

Field Notes.

By Pastor J. W. Brown.

The Union is growing in favor.

Rev. E. E. Locke preached on the Nictaux field during the pastor's absence at the Western Association at Milton. His sermons were much appreciated.

The Summer School for S. S. Workers is nearing reality. The consent of the Minister of Militia has been secured to use the military tents for that purpose. It will probably be held at Port Lorne. Notice of the plan will soon be given the S. Schools of the county.

Our Western Association was a feast of fat things from beginning to end. The devotional element was made emphatic. The necessity of the Holy Spirit's leadership was brought before the Association many times. Something over 500 have been added to our churches during the past year. It was stated during Association that ours is the largest association on the continent.

Rev. W. E. Hall has just touched our field, in the interest of the Forward Movement, in connection with Acadia College. We expect he will return and make a longer stay. We believe our people will give him and the cause he represents a warm welcome. Not one of our members but owes a debt to Acadia. The material advantage which she has conferred upon our denomination has placed upon us that indebtedness. Now, is the time to pay those debts. Acadia is in need of funds in order that she may continue to be in a condition to further benefit us. To withhold these necessary funds would be a ruinous policy, and a sin that would surely find us out. To increase these funds will be to increase our capital as a denomination that will be for us a most paying concern. Let us be LOYAL, FAR-SIGHTED BAPTIST Christians.

Challenges Accepted.

Mr. Editor,—

In your issue of June 15th, you give an exquisitely variegated critique of our little controversy into which your brotherly hand weaves "Mr. Ryan" no less than eighteen times. In the way of criticism it has no parallel; and if you could get it stored away in the archives of the British Museum you would be immortalized while "Mr. Ryan" would not be forgotten. It appears that "Mr. Ryan by an endless

running fire of criticism, abuse and sarcasm" has given you much trouble, and all simply because "in the discharge of your duty as a minister of Christ you addressed a few words of admonition and warning to" "the only true New Testament Church" against the evil arising from association with "the so-called churches in our midst." But it was a strange slip of the memory which made you forget to tell your readers that you published those words of "warning and admonition" and sent them into Pedobaptist families with the gauntlet thrown down that you assumed full responsibility for them and were ready to defend them; and that when you were asked if you really believed that sister churches "in our midst" held and disseminated "the devil's own doctrine" you ignored the question and with new phrases and the cry "a glaring Non Sequitur" tried to hide from your readers the point at issue; and when it was demonstrated that this is the only logical meaning of your words that your "self-respect" had so outgrown your strength that you could not touch an argument and had only vitality enough to represent your opponent as being actuated by base motives and who from a heart full of "the gall of bitterness" was seeking to consummate the work which you began of leading the Baptist and Pedobaptists to antagonize each other. We are sorry for this mission, but a man's memory will fail him some times. Now that you have stooped to tell us what you do mean by the words in your published Berwick address, we can only express our regret that you did not say at first just what you meant and not something just the reverse. We can never now be sure that you do not mean something just opposite to what you say. We shall not characterize your explanation of yourself, but leave your readers to weigh for themselves your reasons for seeking to prevent Christian union among different denominations, and the marvelous sagacity of the man who after a few months residence among us has discovered that there are "milk and water people" in all our churches. There are several things, however, in your criticism which we must notice.

(1) The slander that we "regard anything and everything from a Baptist Church to a society of Shakers as a New Testament Church" you make an attempt to justify by my statement that "my pious Quaker friend who has not received the water emblem, but has received the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and my Baptist Brother, who has received both the emblem and the thing emblemized are equally welcome, as servants of Christ, to my Christian fellowship." Is there one word said

there about a New Testament church? What has become of the Editor's logic? A little time since he was drawing the distinction between unchurching a man and unchristianizing him," but now that little bit of logic is gone and he says that "neither his mental acumen nor his brains are equal to distinguish between receiving a pious Quaker to your fellowship and believing that everything from a Baptist Church to a society of Shakers is a New Testament Church. We cannot make any such confession. God has given us quite enough brains to make the distinction.

We have welcomed pious Quakers to our pulpit, held sweet fellowship with them and had the assurance that they were living in daily communion with Jesus Christ. Any man with whom Jesus Christ holds fellowship is welcomed to "our Christian fellowship" and if the Editor is so blind by bigotry and prejudice that he seeks better company, we must give him up, so far as Christian charity is concerned, just as he gives up the problem of distinguishing between fellowship with a pious Quaker and a New Testament church.

(2) You have not ceased to harp upon our use of the word church; and we have borne with you because it is a piece of pedagogism too low for criticism. But as you persist like a little boy quarreling about the verb to be with the cry, "Mr. Ryan still hugs his confusion in the use of the word church," we must remind you that your position in relation to the word church is an UXTENSABLE ONE. You may be surprised that we do not at once submit to your "Ipse dixit;" but the scholarship of the world is against your narrow use of the term church. Who does not know that the primary meaning of church is assembly or congregation? Who has not read of the church in the house of Priscilla and Aquila? and the church in the house of Nymphas? But Paul never wrote "Nymphas and the so-called church which is in his house." He could not do that for he was a gentleman and a Christian. But who does not know that the law of usage makes it quite proper to use the term church as synonymous with denomination and body? and that the qualifying words in the sentence must determine the sense in which the term church is used? The best writers and speakers of to-day use the term church in this broad sense; and it is only a narrow pedagogue who would stop to criticize such a use. If there is a Baptist body—a Baptist denomination in Kings Co.—then the best dictionaries make it quite proper to speak of the Baptist Church in Kings Co.

Concluded on page 11.