

crowd mind and heart with extreme urgency. Not a few of those who are thus addressed, but not won, will ever be deaf to all religious utterances. Their minds will be as though scathed and burned over. The sweet persuasive tones of Jesus' voice will never again stir their pulses. We, in this city, were unspcakably favored in this respect, by the Evangelist whom God sent us here in '58 and '59*. There was such calm, urgent, logical treatment of the great truths of the cross—so little of the rasping, harrowing, sensational appeals to the sympathies and the nerves of animal excitement—that the hearts not subdued were yet left, we may believe, in a favorable attitude for the future reception of the gospel. We may well thank God for that.

But there is still another point in this connection. The habit of resorting to the labors of an Evangelist is the habit of relieving the Church and the pastor from the most solemn part of their responsibility. What is needed? A revival? Well, how shall we set out to secure it? Why, send straight off to such a man. He never fails. The power of God is with him. That is one way of answering. Can it not be seen that that takes the pressure at once from the pastor and the brethren. It brings upon them, to be sure, another kind of pressure—the running to and fro—the attendance upon multiplied meetings—hours and hours of strong nervous action in scenes of worship and conference. But suppose the work is all laid upon them to do. Who is fit for it? This pastor, how shall he preach for it, and pray for it? These brethren, how shall they pray for it, and visit for it, and labor for it? Close, solemn, and searching questions! Why does the Holy Ghost delay? Who is in the way? Isn't the preaching right yet? Are the brethren cold yet? Why then we must get down lower—we must have broken hearts—we must be baptized anew—we must get power with God—*we—we*—it is upon us—We must get power with souls. It is a great deal easier to say—*invite Mr. Evangelist here*, than it is to melt together and break down a whole Church in penitence and contrition, making them to feel that the work rests with them, and will linger and halt until they are right for it. But this last is far more healthful—a far deeper and more abiding work—more honourable to the Spirit—and ushers in a different future for that Church and people. This sacred responsibility ought not to be relieved. It ought to be piled up upon the heart of pastor and people. "This is your work—you must do it. It is between you, and your God, and these souls. You are to plead and prevail, or the destruction of souls lies at your door." If it be imperatively needed we may have help in our work—but not somebody to do our work for us. That is our great danger. And coupled with the other points suggested, it vindicates the conclusion that the idea of employing evangelistic labor, should be very rarely entertained. It should not be one element in the calculation when we ask what has God for us to do as a Church and a people, for his glory and the honor of his Son. The true answer is: we have all our own spiritual work constantly, faithfully, and successfully to do by ourselves. And if our hearts are not right, nor our hands clean for this work—the awful guilt of denying God the wishes of his heart lies upon us—and we must not run away for help, but repent in dust, and sackcloth, and ashes.

4. Then there is another question. Is there no outside territorial evangelizing work to be performed by the Church? Beside caring for the souls in definite alliance with their own fellowship, shall they do nothing to extend