

SPECIAL  
ARTICLES

## Our Contributors

BOOK  
REVIEWS

## THE GENERAL JUDGMENT.

By Rev. Joseph Hamilton.

The Dominion Presbyterian of July 14 had an article on the above topic, copied from the Herald and Presbyterian. I cannot forbear offering a word of criticism. The article says that only good works that have been done to the brethren of Christ will then be commended. But who are the brethren of Christ? The article quotes the phrase, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren;" and it is very positive that only such kindness as has been done to them will be commended.

Will this stand? Are there not brethren of Christ outside of the favored circle of believers? Is not every man of the entire human race a brother of Christ? Did not He Himself take this larger view? Let us see. When He fed 5,000 men by a miracle, did He think of discriminating between believers and unbelievers? Surely not. He simply fed them because they were hungry. And so it was in regard to all his works of mercy. In some cases He might use His power of working miracles as a means of developing faith; but that placed no restriction on His kindness. And is it to be thought He will require more of us than He exemplified Himself?

Besides; How could we know in all cases if men who need our kindness are the brethren of Christ in the spiritual sense? The fact is, that it is not our business always to know. The fact that they are in need that we can relieve, or in sorrow that we can assuage, is all the warrant that we should look.

Otherwise, how the nerve of enthusiasm would be cut—say for missions. Do not men go to the ends of the earth, and toll their lifetime among savages that are certainly not brethren of Christ in the spiritual sense? And will not such heroism and self sacrifice be commended at last, if anything will?

I think the whole mistake arises from the fact of taking the smaller view that believers only are the true brethren of Christ, instead of the larger view that every man of the human race is His brother. The fact is, that we must conceive of different grades of brotherhood, just as there are different grades of sonship. The highest grade is that of Christ Himself. In a sense peculiar to Himself alone He is the son of God. Secondary to Him are the angels. We read that at the dawn of creation "all the sons of God shouted for joy." Then inferior to them are true believers, as where John says, "Now are we the sons of God." Then there is the lowest grade of sonship, as where Paul says, "We are His offspring," putting Himself and the idolatrous Athenians into one class. This large class of God's children is the class that Christ will speak of when He will say that any kindness done to them He will reckon as a kindness done to Him.

If this were not so, what business would Paul have at Athens at all? Or, what business would Christians have in the world? All the good they can do to others would never be named in the judgment. But only let the objects of their kindness be christian, and then even a cup of cold water will be commended! Away with all such insular, Pharisaic judgment. Let the larger truth prevail. God loves the world; that is every man in the world; Christ died for the world; that is for every man in the world; and the spirit is given to "every man to profit withal." Do not these facts put us on the same plane, whether we are Christians or not? Yes, we take that glorious dictum in the large human sense, "All ye are brethren."

## FURTHER CRITICISM OF THE UNION COMMITTEE.

By Rev. A. D. Dobson.

The Union Committee declares that Denominationalism is a reproach, a sin, and a shame to Christianity. Yet this same committee refused to negotiate with the Anglican Church because that church insisted on some kind of recognition of the "Historic Episcopate." The Committee therefore incurred the responsibility of compelling a sister church to remain in the sinful condition of separation because the Committee itself is not broad enough to be unsectarian. It condemns the Anglican Church to perpetual separation unless that church will do what the committee bids it. The grand ideal of "a re-united Christendom" falls at the start in the hands of the men who preach it! "O Consistency," etc.

The Basis is regarded as the master stroke for the cause of union. The committee eulogizes its own work with most delightful simplicity and complacency. This is a pity. Because the Basis is not worthy of the men who compiled it. And with this conviction one could not help wondering whether one who eulogized it so highly as the convener did had ever read it. Certainly a number of his friends who voted for his motion had not read it.

It would be a large task, even for one fully competent, to discuss the particulars of the Basis. For the purpose of these articles that is not necessary. And it is easy, even for the plain man, to pass perfectly relevant and legitimate criticism on certain main features of that document.

It goes without saying that in the construction of any such authoritative statement of Christian doctrine the great distinctive doctrines and institutions of Protestant Christianity should be adequately and unequivocally stated and specifically emphasized. In this basis they are not. Every man is left to interpret as he pleases.

Accordingly there is no definite pronouncement on several of the great essentials. Worship is one of these. It is mentioned only three or four times. "We worship Him." "It's (church's) worship should be administered accordingly to His will." "It is our duty . . . to maintain the public and private worship of God." A Roman Catholic can subscribe to this; he could bring his images, pictures, etc., into the worship and who could forbid him?

The only declaration on the Sabbath is: "It is our duty . . . to hallow the Lord's Day." This is all. Every man decides for himself how he shall keep it.

The same lack of definiteness is clearly seen in the statement dealing with marriage. "It is our duty . . . to preserve the inviolability of marriage." This places no bar on polyamy, no disability on divorcer or divorced. A Mormon or a Turk would probably accept it.

Turning to the Section on Polity one solitary reference will serve to show the character of the committee's work. In chap. 2, paragraph 4, referring to the Pastoral Charge, occur these words: "Their representatives in the next higher governing body . . . shall be CHOSEN AS AT PRESENT." In Chap. 3 par. 18, (2), dealing with this "next higher governing body" and its members, we read: "They are to be chosen in accordance with regulations TO BE

MADE HEREAFTER BY THE GENERAL COUNCIL," while chapter 2, 16, (2), declares that the joint committee of the congregation shall "select" them. If the convener of the committee admires this basis so much as he claimed to do, it would have been a good act to tell the assembly which statement he would have us believe. For to us plain men it looks like a piece of very poor legislation. Before the vote was taken at the Assembly this strange piece of work was shown to learned and reverend doctors who, failing to explain it, pooh poohed it, and voted with the committee. If it be meant as a serious piece of work we would like to have had some light on it. The committee could do better work especially if given another five years, and if they were to give some attention to it. The moderator was probably kinder to the convener of the Union Committee than he knew when he so considerably refused to have him questioned before the Assembly. For if this were not enough there are other matters quite sufficient to discredit the basis and the work of the committee, all of which, in accordance with the earnest wish of the committee, will be laid before the congregations on the second Lord's Day of October. The Union party claim to be working in the interests of us poor rural folk. The city and large town charges, whose pastors largely compose the committee, are not to be disturbed, they will have no sacrifices to make. Their condescension will be appreciated. But most rural pastors will continue to believe that they know a little about their own work, and especially will they need something better than the committee has been able to offer, and when they want it they will probably let it be known.

Fordwich, July 12, 1909.

## OBITUARY.

Mrs. MacCuaig, of Bryson, wife of Mr. Norman McCuaig, superintendent of the Forest Protective Association, died in Ottawa on Sunday. The Ottawa "Evening Journal," in an obituary notice, says: "Mrs. MacCuaig, who had been in perfect health up to a month ago, came to this city suffering from an affliction of the ear. At that time she consulted a specialist. Her condition did not improve, and after a consultation with other physicians it was decided to perform an operation. Her condition was worse than had been expected. Deceased, whose maiden name was Jane Moorhead, was a native of Litchfield, and since 1868 has resided with her husband at Bryson, they being among the first settlers in that district. Besides her husband, she is survived by six children, her death being the first in the family. The sons are the Rev. W. W. MacCuaig, Montreal; Mr. Evans MacCuaig, of the Imperial Life, Ottawa; Mr. James MacCuaig, of the Canadian Railway Accident Insurance Company, Ottawa; Mr. Arnet MacCuaig, Winnipeg; the daughters, Mrs. G. F. Abbott, Ottawa; and Miss Bertha MacCuaig, of the Auditor-General's department.

Mrs. MacCuaig was a beloved member of the Presbyterian Church in her home town, and for many years was the superintendent of the Sunday school. For her geniality and charitable works she was beloved by all, and will be deeply mourned not only in Bryson, but in Ottawa and throughout the Ottawa Valley. The sorrowing members of the family have the sincerest sympathies of many in this great bereavement. The funeral took place from Bryson on Tuesday morning, when a service was held in St. Andrew's Church by the pastor, the Rev. J. Steele assisted by Dr. D. M. Ramsay, Ottawa.