

barrassment and suffering to which they are subjected, by our inability to meet their orders. Could these cases be spread out before the Christians of this country, in all the particulars of domestic privation, and the curtailment of ministerial usefulness, they would draw tears from the eyes, and, we cannot but think, would draw relief from the hands, that now withhold the needful pittance.

And now, *what shall be done?* We wish the churches distinctly to understand that **THE MISSIONARIES ARE SUFFERING**. It is not a mere *curtailment* of the operations of the Society, which results from the want of funds; not simply the necessity of *declining to send our new missionaries*; but the actual distress of those already in the field. Christians, *your* agents, *your* brethren, sent out to do *your* work, commissioned on the faith of *your* support, are in want; their wives and then little ones are suffering a privation of food and raiment. Says one in a recent letter to the Corresponding Secretary:

"I had counted on the amount due to me to meet some engagements; but for these the Lord will provide. I am willing to live poor, and have to do, whether I am willing or not. At this time I have not a potatoe nor a mouthful of meat in the house, nor means to buy it with; but the Lord will provide for us."

Another Missionary who had made a small draft on the Society, apologises for it as follows: "I received your circular on the 21st June, and am sorry to say that my draft on you had previously been paid away. I had no cow, and scarcely any bread for my family, and the distress under which our country groans, is so severely felt in this region, that my people were unable to assist me in any manner. I have received from them only to the amount of eight dollars in the last five months."

Through the prevailing pressure in most instances, the people aided by the A. H. M. S. are unable to meet their engagements to their ministers, and the latter, have been led to contract debts, for the necessities of life, hoping for better times, and supposing that at least their *missionary* appropriation would be forthcoming when due. The trials of feeling which they suffer in view of the apprehended dishonor to the cause of religion, should they not be able to pay these debts, are more painful than even the privation of bread. One writes, "it was with deep sorrow that I heard of the embarrassed situation of the A. H. M. S., and your desire that I should defer my order for money. I have been compelled to run in debt for several necessary

articles, and I was just on the point of making out my draft when the letter came to hand. Dear sir, what shall I do? I am in debt, and those debts will soon be called for. My situation is trying."

Another, who had disposed of his drafts to a person who is not a Christian, but one "who prides himself on punctuality in pecuniary matters, and narrowly watches professors in this respect," expresses strong solicitude that the amount may be paid, lest the honor of religion should suffer.

Another whose order had been despatched two days before receiving the circular of the Executive Committee "would not have it returned for half its value."

We might multiply extracts giving the same general view of the necessities of these men. But these are sufficient to present the question of duty to the reader. Help must be had, and that quickly. Some of the Missionaries have most nobly relinquished the whole or a portion of their claims on the Society; but this can be done but in few instances and in no instance can it be done except with the prospect of great privation. And while they are thus setting the example of self-denial and liberality, shall it not be followed by the churches? We entreat the disciples of a Saviour, who lived in self-denial, and died amid suffering and scorn for our sakes, not to shut up his bowels of compassion from his ministers—his faithful laborers, whom he has pronounced "worthy of their hire."

By order of the Executive Com. of the A. H. M. S.

We hear much in certain quarters of the efficacy of the *voluntary principle* to supply a country with religious instruction, and reference is often made to the United States as a noble exemplification of its complete success. So persuaded are the people of the United States of its efficacy, that ministers would not dare in that country to whisper a doubt that *it is not the best mode* of providing for the ministry, although the most painful evidences of its insufficiency, and of the sad and numerous evils incident to it, are constantly obtruding themselves on their experience. Of late many in Britain, deluded by the representations that are made respecting the manner in which religion