

THE Canadian Evangelist

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

BY THE

Evangelist Publishing Co.

55 YONGE ST. ARCADE, TORONTO.

Terms \$1.00 per annum in advance

GEORGE MUNRO

Editor.

DONALD MUNRO, Publishers. C. O. CRAWFORD.

All matter intended for publication, and all exchanges to be addressed to George Munro, Editor, Toronto, Canada.

All business communications and remittances to be sent to the EVANGELIST PUBLISHING CO., 55 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 arrears.

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

TORONTO, FEBRUARY 16th, 1891.

Foreign Missions.

The first Lord's day in March, as heretofore announced by Bro. McLean in THE EVANGELIST, is the day on which we are asked to take up a collection for Foreign Missions. For particulars we refer our readers to Bro. McLean's appeal in last number, and also in this issue. It would not be easy to add anything to what he so well sets forth. We can, however, state our convictions, and show our interest in and sympathy with the work. We think the foreign work is worthy of the cordial support of all our brethren, and we are confident that those who are most familiar with its nature, and with its past results, present condition, and future prospects are its warmest and best liberal friends. We do notice in some papers attempts to belittle and ridicule the work and the workers, but we are much mistaken if earnest Christians, who themselves prize the Gospel and enjoy its blessings, can be persuaded that it is wrong to undertake to convey the knowledge of Jesus Christ to those who know Him not. If the heathen have no right to receive the Gospel, who will prove our right to it?

We also see criticisms as to the manner in which the Foreign Society is managed, which criticisms are evidently intended to dissuade the Disciples from contributing to the support of the work carried on by the society. It is very likely that the managers of the society, being men, have made mistakes, and it is not improbable but that they make mistakes in the future; perhaps they are making some now. But what of that? Who does not make mistakes? We have seen nothing established which reflects upon their integrity as men, or their loyalty as Christians to the Gospel of Christ. We have heard nothing which prevents us from considering them to be men of excellent judgment, as likely as any, and more likely than their critics, to manage the business wisely and well.

Many who have no objection to the work or the method of its operation may say that, though they approve of the work and are disposed to aid it, they are unable to do so. The demands made upon them for home work are so urgent and so great that there is nothing left for their foreign work. We are not going to combat the idea that "charity begins at home," nor to intimate that there are no Christians who because of home calls are unable to give something to support the missionaries in heathen lands, but we do not hesitate to express the opinion that there are few who are justified in offering that as a reason for giving nothing. And the principal ground for our opinion is that few, if any, people who handle money at all spend it wisely. Let any one keep a detailed account

of his expenditure for a month or two, and at the end of the period note how five cents here and ten cents there went for naught, making up in the total perhaps a dollar or two. Now our point is this: before a Christian declines to support Foreign Missions on the plea of poverty he should be quite sure that he is economizing at the right place. Are there Christians who claim to be so poor that they cannot give one solitary quarter per year to convert the heathen, who leave many a quarter in the course of a year with the confectioner, the tobacconist, or mayhap the saloon-keeper? Are there such Christians? Are any of us such Christians? Let each answer for himself before God.

We do not believe in urging Christians to give more than they can afford to give, but we do urge them to give what they can afford. And we leave it to each man's conscience to decide what it is his duty to contribute.

As we are only asked to take up one collection for Foreign Missions during the year, every church and every Disciple should endeavor to make the offerings on this one occasion as large as possible, that the missionaries may not suffer, and that where enlargement is necessary it may confidently be undertaken. No doubt, but one reason, if not the chief reason, why the contributions were not much larger than they were last year, was because only one collection was asked for instead of two, as in former years. We trust the Disciples in Ontario, and throughout Canada, will not fail to do their full duty in the matter of assisting to send the Gospel unto the ends of the earth. The Committee asks for \$1,500 this year from Canada. Judging from past performances we think that sum can be raised if the Maritime Province brethren take hold with a will. Let us all, brethren, do what we can, and the Lord will bless us.

The Canadian Baptist Again.

In the January 22nd number of the Canadian Baptist there is the following editorial note:—

In the last two numbers of the Canadian Evangelist much space is given to a reproduction of the discussion touching Articles of Faith which was recently concluded in our columns, and to comments thereupon. It is our wish, of course, that the editor of THE EVANGELIST, like all others interested, should exercise his own judgment and form his own conclusions in reference to the positions taken and the arguments advanced in the Baptist. Two remarks only seem to us to be due, in courtesy, in reply to THE EVANGELIST's strictures. First, in its number of January 1st, it says, referring to our remark that the Disciples are, in effect, a sect as much as any other denomination: "We shall thank the Baptist to point out in what respect the Disciples are a sect, in the sense that they require as tests of fellowship more or less than the New Testament requires." Our reply is that it is just as easy to found a sect upon a negation as upon an affirmation. Unless we seriously misunderstand much that THE EVANGELIST has said, it holds both that refusal to accept a man-made creed in general, and certain specified statements of belief in particular, is essential to membership in the Disciple body. In the issue of January 15th, it states distinctly that "Disciples do regard baptism as in some way a means of salvation." Both the negative and the positive statements of belief, whether right or wrong in themselves, are clearly sectarian tests. Of course no sect will admit that it holds more or less than the New Testament requires. Secondly, in the last number THE EVANGELIST says, touching our remark on the statement of the Committee of Disciples that Baptists hold that baptism is "because of the remission of sins," after quoting a Baptist contemporary, "We think the editor of the Baptist should withdraw the charge of misrepresentation."

We were under the impression that we had already withdrawn the word objected to, "misrepresentation." If we have not, we cheerfully do so, so far as it implies any charge of conscious wrongdoing. We try to treat our critics with courtesy. We should be sorry to accuse or suspect the Committee of intentional misrepresentation. Of course, this does not imply any admission that the fact that a number of Baptists hold a certain theory proves that theory to be a Baptist doctrine, or a term of membership and communion in the Baptist denomination.

We regret that the Baptist has not soon fit to pay greater attention to our "strictures." We humbly hoped that the cause of truth as distinguished from sectarianism might have been furthered thereby. Were it not for the fact that we have received from preaching brethren, and other competent judges, many words of cordial approval of the manner and the spirit in which we conducted the discussion, we might think that our "strictures" merited but scant attention at the hands of our contemporary, the Baptist. As it is we are inclined to suspect that the real reason for the Baptist's disposing of the matter so summarily is that the editor feels that the longer the discussion is prolonged the more evident it becomes that "C. G." and not he is the true baptist, and the more proof is forthcoming from Baptists themselves that the Committee of Disciples accurately measured and fairly stated the Baptist position so far as they undertook to do so. And by the "Baptist position" we mean, as we supposed the editor of the Baptist would have understood from the first, the position of what "C. G." might call the "Regular Calvinistic Close Communion Baptists," to which school of Baptists, "C. G." avers, the Canadian Baptists belong.

We are glad the editor of the Baptist felt it to be due, in courtesy, to make two remarks in reply to us, and we thank him for the opportunity thus presented of removing a misapprehension he, and no doubt many others, entertain regarding the Disciples. The Disciples do not make the "refusal to accept a man-made creed in general and certain specified statements of belief in particular essential to membership." If we wrote anything that would justify the impression that they do, we wrote what is contrary to the fact. The Disciples as a people have constantly, earnestly and energetically opposed the use of man-made creeds as tests of fellowship. We have never heard of a single congregation of Disciples using such a creed in such a way. Neither have we ever heard of the refusal to accept, or the willingness to accept, a man-made creed, being made a condition of church membership by any congregation of Disciples. In fact the Disciples ask no such unscriptural and authorized questions. Neither do the Disciples make any particular view as to what has been called the design of Baptism a test of fellowship. It is true a particular view justified by the plain words of the Lord Jesus and His Apostles is commonly held by Disciples, but they do not demand subscription to that view as a condition of church membership. Here again they make no unscriptural and unauthorized demands, nor are credibly informed many, if not all, Regular Baptists do, nay as even the editor of the Baptist himself would. What the Disciples hold is this, that a person who believes with all his heart that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ the Son of the living God, who reports toward God, confesses with his mouth Jesus as Lord, and is baptized (immersed) in the name of Jesus Christ into the name of the Father

and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, is a Christian in the full New Testament sense, and entitled to enjoy all the privileges of a church of Christ, anywhere and everywhere, so long as he maintains a godly walk and conversation, which consists in observing whatsoever Jesus has commanded through His inspired Apostles. They require no more and accept no less as tests of fellowship. And this let us say to the Baptist and all other enquiring friends, herein is the peculiar strength and peculiar glory of the position of the Disciples. It is solid New Testament ground, and when the Baptists as a people stand thereon they and the Disciples will be one in fact if not in name, and in fellowship.

As to whether the Baptists as a people—the Regular Calvinistic Close Communion Baptists—hold that baptism is "because of remission of sins," we challenge the editor of the Baptist to show that such is not the prevailing, if not the universal view held by that people,—and held as a test of fellowship. If space permitted we would undertake to show that the editor of the Baptist holds that view and makes it a test of fellowship. We think the Baptist is in courtesy bound to give this point a thorough treatment.

A Word to Dancers.

E. L. Powell, of Louisville, Kentucky, is now delivering a series of discourses on "Our Perils." The sermons are being issued in supplements to the Apostolic Guide. The first was on "Perils of the Stage"; the second on "Perils of the Dance."

We subjoin an extract from the latter, and ask any of our readers who may think there is no harm in dancing whether the quotations Bro. Powell makes from Dr. Pentecost should not prevent every Christian lady, nay, every pure-minded lady, from engaging in the modern dance:—

"Dr. G. F. Pentecost is my authority for saying that the chief of police in one of our largest Eastern cities told him 'that seven-tenths of all the girls who came to a bad end, were tempted to their fatal stop through the seductions of the modern dance; that the destroyers of girls could not prosper in their nefarious business without the help of this alluring agency.' Pardon these plain words. As God is my judge, I have no other desire than to sound an alarm. Those of you to whom I speak to night may pass the falls without loss—having all the excitement incident to such adventure; but how many, alas, in making the dangerous passage, sink to rise no more! No one can afford to run the risk. The passage is too perilous. Allow me to call your attention to another fact in regard to 'attitude' and 'grouping' in the modern waltz. Would any one attempt to defend the propriety of such attitude apart from music and motion? Dr. Pentecost, from whom I just now quoted, gives the following clipping. As it is part of a letter from Miss Olive Logan to one of the New York dailies, I am sure you can take no offence from my reference to it. She says: 'I heard of a rather amusing reply, given at a ball the other evening by an American girl in London society, who had strayed away from the ball-room. Her mother subsequently found her in a remote room with a gentleman, who had his arm around her waist, while she rested the tips of her pretty little fingers on his manly shoulder. 'Daughter, what does this mean?' exclaimed the irate mamma. Saucy cheeks looked up calmly and replied: 'Mamma, allow me to introduce Capt. X— to you. I had promised him a dance, but I was so tired that I could not keep my word, and I am giving him a sitting-still waltz instead.' Is there a mother who is willing that her daughter should grant a 'sitting-still waltz' to any young man of her acquaintance? But if the attitude is harmless, surely no objection can be offered consistently to such a waltz. If the attitude is im-

proper under such circumstances, it is equally improper with the accompaniments of music and motion. It seems to me impossible to defend the round dance of our modern society."

We have not the slightest doubt but that the waltz is one of the devil's devices for undermining moral purity and Christian character, and the wonder to us is that any Christian can possibly say a word in its defence. Bishop Coxo, of Western New York, said officially to the clergy and laity of his diocese:—

"The gross, debasing waltz would not be tolerated for another year if Christian mothers in our communion would only set their faces against it, and remove our daughters from its contaminations, and their sons from that contempt of womanhood and womanly modesty which it begets. Alas! that women professing to follow Christ and godliness should not rally for the honor of their sex, and drive these shameless dances from society."

And Gail Hamilton declares that "the waltz in its very nature is unclean and cannot be washed." And who that has ever seen persons waltzing can deny the allegation? And what can justify Christian people if they give any manner of countenance to such a practice? Christians are to think on the things that are pure, and lovely, and of good report.

Do we hear some one say, There are other things just as bad as dancing? That's quite true. Let Christians shun them too.

Canada's New Party.

We are not going into party politics, but we have a word to say about "Canada's New Party." Its organ is the Canadian Nation, whose motto is, "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." That is a good motto from the good book, and we wish the Nation good success in impressing that truth upon the Canadian people. We have not now before us a copy of the platform of the New Party, but from an editorial in the Jan. 29th No. of the Nation we gather that one plank is that "the command, remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy, is firmly and conscientiously and unyieldingly believed to be binding upon the community." So it follows that Canada's New Party is a sectarian, judaizing party and as such is bound to go to the wall. Does not the Nation know, and do not the leaders of the New Party know, that there is a great and increasing number of Christians who do not believe that the fourth commandment is obligatory upon anybody now, not even upon Christians, much less upon the community in general! For a new party the New Party is away behind the times. The New Party then shuts its door in the face of every one who does not believe that the Jewish Sabbath law is binding upon Christians. Since the Nation has adopted a scriptural text for a motto, it cannot object to our appealing to the Apostle Paul, who says to Christians, Col. ii. 16, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days." So the Nation and the New Party take issue with the Apostle Paul.

By the way, how many of those who hold the fourth commandment as binding upon them keep it even moderately well!

"Please find enclosed \$1.00 for THE EVANGELIST for another year. I like its style and would not afford to be without it. I am glad it has changed to a semi-monthly. Its aim is good, and I think that much good will be effected through its columns. Do not weary in well doing, in due season we shall reap if we faint not."