

## Canada.

## Our Heritage, Our Opportunity, Our Responsibility.

BY H. P. ADAMS, TRURO.

What a land is ours! Mountains of iron, fields of coal, forests of timber and ribs of gold, with a fertile soil, furnish the equipment for a fifty or a hundred million population. The direction and position of our mountain ranges running east and west render deserts impossible. Hence our valleys laugh with plenty, and our little hills skip like lambs because of abounding fruitage. No Sahara defies the farmer, and no Simoons devastate his fields. Here cyclones and earthquakes are unknown, while sunshine and shower alternate to bless his tillage and fill his barns. The great rivers and lakes, with our famous canals, furnish a unique highway for commerce from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to Lake Superior. Canada is in the zone that subjects its inhabitants to neither the enervating influences of the torrid nor the paralyzing influences of the frigid zone, but in the zone where they can work ten hours a day all the year round.

To us it is an inexplicable providence that every section of the habitable parts of this continent have become populated except Canada. The United States has 70 millions, South America 33 millions, and ere long both those sections will be too full of people for comfort. Today Canada's proportion of land to every man woman and child is nearly one square mile. Here is the largest tract of habitable land with the smallest proportionate population in the world. I say habitable, because the vast Sahara desert is 3000 miles long and 1000 miles wide but uninhabitable. What a train of suggestions follow a reception of these facts. Does it not seem as if a divine plan had included this reservation of Canada? Does it not appear as if God had hidden this splendid Dominion from the eyes of the Old World for so many years for a purpose? What that purpose is time alone will reveal. And for aught we know Canada and Africa may be sequels in the divine plan.

We know the first permanent settlers in Canada were the French, who arrived at Quebec in 1608. The soldiers and Jesuits seemed to have come together, the latter exploring the country in all directions. But only a few years elapsed before England sought to set her ships in the great St. Lawrence and her soldiers' feet on Canadian soil to contend for the supremacy. For a hundred years "The flag of England and the flag of France waved in war's alternate chance."

France had the first opportunity in Canada to lay deep and broad foundations for a new France. It was indeed wonderful what a golden opportunity the Latin races had to conquer and attach the whole of this vast continent to European crowns. With Spain very early taking possession of Florida and Mexico, Cuba and Bermuda and hundreds of minor islands, and France spreading small colonies all over this Dominion from Port Royal, Annapolis, to Hudson Bay, the whole continent lay at their feet, a magnificent spoil for division. But with all the advantages of first discovery and first conquest the Latins were not destined to hold the land for many centuries. Whatever one may say as to the thirst for empire, or the relative strength and prowess of contending nations for the largest possessions of the habitable globe, I believe that God makes distribution of lands to those who hold them as stewards. Spain's mighty navy and France's dashing soldiery were no substitute for fidelity of trusteeship. I know that much has been written on racial distinctions to demonstrate that God is giving great portions of territory to nations because of their Saxon, Slavic and Germanic origins. But I do not incline to that theory. I do not think race has anything to do with God's partition of the great reserves of the earth among the nations. I believe that fidelity to trusteeship, as expounded by our Lord in Matthew 25, is the principle on which divides lands and peoples to others.

There is not a country conquered by British arms that is not a better place to live in now than before. The Briton slew the Kalifa's fighting dervishes last year, and this year their children are going to school. Half a century ago the Pijis were wild cannibals, this year their children are reading the Bible, fingering the organ and footing the sewing machine. And who can paint India a century ago and India today without the same results.

According to Rom. 15: 24, "Whosoever I take my journey into Spain I will come to you, for I trust to see you in my journey." It seems as if Spain had a very early opportunity of receiving the gospel some six or seven hundred years before England. But her unfaithfulness to Christ and corruption of her preachers led to her degeneration. These in turn led her to treat her colonial possessions as feeders to her selfishness, which meant slavery and demoralization for the natives. Her colonies are transferred.

France's best effort for this great Dominion was to flood it with priests and Jesuits, propagating a perverted version of Christianity which meant bondage of the will and ignorance of the mind. Canada was transferred.

The Dutchman's best effort for South Africa was to enslave the natives and block the march of civilization. The Transvaal will be transferred.

It is strikingly true that England's moral and spiritual resurrection, dating from the Reformation, was followed by her colonial expansion and these two are parallels today. What the English soldier's sword has done for his monarch, the English Christian's Bible must do for his King. As the land has been won for the lower realm in which Victoria's sceptre rules, the people must be won for the higher realm in which Emmanuel's sceptre sways.

The land is our heritage but not the people. The statesman may secure their votes, but he cannot attach their hearts. For a hundred years there has been a war waging in the moral world in Canada as to who shall rule the hearts of her people, the King of Kings or the pontiff of sovereigns.

As the thousands are pouring into our Northwest, the war will wax warmer and hotter, till the flames or the Tiber triumphs. Mennonites and Scandinavians, Germans and Galicians, Icelanders and Doukhobors are pouring into our fair Dominion by thousands. Now word comes that the Finns are fascinated by our fair name, our fair land, and fraternal welcomes. We need not go beyond our three limits to be fishers of men, for Foreign Missions are at our doors.

As Baptists we have a mission to these people distinct and definite. We have no "shibboleth" to pronounce, we have no creed to inculcate. We stand where no other denomination stands, and we offer what every other denomination in part withholds. We abide within the two covers of the Bible for all we hold and teach.

Most of these people fled their native lands because the infamously cruel priests of the Czar's church, and of Austria's King, forced them to believe things not found in God's Word. They are being besieged by Rome's and Russia's priests in the Northwest to come under the wing of the cruel monsters who drove them to the land of the free.

But Galician and Doukhobors stoutly refuse priest and paternoster. They ask for the Bible. They are turning to the Baptists for the truth, for the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. A gracious Providence has brought to our missionary committee two noble men of Russian birth, able to preach the blessed gospel to these people.

These people coming from the land of priestcraft and superstition are asking for bread, and shall we give them a stone? They ask a fish, and shall they be given a serpent? They ask an egg, and will they receive a scorpion? Yes, if we do not do our duty. Are we not responsible to the extent of our ability? And are we not able to give these thousands the Bread of Life? If we are let us do it and end the controversy.

Canada is ruled today by the heads east of Lake Superior. But as surely as that Winnipeg is only half way between Halifax and Dawson City, so certainly is it possible that five million votes may one day be cast on the west side of Lake Superior, and then where will we be. Do we desire that the fruit borne on the national tree of the future be strong and noble and of the true New Testament kind? Then we must attend to the root today. Do we desire that the superstructure of our national life shall grow grander as it nears the headstone? Then the foundations must be of the divine origin, true to the plumb-line, and wrought in by men of God.

## Theological Contrasts in England and America

BY THE REV. CHARLES S. MACFARLAND, PH. D.

The recent International Council, bringing together the leading preachers of Congregationalism from Great Britain and America, about fifty of whom appeared upon the platform, gave opportunity for comparison and contrast. There were two or three very significant points of contrast, both as regards manner and matter.

Nearly all of the American speakers appeared with carefully prepared manuscript, which they generally read verbatim, with only occasional attempts at anything like oratorical effect. Sentences were carefully chosen; rhetoric was good; subjects were handled logically; but the appeal was mainly intellectual, and won intellectual assent. In some cases the reading was almost dull. There was little, if any, of the hortatory tone; the evangelistic fervor was wanting. They were seldom stimulating in any way except intellectually. Each paper was a clear, straightforward presentation of the case, with no attempt at special pleading of any kind. The witnesses were brought into the box; the truth was told; but the advocate did not further urge his suit.

But not so with the speakers from abroad. They were more contemporaneous. They rose to eloquence. They had genuine paths. They could not rest satisfied with merely presenting the truth; they were there to plead for it. They sought not only intellectual assent, but to awaken moral and spiritual feeling. They did not read to the Council; they preached to it and admonished it. Nearly every address had its eloquent peroration. It closed with an appeal. "Suffer a word of exhortation" was the earnest request of one speaker. They were thrilling, tender, simple and moving in their appeals. They sought not only to gain consideration but to effect conviction.

The American speakers sought to present the truth. Those from over the sea pressed it. They not only gave it, but forced it upon their hearers. This is not to say that our own speakers were men incapable of preaching in this sense. There would probably not be anything like so great a contrast between their preaching on Sunday and that of their foreign brethren. And yet this distinction, so marked in the Council, does indicate a certain difference between the Congregational preachers in the two lands. Our men make more of the intellectual appeal and far less of the evangelistic, hortatory method. And this is not to be traced to differing scholarship. This same type of preaching is even more marked in such men as Stalker, George Adam Smith, Forsyth and other men of superior scholarship. Mr. Moody draws assistants for his British campaigns from among men of scholarship, even including theological professors. As preaching is commonly regarded our colleagues from over the sea are ahead of us. We may convince; but they do more, they persuade. But still more marked, and to most of us more to be wondered at, were certain contrasts with regard to what they preach. For one thing, there were fewer illusions to criticism and its results from the lips of the visitors. We know that this is not because they are behind us in welcoming criticism. They are altogether freer, and have always been less fearful than we. They have received it with relative complacency. One or two interviews revealed their attitude. One young Welsh preacher remarked to the writer: "We ignore it in our preaching. Do we accept it? Yes indeed. But we don't talk about it in the pulpit." Said another, an older preacher: "We feel that literary questions are not so important as the substance of the revelation. Criticism underlies our preaching. But we don't bring its questions into the pulpit. There's no need of it, and the people don't want it."

The most marked difference was one distinctively theological and more specifically Christological. Evidently, to the British preachers, the cry, "Back to Christ," does not mean just what it does to us. They would say, indeed, that it means more. Their meaning came out most clearly in the now celebrated address of Dr. Forsyth, but it cropped out in others. In a peroration magnificent in its style, passionate, fervid, profoundly reverent and solemn, Dr. Forsyth declared that "the final seat of authority is in the Cross of Christ as the Forgiver and Redeemer; Christ is King, not as the Son of our Creator, not as the Logos of our reason, or as the ideal of our soul, but as our Saviour." "The seat of authority . . . must stand forth either as an institution or as a person in an act. There is but one authority. It is the grace of God to us sinners in the Cross of Christ. The Ethics of the future must be the explication of the cross, and of the cross understood as a Gospel . . . as an atonement. He redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." In many such striking sentences Dr. Forsyth declared the theory, known of old as that of the "blood-atonement," as the very heart of the Gospel, as the Gospel itself. It was penal-satisfaction pure and simple, clear and explicit. To the young preachers who have been influenced by Horace Bushnell (and who has not), this came like lightning out of a clear sky. It was so old that it was absolutely new. The fervidness and eloquence of the speaker's appeal aroused a tremendous enthusiasm, and one American preacher-delegate called for a hymn ("There is a Fountain Filled With Blood"), which we have not heard for years except at camp-meeting. Whatever we may say of its faulty philosophy and of the gaps in its attempted theological connections, it will become, in some sense, an epoch-making address, for it was one of those utterances that set men to thinking and lead them to reconsiderations. It was a classic of its kind.

This same note was struck by the foreign speakers wherever it was natural or possible to bring it in. Their sermons in the Boston churches on Sunday touched the same chord. The impassioned words of these earnest preachers, asserting the heart of the Gospel as being in the person, Jesus Christ, met quick response in the hearts of all. But this definite attitude, basing everything on a literalistic view of the atonement met strong dissent which did not find open expression in the Council only because there was no time or opportunity for discussion. The distinction between the American and British point of view came out, however, in a natural way. Dr. Gladden, in commending Prof. Graham Taylor's address, referred to a speaker of the day before, and affirmed: "The Sermon on the Mount is not a secondary element in the Gospel." And then Rev. Mr. Ritchie, of England, retorted: "In reply to Dr. Gladden's remark concerning the relative place of the Sermon on the Mount, I would say that to carry out the Sermon on the Mount you need a dynamic; and the only power that can realize Christ's ideals is in the person of our Redeemer and in his cross."

Here, indeed, is a profound contrast. In New England probably two-thirds of the Congregational preachers hold the so-called moral view of the atonement. Most others, while holding that the atonement has another aspect, still feel that the significant thing is its moral influence. The parable of the Prodigal Son is the