

THE Canadian Evangelist PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 85 WELLINGTON ST. NORTH, HAMILTON, ONT.

Terms, \$1.00 per annum in advance. GEORGE MUNRO, - Editor and Publisher.

All matter intended for publication, and all exchanges to be addressed to George Munro, 85 Wellington Street North, Hamilton, Ont. All business communications and remittances to be sent to George Munro, 85 Wellington Street North, Hamilton, Ont. 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 a dealing change of address, be sure to give the old post office as well as the new.

HAMILTON, MAR. 15, 1894.

Baptists and Disciples.

Before reading what follows it is desirable that the article on page two, copied from the Canadian Baptist, should be attentively considered.

Disciples are as thoroughly congregational as Baptists, not to say more so. No man or body of men has, or could have, any power to arrange for a union of Disciples with any other body of believers. But it does not follow that there would be any impropriety in a company of Disciples meeting with a company of Baptists and comparing notes. Such a conference might bring the two peoples nearer together.

As to the name "Disciple," we remark:—

1. The wearing of a sectarian and unscriptural name is sinful, as the Apostle Paul teaches, 1 Cor. iii. 4 "For while one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not carnal?" We wish to avoid that sin by calling ourselves by the name the Lord himself most frequently used to designate His followers.

2. In proposing a basis upon which all believers in the Lord Jesus might unite, our brethren found, in order to make the basis complete, that they were under the logical necessity of discarding all sectarian names, for it is certain that if union is ever brought about, the united body will not wear any of the current sectarian names, but rather some one or all of the New Testament names.

3. When Disciples speak or write exactly they do not call themselves the Disciples of Christ, but Disciples of Christ. This fact should mollify our denominational friends somewhat.

4. Will the editor of the Canadian Baptist be so good as to tell us on what principle he objects to our wearing the name "Disciple," and yet himself (shall we say?) glories in the name "Baptist"? Is he not conscious that in appropriating to himself and his denomination that name he is insinuating that his brethren are the only baptized ones in the world? We do not charge that he holds such a view, but the name he chooses to wear says so. We shall not accuse him of bad taste, for we believe he is a cultured Christian gentleman, but we are under the impression that his logic is somewhat at fault. If our Baptist brethren wish to have a good case against us on the name, they must first cease to call themselves Baptists.

We are sorry the Canadian Baptist does not regard denominational divisions as so very bad a thing. The Apostle Paul regarded divisions in the churches in his day as very bad; and then they had not gone the length of denominational divisions. How much more evil would he consider the condition of things that now exists! And right here let us say, no one understands the Disciples who does not know that it is with them a scriptural certainty that denominational divisions are not only an evil, but a sin. This is

a dominant thought in the mind of every intelligent Disciple, and serves to explain why Disciples "are continually denouncing sectarianism."

According to the version we saw of Dr. Tupper's note to the Watchman, that gentleman did not say that the Disciples "lay undue emphasis on the external act of baptism," but that they "are in error in the emphasis they place upon baptism." So far as the external act is concerned, they insist that that is complete immersion, but Baptists do not count that undue emphasis, unless it might be some of those English Baptists who receive unimmersed people into their churches.

With regard to our supporting our views of the emphasis that should be placed upon baptism by quoting texts, we beg to say that that is where we have the advantage of our Baptist friends. They cannot support their views in that way. We do not say that they do so by mis-quoting texts; but we have observed them engaged industriously in an effort to explain away the obvious meaning of a text. For example take Acts ii. 38, "When Peter said unto them, repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Disciples say we should take that just as it reads; Baptists say "for the remission of sins" means, "because of the remission of sins," and teach that unless a person's sins are already remitted he is not a fit person for baptism; and they make that view a test of fellowship. Disciples say that if a person who is pricked in his heart by the knowledge that Jesus is both Lord and Christ, asks, "what must I do?" he should be told to "Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and he will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit," but that is only saying what Peter said in like circumstances. But the Disciples do not make any view of the relation of repentance and baptism to the remission of sins a test of fellowship. We should be greatly obliged to the editor of the Canadian Baptist if he would give us his interpretation of Acts ii. 38. We shall be happy to lay it before the readers of the EVANGELIST in full. We are sure he does not understand the commonly accepted view among the Disciples, else he would not consider its "spiritual influence" dangerous.

Referring to the expression, "to admit of compromise," which closes the next to the last article we are discussing, we desire to say that Disciples have no thought of proposing a compromise of God's truth. They might compromise on untaught expedients, or even yield their peculiar practice altogether. But with regard to God's truth, our business is to understand it and stand by it.

We now come to the last paragraph of our contemporary's article. If the Disciples are as "narrowly sectarian as any other body of Christians," they are false to their fundamental principles. They should not be a bit sectarian. What is it to be sectarian? It is for one Christian to hold himself aloof from another Christian without a scriptural warrant for so doing. If Disciples violate this rule we shall be thankful to have it pointed out and we shall do what we can to show them a more excellent way. What is a sect? It is a society professing to be a church of Christ which demands more or accepts less in order to membership than the Lord authorizes. And by that rule the Disciples are not a sect, while the Baptists are. With regard to our seeing ourselves as others see us, etc., we are glad to be able to say that an increasing number of Baptists are coming to see us as we really are, and as a consequence, notwithstanding our imper-

fections, are loving us better and desiring more ardently that we and they may be one.

We cannot do better than close this article by quoting here a paragraph which expresses our sentiments and convictions:

In the Central Baptist we find the following comments on the "basis of union" printed in the Guide last week: "We are decidedly of the opinion that a union of the two bodies will never be effected by treaty, or contract, or articles of agreement. The union must come, if at all, by the gradual approach of both bodies to the doctrine and spirit of the Scripture. There are real differences of profound conviction, and there are prejudices. The steps toward union, it seems to us, will be in the order: Unconscious and natural approach toward each other in doctrinal views; enlargement of the spirit of brotherly love; the fading out of unholy prejudices; co-operation in the work of the Lord. The two bodies may grow into one, and then the union will be blessed and permanent; they may compromise themselves into one, but the union can not and ought not to last. For the union of all God's people we pray—union after the divine method." It is instructive to find how nearly alike are our own and Baptist views upon such a matter. We agree exactly with the Central on this matter. —The Christian Guide (Disciple).

A Patriotic Speech.

Sir C. H. Tupper, Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the Dominion Government, delivered an address on "Canadian Footprints" in Hamilton, on the evening of Feb. 15th. It was interesting and patriotic. It is always pleasing to see and hear a prominent party politician on a non-partisan platform discussing a non-partisan theme. It disabuses one's mind of the impression which the youthful and uninitiated often receive that political opponents would slay each other without notice, if the law of the land did not provide a penalty for murder, and that he has no disposition and no ability to treat any subject but one of present practical politics and that in an offensively party spirit.

Sir C. H. Tupper declared himself to be a Canadian, who is proud of Canada's past, not ashamed of her present, and hopeful of her future. Here is one of his paragraphs:

"What country has the making of a better nation than Canada? We have the best people of great nations, and a climate that is the best and most invigorating in the world, and the only difference between the two great political parties is that each is trying to do the most good it possibly can for the country by the policy which it believes to be the best."

Now that is well said, and we are more than willing to believe that it is all true. We have always had faith in Canada, and we have some time ago come to the conclusion that our public men, even those of the opposite party, are not all knaves, but not a few of them high-minded men who are honestly seeking to further the best interests of the country. Sir Charles referred to the Hon. Edward Blake as "one of the grandest specimens of a British Canadian." This graceful recognition will not probably cause any Reformer to vote the Conservative ticket, but it may suggest to some of both parties that it is not well to conclude that a politician who differs from them is necessarily a scoundrel.

Notes.

Toronto is the stronghold of British sentiment and of the Canadian protectionism which finds fervent love of the mother country available as a safeguard against American competition. Englishmen who visit Canada form their notions of Canadian sentiment from what they hear at Toronto or at Ottawa, which, as the official city, is of course the center of attachment to the existing system. If they went among

the farmers, especially in the border counties, they might form a different estimate.—Christian Evangelist.

The above is given on the authority of Goldwin Smith, writing in the Nineteenth Century. Goldwin Smith is a master of expression, and as a rule is, no doubt, a well-informed man. But in the present instance he is very wide of the mark. One of the best informed editors in the Dominion says that there is less annexation sentiment in Ontario now than there was twenty or twenty-five years ago, and according to our observation it is growing less every year.

TORONTO, March 1.—That the liquor dealers consider the plebiscite vote as something of importance was shown by two meetings which were held here yesterday. From all over the province prominent brewers and distillers gathered to discuss the result of the vote. The meetings were held with closed doors. The distillers met at Gooderham & Worts' offices. There were present, Messrs. "Harry" Corby, of Belleville; Jos. Seagram, of Waterloo; H. Walker, of Walkerville, and J. P. Wiser, of Prescott. The state of trade and the threatened approach of prohibition were the topics of discussion. Sir John Carling and Messrs. J. L. Labatt, D. J. McCarthy, ex-Ald. Thomas Davies, Eugene O'Keefe, J. Steeman and representatives of several Toronto breweries met at the Queen's. "Plebiscite and Prohibition" were the subjects of their talk, and the meeting lasted all afternoon. The gentlemen deny that politics were mentioned and said that the subjects were only of interest to the trade.—Toronto Correspondence of Montreal Witness.

The above indicates that prohibitionists have accomplished much and is therefore an encouragement. It also suggests that there is still much to do, and is therefore a warning.

A Winnipeg exchange says: "The question of amalgamating the several church congregations in Rapid City is being agitated, the object being to have fewer ministers, thus enabling the people to grant a proper and remunerative salary." The present would seem to be a favorable time for "amalgamation" of this character in Manitoba and the Territories. No one can spend a few months in that western country without being impressed with the surplus of churches in towns of limited population. A place of five or six hundred people, all told, will have three or four churches. It is needless to say that all these churches are not supported by the people themselves; they are mostly on the mission list of the great ecclesiastical bodies in the eastern provinces. If necessary, examples might be cited of these unnecessary divisions of the people among three or four denominations, when the entire population is not equal to the support of one pastor and one church, although the work is doubtless hard enough for all who are there, even if they were all pulling one way, instead of all pulling different ways. Certainly, church union should be encouraged in a country such as our Northwest, which is being newly settled, and where the circumstances of the early settlers favor union and co-operation in most matters.—Montreal Witness.

The remarks of the Witness illustrate the sin of denominationalism. And we quite agree that there are special reasons for urging church union for the Northwest. We should like to ask the Witness to set forth a basis on which all the Protestant bodies in that region might unite. How would immersionists and affusionists manage?

Our Omnibus.

We are pleased to hear that Bro. James Beatty was so far recovered as to be able to leave Omagh for Toronto some time ago, and that he is now going about.

WALKERTON, Mar. 7.—I will be at liberty to visit any church for one or more Lord's days during this month and the first of April. I will at once respond to any call. E. SHEPPARD.

Here is a postscript to a letter received from one of our Ontario preachers the other day: "THE CANADIAN EVANGELIST is a credit to our cause. I am proud of it." Thank you, brother, very much. N.B.—That preacher exhorts the brethren to take the EVANGELIST and pay for it.

We have received an invitation to attend the exercises of Laureation of the Cleveland University of Medicine and Surgery, on March 20th. We are pleased to find in the list of candidates for laureation the name of our old friend, Bro Hiram Brown, of Warton. We heartily congratulate him upon the realization of a cherished project, and wish him much success in his profession.

Feb. 17th was made a very eventful and happy occasion at the residence of Bro. Wm. East, Marsville, by the marriage of his youngest child—Addie—out of a family of twelve, to Mr. Thomas Watson, of Reading, a very promising young man. The marriage was solemnized by the writer. The presents were beautiful and useful. Their many friends join in wishing them a happy and prosperous life.

D. STEWART.

A very interesting and pleasant event took place at the residence of Bro. Wm. Beatty, Ashdale Farm, Omagh, on the evening of March 7, 1894, the occasion being the marriage of his daughter, Elizabeth Ada, to Mr. Geo. E. Buck, of Toronto. About eighty guests were present and testified to the high esteem in which Brother and Sister Buck are held by many valuable and useful presents. They begin married life with the best wishes of a host of friends.

P. BAKER.

Really, now, one dollar a year is not much to ask for a year's subscription to a paper like the EVANGELIST. A few old friends ask the paper stopped for the present owing to the hard times. We are wondering whether it would not be better to stop something else, owing to dull times, and stick to the EVANGELIST. How would our friends like the EVANGELIST stopped for the present on account of dull times? So far as we can judge, the EVANGELIST is now more popular with our brethren than ever. They can easily make it comfortably self-supporting.

Co-operation Notes.

CONTRIBUTIONS.

Miss P. C. Leach... \$1 00

It is now only two months and a half until the end of the current mission year. During that time it is desirable that all subscriptions to the Home Mission Fund should be paid, and also that many friends of the work who have not subscribed should make liberal gifts.

Last year the Cor. Sec. made the mistake of not notifying the friends of the Co-operation early enough of the danger of a deficit. This year he gives timely notice that unless all subscriptions are paid before June 1, and generous collections given by the churches on the first Lord's day in May, the Board will not be able to pay to the mission points the sums directed by the last Annual meeting.

So far this year, especially considering the dull times, the contributions have been such as to show a constant interest in the work. We observe that the managers of mission funds everywhere are reporting prospective deficits this year. We desire to avoid a deficit if possible, and we think our brethren can meet the present demand, if only the elders and preachers will earnestly lay the matter before the churches.