits of his district under a penalty of \$50 for each day in which he neglects so to do.

4. Such penalty shall be recovered from such sheriff by any person suing for the same before any Circuit Court of the district in which the offence has been committed, and shall belong to the prosecutor.

If it were intended to provide a crucifix to help Roman Catholics in their swearing to tell the truth, there might not be any very serious objection to it, though why it should be required in addition to the New Testament is not very clear. But to demand the recognition of the crucifix by Protestants is simply an insult to their intelligence and a violation of their religious convictions. There is, of course, a strong protest against it by Protestants, and the more enlightened and liberal-minded Catholics also object to it. It may not pass. But the fact that it has been introduced, and receives serious consideration, indicates clearly enough the sort of spirit that is dominant in Quebec—the spirit of the papacy, and that it has not changed any, asserting itself in the old way wherever it dares. The people who could work themselves into a frenzy over the hanging of a cruel and blood-thirsty rebel and murderer, simply because he was a French half-breed and a catholic, can be depended on to do almost anything at the bidding of their ecclesiastical leaders.

—MEDDLESOME. The Parliament of Canada might better employ itself than in discussing Irish affairs and passing resolutions instructing the British Government. The most of the time of Parliament for a week has been consumed in this foolish way. It is quite likely the British authorities will reply by intimating, as once before, in the phrases of official politeness, that the Canadian Parliament would do well to attend to its own business, that when its advice is needed in Irish affairs it will be asked for.

—GROCERS WILL BE INTERESTED in the advertisements of the sale of Whittier & Hoopers stocks in another column.

—BUILDERS should read the new advertisement of J. C. Risteen & Co.

Improper Eulogy of the Dead.

Indiscriminate eulogy of the dead in funeral discourses is a serious wrong, much practised and responsible for much prejudice against the christian religion. The object of funeral sermons ought to be to impress the living who hear them with the uncertainty of life and the need of preparation for the death which is sure sooner or later to come to all. But instead of this, many funeral discourses are devoted wholly or chiefly to sounding the praises of the dead; and often those praises are not at all deserved. The people listening know quite as much of the life of the eulogized as does the preacher, and often much more. And when they hear the deceased praised for virtues which they know he did not possess, and commended for a faith in Christ which he did not manifest, they have contempt either for the preacher who is guilty of the untruth, or for the religion which will permit such things, or for both. We recall a case within a not very long time in which the minister talked about a man's good qualities, and love for his church, and trust in the Redeemer etc., etc., leaving the impression that he lived a good life and died as dieth the righteous, and yet probably there was not a listener to the sermon but knew the man's life to have been everything but christian. We think of another case, also quite recent, in which the ministers eulogized a dead man as though his life had been exemplary and his last days quite saintly, when, as a matter of fact, he had spent his years in keeping a low groggery, and only desisted when by his own drinking habits he had become incapacitated for even that mean business.

What must the unconverted think when they listen to such things from the christian pulpit? They know the preacher is not telling the truth. They must have great contempt for the preacher; he can never impress them when he undertakes to preach to them the precious truths of the gospel; they are likely to attach as little importance to them as to his utterances that they knew to be untrue, for they will reason that a man who is so careless of the truth in one case is quite as likely to be in another. The effect is evil in another way, too. The line between right and wrong is obliterated in their minds. Hearing a character which they knew to be defective highly and unqualifiedly extolled by a recognized teacher of morals and religion, they conclude that after all, moral and religious teachings have no real basis, and that evil is about as good as good.

One thing that has led to the wrong and harmful practice to which we refer is, probably, the desire—a very natural one—of the relatives of a deceased person to have good things said of him. And some ministers have weakly allowed themselves to gratify this desire, greatly to the injury of truth and of those who might, by a wiser course, be helped to better living.

That ministers who are guilty of these things have a kind of popularity is true; but it is a poor kind, and is purchased at the expense of what is infinitely greater value—truth and faithfulness. They are sent for long distances, especially when there is the funeral of one whose life has not been what it should have been, and simply because they can be depended on to give him a good name and “preach him into heaven,” as the phrase is.

We are glad to believe that there is much less of this reprehensible practice than was common a few years ago. But it needs to be stopped altogether. If funeral sermons are of any use at all they should be made the occasions of the most earnest preaching concerning every one's need of present salvation. Failing thus they are worse than wasted providential opportunities.

The “Witness” on Baptist Union.

The Christian Witness—organ of the (so-called) “holiness conventions,” movement—has turned its attention to the question of Baptist Union. In its issue of the 21st inst., it has an editorial of about two and a half columns entitled, “Is it an attempt to legislate heart piety out of New Brunswick?” The article is designed to show that the union movement is such an attempt. If we had the space to spare we would publish it in full, that our readers might see for themselves the spirit and style of the treatment given a subject which many people in the denominations concerned have come to regard as of large importance, and involving in some degree the kingdom and glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.

We can, however, without quoting the full text of the article, indicate its character. And we think that when our readers have learned what is in it, they will agree with us when we say that it is strongly marked by the reck-

lessness of statement which is characteristic of the references of the Witness to men and things that it does not like, that it flagrantly disregards facts, and that it breathes a venomous spirit.

Among the thoughts that first suggest themselves are these,—(1) Why should one not a member of either Baptist denomination be so much concerned about the matter? (2) Why should he think union among Baptists so much more dangerous than union among Methodists? and (3) why should his opposition take the bad form of imputing the worst motives to the friends of union.

There is a reason for these things; for the present we leave our readers to judge what it is, without any suggestions from us. To help to a clear understanding of the Witness article we will classify its statements under three or four heads. It charges against the union movement as follows:

1.—That it “can be accounted for on no other ground than a deliberate determination to form a denomination strong enough to unchurch preachers and people who profess ‘entire sanctification.’”

The fact is that the union movement has not, nor ever had, anything whatever to do with the “entire sanctification” movement; it has not the remotest reference to it. This is well known to the brethren in the Provinces. It is quite possible that the Witness knows it too; but to ignore facts in attempting to further its purposes is no new thing for it.

2.—That not permitting the discussion of the Basis in the denominational papers is an attempt to keep the matter in the dark, and in the hurry of Conference business rush it through without proper consideration, and that it is “a trap to obtain the endorsement of the conference.”

If the editor of the Witness has read the paper which contained the Basis, and the other references to the action of the joint committee on union, (and he should have done so before criticizing that action) he must know the truth of his insinuation that there is an attempt to keep it in the dark. He must know that in submitting the Basis to a general meeting called for the purpose, and subsequently publishing it in the papers, the committee really exceeded their duty, and did so solely that the people at large might know what progress had been made. If the committee had kept strictly within the limits of their duty they would have declined to make any public statement, reserving their statement for the bodies from which they received their appointment, and to which they must report at their next sessions. But they knew that the people, being interested in the matter, desired to know what had been done; they, therefore, called a general meeting, and then, the meeting approving, made the Basis public through the papers. As to keeping controversy out of the papers, it was not only the wish of the editors, but it was the judgment of the general meeting, expressed by resolution. The object must be obvious to anyone who knows anything about average newspaper discussions. It was not only not to prevent consideration of the Basis, but rather to promote the better, cooler and more christian consideration of it. If it had been desired to prevent consideration, the committee had only to keep strictly within their duty, and let no one know what they had done.

All this was explained at the time in both denominational papers, and was, we believe, fully understood by the people generally. The Witness man probably read the explanations, but it suits his purpose to ignore them, and to charge the committee with an attempt to keep the people “in the dark” and to “trap” them into accepting what they do not understand nor want. Such a despicable trick may be—and we regret to believe, evidently is—in keeping with the Witness writers ideas of promoting christian plans; but we beg to assure him that in this region such things are not tolerated among honourable men who do not profess to be christians, much less practised by ministers and others active in christian work. We hope that the doubtful methods of which the Witness seems to be the exponent may never prevail to any extent among a people who have still the old fashioned regard for things honest and straight-forward.

3.—That “provision is made in the Basis for disciplining holiness preachers and laymen,” and for “expelling any holiness church from the body.”

By “holiness” preachers, laymen and churches he evidently means those—if there are any—who have adopted his views and methods. We hope there are none satisfied with so low and poor a standard of manly character, christian life, and methods of religious work as he teaches and exemplifies.

Those who have read the Basis

know that it contains no provision such as the Witness charges. There is simply the provision that all well-regulated christian bodies make for the scriptural discipline of their members. But it suits the Witness to say that this is a special provision aimed at a class. It is proper for us to say that no class was once mentioned, and it is fair to assume was not even thought of, in the framing of what the Witness is pleased to call the “iron-clad” clause designed to expel “holiness” people.

4.—“That among them (Free Baptists) Butler's Theology has been in use for more than twenty-five years; that it has been considered the ‘standard of theology, and that as soon as certain preachers and people made his teachings on entire sanctification practical in their experience, the others of the denomination ‘wished to throw away Butler.’”

This statement contains an unqualified falsehood. It calls for fuller treatment than can be given it in this article, and we pass it now, promising to deal with it in a future issue.

There are other things in the Witness article equally at variance with truth; those we have quoted are fair samples, however, and are sufficient to indicate the matter which their writer has thrown together, and the spirit actuating him in doing it.

It would, perhaps, be inexcusable, though, did we keep our readers in ignorance of the opinion the Witness editor has of the great body of the members of the Baptist and Free Baptist denominations in these Provinces. We therefore quote the exceedingly frank, though somewhat brutal, opinions of some which he apparently glories in holding and expressing. It is a wonder he had not gone so far as to put Hallelujah! in large type and with several exclamation points, at the end of each sentence of his condemnation of them. He says they (those who favour union) are opposed to “heart piety,” and are determined to “legislate” it “out of New Brunswick.” He likens them to certain “wild animals,” naturally hostile to each other, who, in times of freshet, herd together in peace on a bit of land above the reach of the water, but who, as soon as the freshet subsides, return to their old habits of ferocity towards each other. He says they are “like Samson's foxes, they unite not so much to benefit themselves, as to carry destruction to others.” Not satisfied with these two representations, he goes farther and likens the parties to the promotion of the proposed union to Herod and Pilate who “agreed to lay aside their differences and join together to crucify the Son of God.” To say these things of a large number of sincere christian people is scarcely in keeping with the charity that thinketh no evil. But, then, some men seem to regard any dissent from their opinions, and particularly any objection to their schemes, as sure indication of deep depravity, and feel themselves justified in saying the severest things of the dissentients. The Witness man is, we are compelled to believe, a notable representative of this class. It is scarcely necessary to suggest to our readers that the men they know, and have known for long, and whom they have regarded as God's servants, are not what the editor of the Witness says they are—like wild animals, like Samson's foxes, and like Herod and Pilate hating the Son of God and seeking to crucify Him; nor to suggest that they are quite as likely to have an honest and intelligent interest in the cause with which they are connected as is a Boston man, who, whatever his record there, has when in this Province and in his writing about its religious interests, pursued a course that does not at all commend him as a very sound christian nor an exceptionally wise man. We beg most kindly to submit to any brethren who may have been disposed, for any reason, to sympathize with this man in anything, that his attitude towards the cause they love, and his assaults upon those who, as they know, love God and His church with all their hearts, is wholly unchristian. They do not—they cannot, we are sure, agree with and endorse him; and they owe it to themselves and to their brethren and to the cause of Christ to promptly and emphatically repudiate him and his assumed leadership. It is not a question as to whether they are favourable to union or opposed to it, but whether they believe a large proportion of the ministers and other members of their denominations are honest christians, or unscrupulous tricksters, hating God's cause and seeking to destroy it.

OUR PHILADELPHIA LETTER.

Philadelphia has had a Municipal election lately. The new Mayor and staff were inaugurated on the 4th inst, and April 10th was the first sabbath under the new arrangements, and it was certainly a great improvement on the old. But we are yet a long way from what is desirable in the observance of the Sabbath. It was a perfect Sabbath, bright, breezy, and unclouded, and afforded “the powers that be” a fair test of their ability to enforce the restraints promised under the new administration in regard to saloons and public resorts. The conditions were so favourable that, very early in the morning, it seemed as if the entire population of the city was in motion to celebrate the close of the Lenten season and join in the Easter festivities. All sorts of humanity appeared to be out in its best clothing and it was generally conceded, according to the printed reports, that in the city and the suburbs, Philadelphia's streets and public resorts were never occupied with throngs of men, women and children, so generally happy and well behaved. With such throngs in motion, on such a day of jubilee, it has been the custom in this city to throw open the saloons and suburban resorts of festivities of all kinds and characters. In recent years, especially under the late Mayor's rule, the scenes enacted in and about those places were notoriously boisterous and disgraceful. I am informed that nothing of the kind was to be seen or heard last Sabbath, owing no doubt to the new departure in municipal management and the improved police control. The officers, the proprietors of saloons and public houses, and the people generally, appear to have made up their minds that the men in authority meant just what they said when they declared that a new and improved order of things must prevail. It is well that they accepted the new situation so gracefully.—The saloons without exception, so say the police, even closed their curtains down, and perfect quiet maintained. This state of things on Sabbath is spoken of here as something most marvelous; to me it seems passing strange that it should ever have been otherwise. Occasionally the side and back doors were opened to regular customers, but, as a rule, I am told, it was not easy to get access to drinking places, as all entrances were guarded by the proprietors or some trusty employee, and no one was admitted that would be likely to give the place a bad name or furnish

informal sequences, reputations, ferrying out their un-lant, a ing of a vote staff for of cust been r some on the able compl new preven of sid but th the sar all su rowly new law of a dea revo so th Eight and C resort custo day at le prop that pay nigh thos prov little boist tion ed on note adm in t grege men alw of and adm decd was Su bec reg ye ha ing ad me au ke fin se

Muller's Statement.

Rev. George Muller, during his visit to Japan last December, in compliance with a request of the Japanese Christians, seconded by Americans and Englishmen, occupied two evenings with an account of the beginning and