The Protestant

AND EVANGELICAL WITNESS.

"PROVE ALL THINGS: HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."—1 Thess. v. 21.

Vo. 2. | Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, Saturday, February 23, 1861. | No. 34.

The Protestant,

AND EVANGELICAL WITNESS,

Is issued every Saturday from Haszard's Printing Office, South Side Queen Square,

BY

DAVID LAIRD, Editor and Proprietor.

TERMS:

Twelve Shillings if paid within the First quarter after being taken, or from the date of the last payment; Thirteen Shillings, if paid within the Second quarter; Fourteen Shillings, if paid within the Third quarter: after which, Fifteen Shillings will be charged.

Advertisements inserted at the usual rates. [To prevent disappointment, all advertisements should be sent to the Office before 3 o'clock on Friday.]

[Original.]

Lines

On the death of a little English girl, hardly five years of age, who, in the last hours of her short life, saw angel visions of a future life. She fell asleep, peacefully, on the first dawning of a new year,—perhaps the first little lamb gathered to the fold of God, by the Great Shepherd, in the year 1860. The circumstance, as related to the writer, at the time and on the spot, seem singularly illustrative of the 3d verse of the 10th chapter of St. John's Gospel "He calleth his sheep by name, and leadeth them out;" and as the facts were likely to be read with much interest by many little children, suffered to go to Jesus, if thrown into simple verse, the following lines were penned:—

Ho! strangers to the blessed hope
Of life and joy to come;
List, list to words and infant said,
When called by Jesus home.

Now, if ye prize unvarnished truth,
'T will solemn feelings raise,
And shew you that the mouths of babes
Can perfect be in praise.

Ho! strangers—'tis a truthful strain,
When infant tongues narrate;
No worldly guile or vain conceit
Disguises what they state.

A little saint had not seen five
Full years of mortal strife;
Yet had true knowledge of a home,
And everlasting life.

Her years, I say, were scarcely five,
When death approached her bed,
And told her in two hours' time
She'd number with the dead.

'T was then her vision clear and bright
Saw angels waiting there,
And one of them in accents mild
Said, "lamb of Christ prepare."

And so she turned and earnestly
Besought her mother's aid,
To dress her in her "finest clothes,"
And "brightest shoes," she said.

Her mother's heart indulged the whim,
And dressed her in her best;
And she arose, and paced the room
As journeying to rest.

The little pilgrim then returned,
And laid her feeble frame
Upon the couch that angels watched,
And heard them call her name.

Then melody was in her heart,
And prayer was on her tongue,
And loving thoughts came to her mind,
And this is what she sung:

"I am ready, I am coming,
Kind Jesus, gentle, mild,
Mary's ready, Mary's coming,
To be thy little child."

She saw no more of earthly love,
Her last embrace was given;
She knelt, and turned toward the wall,
And nothing saw but heaven.

Her lifted hands and glowing eyes,
Made death a welcome guest,
And when those two short hours had passed,
Her soul was with the blest.

C. B. B.

Plymouth Brethren.

It appears that Mr Guinness, a now celebrated itinerant preacher, is one of the "Plymouth Brethren," and the question has been asked, what is the origin of this sect, and what doctrines do they hold? As the subject, under these circumstances, is invested with a little more than usual interest, we copy the following from a late Boston paper:—

They are called the Plymouth Brethren "because they originated in Plymouth, in the West of England," but they now call themselves simply—The Brethren. They "originated some thirty years since, and for the most part hold substantially the great and leading doctrines of the Gospel; but as they have no written creed or confession, it is exceedingly difficult to find out exactly what they do hold. Each one is allowed to hold whatever he pleases, consistently with continued practical evidence that he is a real Christian, which includes a belief in the leading doctrines of evangelical Christians. No one pretends in any thing to judge for another, or make his convictions obligatory any further than he can, by more perfectly instructing the other, induce him to accept them. * * * As far as I can understand, they hold the depravity of man, the necessity of regeneration by the Holy Spirit, the atonement by the sufferings and death of Christ."

Mr L. informs us that "the views of the Brethren in regard to the ministry are peculiar. They do not believe in any human designation or ordination to the office of the ministry, but regard all the Lord's people as 'priests' so far as they possess ability." They insist that all are to use their talents publicly, if they are found able to edify the Brethren. "That to them is an indication that God has called them to the work of the ministry in some of its forms, and that then they feel themselves authorized to preach and administer all the ordinances without any human call or ordination. Hence William Carter, the converted chimney sweeper, baptizes as well as preaches, and Lord Congleton, a layman, baptized Mr Guinness. As a body they hold to adult believers' baptism only, but if one comes to them who was baptized in infancy, while they receive him, they generally manage to convince him very soon of the importance of being re-baptized." They observe the Lord's Supper every Sabbath morning.

"In regard to the Sabbath," says Mr L., "the teaching of the Brethren is, that it was never instituted until the time of Moses—that it is not of moral and universal obligation, but was given to Israel redeemed from bondage 'as the mark or sign of their redemption.'" They believe "that when Christ came, the Sabbath was utterly abolished, as were all ceremonial laws." Yet "they regard the observance of the first day of the week, called 'Lord's day', as very important and useful to Christians, and, indeed, as obligatory, as being the day on which Christ rose, and on which a finished redemption was made." They hold that, therefore, "its observance becomes obligatory on real Christians, true converts, just as the observance of the Mosaic Sabbath was obligatory on the Israelites."

The London correspondent further informs us that the Brethren are very active and zealous, their principles leading all their members to try to do good, as they understand it. They have Sabbath schools, and distribute large numbers of sound gospel tracts, and are all, men and women, most diligent readers of the Bible. * * * They are nearly all, I believe, millennarians, and are expecting the temporal reign of Christ for a thousand years on earth."

"From every charitable and benevolent enterprise they exclude all except actual believers, and will have nothing to do with temperance societies, or indeed with any society to which unconverted men give money. * * * I believe their numbers are increasing at present. This winter, they, like other denominations, have opened a number of places in London, where they hold services for the poor and the working classes."

It seems that these singular people came in the way of the missionaries in the East Indies, and Dr Judson, than whom a kinder and more generous spirit towards everything that could claim a Christian recognition never breathed, had his very decided opinion of them. We quote from an account furnished by Mrs. E. C. Judson, and found in "Wayland's Life," vol. ii., p. 364:—

A pious officer called on Dr Judson one day, just as his fever was coming on.

"Why, I can't do him any good. Must I see him?" he said, with a deprecatory smile. "Well, show him in."

I soon discovered, however, that my husband was suffering intense pain, as he very often did during the hours of his fever, and was about to repair my mistake as well as I could, when the visitor chanced to mention the name of a common friend. Dr Judson's countenance instantly brightened.

"You know Major ——, then!" he exclaimed, with warmth.

"Yes; one of nature's own noblemen, is he not?"

"The nobility of nature, or grace, do you consider it?" asked Dr Judson; and then both of them smilingly agreed that there was something of both in their friend.

"I loved him like a brother;" continued Dr Judson, rather sadly. "But, poor fellow! many are the tears I have shed for him of late."

"Indeed!" exclaimed his visitor, in amazement.

"I suppose you know he has taken to certain wild courses?"

"Impossible!"

"Both possible and true. You know something of the Plymouth Brethren, of course?"

Our visitor's features relaxed, though his color was very manifestly brightened,—a demonstration which I understood, but was afraid my husband did not.

"Well, they got hold of poor Major ——," he continued, "and have utterly ruined him—that is, his usefulness to the world; I believe his eternal salvation is secure."

"Then you have no very high opinion of the doctrines of the Plymouth Brethren?"

"Most assuredly not. They do not believe the promises of God to his people, and their influence goes to discourage and paralyze all missionary enterprise; they do not believe in church organizations, and so the poor, ignorant soldiery, and Protestant half-castes, coming under their influence, are scattered as sheep without a shepherd."

"But there seem to me to be many good, spiritually-minded Christians among them."

"Have you never observed that when seekers after sanctification attain to a certain degree of spirituality, they are peculiarly liable to fall into errors of form? Why, it is in this way that the wildest impostors have sometimes gained their most deluded and unquestioning followers. Men long for what they have not, and instead of sitting down at the Saviour's feet, and drinking in his words, they go away to furnish themselves with swimming bladders, the work of their own invention."

"This cannot, however, be said of the Plymouth Brethren. They are especially opposed to forms."

"That is, they throw away the forms of every other sect, and adopt a new set, peculiar to themselves."

"I see," said the visitor good-humoredly, "that you have no mercy."

Dr Judson smiled. "Shall I tell you, my dear,—at the risk of being written down a bigot, what my real, candid opinion is in the matter! When the arch enemy of souls finds a Christian so weaned from the world as to be inaccessible to all the grosser modes of temptation, he just dons the sheep's clothing of Plymouth Brethrenism, and in despair of getting this particular soul, puts a veto on the man's usefulness, to the serious detriment of hundreds and thousands of others."

"Did you know," I inquired, as soon as the visitor had withdrawn, "that —— is said to have a strong bias towards Plymouth Brethrenism, so much so that his best friends are trembling for his stability?"

"Of course I know it," came a faint voice up from the pillow, where the tired invalid had sunk down in utter exhaustion. "You do not fancy me so over-burdened with strength as to throw away any in warning men who are not in danger?"

Is the Free Church free.

THE CARDROSS CASE.

From the days of John Knox, Scotland has been one of the great battle-fields of religious freedom, and the Tri-centennial of the Reformation finds her still the scene of a conflict, on the issue of which the independence of the Church as a spiritual body is staked. In no other land has the efforts to bring the Church under secular or civil control, been more persistent, and nowhere has it been more firmly resisted. The first encroachment was on the part of a popish queen and her obsequious minions, but this was defeated by the sagacity and boldness of the great Scottish Reformer. Then came the insidious policy of the first James of England, less threatening but more dangerous; and subsequently the arbitary measures of Charles I., in attempting, by virtue of his royal prerogative, to enforce the liturgy upon a people who abhorred it. Out of this sprang the rebellion which sent Strafford, Laud and Charles himself to the block, and put the national sceptre into Cromwell's hands.

The restoration of the Stuarts was, for Scotland, but the renewal of the old attempt to subjugate at once her civil and religious liberties. Episcopacy was imposed upon her at the point of the bayonet. Dragoons, with men like Claverhouse at their head, were the Apostles of the new Ecclesiasticism. But the spirit of the nation was goaded to fury, and the old Covenanter learned at once to fight and pray. Persecution could not crush the spirit it had provoked, and the bigotry of the last of the Stuarts provoked nowhere a more vigorous reaction than it did in Scotland.

But even the advent of William of Orange to the throne of England did not fully restore peace. The civil power was jealous of the Church, and sought to control it. And now commenced the struggle against patronage, and in behalf of the independence of Church courts, which was to be continued for more than a century, till it issued in the disruption of the Establishment and the organization of the Free Church.

The grandeur and dignity of that great movement thrilled the heart of every lover of freedom throughout the world. Hundreds of clergymen resigned stipend and manse, and went forth with a noble self-denial to enjoy independence upon voluntary aid, a liberty that was denied them in connection with the Establishment. Many looked on and praised what they dared not imitate. But the noble band, under the lead of Chalmers, exulted in the prospect now opened before them of final deliverance from Erastian policy and civil control.

But this exultation even yet seems premature. The Free Church for seventeen years has received no aid from the State. It has vindicated the sole headship of Christ and demonstrated the vigor of the voluntary principle. It has furnished and equipped itself with schools and colleges, and churches, and missionary organizations, and entered nobly and successfully upon its great work. But at this point, most unexpectedly, it has again come in conflict with the civil authority, and in the great question now at issue, the rights and interests of all the dissenting bodies in England and Ireland, as well as Scotland, are intimately involved.

The circumstances in which the question has been raised, are briefly these. Rev. Mr. M'Millan, a minister of the Free Church at Cardross, was arraigned before his Presbytery on charges affecting his ministerial character. Some of the charges were sustained, and he appealed to Synod. Failing here also, he appealed to the General Assembly, and in this highest Court of the Church, the case was decided against him. There had been an informality, as most American Presbyterians would decide, in the proceedings, a higher court taking up charges of the Presbytery which had been stricken out on appeal to the Synod; and now Mr M'Millan, who by his very connection, as a minister, with the Free Church, was precluded from any resort to civil power to interfere in his behalf, and who on the ground of such resort might have been excluded from its connection, makes his application to the civil court, and demands of it to employ its authority, enjoining the Assembly to review and correct its proceedings.

The advocates of the Free Church maintained that the Court had no jurisdiction in the premises. They denied that there had been any informality in the proceedings, and even if there had been, the civil power had no right whatever to interfere, or order the correction. The case was argued ably and at great length. The decision of the Judge, Lord Jerviswood, was, not an order requiring the review and correction demanded, but what was equally fatal to the claims of the Church to spiritual independence, that the *Constitution* of the Free Church should be submitted to probation, so that it might be determined whether the Assembly had or had not proceeded consistently with its own rules.

It will thus be seen that the decision—so far as it goes—is adverse to the claims of the Church as a body independent in its own proper sphere of all civil control. If the civil court can take cognisance of complaints of ecclesiastical proceedings, it is virtually a court of appeal, and holds at its mercy or caprice, the rights of all ecclesiastical bodies. The Free Church holds, with a tenacity worthy of the descendants of the old Covenanters, that Christ alone is head of the Church, and that she is governed by these laws. These can neither be reversed, repealed or interpreted by any civil court. Yet in face of these positions, on which the existence of the Free Church as a spiritual body is staked, the civil court has decided that she must submit her Constitution—as if it were a mere human compact, or the articles of a business firm—to its inspection.

To this decision the Free Church cannot submit. The old struggle must inevitably be renewed again. The question, beyond doubt, will be carried by appeal to the House of Lords, to be there finally set at rest.

Already the other dissenting bodies throughout the kingdom have taken the alarm. There is, especially in Scotland, a strong and unanimous feeling as to the magnitude of the crisis which has arisen. They are agreed in the solemn conviction that the doctrine laid down by Lord Jerviswood, strikes a blow at the sacred rights of conscience, and at the spiritual freedom of every church in the land. Immediately after the order of the Judge was made, meetings were held of ministers and members of different religious denominations in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and we presume elsewhere, to take the subject into consideration, and committees were appointed, embracing members of the United Presbyterian, Free, Reformed Presbyterian and Congregational churches, who were to take steps with a view to a common course of action in the matter. At Edinburgh, Dr Candlish made a lengthy and powerful speech, in which he endeavored to show that the church might as soon surrender her whole controversy as yield the principle for which she was forced to contend. Other speakers and correspondents coincided in this view, and it unquestionably represents the convictions of the immense majority of the Non-Established churches of Great Britain.

Thus, after three centuries of struggle, the ground of conflict has been narrowed down to the simple issue—whether under the English Government, there can be really any such thing as a Free Church—a dissenting body, where spiritual decisions are independent of civil control or interference. When this question is settled, the long struggle of centuries which has signalized the history of the Scottish Church, will have reached its close.

The Religion of Paying Debts.

The following remarks from two contemporary papers contain a lesson worthy of serious consideration:

"Men may sophisticate as they please. They can never make it right, and all the bankrupt laws in the universe cannot make it right for them not to pay their debts. There is a sin in this neglect as clear and deserving Church discipline as is stealing or false swearing. He who violates his promise to pay, or withholds payment of a debt when it is in his power to meet his engagement, ought to be made to feel that in the sight of all honest men he is a swindler. Religion may be a very comfortable cloak under which to hide; but if religion does not make a man deal justly, it is not worth having."

Good! every word. So if you owe anybody a cent, in your possession, go and pay it. If you have none, go work, dig, ditch, work incessantly at any honest work, until you get it and pay it out. You will breathe freer, sleep easier, eat and digest better. You will honor and love all men and yourself more. Do you owe your merchant? Pay him, or stop buying. Don't eat your bread without paying for it, or knowing that you can whenever it is wanted. Otherwise it won't fatten you, and will bring on physical and moral dyspepsia. Do not forget that little subscription for your editor and preacher. Have you paid up both? It is a small amount, but their income is made up of *littles*. He that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much. You will enjoy your paper a thousand times more: the sermons you hear will seem infinitely better if you know you are not in debt to either your printer or pastor.

Frederika Bremer's Interview with the Pope.

The portraits of the Pope are in general like him; but his full, short, broad countenance has, when seen more nearly, less expression of kindness, and considerably more of self-will and temper, than the portraits exhibit. The glance of the blue eye is lively but not profound, and is deficient in earnestness. The complexion and physique generally, indicate the best of health, a good appetite—and a good cook.

The Pope cast his eye on a written paper which he held in his hand; and, having inquired about my country and place of residence, added, "You have written somewhat?"

Myself—Yes, your Holiness; novels of domestic life—more properly descriptions of life, but in the form of novels.

The Pope—But you are a Catholic?

Myself—No, your Holiness, not a Roman Catholic.

The Pope—Then you must become one. There is no completeness or consequence out of the Catholic Church.

Myself—Permit me, your Holiness, to ask a question.

The Pope—Yes; ask it.

Myself—I love with my whole heart our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. I believe in His divinity; in His redeeming efficacy for me and the whole world; I will alone obey and serve Him. Will your Holiness not acknowledge me as a Christian?

The Pope—For a Christian! Most certainly! But—

Myself—And as a member of the Church of Christ?

The Pope—Ye—s, in a certain sense; but—but, then, people must acknowledge as true everything which this Church says and enjoins. You ought not, in the meantime, to believe that the Pope sends to hell all who do not acknowledge the infallibility of the Catholic Church. No, I believe that many persons of other creeds may be saved by living according to the truth which they acknowledge. I believe so, most certainly.

Myself—It delights me infinitely to hear this from your Holiness, because I have cherished the hope of finding in your Holiness a more righteous judge as regards these questions than in many other Catholics, who say, "You are not a Christian; you cannot be saved, if you do not, in all respects, believe as we and our Church do."

The Pope—In this they are wrong. But you may see, my daughter, people may give an account of their Christian belief—not believe alone in general, but believe in the separate parts of a doctrine. It is already something to believe in the second person of the Godhead, and in His incarnation; but it is necessary also to believe in the institution which he founded on earth, otherwise there can be no reality, no faith in him. And people must believe the Pope. The Pope is Christ's representative on earth. In Sweden people do not believe in Christ and in his Church. In Sweden intolerance exists towards those who think different to themselves. The King there has twice endeavored to introduce religious freedom, but they would not have it!

Myself—I know it, your Holiness; but Sweden in former times suffered from Catholics in the country, and old laws still remain unrepealed in consequence. But it will not long be so, I hope. My countrymen will learn to have confidence in the power of truth and of Christianity.

The Pope—Your reigning Queen is Catholic.

Myself—Yes, your Holiness, and the noblest of women, an example to her sex, an ornament to the throne!

The Pope—All Christian princes and people ought to believe on the Pope and obey him. Their not doing so arises from pure pride and a worldly mind. Hence State Churches have arisen. The Emperor of Russia will not acknowledge the Pope, because he wishes to be Pope himself. Queen Victoria will not acknowledge the Pope, because she herself will be Popess; and so it is in every country where there is a State Church. Belief in the Pope, as the head of the Christian Church, is the only rational and consequent thing; it is that alone which leads to unity and clearness. The Church is an organization—a representative monarchy, with its supreme head—a spiritual State. If in a State people will not obey the supreme head, then there can be neither clearness nor order—everything becomes confusion.

The Unity of Protestantism.

The following remarks of the Rev. Dr Norman M'Leod on this subject, in a speech delivered by him at a public meeting in Glasgow, are worthy of perusal:

But we are taunted by the want of unity amongst Protestants. It is said that the results of the Reformation have been a failure. But what kind of unity, let me ask, is demanded or expected? Is it the unity of a living church, or of a dead churchyard? The unity of life, with its necessary diversities of thought and action, or the unity of death, head to head and heel to heel? For what is a man but a dead person, when he makes another person a substitute for his conscience, his reason, and his will? Which unity is desired? The unity of life or of death? Or, to take another illustration, is it the unity of a mighty multitude listening eagerly to music, each man differing from his neighbor in the degree of his musical taste and culture, in his estimate of the productions of the greatest musicians, yet all hearing and all enjoying the music? Or, is it the unity of a similar multitude, without any difference of opinion among them, either about music or musicians; but this result having been gained by the sacrifice of hearing the anarchy of difference destroyed by the placid reign of indifference—all errors in individual taste and judgment being abandoned only because a priest's judgment has been made the rule for all, while the man glories in being deaf, and being guided solely by the authority of his church, or of a remote tradition? Which unity, I ask, do you demand? I think we can be at no loss to determine in what that unity consists which is alone worth striving after, worth living and dying for. It is the unity of life and character, the unity of love to Christ and our fellow-men, through faith in Himself, the Head of all and the Brother of all. It was for this unity alone Jesus prayed when he desired "that all might be one, as thou, Father art in me, and I in thee." What can this mean but the unity of a common life; for the only real schism in the Church or out of it is the schism of our souls from our Maker, and therefore from one another, through the reign of "self;" and, consequently, the only real unity is the restoration of our souls to God and to one another, through the reign of Christ and the spirit of love in the heart. Now, Protestantism did not itself profess to secure this unity; it professes only to obtain for man the means by which under God, this unity can ever be realized. But while Protestantism professes only to secure the means of unity, I ask with confidence whether the grand result has not been attained in an incomparably greater degree through this means than through the Papacy? Only compare the faith in Jesus Christ as a living Saviour, and the reality of love to him and reverence for his laws—the Christian character in short—of the clergy, the laity, and the families in Protestant and Popish countries, and in which will you find the greatest amount of this true unity? Now, if the theory of Protestantism fail from its nature to produce this spiritual unity, how, let me ask you, does Rome propose to attain this object? By what better process is the schism to be healed between man and God and man and man? Is it by concealing the Word of God? Is it by trampling upon human freedom, and denying the holiest rights of conscience? Is it by the tyranny of priests and of kings, of the Antonellis and the Bombas of Europe? Is it by the horrors of the Inquisition, and by bloody persecutions, never confessed, never repented of by Rome, never confessed with shame or with sorrow by any of her Popes or by any of her prelates. Is it by such means that unity is to be produced? Lest men should wander in the wrong path, their eyes, forsooth, must be put out, and a priest sent to lead them by the hand. Lest they should hear evil their ears must be stuffed, and a dumb priest sent to instruct them. To Rome Papal we may exclaim as the old British chief exclaimed to Rome Imperial—*Ubi solitudenum faciunt pacem appellant*—"they make a solitude and call it peace." We maintain, therefore, that our Protestant congregations possess more than exists in all the world besides of the only kind of unity which mortal and responsible men can possess, and which enlightened Christians desire.

Treasury.

Be Ye Reconciled.

How wonderful it is that God should take the attitude of a supplicant, in inviting—in *beseeching* sinners to be reconciled to himself! but how much more wonderful that sinners should refuse to be reconciled to him! Yet thus it is. God beseeches. Sinners refuse. "As though God did beseech you by us," says the apostle, "we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." Wondrous words! How full of grace!

God is now sending out the message of the gospel, and that message tells us of a love so great, that He gave his only begotten Son to take the place of the sinner—to bear his iniquities, and to suffer death under the judgment which they demanded, in order that every one of the guilty race of Adam, whoever and whatever he may be, who comes as a lost and ruined sinner, and trusts in Jesus for salvation, "should not perish but have everlasting life." (John iii. 16.) God's love could not have been manifested in a more marvellous way. The gift of Christ was the proof of God's perfect love to sinners. And what has Christ done? He voluntarily took upon himself the mighty load of guilt, and died under it.

Man by sin had forfeited life, and therefore Jesus gave up his life in man's stead. His blood shed on Calvary has thus made a perfect atonement for sin. It was sufficient—yes, infinitely more that sufficient, from its own intrinsic and divine worth, to blot out "the sin of the world." This is God's estimate of the blood of Christ; and now it is his gracious will that the message of free pardon—of full remission of sins—should be proclaimed to perishing sinners *on the ground of what Christ has done*. Christ has wrought a work on the cross, which fully displays the glory of God, as a God of infinite grace and perfect holiness. Christ has met all God's demands upon the sinner, and therefore salvation is now freely given to every one who trusts in Christ as his Saviour.

Reader, if you value the blood of Christ as God values it—if you look upon it as He looks upon it, your soul must trust in in it as the ground of perfect confidence towards God. God has accepted the blood of his Son as an atonement for sin. He looks upon it as having made satisfaction for sin. If you do not so accept it, but make light of it, and think it insufficient, and cannot trust it, then there is no other way in which your sin can be put away. God can do no more for you; for He says, "*without shedding of blood* there is no remission" of sins; and Christ having offered himself "once for all," there is now "*no more sacrifice for sins.*" (Heb. x.) Rejecting his sacrifice, you seal your own destruction.

Dear reader, let us once more say to you; every hinderance to your return to God has been removed by Jesus on your behalf, and God now invites you to return to him. He beseeches you to be reconciled. If you refuse, you refuse to be saved. You despise God's grace. You put indignity upon the blood of Christ. You reject the offers of mercy, and so you must be left to perish.

Oh! reader, think of these things. Think of the love of God that yearns over perishing sinners. Think of the agony and death of Jesus on their behalf, and say, will you reject it all. Think what joy there is in heaven over the sinner that repenteth. Oh; will you not be one of that happy number who receive Christ as their Saviour, and who shall forever dwell in the very presence of God, in a region of blessedness and glory, which the heart of man has never conceived?—*Am. Messenger.*

Familiarity with Jesus.

When Jesus is present, all is well, nothing seems difficult; when Jesus is absent, all is painful. When Jesus does not speak within, our comforts are paltry; but if He utters only one word, great consolation is felt. Did not Mary immediately arise from the place in which she was weeping, when Martha said to her, "The Master has come and calleth for thee?" O happy hour, when Jesus calls thee from tears to spiritual joy! How unfruitful and spiritless thou art without Jesus! How foolish and vain to desire anything except Jesus! This is a greater loss than the loss of all the world. What can the world bestow upon