

The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

IN THE INTEREST OF EVANGELICAL TRUTH, BY JARVIS STREET BAPTIST CHURCH, TORONTO, CAN., AND SENT FOR \$2.00 PER YEAR (UNDER COST), POSTPAID, TO ANY ADDRESS, 5c. PER SINGLE COPY.

T. T. SHIELDS, *Pastor and Editor.*

"I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ."—Romans 1: 16.

Address correspondence: The Gospel Witness, 130 Gerrard Street E., Toronto.

Vol. 3.

TORONTO, JUNE 26th, 1924.

No. 7

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

THE RENT VEIL.

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto.

(Stenographically reported.)

"So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life."—Genesis 3: 24.

"And thou shalt make a veil of blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen of cunning work: with cherubims shall it be made."—Exodus 26: 31.


"And he made a veil of blue, and purple, and crimson, and fine linen, and wrought cherubims thereon."—II Chronicles 3: 14.

"And, behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom."—Matthew 27: 51.

"Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh;

"And having an high priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."—Hebrews 10: 19-22.

"And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day: for there shall be no night there."—Revelation 21: 25.

 UR text begins with the story of how sin set a veil of separation between the sinner and his God. God made man in His image and likeness, and without fault. God walked in the garden in the cool of the day. The tabernacle of God was with men; and He dwelt with them. There was no veil of separation between man and his Maker. But sin entered; and you find him hiding among the trees of the Garden. "So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life." And when later, as we have it in our lesson to-day, a tabernacle was built in the wilderness, representative of the dwelling-place of God in the midst of His people—in that tabernacle there was a place which was called the holiest of all; which was separated from the holy place and from

the outer court by a veil through which no man might pass and live; but which was entered only by the high priest once, a year, and then not without blood. On that veil there were embroidered figures of the Cherubims, even as they were placed at the garden of Eden with the flaming sword. The Cherubims, in symbol, stood guard at the entrance to the holiest of all, determining upon what terms man should come into the presence of his Maker. And when the tabernacle was replaced by the permanent temple in Jerusalem, Solomon made a veil; and upon that veil there were embroidered again wrought figures of the Cherubims. Man was kept in perpetual remembrance of that great fact that between him and his God his sin had set a veil of separation. That is the truth that I want to bring you this morning to begin with—"Your iniquities have separated between you and your God."

There is, first of all, a **veil of moral separation**. God is infinitely holy. It is said that He is "of purer eyes than to behold evil, and can not look on iniquity." I have known some people to whom certain colours were especially objectionable. I remember hearing a lady remark, "How any woman in her senses would choose to wear red, I cannot understand." She said, "I hate it. It makes me feel uncomfortable. I cannot be at peace where that colour is." Other people find other colours particularly distasteful. I was travelling on a street-car here with one of the deacons of this church, a few years ago, whom I thought was not without some love for the beautiful; and he took some street-car tickets from his pocket—it was before the days of the pay-as-you-enter car—and he said, "What colour are they?" He said, "Are they limited tickets, or are they unlimited tickets?" I said, "Can't you see?" He said, "No, I cannot tell one colour from another. All colours are alike to me. I am colour blind." Now, there are some people in the moral realm like that. There are certain things which are objectionable to them. They would not think of admitting a drunken man to their table; they would not think of opening their door to one who was guilty of some flagrant wrongdoing. But they are unable to distinguish the finer shades between right and wrong; they are unable to make the finer moral distinction. But the Lord our God is holy; and it is said He is "of purer eyes than to behold evil, and can not look on iniquity." Hence, there is a veil which separates Him from all workers of iniquity; and while there is sin upon us, sin in our hearts, sin unconfessed and unatoned for, we cannot pass that veil, nor come into the presence of God at all.

In these days when, in the thought of men, God is dragged down to the level of men, when men persist in making a god not a God, but a god like to corruptible man, and insist upon measuring God by their own standards, going about to establish their own righteousness because they are ignorant of God's righteousness—we do well

to remember the great truth, symbolized by this separating veil, that God is infinitely holy; that He cannot tolerate our sin; that He cannot look upon it; that it is an offence unto Him. If it were possible for a sinner to come into heaven with his sin upon him, he would dim the glory of that celestial land; he would make it impossible for God Himself to be at peace: hence, the veil which hides our sin from God, which separates us from His holy presence. By nature, we are all on the outside of that veil, and cannot come where He is until our sin has been confessed, and washed away by the cleansing blood.

But I think the veil means more than that. Man was forbidden, in the beginning, to partake of a certain tree. The tempter came to him and said, "For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.—The way to know all that is to be known is to take things into your own hands, and be a law unto yourself; every door shall then be opened to you, and you shall be as gods, sharing the wisdom of God, infinite as God is infinite, knowing all things." Man yielded to the temptation; and he learned that which he might better never have learned. He obtained a knowledge of evil; but in the day that he obtained a knowledge of evil, he lost all knowledge of good: a veil dropped before his eyes, lest he should put forth his hand and eat of the tree of life and live for ever. "He drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life." And God has dictated the terms upon which man shall go to school from that day until this. Nowadays we are told that men are too clever, too learned, too wise, to subscribe to this Book of divine revelation. Man has been moving about like an interrogation point from that day until this: and yet, between him and the realm of true wisdom, there has always been a veil. "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." Thus, my friends, if you would go to school; if you would become really wise; if you would be a companion to One above the gods of man's making—yea, if you would be a companion of God Himself, you must find the terms upon which you may pass within that veil, and sit at His feet, and learn what He has to teach you.

I think there is a veil in another sense. We are separated from God by a veil of **physical incapacity**. The whole man has fallen—the spirit is veiled; the mind is veiled; and the body is veiled. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." "The things which God hath prepared" are all within the veil; and the carnal mind cannot see them. "The natural man (the man of the flesh) receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again." This flesh of ours can never inherit the kingdom of God. There is the veil. There was a reminder of it in the tabernacle, in the Cherubims, and again in the temple.

You have been studying this morning the significance of the ark. I need not go over it again with you. The ark within the veil had within it, the unbroken tables of the law, representing the righteousness of Christ; the budding rod, significant of his divine anoint-

The publication of this paper as a missionary enterprise is made possible by the gifts of members of Jarvis Street Church and others, and is sent to subscribers by mail for \$2.00 (under cost) per year. If any of the Lord's stewards who read this have received blessing, we shall be grateful for any thank-offering you may be able to send to The Witness Fund at any time; and especially for your prayers that the message of The Witness may be used by the Holy Spirit for the defence of the Faith, the salvation of souls, and the exaltation of Christ. As our funds make it possible, we hope to add to our free list, from time to time, the names of ministers at home and missionaries abroad.

EDITORIAL

A MEETING OF SOME TORONTO MINISTERS.

For some time the Editor of this paper has felt called upon to give his testimony against the modernistic tendencies so conspicuously manifested in the administration of McMaster University. His stand in this matter, as all the Convention of Ontario and Quebec knows, has brought down upon his head the wrath of the Educational powers that be. We are not in the least disturbed by that fact; we expected it, and do not complain. Nor have we any personal grievance against any man on earth. Some of the brethren have not been particularly gracious in their speech. We think we have abundant ground for objecting to the "spirit" and "methods" of those whom we have felt compelled to oppose in this controversy. But we freely forgive them all, though we have never been asked to do so. We can honestly say that, through all this controversy, there has never been a day when we could not sincerely pray, "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them who trespass against us."

In our contention for the faith within this Convention, we have deliberately refrained from any attempt at organized opposition to the Educational authorities. At the Ottawa Convention, we gave our testimony as an individual. We had asked one man to second our resolution, who later wired that he was unable to be present. When our proposal was made at the Convention, we had not so much as a seconder of the resolution, but had to depend upon such support as might be given from the floor.

Again, in our endeavour to cleanse the Board of Governors from those influences which had so manifestly been a blight upon our denominational life for years, we acted as an individual. And further, in our protest against the University's action in conferring a degree upon Dr. Faunce, we did not ask anyone to share the obloquy which we knew would be visited upon the head of the protestant.

We have taken this course, however, not because we did not believe that there were thousands of others who were just as concerned about these matters as we; nor yet was it because we did not covet the fellowship and comradeship of other ministers in the great battle; nor, certainly, because we felt in any sense that we were sufficient for the task alone: we took the initiative in these matters hoping and praying that courageous volunteers would come to our help. In this we have not been disappointed; but at every stage we have refrained from putting any brother in the position of having to say "yes" or "no" to an invitation to engage in this war. We have not sought division but unity on the basis of truth; and for this reason we have acted as an individual only.

Last week—to be exact, June 19th—a very interesting experiment was tried in Toronto. Dr. John MacNeill, Pastor of Walmer Road Church, issued an invitation to certain of the brethren to come together for prayer and conference respecting denominational matters. Some days prior to June 19th, the Editor of this paper received several telephone communications from pastors

in the City, asking us if we would be at this Thursday meeting. Our reply was that we would be delighted to attend if we were included in the list of invited guests, but that as yet no invitation had come.

A number of brethren assembled in Walmer Road the morning of the 19th; and, from reports that have reached us, some were surprised to discover that the invitation had not been issued to the ministers in general. The majority had been invited; but the Pastor of Jarvis Street had been omitted. We are informed that Dr. MacNeill explained to the brethren assembled that he had omitted the Editor of this paper because he was the storm-centre. Several brethren, it would appear, expressed their disapproval of the selective principle of the invitation; and we are told that some expressed the opinion that it was hardly fair. Apart from any personal interest in the controversy, it would really seem to be a psychological blunder to hope to effect peace by ignoring one who was called "the storm-centre". But we have been long accustomed to such treatment, so that our repose in spirit is not in the least disturbed. One brother protested against the principle of the invitation, and asked to be excused from remaining at the conference, and withdrew. Another of the pastors present, we are told, expressed the opinion that it was useless to shut one's eyes to the fact that there was much unrest and dissatisfaction prevailing in the Convention; and he traced that dissatisfaction back to the Bloor Street Convention of 1910, when, in the controversy led by the late Dr. Elmore Harris, in protesting against the continuance of the professorship of Professor I. G. Matthews, Dr. John MacNeill moved a resolution which was seconded by the Editor of this paper.

To refresh the memories of those who do not carry that motion in their minds, we print it herewith:

"The Convention approves of the statement touching the attitude of the University to the Bible presented to the Senate on the 15th November, 1909, by the members of the Theological Faculty, and relies on the Senate and Board of Governors to see that the teaching in the Institution is maintained in harmony therewith."

In seconding Dr. MacNeill's motion, we expressed our entire dissent from the position Dr. MacNeill had taken in his speech, and seconded the motion only that the matter might be referred back to the Board of Governors. We did it in the confidence that they would relieve the Denomination of the further presence of Professor Matthews.

We believe that the brother who made this remark last week at the meeting in Walmer Road Church, went to the heart of the matter. Beyond question, Dr. MacNeill's motion on that occasion was responsible for all the trouble that has been with us from that time until now. We have no desire to shirk our responsibility in this connection. Dr. MacNeill came to us and said that together we might save the Convention from disruption. The Editor of this paper acted in good faith at the time, feeling confident that the Board of Governors might be trusted. It is a matter of history that *the Board of Governors absolutely betrayed the Convention's trust*. Professor Matthews was continued in his position until he voluntarily resigned in the Spring of 1919. We still believe that the principle of the motion printed above was sound. If the Governors had been as sound as the motion, it would have put an end to all our trouble. We expressed our entire disagreement, however, with the speech which Dr. MacNeill delivered when proposing his motion, and, when we rose to second it, remarked that, in view of his speech, it was exceedingly difficult to keep our promise to second the resolution. *We plead guilty, however, to having followed the leadership of Dr. MacNeill at the Bloor Street Convention in 1910. In our judgment it was the greatest mistake we ever made; and we have been endeavouring from that time until now to bring forth fruits meet for repentance.*

What has followed? Professor Matthews remained in apparent comfort under the ministry of Dr. MacNeill in Walmer Road Church for nine years. In the same church, Dr. Frank Sanderson, who had been the fountain-head of all the influences which have disturbed the Denomination for more than fifteen years, has continued with apparent satisfaction. Professor Wilson Smith, the

teacher of Evolution in McMaster University, is a member of the same church, and apparently enjoys the same ministry. We would not be misunderstood. We do not believe the writer of "The Spotlight", in the Toronto Star, was correct in describing Dr. MacNeill as a Modernist. On the contrary, we believe that when the Convention of Ontario and Quebec takes a determined stand, not only in professing its faith, as at the Ottawa Convention, but in insisting that the modernist tendencies in the Denomination shall be checked, and that the men responsible for them shall be removed from office—when that day comes, and the historic Baptist position becomes once more popular in the Convention, Dr. MacNeill will be as pronounced on the matter of the fundamentals as any of us.

Of one thing we are sure: the great majority of the Baptists of this Convention are sound in the faith; and, as soon as they are informed of the facts of the case, they will rise in their might and remove from office those who have so long disturbed the peace of the Denomination. It is difficult to get the facts before the people. The modernist group have obtained control of *The Canadian Baptist*. They have certain paid officials, of fundamentalist profession, who are going up and down the country, at the Denomination's expense, flagrantly misrepresenting the facts of the case. But the truth cannot forever be suppressed; and the calling together of a group such as assembled in Walmer Road this week, in an attempt to make light of the issues involved, and to persuade men to be good fellows and forget the past, will never bring peace. There will be peace with righteousness, and in no other way. *We are sorry that Dr. MacNeill should be so unwise as to endeavour to use his influence to persuade a company of intelligent Baptist ministers to join him in sitting on the safety valve. The fires are burning, and pressure is increasing every hour. We shall see what we shall see!*

THE WEAKNESS OF OUR DENOMINATIONAL LEADERSHIP.

He would be a super-optimist who would contend that the condition of affairs in the life of the Denomination in the Convention of Ontario and Quebec is satisfactory. One cannot avoid asking where the responsibility for the present deplorable state lies. No doubt some would immediately answer that it lies with those who have protested against the conduct of our Educational affairs; but that contention, as a Southern negro of whom we have heard, would say, "fetches on more talk." If our Educational work is being properly conducted, certainly the critics of that work must bear the blame of disturbing the Denomination's peace. But let us see!

The present denominational unrest began nearly twenty years ago. Dr. Elmore Harris valiantly stood in the breach and tried to awaken the Denomination to its peril. In the beginning, Dr. George Cross, who is now Professor of Systematic Theology in Rochester Seminary, was a Professor, as was also Professor I. G. Matthews, now at Crozer. Were those who were concerned about the teaching of Dr. Cross justified in their anxiety? Let us hear what Dr. Cross has to say in his book on "Creative Christianity":

"It is doubted whether any absolute external authority in matters of faith has been provided or is needed. Similarly, it is doubted whether the series of events recorded as occurring at the beginning of the Christian faith, or at any stage of its progress, are to be considered as supernatural in the sense commonly intended hitherto by that term. Similarly, also, the question whether there was an original supernatural deposit, and, if so, what it was, is now open to perfectly free discussion, without prejudice to the Christian character of him who raises the question." (Page 30.)

"The representations which the New Testament writers make of the personality of Jesus must be used with discrimination. The accounts of such scenes as his exorcism of demons, his transfiguration on a mountain top, his stilling of storms, his summoning of deceased persons back to life, his physical ascension into the sky before the eyes of men, picture him as exercising a kind of magical power and as hav-

ing access to influences of a kind extraneous to our lives. To men of that time these might seem evidences of his high calling, but they make him in a corresponding degree a stranger and an alien to us. In all this our minds are drawn to the region of the mysterious, the unaccountable, the unknowable. With a personality whose native abode is there we can never be at home." (Page 75.)

"It is even possible * * * that if all the teachings of Jesus were brought together in the exact form in which he gave them there might be found among them some that would not commend themselves as fixed, and final to the faith of the most intelligent and devout Christians of the present day. Men cannot be called upon to believe things simply because of the name that is attached to them." (Page 34.)

In his book entitled, "What is Christianity?" (pages 4 and 5), Professor Cross says:

"And now after the lapse of all the intervening centuries, it is still an open question whether after all it was not misleading to call Jesus the Christ."

Sometime ago we bought Professor I. G. Matthews' book, recently published, on the Old Testament. We intended to review it in these pages, and would have done so, but, after examining the book, we concluded it was not worth the powder to blow it up. It consists of a certain number of chapters of intellectual drivel. It is shot through with infidelity from beginning to end; and, where it is strong enough to do anything, it denies every element of the supernatural in the Christian religion. Yet Professor Matthews was permitted to exercise his pernicious influence until it suited him to take his departure. From that time forward we have had abundant evidence that there is a group of modernists working secretly to turn away the Denomination from the faith. Such examples as, the Editorial in *The Canadian Baptist*, repudiated by the Convention at Ottawa; the favourable attitude of some of the McMaster Faculty toward the infidel so-called "Student Christian Movement"—so heartily approved of by Dr. Whidden in Brandon College; the appointment of the present Chancellor, in spite of his Brandon record, and the marking of his inauguration by honouring the infidel, Dr. Faunce,—these things are but symptoms of a tendency which cannot be ignored. We are not surprised that these efforts should be made; it is only a part of a world movement away from the faith of Christ. Our complaint is, that no Educational leader has appeared among us to offer any opposition to this tendency. In Dr. Harris' time, there was no one within the University who offered any help. The Dean in Theology, a man of undoubted ability, and of many admirable qualities, had no courage to utter a word of protest against Professor Matthews' infidelity. A change of Chancellors was made when Dr. McCrimmon succeeded Dr. McKay; but still the pernicious teaching was allowed to continue. Meanwhile, the confidence of many in the Denomination in our Educational leaders was undermined; their affection for our Educational institutions was alienated. Not a few men of wealth, some of whom have since joined the great majority, struck McMaster from their wills. During the last ten or twelve years, while prices were mounting, and the value of money was declining, and the relative value of our Educational endowment correspondingly shrinking, no leader has arisen to propose a plan whereby the Educational treasury might be replenished, and the policy of flouting the Denomination's convictions continued. Other Educational institutions in Canada, and in the land to the South, have greatly augmented their resources; but McMaster remains as poor as ever.

Then came the Forward Movement, by which an amount of money was raised which promised to give the University relief for a term of five years. Had we possessed an Educational leader of strength, he would have instantly recognized that those five years must be used in the removing of causes of dissatisfaction, in order to the re-establishment of our Educational work in the affection and confidence of our people. At the first meeting of the Board of Governors which we attended after our election to the Board nearly four years ago, we warned the brethren of the folly of their course, and of the certainty of their discovering at last that valuable time had been wasted.

We are now nearing the end of the five years of plenty, and the years of

dearth must begin to come. How have the intervening years been spent? By utterly fruitless discussion of the proposal to move to Hamilton. Anyone of discernment ought to have seen from the beginning that the proposal was an impossible one; and that no relief might be expected from that quarter without the surrender of every principle for which the University stood. But we have had absolutely no leadership either from the Board of Governors, from the Chancellor, or from his predecessor, or from either of the Deans. The time which has elapsed since the Forward Movement has been years which the locusts of incompetence have eaten. The University has followed a policy of drift for more than fifteen years. It has been like a ship without a captain; and one needs no telescope to discern the breakers ahead. Woodstock College has become almost a by-word: it has taken nearly all that the Denomination has contributed through the Budget to meet its annual deficit. To-day the Board of Governors are nearing the end of the five years' relief afforded by the Forward Movement. The present Chancellor's inauguration was signalized by an act which has still further undermined the Denomination's confidence in the University's administration. Several of the larger churches are now facing great building programmes of their own; and, so far as we are able to see, there is not the remotest possibility, under present conditions, of the University being able, in the near future, to raise a sum of money sufficiently large to make any advance possible. With the expiration of the five years of the Forward Movement allowance, a strenuous effort will be necessary even to maintain things as they are.

We ask our readers carefully to survey our Educational history of the past fifteen to twenty years, and to consider whether a policy more deplorably weak—characterized by vacillation, compromise, and expediency,—could be imagined than the policy of McMaster University. Our chief comfort is found in the reflection that it could scarcely be worse; and that any change, therefore, must be for the better. If there is no need for radical reform in our Educational affairs, there never has been a reason for a thorough housecleaning since time began.

We intend to continue our discussion of denominational problems in this paper for some weeks. Next week we hope to examine more carefully the relation of the Publication Board to our general denominational interests.

THE WHOLE BIBLE SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSON COURSE.

LESSON XL.

JULY 6th, 1924.

DAVID AND JONATHAN.—I. Samuel, 18-21.

I. Saul's Jealousy of David.

Of all the passions which tear the human soul, jealousy is the most cruel. Notwithstanding his former apparent affection for David, because "the women answered one another as they played, and said, Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands", Saul became insanely jealous of the son of Jesse, saying, "They have ascribed unto David ten thousands: and what can he have more than the kingdom? And Saul eyed David from that day and forward". Analyzed, it would appear that Saul's jealousy was made up, (1) of an intense self-love. If ever a man had reason to expect consideration and approval from his superior, David was justified in expecting these things from Saul. He had rendered great service to the state, and to Saul as king. He had, moreover, personally ministered to the king in his distress. But all this was forgotten in the intensity of Saul's love for himself. (2) A further evidence was a passion for human approbation. One might have expected that because of his years and experience, Saul would have shared in the rejoicing acclamations of the people when they expressed their enthusiasm for David; but, like certain men of prominence at a later day, he "loved the praise of men more than the praise of God". As the fear of man bringeth a snare, so

does also an inordinate desire for human approval. We need to be on guard against this vanity. (3) There are no lengths to which a jealous passion will not go. Saul's jealousy inspired him to compass the death of David. Repeatedly he endeavoured to slay him with his own hand with the javelin he kept beside him, and, foiled in that, he sought to effect his death by the sword of Philistia. We have the authority of the Book for the statement that jealousy is as cruel as the grave.

II. In sharp contrast to Saul's jealousy, we have here **The Matchless Picture of Jonathan's Love for David.**

(1) It was a self-sacrificing love. If anyone in the world might have been justified in feeling jealous of David, it was Jonathan. Saul himself tried to stir that passion in him, saying, "Thou hast chosen the son of Jesse to thine own confusion * * * for as long as the son of Jesse liveth upon the ground, thou shalt not be established, nor thy kingdom." And Jonathan knew his father spoke the truth. He was heir-apparent to Israel's throne; and knew that David had been anointed to take his place in the succession. But his love for David was such that he was willing to yield the crown and the kingdom that the beloved of his soul might reign. There are few more beautiful illustrations of the love of Christ to be found, even in the Bible, than the love of Jonathan for David. It cost Jonathan much to give David the pre-eminence; yet the price he paid was insignificant compared with the price which our Lord Jesus paid as an expression of His redeeming love. (2) Jonathan's love endured his father's anger for David's sake, standing between his friend and death. Thus, too, did Jesus Christ become the Mediator; and bared His bosom to the storm of divine wrath in our behalf. (3) Jonathan's was a courageous love: he was not ashamed to let everyone know that David was his friend. The knowledge of the king's anger and the conspiracy to destroy the son of Jesse did not deter Jonathan from an open espousal of David's cause. Thus did the love of Christ constrain Him, and in spite of our adversaries, He is not ashamed to call us brethren. (4) The love of Jonathan was an unchanging love. Much that is called love is as changeable as the weather; but the soul of Jonathan had been knit to the soul of David, and, having loved him as his own, he loved him even unto the end. And so at last when the news of his untimely death came to David, the son of Jesse exclaimed, "I am distressed for thee, my brother Jonathan: very pleasant hast thou been unto me: thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women". So, too, are we loved by our Jonathan—with an everlasting love.

III. **David's Relation to Saul and Jonathan.**

He patiently endured Saul's jealous rage; and refused to allow it to embitter his spirit: "For what glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? but if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God." David's unwavering trust in God enabled him to turn Saul's conspiracy into victory; and to make the stones his enemies hurled at him but stepping stones to higher achievements: "And who is he that will harm you, if ye be followers of that which is good?" (3) It is repeatedly said that David behaved himself wisely and the Lord was with him. We never have greater need of divine wisdom than in the presence of our enemies. (4) David found refuge from the wrath of Saul in the love of Jonathan. So, in the love of our Beloved, there is abundant compensation for all other ills. (5) David covenanted with Jonathan that he would not cut off his kindness from his house for ever. Thus the love of Christ should constrain us to minister the kindness of God to others. (6) The love which David felt for Jonathan—begotten in his heart by Jonathan's love for him—led him to view even the anger of his enemy through the love of his friend, and in spite of all that Saul had done, when at last his course was run, he exclaimed, "Saul and Jonathan were lovely and pleasant in their lives, and in their death they were not divided". So, through the medium of the Lover of our souls, we may learn to look upon our bitterest enemies with tenderest compassion and delivering grace.

NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.

Jarvis Street Picnic—The Annual Church and Bible School Picnic will be held Friday, July 4th, at Centre Island. Scholars and friends are asked to meet at the wharf at 1.30, but boats will leave every twenty minutes. There is a long and interesting programme of races for the afternoon; supper at 5.00 for the Intermediate and lower departments, and at 5.45 for adults. If you cannot come until after business hours, join us then; you will not be too late. In the evening there will be the usual song and testimony service—the return boat leaving Centre Island at 9.10.

The Annual Picnic in connection with the Parliament Street Branch was held Thursday, June 26th, at Scarboro Heights. We went to press too early to receive any report of the day; but have been requested by the workers to ask those of our readers who are interested in the work of the Branch, to make an offering toward the expenses. Offerings will be received by Mr. McKay, Mrs. Ford, Miss Louise Macdonald, or may be left at the Church Office.

Last Sunday witnessed another day of blessing in Jarvis Street. In the morning three were baptized, and several professed conversion; while at the evening service six were baptized.

Next Sunday, in the evening, the Pastor will preach on, "A Young Man's Phenomenal Rise to Power,"—second in a series of special evangelistic addresses. Come, and bring unconverted friends with you. Leaflets announcing the whole series may be had for distribution by application at the office.

JARVIS STREET CHURCH DIRECTORY.

T. T. Shields, Pastor, 3 Scarth Road. Rand. 9730w.
George Greenway, Treasurer, 28 Broadway Avenue. Tel. Hudson 0910.
Violet Stoakley, Church Clerk and Office Secretary. Tel. Rand. 8366.
W. J. Hutchinson, Sunday School Superintendent, 295 George St. Tel. Rand. 0339.
C. Leonard Penny, Director of Music, 36 Earls court Ave. Tel. Ken. 9175W.
William Fraser, Pastor's Secretary, 40 Nanton Ave. Tel. Randolph 1268.

The Church Calendar

Sunday For the week beginning June 29th, 1924.
 9.45—Bible School, including an Intercessory Class. W. J. Hutchinson, Supt.
 11.00—Public Worship. The Pastor will preach.
 3.00—Chinese Bible School.
 6.00—Prayer Meeting in Church Parlor.
 6.30—Communion Service.
 7.00—Public Worship. The Pastor will preach. Subject: A Young Man's Phenomenal Rise to Power.
 Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday—8.00—Prayer Meeting.
 Tuesday—8.45—Lecture by Dr. Shields on the Bible School Lesson for July 6th: David and Jonathan—I Samuel, 18-21.
 Wednesday—12.00-1.00—Meeting for Prayer. 3.00—Women's Gospel Service.
 The Parliament St. Branch, 250 Parliament St. Sunday: Bible School, 3.00. Evangelistic Service, 7.00—Rev. W. L. McKay, B.A.
 Wednesday—8.00—Prayer Meeting.