

THE
Canadian Evangelist
PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY
BY THE
Evangelist Publishing Co.
65 YONGE ST. ARCADE, TORONTO.

Terms \$1.00 per annum in advance.

GEORGE MUNRO, Editor.
DONALD MUNRO, } Publishers.
C. C. CRAWFORD, }

All matter intended for publication, and all exchanges to be addressed to George Munro, 65 Yonge St. Arcade, Toronto, Canada.

All business communications and remittances to be sent to the EVANGELIST PUBLISHING CO., 65 Yonge St. Arcade, Toronto.

Remittances sent by post office order or registered letter will come at our risk.

No paper discontinued without express orders and payment of all arrearsages.

In ordering change of address be sure to give the old post office as well as the new.

TORONTO, APRIL 16th, 1891.

Home Missions.

THE MAY COLLECTION.

Judging from the number of churches which have heretofore responded to the request to take up special collections twice a year for Home Missions, we conclude that the plan is well adapted to the circumstances of the congregations of Disciples in Ontario. And the sums contributed on these occasions indicate a genuine and intelligent interest in the work on the part of the brethren. These considerations lead to the hope that the next special collection asked for will be generous, and ample to meet the demands of the Home Mission work at the present moment. It is believed that the work undertaken by the Board of the co-operation this year is not beyond the ability of the Disciples in Ontario to support. It is true, we believe, that more money has been raised for the support of the local work of the churches during the present year than ever before. And it is only fair that due allowance should be made for that. But when that has been done, there still is no reason for doubting that the amount necessary to sustain the mission points can well be spared by the brethren; that it can be spared without taking us to the region of self-doubt. How many of us have ever gone that far in any way to further the cause of our Master? How many of us have denied ourselves in certain ways in order to gratify ourselves in other ways?

We do not know that it is necessary to multiply words here. It is a plain case. By the direction of the annual meeting the Board of the co-operation has undertaken to contribute so much towards the maintenance of six preachers of the Gospel who are laboring in six fields where their presence was greatly desired, and where they are all now, as we learn, doing much good. The Board promised to aid those points, depending upon the brethren to furnish the requisite funds. Their expectations in previous years have not been disappointed and they trust that they will not be now. It seems to be needful from time to time to stir up the pure minds of the brethren by way of remembrance; many, who, when their attention is drawn to the matter, give with cheerfulness, would probably not give at all if not prompted to do so. Some almost take it as a slight if they are not personally solicited. Those facts account for and justify what some may look upon as unnecessary and offensive appeals. They are not unnecessary, and they are not intended to be offensive. Some when the matter is presented to them have the air of one who should say, "Why didn't you ask before?" There is not much danger—we might say no danger—of hurting the feelings of an individual or a congregation by kindly laying before them the needs of the mission field,

and as kindly urging them to do what they can to supply those needs. Earnest Christians are thankful to have their duty impressed upon them; they grow to love those who faithfully exhort them to do their part towards the evangelization of the world. And in this connection we beg to say that the elder or preacher who does not urge the congregation to do its full duty in this regard, not only does the congregation a grievous wrong, but denies himself a precious privilege.

Yes, brethren, it is a plain case. Let there be cheerful and liberal giving on the first Lord's day in May, that there be no deficit in the mission fund, and that we may go forward to another year's work joyfully and hopefully, assured that the Lord will not fail to bless us exceeding abundantly above all that we can ask or think.

"Turn."

We have frequently given our readers extracts from the *Sunday School Times*, and have now and again commended it to them as one of the best papers in America, and we have always been pleased when we have been instrumental in leading some live preacher or Sunday school worker to become a subscriber to it. We give prominence here to a paragraph from that paper. It directs attention to a fact we have often labored to impress upon congregations in addressing them. It gives what should be a death-blow to one of the most persistent and pernicious ideas of calvinistic theology:—

A word may mislead, or a word may direct aright. One word mistranslated in our English Bible may be the cause of endless harm, and the correction of that translation may need repeated calls to its notice as a means of making clear an all-important truth of inspiration. A Greek word that means "turn" is translated, in our English New Testament, "be converted;" and, in consequence of this error, thousands and thousands have sat waiting in their sins to be converted, when they ought to have been on their feet turning square about in accordance with the specific command of God. In the Revised New Testament the term "be converted" is not to be found, the correct word "turn" being always in its stead. Every preacher and every teacher has a duty to proclaim the truth that the gospel message to every evildoer, in or out of the church, is "Turn;" but it never is "Be converted."

Yes, "thousands and thousands have sat waiting in their sins to be converted, when they ought to have been on their feet turning square about in accordance with the specific command of God." Do you not believe it? We could give you instances—pitiful instances—inexpressibly pitiful instances—in confirmation of that statement. Instances of earnest, pious souls longing for light and pardon, longing to rest in a Father's mercy and a Saviour's love—waiting, waiting, waiting for what never came to them, and passing into the beyond broken-hearted. At whose hand shall their blood be required?

The *Sunday School Times* is correct as usual. The word of command from the great Captain of our salvation is: "Right about face," and not "Right about face—stand," but, "Right about face—MARCH." Let us all take heed therefore, and "Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward."

As to true friends, choose them with great care, and let their number be small. Have no friend who does not fear God, who is not wholly governed by "the truths of religion. To friends like these open your heart without reserve, and keep nothing secret from them but the secrets of others.—Fenelon.

"The Christian Church."

ITS CARDINAL PRINCIPLES.

The *Christian Sun* publishes at the head of its first page the following as its cardinal principles:—

"1. The Lord Jesus is the only head of the church.

"2. The name Christian, to the exclusion of all party or sectarian names.

"3. The Holy Bible, or the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, a sufficient rule of faith and practice.

"4. Christian character, or vital piety, the only test of fellowship or membership.

"5. The right of private judgment and the liberty of conscience, the privilege and duty of all."

From the fourth "principle," we infer that any person having "vital piety" would be admitted by the *Sun* to church membership, whether baptized or not.

One may have water sprinkled upon him for baptism, be immersed, or, like the Friends, repudiate water baptism entirely, and yet, according to the *Sun*, be eligible to church membership. We wonder how it settles the question why Cornelius was baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.—*Missionary Weekly*.

The *Christian Sun* is published in Raleigh, N.C., and is described as the "organ of the General Convention of the Christian church"; and it is for this reason that we place the clipping from the *Weekly* here. By "the Christian church" is to be understood that body of people with whom the Disciples in Ontario had some conference with a view to union a year ago. The comment of the *Weekly* on the fourth "principle" needs no added word from us.

We should like to have explained to us how the Holy Bible can be a sufficient rule of faith and practice as "principle" three asserts, and as we believe, while, at the same time, according to the practice of "the Christian church" the teaching of the Bible in regard to baptism is so indefinite that it cannot be determined with certainty what baptism is, and that it may even be left an open question as to whether baptism is an ordinance of Jesus Christ. If the Bible were that kind of a book, we would not hesitate to denominate it an "insufficient rule of faith and practice." We would kindly advise "the Christian church" to so amend "principle" four as to bring it into harmony with "principle" three. And we would respectfully say to whomsoever it may concern that so long as the Bible is held as a sufficient rule of faith and practice, so long will it be necessary to maintain that it teaches clearly what baptism is, and declares definitely whether it is now obligatory upon those who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ.

"As Becometh Saints"

The Apostle Paul, in 1 Cor. xi. 20, not only rebukes a practical evil in the church in Corinth at that time, but suggests a principle which Christians should constantly have before their minds when considering what is proper and what is not when the church is met together in one place to worship. The Revised Version, we think, more accurately sets forth the apostle's thought in the twentieth verse than the authorized version does, in the reading, "When therefore ye assemble yourselves together it is not possible to eat the Lord's supper." Verses 21 and 22 explain why it was not possible for them to eat the Lord's supper—that is, not possible for them to do the very thing they came

together to do. There was conduct entirely incompatible with the orderly and devout observance of the ordinance and to such an extent that "the supper" could not be said to be eaten at all. We need not say that was a great wrong.

The principle suggested is, that whatever has a similar effect or tendency with regard to any of the recognized and scriptural parts of church worship should not only be viewed with suspicion but scrupulously avoided. Everything that is out of harmony with the time and place and purpose of meeting together should be rigidly excluded. One of the most inharmonious things in a house of worship on the Lord's day is—we shall not say undue levity—but levity. It does not comport with the religious tone of the Old Testament and the New, nor with the religious instincts of the human soul. It chills the atmosphere of the house and the heart of the worshipper. It is a foe to devout aspiration and an enemy to the serious reception of the truth.

We were set upon these reflections by a consideration of what we must consider the unfortunate and painful circumstances which gave occasion to the letter from Bro. Edward Trout, which appears in another column. Though deeply grieved by those circumstances, and unpeppably disappointed that so auspicious an occasion (as we thought it and still think it) should have been marred in such a way, we had decided to pass the method of raising money by in silence, out of respect to the members of the congregation, many of whom we know entirely disapproved of it, and few, if any, of whom will now, we trust, defend it. Should any one say that silence in such a case is not golden, we shall not take the trouble now to dispute with him, but simply say that the criticisms pronounced and severe that we heard from many of our own brethren, and heard of as coming from others, led us to believe that without any word of ours that method of raising money would not soon again be used by our brethren. While holding this opinion we did not feel at liberty to prevent Bro. Trout from being heard in THE EVANGELIST, and it seems proper that as we allow Bro. Trout to speak we should also express our own sentiments, which we have done, perhaps, with sufficient fulness and in all kindness we know towards all concerned. What we have written is rather by way of warning for the future than of censure for the past; for we believe we should be slow to censure where we have reason to think all was meant for good.

Here is a pointer from Texas for our premiers and all others interested in preventing corrupt practices at elections:—

The Texas legislature has done at least one good thing. The new election law provides that in cities of 10,000 inhabitants or more, when the vote of a person is challenged his vote shall be refused, unless, in addition to his own oath, he proves by the oath of one well-known resident of the ward that he is a qualified voter in that ward, and then both oaths shall be indicated on the record and the ballot shall bear the word "challenged." These ballots shall be kept for at least six months after the election, and all fraudulent voting and false swearing are subject to penalty. *Christian Courier*.

How a truth is told has much to do with making a truth attractive or repellant. It is not enough to speak a truth that ought to be spoken: it is needful to speak it in such a manner as to influence in its favor those who hear it spoken. A fault may be pointed out in a spirit that will prompt

the one corrected to turn from that fault, or in a spirit that will tend to fix him firmly in its defence. When a prominent English artist was told that his portrait of Ruskin flattered its original, his answer was: "No, it is only the truth told lovingly." How much more of gladness of heart, and of added interest in the right, there would be if the truth, when it was told, were always told lovingly! But in order to tell the truth lovingly we must first look at it lovingly.

The above, from the *Sunday School Times*, brings to mind what Paul says, in Eph. iv. 15: "Speaking the truth in love." Those desiring to reach men with the truth injure their influence exceedingly when they forget that rule. And yet it seems very easy to forget it. When people appear to us to be unwilling to receive what we conceive to be the truth, our method of presenting the truth is very apt to become unlovely. But that method seldom, if ever, wins.

This from the *Canadian Advance* is worthy of being passed around:—

Young George Vanderbilt is building a castle in North Carolina, which will require ten years of labor and the expenditure of from \$8,000,000 to \$10,000,000 to complete. Two strangers in a strange land were found on the streets of Toronto, during the past week, penniless and homeless. An investigation made by a local contemporary into the condition of the poor of this city has revealed many cases of distress that were startling even to those who thought that they knew something of Toronto's poor. Were it necessary, we might quote from such valuable works as "How the Other Half Live," written by Mr. Jacob A. Riis, of New York, and from other indisputable records, showing the extent of poverty in all our cities on both sides of the Atlantic; but who does not know of these things? \$10,000,000 to build a castle for one young man; thousands without a roof over their heads, nor a "bite" to satisfy the terrible cravings of a starved stomach. We are no alarmists; but who will dispute the statement that there is something radically wrong in the social conditions of any country where paradoxes of this character find an existence.

It occurs to us to say that one way in which these inequalities may be lessened is for the laboring classes to be careful how they spend what money they do receive. Let them cease to aid in building up millionaire distillers, brewers, tobaccoists, etc., and instead start an account in the savings bank.

"Don," of *Toronto Saturday Night*, is sound on the school question, as witnesseth the following paragraph:—

As far as a State is concerned, as far as we as citizens of a country can be concerned, education, either secular or paid for by the State, must be confined to the idea of improving citizenship. We cannot unite on a doctrinal method of making each voter sure of Heaven, but we can unite on a system likely to make each voter more fit for earth. It is for this improvement of citizenship and the proper enjoyment of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness by each individual, for the fostering of that which is good within us and the repression of what is bad, that we have government; and it is only by sticking to earthly matters that we can unite in insisting upon a government satisfactory to all. If the Roman Catholic church believes that this government is incorrect, it has the privilege of removing its supporters to such countries as may entertain a different idea as to the purpose of citizenship and the chief ends of being. Where Romanism has worked its system without opposition it has been such a dismal failure that now in Roman Catholic countries religion has less to do with politics and with the most approved method of advancing civilization, than in those lands where the church holds the balance of power. In such places they are strong because they can influence votes.

It betrays a great lack of confidence in their system when Roman Catholics