

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

HAMILTON, FEB. 15, 1894.

Foreign Missions.

THE MARCH COLLECTIONS.

On page seven will be found much important information concerning the Foreign Mission work. Our readers will have gathered from the articles we have published recently from A. McLean and F. M. Rains, that the managers of the Foreign Society are having a very anxious time owing to the scarcity of funds occasioned by the dull times in the States. The Board has had to borrow money and yet has not been able to pay the missionaries their salaries in full. This is a condition of things which no Disciple with right feelings can think of without pain. It goes with the saying that the Disciples in the States, notwithstanding the hard times, are able to replenish the treasury of the Foreign Society, so that there need be no fear of any of the missionaries suffering or being subjected to inconvenience, or the necessity of running bills in heathen lands. We can conceive of scarcely anything more despicable than for Christians in these favored lands to neglect to adequately support their brethren and sisters who are preaching the gospel in foreign lands.

We have always been forward in commending this work to the readers of the EVANGELIST, and have been pleased to note that the congregations of the Disciples of Christ in Ontario have for the most part contributed to its support. What we would insist upon is that every church and every Disciple should give something, and that the giving should be according to everyone's ability.

There is often a danger that appeals for money even for mission work will be misunderstood, or, at least, fail to make the impression intended. Our attitude is briefly this: It is a good work, our work, the Lord's work. Loyalty to the Master demands that we should do our duty always. There is very special need that we should all do our part now. Let us keep in mind the March collection and give as God hath prospered us.

Baptists and Disciples in the States.

The Baptist and Disciple papers in the United States are now having a very interesting discussion on the propriety, possibility and probability of union between these two bodies. It has been occasioned by Dr. Kerr B. Tupper, a leading Baptist minister of Denver, Colorado, who in a statement before the Denver Baptist Ministerial Alliance, which was extensively noticed in the secular press, was very strongly in favor of the union of Baptists and Disciples as published, and at the same time unexpectedly friendly to the Disciples.

Baptist and Disciple editors—as our United States cousins are wont to say—from the lakes to the gulf, and from

the Atlantic to the Pacific, laid hold of Dr. Tupper's statement as reported in the secular press, and commented upon it from their several and diverse standpoints. Very little attention has been paid to the matter by the *Canadian Baptist* of Toronto. We have noticed but two clippings in it from United States Baptist papers. We reproduce them here as found in the *Canadian Baptist*, as furnishing the only indication we have yet received of how Canadian Baptists would contemplate union with the Disciples.

"Touching the matter referred to in the extract quoted in another paragraph from the *Watchman*, and which, by the way, was crowded out last week, Dr. Kerr B. Tupper, writes to the *Examiner*:-

"At our Denver Baptist Ministerial Alliance I said that I liked the name 'Christian' because it is Biblical; that there is not so great a difference between Baptists and Disciples as is generally supposed; that the latter people are in error in the emphasis they place upon baptism; that I had hopes that Baptists and Disciples might some day be organically connected; that I had even had correspondence with prominent pastors on the matter. Only this and nothing more. With my speech every Baptist pastor agreed."

The following from the Boston *Watchman* explains itself. We heartily endorse the sentiment:

"A sensational report comes from the west that Dr. Kerr B. Tupper, pastor of the First Baptist church in Denver, has made the startling announcement that 'in a short time the Baptist and the "Christian" denominations will be united under the name of the latter, conferences tending to that end being now pending.' This statement is said to have been confirmed in Indianapolis, and it is developed 'that the scheme has progressed secretly to a point that makes its consummation quite probable.' By the 'Christian denomination' is meant, we presume, that of the 'Disciples,' sometimes called 'Campbellites.' We have only to remark, on this statement, that the Baptist churches are ecclesiastically independent, and that there is nobody on earth competent to act for the 'denomination,' to treat for its merger in another. Nor could the vote of a majority in any single church bind a dissentient minority to agree to commit ecclesiastical hari-kari. We say this, not as being at all committed against an enlargement of our fellowship, provided the fellowship be true and sincere. But we wait for a further development of those secret conferences. We risk nothing in expressing the belief that they will turn out to fall considerably below the importance attached to them by the newspaper correspondents. We trust, at all events, that if we are to take a new name it will be some other than 'Christian.' The assumption implied in calling the Episcopal church THE church, and all other Christian 'dissenters,' is modesty and charity compared with the assumption by one denomination of the name of 'Christian,' as a distinctive title. The name 'Baptist' may have a sectarian savor, but the name 'Christian' as a distinguishing title is worse."

We make a few comments on these extracts:

1. Dr. Kerr B. Tupper, according to his own telling, did not say so much, or go so far as he was reported to have gone, yet he went a great deal farther than is agreeable to very many of his Baptist brethren.

2. Dr. Tupper says he likes the name "Christian," because it is Biblical. He does not therefore entertain the sentiment of the Boston *Watchman*, which the *Canadian Baptist* endorses.

If Dr. Tupper prefers the name "Christian" to that of "Baptist," he is not the only Baptist who prefers a Scriptural to an unscriptural name. It is not long since a Baptist minister, occupying a prominent Canadian Baptist pulpit, said in the presence of his own congregation that he did not thank his ecclesiastical ancestors for calling him a Baptist, and went on to discuss the question of names from a New Testament standpoint in a way that would rejoice the

heart of an old-fashioned Disciple. Among other things he said that he liked the name Disciple, because it denotes the constant attitude in which a follower of Jesus should stand to his Lord. So we do not despair of our Baptist friends by and by being willing to give up a human name for a divine one. The reason why the Disciples object to sectarian names is because they believe it is sinful to wear such names. They quote, for example 1 Cor. iii. 4: "For while one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos, are ye not carnal?" Moreover, they do not take to themselves the names, "Disciple," or "Christian" in an exclusive sense.

"Dr. Tupper says the Disciples are "in error in the emphasis they place upon baptism." The purpose of the Disciples is to place the *Scriptural* emphasis upon baptism—no more, no less. Can it be wrong to quote to penitent believers the words of the inspired Apostle Peter as found in Acts ii. 38, "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." If it is, then the Disciples are "in error in the emphasis they place upon baptism," otherwise not. It would do our Baptist friends good if they would lay aside their regular Baptist spectacles a little while and note what emphasis the New Testament places upon baptism.

4. We are fully persuaded that if the more liberal section of the Baptist denomination were to examine the position of the Disciples, they would find themselves very agreeably surprised, and in very congenial company. We should like to know, for example, that the able editor of the *Canadian Baptist* had given our distinctive principles a careful study.

5. What the Boston *Watchman* says about the independence of Baptist churches is equally true of congregations of Disciples. Each is absolutely independent and at perfect liberty to act for itself.

We take leave of this interesting topic here for the present, as in another place we have somewhat to say on matters Baptistic.

Prohibition.

It will be known to all that the Prohibition Convention, held in Toronto, February 6th, was a magnificent success. About 1400 delegates were present from all parts of the province. A most harmonious occasion it was, and, best of all, the Ontario Government is fairly and squarely committed to prohibition. Prohibition is in politics now, practical politics, very practical; and that is well.

Chief among the forces leading to this result, we would name *The Templar*, of Hamilton, and its able editor, W. W. Buchanan. Mr. Buchanan is a prohibitionist from away back, but he is also a master organizer and a political genius. He should be in the Dominion Parliament, not only for prohibition's sake, but also for the sake of other great questions that will press for solution in the near future. He is a party man, but not a partisan. He can see the faults of his own party and the merits of the other. We predict for him a career increasingly conspicuous and useful.

This is not exactly what we started out to write this morning, but as we wrote Mr. Buchanan came into our mind, and it occurred to us that it was about time we had tendered him our best respects.

Prohibition is coming, friends; let us rejoice.

Stocum's Emulsion has no equal, 35c.

The "North-West Baptist" Again.

Our readers will, of course, understand that in following up the Editor of the *North-West Baptist* in a way that is evidently not pleasant to him, we have a good object to serve, viz., to prove to him and other Baptists like him, that they do not understand the position of the Disciples with reference to the design of baptism, and are consequently given to misrepresenting the Disciples on that point.

In the February 1st *North-West Baptist* we find the following paragraph, which surprises us as coming from an editor of experience. We give it entire, that our readers may see it in all its native beauty:

"THE CANADIAN EVANGELIST ONCE MORE.—For our readers' sake we say 'once' more. The CANADIAN EVANGELIST wriggles and wiggles like a worm on a hook. Its last declares that we have shifted our grounds of attack by asking it to say 'whether or not Disciples have taught and do teach that the forgiveness of sins is connected with the act of baptism.' It also assures us of its readiness to publish a statement from the Disciples of Winnipeg to the opposite effect of the EVANGELIST'S editorial, charging the Baptists of this city with hostile acts towards Disciples. Now, Mr. EVANGELIST, what do you take us for? We offered to furnish such a statement 'in return' for proof or evidence sustaining your charge. We re-pledge ourselves to the bargain. But you know we will never have to send such a statement signed by the Disciples of Winnipeg, inasmuch as you will never, because you can never, give one tittle of proof that Baptists were especially hostile, or hostile at all, at the time the Disciples were trying to plant their cause here. Own up or quit. As to 'amending the charge,' if such we did, it was to add to it and make it more easily refuted. In the first we said that 'Disciples taught that the certainties of salvation hang upon, etc.' In our second we said that Disciples taught that 'salvation itself depended on baptism. One can conceive how many would agree that the certainties of salvation depended on obedience, who would dissent from the doctrine that salvation itself depended on anything but faith in Jesus Christ. But we question the wisdom of spending time over Disciple doctrine. Disciples, among themselves, have a hard enough time in settling what they believe and what they do not believe."

"Once more." We did not think the editor of the *North-West Baptist* would play the part of him "who fights and runs away." We had thought he was nothing if not courageous. But here we find him squarely intimating that he does not intend to prove his slanderous charge against the Disciples. Perhaps he is ashamed of the charge himself by this time, and desires to retreat amid a cloud of dust of his own raising, and being an editor he can do that if he is that kind of an editor. As he leaves the field we fire this shot from the *Christian Courier* after him:

"There are two methods open to the theologian who encounters a proposition which can not be successfully controverted. One is to frankly admit the fact, confess error, and change position. This is the part of Christian manhood. The other is to distort and misrepresent the proposition until a very different proposition, and one easily met, is presented. This is the part of the weakling and trickster."

We leave him to make the application at his leisure, simply reminding him that his original gratuitous charge was. "Both Catholic and Disciple are agreed, however, that the certainties of salvation hang upon ecclesiastical ceremonies and sacerdotal functions."

That is the proposition we call upon him to prove. But, to use his own elegant words, which our readers will see do not apply to us at all, he "wiggles and wiggles like a worm on a hook," and simply refuses to act the man, to say

nothing of the Christian, and prove the charge, or retract it. And oh! superlative charity, he says as to "amending the charge," if such we did, it was to add to it to make it more easily refuted. How kind! to "make it more easily refuted!" Say, rather, to make it more easily established. We are not asking any favors of the editor of the *Northwest Baptist*; we are not asking him to make that task easy for us. We are more than willing to wrestle with him on the ground he himself originally selected; and, by the way, is it usual to spend time refuting charges before some evidence has been produced in support of them? Our critic has made a charge, and amended it once or twice, but he has so far offered not one tittle of proof. How is that for high-toned Christian journalism? When he adduces some evidence in support of his allegation we shall be ready to meet him.

As to the wisdom of discussing Disciple doctrine, all we have to say is that the editor of the *Northwest Baptist* began it himself this time. And with reference to what he says about the difficulty Disciples have in settling among themselves what they believe, we are amazed that a Baptist, supposed to be intelligent, should allow himself to write that. For this reason, that it is so easy to retort, and that truly, that the Baptists are just as bad (or just as good), as the Disciples in that respect, to say the least; and by way of illustrating we quote here a recent letter of a well-known Baptist minister to the *Christian Evangelist* of St. Louis:

"Some of our most prominent secular papers have very lately circulated the report that our two denominations were to unite. To that project I can say a hearty Amen! But as much as I desire it, I hardly dare expect it. I suspect that there are too many in each denomination who are too bigoted to be willing to yield anything of what they have held to be the truth—and one of the chief reasons why they think it must be true is because they have held it. So far as I can gather from a distant view, I should think your denomination was better in that very respect. You do not seem to have quite so much of a cast-iron creed. Baptist churches ask prospective members to subscribe to a rather lengthy creed. But the fact is that hardly any two thinking members hold to all these articles alike. Baptists are improving in this matter, however. Time was when it was thought to be rank heresy to disagree in the smallest particular with the published articles of faith. But that is now very common. I should not be surprised to find out that there was as great a difference in the belief of different members of the Baptist church as in the church to which you belong. But this is a point in which Baptist theory does not quite agree with Baptist practice."

Evidently that Baptist would have some trouble in adjusting himself in all respects to his pugnacious brother Baptist in Winnipeg. Why, he even thinks that the Disciples are better than the Baptists in a certain respect! It really looks to us as though the editor of the *N. W. Baptist* does not know the current history of his own denomination. We feel like posting him a little, and may do so at another time.

Though our readers may be getting tired of this, we cannot close without referring to the dreadful offense we committed when we alleged that when the Disciples were attempting to start a church in Winnipeg, the Baptists of that city were specially hostile. We made the statement upon the authority of a brother in Manitoba, whose word we had no reason to question. When the *N. W. Baptist* demanded proof we did not happen to see that paper, and knew nothing of the request until the present interchange of courtesies. We intimated the same to the editor in a former article and expressed our readiness to publish the statement signed by Winnipeg Disciples. We