

Southern Baptists at the Cross Roads

(Page 12)

S. S. LESSON Page 30

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 East, Toronto.

Vol 4

TORONTO, MAY 21, 1925

No. 2

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

WILL THE METHODIST WHALE BE ABLE TO DIGEST THE PRESBYTERIAN JONAH—IS CHURCH "UNION" LIKELY TO BE PERMANENT?

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, May 17th, 1925.
(Stenographically reported).

"Can two walk together, except they be agreed?"—Amos 3: 3.



Read this evening that the company of God's redeemed people are compared to a body: they are said to be the body of Christ. Though they may have different ministries, though they may exercise different functions in that body, yet they are so related to each other that it is impossible for one member to suffer without all the members suffering with it, or for one member to be honoured without all the members rejoicing with it. There is a real unity of the Spirit among true believers. The week before last I attended the Christian Fundamentals Conference in Memphis, Tenn. We had at that Convention, Presbyterians, Methodists, Lutherans, Baptists,—men and women of nearly every evangelical denomination; and while they maintained their distinctive positions, yet in the great fundamentals of the faith they were one. And I think there was no one there who did not feel that the unity of the Spirit among those who are born again is very real, whatever their name may be.

I would make that perfectly clear this evening, as I venture upon a discussion of this matter; because I do not conceive of the various denominations as being unrelated to each other. Whatever is my business as a Christian must concern every other member of the body of Christ. You must not suppose because you choose to be a Methodist, or a Presbyterian, or a Baptist, that you can shut yourself within the particular denomination to which you

belong and say to all others, "It is none of your business what we do." In the nature of the case it must be everyone's business, for no man liveth unto himself. I think we should readily concede, as Baptists, to all other denominations the right to discuss our affairs; because the profession we make, and the life we live, and the ministry we endeavour to exercise, must affect all religious bodies in some measure, and in one way or another. It is idle, therefore, for people to say that those who choose to remain out of this merger have no right to discuss it. We have a right to discuss it: it is our concern, because it is bound to affect the life of all bodies who stand for "the faith once for all delivered to the saints".

I have no desire whatever specially to criticize any particular denomination. Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones; and I know of no denomination that does not need criticism sometimes. I have done my full share—some people are of the opinion that I have done more than my share—in criticizing my own denomination. (Laughter.) But I think it would be a cowardly thing to shut one's self behind a name; and assume that such defects as may be found, belong always to someone else's denomination—not to ours.

If there are people here this evening who are Presbyterians in the sense that they are wedded to a name, and that the name, to them, represents certain historical associations, and a certain body of sentiment which they have inherited from their fathers,—if your Presbyterianism is not based upon some profound personal conviction of truth, then I dare say you will sit apart this evening and not understand what I am talking about. Similarly, if there are Methodists here who are so devoted to the Methodist Church as an institution and to its traditions, as to persuade themselves of its infallibility, so that they will resent any suggestion that perfection does not reside within that organization,—you, too, will probably sit apart and receive but little profit. But what I desire to do is to discuss this matter as one of the great movements of the time, in the light, so far as light is given to us, of the Word of God itself; that we may discern, if we can, whether these movements are of God; for if they are, we should by all means have a part in them. But unless, on the other hand, they carry with them our convictions, unless we are fully persuaded in our own minds from our own personal study of the Word of God, that this thing is of God, then I counsel you to remain apart from it until you have a clear conviction that you ought to belong to it.

We hear a great deal about the oneness, or the unity, of the body of Christ, and I frankly say that I marvel at the superficiality of those who discuss that principle; for it is a mere truism, a mere commonplace, to observe that there is a world of difference between unity and uniformity. Take the figure under which the company of God's people are represented in the chapter I read to you about the body of Christ; and the inspired Word plainly tells us that there are diversities of gifts: God does not give to all people the same gift,—but it is the same Spirit. There are differences of administration, but it is the same Spirit; there are diversities of operation, but it is the same Spirit. And in the body of Christ there are the eye, the ear, the hand, the foot,—they all belong to the body; but each has its own special and peculiar function. This whole chapter is an argument against the idea that unity and uniformity are synonymous terms. There is a unity of the body, but there is great diversity in the members of the body. And so in the body of Christ.

I have said before that I am a Baptist; but I tell my own people not to be guided by what Baptists say, but to get back to God's Book, and follow Baptist practices and belief just so far as they are in agreement with the Word of God; and if, and where they depart from that, have nothing to do with them. I do not believe that any denomination has all the truth. Of course, if I did not believe that we have a little more than most folks, I would not be a Baptist! (Laughter.) You may not agree with me, but I think you will respect my convictions; and you will agree that every man ought to find his place in that section of the church of Christ which he believes is most closely conformed to the teaching of the Word of God.

While there are some things about Presbyterianism which I cannot accept; yet anyone of spiritual discernment, even though he may not agree with some aspects of that denomination's life, must recognize that it has made an enor-

mous contribution to the spiritual wealth of the world. And similarly, there are many forms of modern Methodism with which I find myself distinctly at variance; yet I believe the Methodist Church has, in time past, rendered great service to the world. And beyond any doubt, there are thousands of people, ministers and laymen and women, in both communions, who are to-day just as true to the great fundamentals of Evangelical Christianity as they ever were. Understand, I am not speaking of the whole body of Presbyterians when I speak to-night, nor am I speaking of the whole body of Methodists: I propose to discuss certain principles with you; and if I make my case clear, I hope you will receive instruction from it; if not, you will not, that is all. And I want, if I can, to bring all these things into the light of the Word of God.

The Suppression of Individualism.

Let me, first of all, call attention to the fact that there are certain tendencies observable in all realms of life to-day; and from the influence of these tendencies, no religious body is entirely immune. There is a tendency toward centralization of government and control. We boast much to-day about our democracy. President Wilson, you remember, coined a phrase which became famous, that one of the ends of the war was to "make the world safe for democracy." He said nothing about making democracy safe for the world! And in Russia, for instance, there was a swing of the pendulum, so that to-day Russia is under the most autocratic form of government known on earth. They have surrendered one autocracy only to yield to another that is nothing less than a merciless and conscienceless despotism.

Now, in religious bodies also, there is a tendency toward centralization of authority. Again let me say that I want to be perfectly fair, and I want to speak from the Baptist point of view first of all. There may be some Baptists here—I think there are a few—but I mean some who belong to Baptist churches other than Jarvis Street; and I say to you that among Baptists there is a tendency toward that same thing. Of course, the fundamental principle of Baptist polity is this, that the church—the local church—is a self-governing organization: it is absolutely independent of external control. This church, for instance, is a little democracy in itself: it rules itself; it orders its own affairs; and if people are not in agreement with its affairs, we never lock the doors,—they may go out at any time, and stay out, if they wish. But we tell anyone from outside who attempts to control us, that it is our business; and I am inclined to believe that the recent history of this church, in a large measure, vindicates the principle of congregational autonomy, self-government of the local church.

Of course, Baptist churches get together and meet in Convention. They appoint denominational officials to look after their interests: we want to do mission work in India, or in China, or in some other part of the world; we must have our educational institutions, and someone to look after them; and we must attend to our Home Mission interests, we must have someone to direct that. Therefore we appoint in these free-and-easy meetings representatives of a group of local churches, certain people to look after these interests; but unless we are very careful, after a while, these men whom we have appointed to be our servants, become our lords; and some dominating secretary comes along and tells the pastor what he must do, or, some educational institution says, "We won't let a pastor take a charge unless he does what we say." I attended last week the largest evangelical Convention of any sort in the world—the great Southern Baptist Convention, which met at Memphis, Tenn. There were upwards of six thousand delegates in attendance; and it represented an adult white membership of over three millions of people. And I was able to see there this tendency toward centralized control. They put a few men in, first as servants of the Convention, who, by and by, assume lordship and undertake to rule the church. Mr friend, Dr. A. C. Dixon, once remarked that he was perfectly sure that the first pope was a denominational secretary! He said that is how the thing started; and I am rather inclined to believe there is some truth in his remark.

But this tendency is everywhere observable. You find it in the commercial and industrial world. There was a time when the local corner store was able to do business; but now, very largely, except as a convenience to people who

live in the suburbs, such stores are crowded out by the great central departmental store, with everything under one roof and under one control. There was a time when a man who was an exceptionally good carpenter got a larger wage than the man who was able to serve less efficiently; or, if a man were skilled as a machinist, he received the reward of his special ability. Now all the industrial skill is pooled in a certain organization; and a certain standard is set, so that a man must not work more than so many hours. I do not know whether there are any trades unionists here; but you could not belong to a trades union and be a minister at the same time! A trades unionist came to me one time and asked me to subscribe for their paper. I said, "I will subscribe for the paper. But you would not allow me to join your Union." He said, "Why not?" "Because," I said, "my first day's work would smash your rules all to pieces. I never could get through my work in eight hours." But the tendency is toward the suppression of individualism everywhere; toward the casting of men in a mould. It is proposed, in every direction, to make men much as Henry Ford makes cars,—so much alike that you cannot tell them apart, unless their wives put a special mark on them!

You will find this tendency operating, too, in the realm of education. There is a standardized system of schools and colleges; and it is assumed you can turn out "educated" men just as you make pig iron in the foundry: pour them into a certain mould, and turn them out according to standard. So that in every direction the tendency toward the suppression of individuality, of that which characterizes the individual, of the idiosyncrasies which differentiate one man from another. In theological schools a professor who is not a preacher himself, sometimes undertakes to run all his students into one mould, and tells them what they must do. When some bright young man who has a pronounced individuality begins to do his own thinking, he is curbed: he must be put into a cast; because, unless he is standardized, he will not make the right sort of preacher.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that principle attempting to control and mould the church's collective life. I have observed it for years. Instead of going back to the New Testament for our standards, we have followed the maxims of the world; we have had a sort of half-way-house between the church and the world in the organization known as the Y.M.C.A. They have all kinds of drives and methods devised by supposedly clever business men; and then, because by this means a large sum of money has been raised for some benevolent object, we must adopt the same methods in the church! In this and other ways the line of difference between the church and the world has been gradually worn down, until one can scarcely tell where the world ends and the church begins—we are so much alike.

This so-called Church Union is based on the same principle. I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet,—although I am a preacher, and the son of a preacher—but I have never felt free, as some of my brethren have, to enter the realm of prophecy, and to tell exactly what is going to be in the future. I think there are certain things clearly revealed in the Word of God; and I can see in the Scripture the teaching that some day there is to be a great federation of all evil powers under one central control, and everything that is anti-Christian will be gathered up under the control of anti-Christ; and there will be a great battle between Christ and anti-Christ, between the Lord of Glory and the Man of Sin, the Lawless One. Whether these tendencies, now everywhere so pronounced, are gradually preparing the world for that great federation, I do not know. But I do know this, that I have seen in the Baptist denomination men by the score who seem, when you talk with them personally, to have their own pronounced convictions of truth; who yet in their denominational relationship, are so terrorized by the powers that be as to be afraid to express the deepest convictions of their souls. I have before me a letter from an unknown Methodist friend, who says the pamphlets entitled "The Christian Hope" express only the view of their author, and that it is unfair to hold the Methodist Church responsible for them. But they have gone out to the world, with the approval of a department, at least, of the Methodist Church—I wonder why this anonymous Methodist minister did not stand up and, as a minister of that church, declare them contrary to the doctrines of the church, and to the great principles upon which the church professes to be

founded? Anyone who knows the centralized form of government in the Methodist Church knows perfectly well that it would be extremely difficult for a Methodist minister to take any such position: he would be a marked man from that hour. And I venture to affirm, and I can prove my point, I think, that such centralized control of ecclesiastical bodies makes it almost impossible for the prophets of the Lord to declare the whole counsel of God. This great merger, this great United Church will undoubtedly have that effect—only in a larger measure—for from the top down, the principles, the practices, of that church will be dictated; and it will be within the power of the General Council to cut off the head of any man who does not do exactly as he is told. Get a great body of people like that, and what effect will that have upon the religious life of the country?

God's Programme Makes Men, Not Institutions.

Let me pause again to say that the divine programme is not the making of institutions; it is the making of men. God said in the beginning, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness". And the church is His instrument for the undoing of the works of the Devil and for the remaking of man. The institution is only the by-product of sanctified human lives. Take, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, that great passage which says, "When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. . . . And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers"—to be instructors of members of parliament and leaders in various forms of moral and social reform? Now understand, I believe that the church should have such an influence upon the community that it will make better members of parliament, better law-makers, and that the work of the Spirit of God in the heart of the individual should and will produce a law-abiding community. But let me go back to my Scripture, I must show you God's plan—"He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors, and teachers. For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God,"—unto what? "Unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." And any kind of institution that requires in order to membership in it, the suppression of our personal convictions of truth; any sort of institution that insists, in order to union with it, on the suppression of my individuality, that requires of me that I be something less than a man in order to join that institution,—that institution is not of God. God is making men; and any kind of institution, or any kind of movement, that sets out a certain prescribed course, and demands of you that in the interests of that institution—not your individual interest, but in the interests of that institution—that you cease to do your own thinking, that you subordinate your own convictions to the general interests in order to build up a great institution, to march forward together to exercise a "religio-political" influence—to use Dr. Chown's expression—I affirm that that is as contrary to Scripture as anything could possibly be!

Now, what is this Union? I had a talk with Dr. Connor, or Dr. Gordon, I get his names mixed up. A man has no business to have two names—Dr. Gordon, "Ralph Connor"! He came to see me while I was in Winnipeg. And he read to me a statement of faith, the basis of union, and he intimated that the basis of union of the United Church had conserved every essential principle of Presbyterianism, and, according to his view, the Methodist Church was joining the Presbyterian Church. (You are all going to become Presbyterians.) "Well," I said, "will you talk to Methodists that way?" And he said he would, and did.

I shall not discuss the doctrine of the Basis of Union first of all, but I shall refer to that in a few moments. I want to discuss with you first the polity of this United Church, and show you whether the Methodist Church is going to swallow up the Presbyterian, or, to put it another way, whether the principles of Methodism are to be predominant in this church, or the principles of Presbyterianism; or whether there is a real amalgam combining the two. (Incidentally I want to talk to you Baptists because I think you ought to know

some of these things. We want real Baptists in Jarvis Street, so that we may know exactly where we stand.) Here is the article on the Church:

"The members of The United Church shall be the members of the negotiating Churches, and such others as may hereafter become members.

The unit of organization for The United Church shall be The Pastoral Charge. A pastoral charge may consist of more than one local church; a local church is a body of persons meeting for public worship in one place.

The governing bodies or courts of the Church, higher than those of the pastoral charge, shall be:

- (a) The Presbytery;
- (b) The Conference;
- (c) The General Council."

That is to say the church is not a local organization, it is not conceived of as such in this United Church. The local congregation is called The Pastoral Charge. If this Jarvis St. Church belonged to the United Church it would be a Pastoral Charge. The United Church will embrace the entire membership of all the congregations coming into that united body. Now what sort of members are they?

"The members of the Church entitled to all church privileges are those who, on a profession of their faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him, have been received into full membership. The children of such persons and all baptized children are members of the Church, and it is their duty and privilege, when they reach the age of discretion, to enter into full membership."

I want you to be clear on this. According to that definition this United Church does not require regeneration in order to membership in the Church. I may hit some of you Presbyterians on that score, I don't know, but here it is clearly defined. The Church is the great body embracing all these uniting bodies. All become members of the United Church and the children of such persons, who have been baptized—whether they are two years or five years or more—although they may know nothing about Christ, although they may not have given themselves to Him, they are members of the Church. Obviously, therefore, this United Church does not insist upon a regenerated church membership. Such being the case it is contrary to Scripture; for the churches of the New Testament were made up of men and women who had been baptized on profession of their faith, and there was not one of them in the church who had not at least professed faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as his or her Saviour.

Now another thing: the property of the church does not belong to the individual congregation: it is merged in the great body. And if this were a United Church there would be certain trustees to administer the property, but the property itself would belong to the United body, and would be under the control of the United body: so that if you put a hundred thousand dollars into a church, as members of the United Church, you would not own it after you pay it, it would belong to the Body. I believe that principle does not belong to Presbyterianism.

Then I must speak for a moment or two on this point—just hold it in your minds incidentally—I have noticed clause after clause like this: "under such regulations as the General Council may pass"; "under regulations to be passed by the General Council"; "in accordance with regulations to be made by the General Council"; "subject to regulations of the General Council". Now observe: The unit of organization is the pastoral charge, next to that is the Presbytery, which is composed of ministers "who have been placed on the roll by special enactment of the Conference in accordance with regulations to be made by the General Council". The Conference consists of ministers "on the rolls of the Presbyteries within its bounds," and certain non-ministerial representatives, but the "rolls" of Presbyteries are subject to "regulations to be made by the General Council". Thus the rulers of the church derive no authority from the local church, nor from Presbytery, nor Conference—but from "the General Council", the Council of bishops, or whatever they are, at the top. They are the rulers! And if you examine this instrument from top to bottom I venture to say you will come to the conclusion that outside of the Roman Catholic Church itself, you will not find in all history an instrument that puts so much power in the hands of one body as the constitution of this United Church puts into the hands of its General Council. It destroys abso-

lutely the autonomy of the local congregation, but that I will show you a little later.

"The Presbytery shall consist of:

- (1) The ordained ministers within the bounds—
 - (a) Who are engaged in some department of church work; and
 - (b) Who have been placed on the roll by special enactment of the Conference in accordance with regulations to be made by the General Council.
 (The rights to membership in Presbyteries, District Meetings and Associations, enjoyed by ministers at the time of the union, shall be conserved.)
- (2) The elders, deacons, leaders or other non-ministerial representatives of pastoral charges, within the bounds, equal in number to the number of ministers, and chosen in accordance with regulations to be made by the General Council."

Made by the church? made by the Conference? made by the Presbytery? No, made by the General Council, the rulers, the men at the top, who shall determine and lay down the rules even for the Presbytery, all rules, you will observe, must be in agreement with regulations made by the "General Council".

"21. The Conference shall consist of the ministers on the rolls of the Presbyteries within its bounds, and an equal number of non-ministerial representatives of pastoral charges chosen as provided for in subsection 20 (par. 10).

22. It shall be the duty of the Conference:

- (1) To meet very year.
 - (2) To determine the number and boundaries of the Presbyteries within its bounds, have oversight of them, and review their records.
 - (3) To receive and dispose of appeals and petitions, subject to the usual right of appeal.
 - (4) To see that, as far as possible, every pastoral charge within its bounds shall have a pastorate without interruption, and that every effective minister shall have a pastoral charge, and to effect this through a Settlement Committee which it shall appoint annually.
 - (5) To examine and ordain candidates for the ministry who have fulfilled the prescribed requirements and have been recommended by Presbyteries.
 - (6) To receive ministers from other Churches subject to the regulations of the General Council.
 - 7 To deal with matters referred to it by the General Council.
 - (8) To select an equal number of ministerial and non-ministerial representatives to the General Council.
 - (9) To have oversight of the religious life of the Church within its bounds, and to adopt such measures as may be judged necessary for its promotion."
- "23. The General Council shall consist of an equal number of ministers and non-ministerial representatives chosen by the Conferences. Its regular meeting shall be held every second year. Its presiding officer shall be the chief executive officer of the Church, and during his term of office he may be relieved of his pastoral or other duties.
24. The General Council shall have full power:
- (1) To determine the number and boundaries of the Conferences, have oversight of them and review their records.

The General Council, therefore, rules the church!

"To legislate"—

—now mark: they do not legislate in the church, nor in the Presbytery, nor in the Conference, but in the General Council, so that the local church shall have nothing to say about it—

"To legislate on matters respecting the doctrine, worship, membership and government of the Church, subject to the conditions: First, that before any rule or law relative to these matters can become a permanent law, it must receive the approval of a majority of the Presbyteries, and, if advisable, pastoral charges also; Second, that no terms of admission to full membership shall be described other than those laid down in the New Testament; and, Third, that the freedom of worship at present enjoyed in the negotiating Churches shall not be interfered with in The United Church."

But now, come down to the last paragraph. I have not time to go into all the particulars:

"And in general to enact such legislation and adopt such measures as may tend to promote true godliness, repress immorality, preserve the unity and well-being of the Church, and advance the kingdom of Christ throughout the world,"—

but the principle is this, that the government of the church is with the Council, down through the Conference, through the Presbytery and into the local church. It is a centralized form of government, and property is vested in that centralized government.

Now, you Presbyterians, What about the ministers?

"There shall be for each Conference a Settlement Committee, consisting of ministers and laymen, and appointed annually by the Conference"

Now remember, the Settlement Committee is not appointed by the local church,—it has nothing to say. It is not even appointed by the Presbytery. It is two units removed from the fundamental unit of the Pastoral Charge.

"On this Committee each Presbytery shall be represented."

And what is the power of the Settlement Committee?

"Any pastoral charge, in view of a vacancy, may extend a call or invitation to any properly qualified minister or ministers, but the right of appointment shall rest with the Settlement Committee, which shall report to the Conference for information only."

The right of appointing a pastor is in the hands of the Settlement Committee. Is that Presbyterianism? I thought Presbyterians called their own pastors. But the "pastoral charge" in the United Church will enjoy no such privilege. You may extend a call as a matter of form, but it is specifically stated that "the right of appointment rests with the Settlement Committee"—and with that Committee alone. May not pastors be tempted to try to keep on good terms with the Settlement Committee? Do you think that makes for freedom of the pulpit, for purity of doctrine? Listen!

"While the right of appointment shall rest with the Settlement Committee it shall comply as far as possible with the expressed wishes of ministers and pastoral charges."

Now here is a clause that is very suggestive:

"The Settlement Committee shall also have authority to initiate correspondence with ministers and pastoral charges with a view to completing arrangements to secure necessary and desirable settlements."

It is expressly said that the Settlement Committee has the right "to initiate correspondence" with a view to completing arrangements to secure settlements. A settlement may be very happy until a pastor preaches a sermon that is contrary to the desires and policy of the General Council. The Settlement Committee, by this constitution, has the right to interfere, has the right to go into that congregation and to initiate correspondence with a view to making a settlement—a settlement! It does not say unsettlement; but that is what would happen. I wonder what would have happened to me if I had had a "Settlement Committee" over me in Jarvis Street? (Laughter.) Now I am speaking out of my own experience. By the way, I am just beginning the sixteenth year of my ministry in this church to-day. Just three or four years ago a brother came up here, and he moved a resolution (I can see him walking up the aisle now) and he moved a resolution "that the pulpit of this church be declared vacant as from this date, September 21st, 1921; that the Deacons, Finance Committee, and House Committee of this church are authorized and instructed to forthwith take any and all such steps as shall be necessary to see that the above expressed will of the church is carried out and the regular services of the church maintained"—There might be many gentlemen walking down the aisles like that when pastors preached the fundamentals of the faith, if the Settlement Committee disapproved,—but somehow or other, this pulpit was not vacated, and has not been vacant since—nor the pews either. I want you to mark that, and to consider what effect that clause which authorizes the Settlement Committee to interfere with the pastoral relation is likely to have upon the ministry of the church.

The Doctrinal Basis of Union.

Now, let us come to the doctrine of the Church. I believe this is an admirable Basis of Union as to its doctrinal statement—of course, I don't believe in this mixing up of the fathers, and the mothers, and the babies in church membership, I don't believe in that—but, in the main, this Basis is admirable. It is not modernist by any means. It contains all the essentials of the Christian faith: it may not express them as some of us would like to have them expressed, but, reasonably interpreted, it seems to me to conserve all the

fundamentals of the Christian faith. "Well," you will say, "what is the matter with that?" But you can have any kind of fundamental statements if you are not bound to them. And there is nothing to bind any minister to the doctrine. For instance, I defy anyone to reconcile Dr. Salem Bland's position with this basis of union. If Dr. Salem Bland were required to sign this document, or get out, according to his public utterances, he would have to get out: he could not sign it. I have said that that is an admirable document, but what is the use of it if ministers are not pledged to it? And they are not, because the ministers are not required to subscribe to it.

The Minister's Relation to the Doctrine of the Church.

What is the relation of the minister to the doctrines of the church? I will read this, it is not very long, and I want you to listen!

"1. The duty of final inquiry into the personal character, doctrinal beliefs, and general fitness of candidates for the Ministry presenting themselves for ordination or for reception as ministers of The United Church, shall be laid upon the Conference.

2. These candidates shall be examined on the Statement of Doctrine of The United Church, and shall, before ordination, satisfy the examining body that they are in essential agreement therewith, and that as ministers of the Church they accept the statement as in substance agreeable to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures.

3. Further, in the ordination service before the Conference these candidates shall answer the following questions:—

(1) Do you believe yourself to be a child of God, through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ?

(2) Do you believe yourself to be called of God to the office of the Christian ministry, and your chief motives to be zeal for the glory of God, love for the Lord Jesus Christ, and desire for the salvation of men?

(3) Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrines required for eternal salvation in our Lord Jesus Christ, and are you resolved out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing which is not agreeable thereto?"

When I read this first I said, "That is not so bad"—"And shall, before ordination, satisfy the examining body that they are in essential agreement therewith". Now, all that they are required to do is to satisfy a certain committee that their views are in substantial agreement with these things. Any of you who have had anything to do with investigating committees know how easy it is for brethren to accommodate themselves to such forms as you have here. They are not required to sign it, saying, "I solemnly undertake, believing it, to preach it." They do not subscribe to it, but they are to satisfy this committee. If that committee is a committee of modernists, they will be very accommodating I am sure. I have seen this thing worked in theological seminaries. As far as I can see, there is nothing in this to require that ministers of the United Church shall be bound to the doctrines upon which the church is to be based. All they need to do is to comply with the idea here set forth, to go on with their ministry.

Presbyterianism Destroyed.

Now, my friends, do you call that Presbyterianism? I think it is modern Methodism and a little more. And you Presbyterians who go into the United Church will discover that you have not one atom of Presbyterianism left;—not a thing. The eldership is gone, the right of the local congregation to call its own minister, the right of the local church to hold its own property, to manage its own affairs—is all gone, and you are just merged in this great body over which there is a General Council, whose will you must obey. How in the world the local congregation is going to get past the Presbytery, past the Conference, and past the General Council, to protect its rights, I do not know. Where is the freedom of the Spirit? May we expect in such a church a free pulpit, an uncompromising testimony to the great fundamentals of the faith?

Who are the champions of this united movement, specially? One who at least approves of it is Dr. Salem Bland!—a very amiable gentleman. But his gospel is not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: it is not the gospel of supernaturalism. But he knows that he will have no difficulty in remaining in the United Church. Dr. Fosdick was here a few weeks ago. Read the *Christian Guardian*—I don't know what it guards—but read it anyhow; and you will

find that it glorifies Dr. Fosdick. He was the honoured and much advertised guest of a neighboring Methodist Church. He came to the city under the auspices of the Alumni of Victoria College. That is the kind of thing you are going to have.

I am inclined to think, therefore, that my figure about the Methodist whale is justified, don't you? And I do not think Jonah would have been there if he had not run away from his duty! That is how Jonah was swallowed up; because he would not go to Ninevah and preach as God had bidden him! So he was swallowed up. But Jonah came to his senses after a while, and he prayed, and the union of the whale and Jonah was dissolved, and Jonah found himself free. I don't know whether he lost his coat in the process or not!—but the Presbyterians will certainly lose a lot of their property in the transaction. Those who really love the Lord in sincerity and truth, and who love the whole Book, and the great essentials of the Christian faith, are going to discover that they have been swallowed by a whale. I hope they will repent as Jonah did! I do not think the whale will be able to digest them very well; and I fear they will give the United Church an uncomfortable time once they get in.

Return to God's Book.

What is the remedy for all these things? The remedy is to get back to God's book. That is all I know. He "gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." If you can find the idea of Church Government in the Book which is to prevail in the United Church, I have nothing to say; but I have never been able to find it. I think it is not Christian at all; it is pagan; it belongs to Rome; it is not according to the Word of God.

I make an appeal to every man and woman here this evening. If you are Baptists, get rid of all your Baptist prejudices, if you have any, and study your Book; and if, by the study of the Word, you are able to maintain your position then stay where you are. And you Methodists and Presbyterians, assert your right to freedom of judgment and with your Book open vote as the Spirit of God leads you. One thing I know, there is nothing this world needs so much as the gospel of redemption through the blood of Christ.

We Baptists, particularly on the other side of the line, need it badly. We have had too much of Rockefeller's money; and it has corrupted the springs of life. I saw by last night's paper that Park Avenue Baptist Church, New York, has called Dr. Fosdick; and that Dr. Fosdick has stipulated that before he will accept the call they will have to do away with the requirements of this ordinance which you witnessed to-night. A lot of Baptists will be up in arms now, and will say, "Oh, they are going to do away with baptism!" Well, why not? If you do away with the Book, why do you not do away with baptism? In that matter Fosdick is right. If the Bible has no authority, if we may take what we like and leave what we don't like, then I would do away with baptism. We practice it only because we believe in the divine inspiration and authority of this Book. Many of the modernist Baptists in the United States do not want to come out in the open and say, "Let us close our baptis-tries"—that would alarm people—but they will rob the Bible of its authority and yet practice the ordinance! We had all better get back to the Book, and to the authority of God's Word.

Dr. Fosdick wants to have all sorts of clubs. He wants to build a religious skyscraper in New York. I think there are skyscrapers enough in New York City already; and I am inclined to think there are a good many clubs in New York, that have failed to change men's lives,—unless it be for the worse. What New York, and Toronto, and every other city, needs, is the gospel of the redeeming grace of our God! John D. Rockefeller, Jr., says we used to say that we had to snatch men as brands from the burning; but now we are busy putting out the fires. The fire of sin burns from the lowest hell and you cannot put it out. There is no human power that can extinguish that fire:

"Venture on Him, venture wholly,
Let no other trust intrude;
None but Jesus
Can do helpless sinners good."

Whether you are Methodist, Presbyterian, Anglican, or Baptist, or whatever you are, I conjure you to get back to this great central principle that the first thing you need to do is to believe in the crucified and risen Christ; then, having been cleansed by the Blood, and regenerated by the Spirit, your main business, as a Christian, is to bear witness to the fact that Jesus lives and is able to save sinners. And I beg of you all not to go into any union or organization that does not keep that great central truth first. If we are right there, we shall not be far wrong in other matters. Let us put our Lord Jesus Christ in the centre, and crown Him Lord of all. ("Amen!" "Hallelujah!") And especially, pray! My brothers and sisters of every church of every name, if ever there was a time when God's people ought to pray, it is now. Let us be much in prayer over these matters. What a day that will be on the 10th of June! What a crisis for this country! There is only one thing that can save us from all these movements that have so much of error in them, and that is a great spiritual revival. Oh, if the Spirit of God would come and fill our hearts and quicken us again, and teach us to subordinate every other consideration to the honour and glory of Christ Who died for us all, then we should all get together and crowning Him Lord of all, we should love each other, because we love Him Who gave Himself for us.

I will continue the discussion of this subject next Sunday evening. It is our practice here always, every Sunday evening, and I am going to do it tonight, in spite of the crowded aisles, to give an opportunity for those who so desire, to confess their faith in the Lord Jesus. One dear brother, let me tell you this,—don't turn to your books for a minute—one dear brother said one Sunday morning, "I was converted in my own home, and I came to see you and I was baptized with my wife and family, and I have since had a feeling that I came in through the back door. I did not come down the aisle and confess Christ openly. I wish you would give an opportunity some time to those of us who did not come that way. I would love to have an opportunity to confess Him that way." It is a blessing to be out and out for Him. Come now as we sing:

"Just as I am! without one plea,
But that Thy blood was shed for me,
And that Thou biddest me come to Thee,
O Lamb of God, I come! I come!"

AN UNFORTUNATE ASSOCIATION.

We have before us an eight-page pamphlet entitled, "Ontario Religious Education Council Bulletin—May, 1925". On the front page it has a large portrait of the Rev. H. P. Whidden, D.D., LL.D., Chancellor of McMaster University, President of the Ontario Religious Education Council. On the last page, one half of the page is taken up with paragraphs under the general head, "The Book Shelf". Under this head ten books are advertised and implicitly recommended, among them—third in the list—we find:

"The Modern Use of the Bible, by H. E. Fosdick, Associated Press.

"The purpose of this book is to give a more thorough understanding of the content of the Bible and an interpretation of its great truths in the light of the circumstances under which it was first written."

Two weeks ago in a sermon on Dr. Fosdick we had occasion to quote from this book. If any book ever issued from the press was designed to destroy faith in the Bible, it is this book by Dr. Fosdick. But the Chancellor of McMaster University is the President of the Ontario Religious Education Council that recommends Dr. Fosdick's book. It would, perhaps, be unfair to hold Dr. Whidden responsible for this recommendation; but we regret exceedingly that the Chancellor of our Baptist University that is supposed to stand for the essentials of the Christian faith, should have any association with an organization that would recommend the writings of the infidel Fosdick. It is always a dangerous thing to walk in the counsel of the ungodly.

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

Southern Baptists at the Cross Roads

The Southern Baptist Convention is the greatest Baptist convention in the world. This year the Convention met in Memphis, Tenn., opening its sessions on Wednesday, May 13th. From the newspapers we learned that about six thousand messengers were in attendance. Southern Baptists have long been renowned for their orthodoxy; and have been generally regarded as an almost impregnable fortress standing for the "faith once for all delivered to the saints." But for some years many influential Southern Baptists have been concerned on account of the inroads of Modernism upon the Baptist life of the South, especially because of its outcroppings in several of their educational institutions. The truth is, Modernism has greatly disturbed the peace of the Southern Baptist Convention, as well as some of the State Conventions, for some years.

At the Convention of 1924 a committee was appointed which is described as a "Committee on Baptist Faith and Message". The Committee consisted of Drs. E. Y. Mullins, Chairman, S. M. Brown, W. J. McGlothlin, E. C. Dargan, L. R. Scarborough, R. H. Pitt, and C. P. Stealey. Apparently Dr. R. H. Pitt did not act, and Z. T. Cody is mentioned as his substitute. The entire report of this Committee submitted at the Memphis Convention, and adopted by the Convention, will be found at the end of this article.

The Confession as adopted was recommended by six out of seven of the Committee, a minority report being submitted by Dr. C. P. Stealey, of Oklahoma. Dr. Stealey's objection was to article three on the "Fall of Man". We give below the two versions: first, the amendment proposed by Dr. Stealey, which was voted down by the Convention; and secondly, the article as embodied in the Committee's report which was approved:

THE AMENDMENT THAT WAS DEFEATED.

"We believe that man came into this world by direct creation of God and not by evolution. This creative act was separate and distinct from any other work of God and was not conditioned upon antecedent changes in previously created forms of life. Gen. 1: 27, 'God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him.' Gen 2: 27, 'And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.'

"Man was at first in a state of holiness under the law of his Maker, but through the temptation of Satan, he transgressed the command of God, and fell from his original holiness and righteousness, whereby his posterity inherit a nature corrupt and in bondage to sin, are under condemnation, and as soon as they are capable of moral action, become actual transgressors."

THE ARTICLE THAT WAS ADOPTED.

"Man was created by the special act of God, as recorded in Genesis. 'So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.' (Gen. 1: 27). 'And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.' (Gen. 2: 7). He was created

in a state of holiness under the law of his maker, but, through the temptation of Satan he transgressed the command of God and fell from his original holiness and righteousness; whereby his posterity inherit a nature corrupt and in bondage to sin, are under condemnation, and as soon as they are capable of moral action, become actual transgressors."

THE WAR BETWEEN FUNDAMENTALISM AND MODERNISM.

We propose in this article to discuss the bearing of the decision of the Southern Baptist Convention upon the general war between Fundamentalism and Modernism. We shall discuss this Confession of Faith passed by the Southern Baptist Convention first, and then the great Baptist Bible Union meetings which preceded it.

All familiar with the Southern Convention will recognize that the Committee referred to above was composed of very representative men. The day and a half preceding the presentation of the Committee's report reminded one of a great political meeting: all the hotels were crowded, and Baptists were to be found everywhere. The tensify of the situation may be judged by the fact that great leaders, whom one would never have expected to stoop to such menial work, were found busily personally canvassing for votes for the Committee's report. Dr. Stealey was the special target; and the most stupendous efforts were made to break down his opposition. But like a true witness he stood his ground unmoved, and heroically presented his minority report in opposition to the prestige and influence of the other six members of the Committee.

An examination of the two articles printed above on "The Fall of Man"—that embodied in the Committee's report, and Dr. Stealey's amendment—will show that there was very little difference between them viewed from one standpoint. But from another point of view the difference was very great. Under ordinary conditions, the Committee's article on "The Fall of Man" would be perfectly satisfactory; but those who are familiar with the wiles of the evolutionist know that it is not enough to say what we believe: we must also say what we do not believe.

FEAR OF DIVISION.

There seemed to be among the messengers a serious apprehension of a division in the Convention at a time when the Convention could least afford to be divided. Practically all the funds of the Convention are admittedly in a very low state. From what we could hear, it would appear that nearly every Board is like a man trying to keep his head above water when the tide has risen to his chin, and he is fighting for breath. Certainly, there never was more need for union in a body of people than in the Southern Convention at this time. One would therefore have supposed that the Committee would have been ready to go a long way in the direction of placating Dr. Stealey and those he represented. To make a proposal that would incur the risk of a further depletion of the various treasuries involved a very serious responsibility. Knowing how strongly Dr. Stealey was opposed, and the determination of the Committee to secure the defeat of his amendment in the Convention, if possible, one could not help feeling that behind it all there was some strong reason for the Committee's unwillingness to agree to the anti-Evolution amendment.

AN ELECTRIC ATMOSPHERE.

We pause here to give our readers some idea of the atmosphere of the Convention. We shall return later to a discussion of the Baptist Bible Union meetings which preceded the Convention; but it is necessary here to refer to two sessions of that Conference.

DR. RILEY'S ADDRESS.

In an address before the Christian Fundamentals Convention the week before, Dr. Riley had dealt with the subject of Evolution; and his utterances had been challenged by one of the Episcopalian clergy of the city. To this, Dr. Riley had replied by challenging the gentleman to debate. This the Episcopalian refused to do; but Dr. Riley spoke on the subject of Evolution Monday night notwithstanding. Upwards of three thousand people were present to

hear him. He spoke with his characteristic fire and force; and his address, exposing the menace of Evolution, must have carried conviction to many.

DR. NORRIS' ADDRESS.

On the Tuesday night, Dr. Norris spoke in the Second Presbyterian Church. The Baptist Bible Union Committee had understood that the City Auditorium was theirs for that occasion; but some change had been effected, and a Sunday School pageant of some sort, of interest to very few, had been put on to occupy the hall, with the result that we relinquished our claim and held our meeting in the Second Presbyterian Church. The church was packed to capacity, with hundreds standing, an hour before the time announced for Dr. Norris' address. The aisles were filled with men sitting on the floor, the platform was crowded with men in the same posture, while all around the walls, at the doors, and in the vestibules, people stood as closely packed together as was possible.

Dr. Norris spoke on "Evolution in the Southern Schools"; and from the writings of the men themselves, and from an address approved by the Southern Baptist Educators' Association, proved that the teaching of Evolution was an established practice in not a few of the educational institutions of the South.

The response to these two messages, and particularly to that of Dr. Norris—for that audience was more largely composed of messengers to the Southern Convention—showed that there was a tremendous anti-Evolution sentiment in the South. That this anti-Evolution sentiment was known by the leaders of the Convention to exist, there can be no doubt. Yet in spite of the danger involved in challenging that sentiment, the Committee on Confession of Faith was obviously determined that no anti-Evolution statement should be included in the Confession of Faith. This was very significant. It is not difficult to discern when a witness on the stand is endeavouring to cover something up. We suggest to our readers that they pause here and turn to the Confession at the end of this article and read it in full, so that they may follow our further discussion clearly.

DR. E. Y. MULLINS PRESENTS COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

The Committee on Order—if that is what it is called—had put down the consideration of this Confession of Faith for Saturday night, the last item on the programme; but this was changed, so that by special order it was brought on, on the afternoon of Thursday, May 14th, at three o'clock. There was a great attendance of messengers; and it was our privilege with scores, perhaps hundreds, to sit upon the platform and watch the proceedings. The report was read by Dr. Mullins. Dr. Mullins has not a strong voice; but he read the report very clearly. It was evident that he was being fairly well heard. Following this, Dr. Stealey submitted his minority report, and moved his amendment as a substitute for clause three of the Committee's report. When the report and amendment had been duly seconded, Dr. Stealey spoke to his amendment.

DR. C. P. STEALEY'S SPEECH.

Dr. Stealey's speech was really a great speech: it was the speech of a man whose heart is in every word he speaks, whose words are an expression of the deepest conviction of his soul. He explained that there was nothing in the clause of the report under discussion to which he could object, and that a few years ago such a clause would have been perfectly satisfactory; but that in view of the well known prevalence of the teaching of Evolution in the South, and of the menace of Modernism generally, it was necessary that Southern Baptists should make an unequivocal statement on this subject. While Dr. Stealey was speaking, some question was raised as to the time to be allowed him, when Dr. Scarborough with apparent generosity, which to many was surprising, suggested that Dr. Stealey's speech should not be limited as to time; and the Chairman ruled that Dr. Stealey would speak until he was ready to surrender the floor. Dr. Stealey did not, however, take full advantage of this, but delivered a very able address in a short time.

DR. MULLINS' SPEECH.

He was followed by Dr. Mullins, who spoke in a clear tone reaching, apparently, the farthest gallery. He began with an appeal for "fair play". What

he meant by fair play, no one seemed to understand but himself; but he proceeded to say that the question at issue was only as to where the objection to Evolution should be stated. He explained there was a clause which was not part of the Confession of Faith—added to it—respecting the relation of science and religion; and that the question of Evolution was dealt with there; and that there was really no division among them as to their attitude toward Evolution,—that everyone was opposed to it. Dr. Mullins said the only question was whether the statement should be embodied in the Confession of Faith, or in the supplementary statement referred to.

As we listened to Dr. Mullins we found ourselves putting a question-mark after his every utterance. He was submitting to the Convention a document which he asked the Convention to approve; and then asked the Convention to believe that he was ready to divide the Convention on the question as to whether the objection to Evolution was stated on page two or page six. If the difference was so trivial, why ask the Convention to divide upon such a matter? Granted, for the sake of argument, that Dr. Stealey was a very stubborn man,—in view of the near bankruptcy of the treasuries, and the necessity for united action, one found himself asking, What possible motive could actuate the Committee in determining it to force a division on such a trivial difference as to whether objection to Evolution should be stated in the Confession of Faith, or in a supplementary statement?—especially when the Convention was being asked to vote on both. We frankly say that we could not help feeling that Dr. Mullins had put a very low estimate upon the intelligence of his audience by supposing that his plea would be generally believed. His argument carried its own refutation on its face; and anyone of discernment was forced to the conclusion that Dr. Mullins was playing a part, and was indulging in a bit of special pleading for some who dared not plead for themselves.

WHAT DID DR. MULLINS MEAN BY "FAIR PLAY"?

We have said that we did not understand what Dr. Mullins meant by pleading for "fair play". So far as we could see, no one proposed to strive in this game unlawfully. We were led, therefore, to ask, For whom is Dr. Mullins pleading? Who are to be given "fair play"? Certainly his own Committee had had one full year to consider their proposals; and we supposed that he was going now to plead that time should be given the Convention to digest the Committee's proposals; that their report should be put before them, and that the Convention should be given the same time to analyze it as the Committee had been given to propose it.

DR. MULLINS DROPS HIS VOICE.

Dr. Mullins completed his argument in a very short time; and then began quoting from newspapers in support of his position. We heard the name of Dr. Pitt mentioned as one editor whom Dr. Mullins quoted; and we heard also the name of *The Western Recorder*. From both these papers Dr. Mullins read at great length; but in spite of the fact that he had before been making people hear distinctly, and that now repeatedly messengers called from the galleries that they were unable to hear a word, Dr. Mullins continued to speak in a low tone, and succeeded in giving the Convention the impression that *The Western Recorder* was opposed to Dr. Stealey's motion, though we are perfectly sure that very few people heard the statements given by Dr. Mullins in support of his contention. Familiar with the tricks of ecclesiastical politicians, it was soon apparent that Dr. Mullins' chief object was to consume time. He had made his argument in a clear tone; now he read so that no one could hear him. All this time we wondered where the "fair play" was to come in; and whether the famous President of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary had asked for "fair play" for himself, for the truth, or for the messengers of the Convention!

MANY WERE READY TO SPEAK.

Dr. Mullins continued until nearly five o'clock. Many were waiting to speak. The great anti-evolutionist, Dr. Porter, was on the front seat close to the Chair. As soon as Dr. Mullins concluded, he, Dr. J. Frank Norris (also on the platform) and many others, tried to get the President's attention; but the Chair recognized Dr. Barton, State Secretary of Missouri. We had not noticed

Dr. Barton before, but he was recognized by the Chair and took the floor. Being an officer of a Convention and familiar with its machinery, it might have been expected that Dr. Barton would support Dr. Mullins' plea for "fair play"! Possibly, in his own view, he did so. Whether or no, he moved the "previous question". We have been at other great meetings where that motion caused some confusion. It is, of course, understood by those who have studied parliamentary procedure; but it is quite evident that comparatively few of that great number understood what the "previous question" involved.

The President took the ayes and noes twice, and secured a different registration each time. At one time the noes thundered like the sound of many waters, and it seemed as though Dr. Barton's motion had been defeated; at length a count was taken. The greatest possible confusion prevailed. We would not venture to criticize the conduct of the Convention in this matter, for it is difficult to control so great a meeting. It will be admitted that the motion for the "previous question" has grown out of experience of public debate. It is obvious there must be times when it is wise to terminate discussion; but on a vital matter like the consideration of a Confession of Faith by a great Baptist Convention, and that Confession a report of a committee that has had a year to consider it, in view of the fact that an amendment which no one had had opportunity to consider had been proposed,—to move the "previous question" after only Dr. Stealey and Dr. Mullins had had opportunity to speak was the essence of un wisdom.

A VERBAL CARTOON.

If we were a cartoonist we would report the action now under discussion by a sketch of the Southern Baptist Convention as a steam boiler of immense capacity, with a great safety valve on the top of it, which we would name "Baptist Democracy". We would then put up to the safety valve a ladder which we would call the "previous question"; and we would represent a little man climbing the ladder and building a platform on top of the safety valve, and inviting all of the same degree of intelligence as himself to climb up on the platform. Underneath the boiler we would show a fire burning, and we would call that fire "Conviction of Truth"; and there we would represent a great army of faithful stokers whom we would call "Contenders for the Faith", each one of whom we would picture as doing his best to keep the fire of conviction burning. On the platform on top of the safety valve we would sketch the features of Dr. Barton, Dr. Mullins, Dr. Scarborough, Dr. Geo. W. Truett, and not a few others. Underneath our cartoon we should write, "If the fire keeps on burning, what will happen to the politicians on the safety valve?"

2,013 TO 950—OR 32.06 PER CENT.

The vote on the "previous question" was taken by standing; and it was almost amusing to observe the confusion which still obtained. In the galleries we saw people repeatedly stand up and sit down again and again; and whether they were counted standing or sitting, it would be difficult to say, nor why they were so uncertain: whether they did not understand the meaning of the motion, or whether they were afraid to be seen standing while some others were sitting, or, again, to be seated while some others were standing—we do not know. The vote, at last, was recorded; and Dr. Stealey's motion was declared defeated by two thousand and thirteen to nine hundred and fifty.

DR. MULLINS' INTERPRETATION OF "FAIR PLAY".

As Dr. Mullins voted for the closure we can only assume that that was what he meant by "fair play". A whole year for himself and his colleagues to consider their proposals, approximately two hours for the reading of the report—Dr. Stealey's speech and his own—and then the denial to every other Baptist the right of discussion! Certainly Dr. Mullins' interpretation of "fair play" is entirely new.

AN ANALYSIS OF PARTS OF CONFESSION OF FAITH.

We come now to an analysis of parts of the Confession of Faith, and to Dr. Mullins' speech in presenting that Confession. Dr. Mullins began his speech by saying that there were several groups in the Southern Convention, and that

the Committee had tried to frame a Confession which would be satisfactory to all and which would secure the unity of the body. We do not quote his exact words but they were to this effect. He said he did not belong to the group who believed that no Confession of Faith should be made. He observed, however, that such Confession might be made a "dangerous" weapon unless it were surrounded by certain safeguards. He insisted that a distinction and a separation should be made between science and religion, and that inasmuch as the doctrine of Evolution belonged to the realm of science, a statement of attitude in respect to that doctrine should not be embodied in a statement of religious faith. This was his justification for opposing the inclusion of Dr. Stealey's amendment in the committee's report. The preamble says "Baptists approve and circulate Confessions of Faith with the following understandings"; clause 5 of which reads as follows:

"(5) That they are statements or religious convictions, drawn from the Scriptures, and are not to be used to hamper freedom of thought or investigation in other realms of life."

We do not know but we assume that this statement comes pretty largely from Dr. Mullins' pen, and we have always thought of him as one who could think clearly and when occasion required, could express himself with equal clarity. Here we are told that the "statements of religious convictions, drawn from the Scriptures" "are not to be used to hamper freedom of thought or investigation in other realms of life." To what realms of life, may we enquire, do our "religious convictions" not apply? Since when did Baptists regard religion as something applying to Sunday and not to Monday; to the spiritual and not to the physical; to one department of life and not to all? Truth never contradicts itself but is in agreement in all realms; and any religious conviction that would hamper freedom of thought or investigation surely cannot be drawn from the Scriptures: otherwise the Scriptures were untrue! Here, wrapped up in this clause, is the popular modernist conception that the Scriptures may be true in their revelation of religious values but are not to be relied upon in other realms of life.

IS EVOLUTION SCIENCE?

But let us now examine Dr. Mullins' contention that a statement of Evolution properly belongs to the department of science. Does the doctrine of Evolution properly belong to the realm of science and is it thereby excluded from the realm of Christian faith? What is Evolution but a doctrine of origins? It is a philosophy rather than a science, and as a philosophy it is in every sense anti-Christian. But let us see what the Word of God has to say about the doctrine of origins. The first and second chapters of Genesis answer the question. So also the first chapter of John's gospel: "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." So also the first chapter of Colossians: "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: And he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Dr. Mullins contended that Evolution (which no one will deny is a doctrine of origins) properly belonged to the realm of science. The book of Job is a discussion of the profoundest problems of human life. There we see Job and his three friends and Elihu each by turn trying to relate human experience to the law of God, and seeking to ascertain why trouble comes. But at length God speaks: "Then the Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind, and said, Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge? Gird up now thy loins like a man; for I will demand of thee, and answer thou me. Where was thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare, if thou hast understanding. Who hath laid the measures thereof, if thou knowest? or who hath stretched the line upon it? Whereupon are the foundations thereof fastened? or who laid the corner stone thereof; When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy? Or who shut up the sea with doors, when it brake forth, as if it had issued out of the womb? When I made the cloud the garment thereof, and thick darkness a swaddling band for it, And brake up for it my decreed place, and set bars and doors, And said, Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further: and here shall thy proud waves be stayed? Hast thou commended

the morning since thy days; and caused the dayspring to know his place; That it might take hold of the ends of the earth, that the wicked might be shaken out of it?"

But let us now apply Dr. Mullins' principle to the other clauses of the Confession. Let us take, for example, the clause on education.

EDUCATION.

"20. Christianity is the religion of enlightenment and intelligence. In Jesus Christ are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. All sound learning is therefore a part of our Christian heritage. The new birth opens all human faculties and creates a thirst for knowledge. An adequate system of schools is necessary to a complete spiritual program for Christ's people. The cause of education in the Kingdom of Christ is co-ordinate with the causes of missions and general benevolence, and should receive along with these the liberal support of the churches."

Not a single passage of Scripture is quoted in support of this clause, or of other clauses except 3 and 17, yet we believe the clause to be true in principle. But we would call attention to the fact that the committee includes such a phrase as this in this clause: "An adequate system of schools is necessary to a complete spiritual program for Christ's people. The cause of education in the Kingdom of Christ is co-ordinate with the cause of missions and general benevolence, and should receive along with these the liberal support of the churches." Thus a statement of education is included in this statement of faith. Does Dr. Mullins mean to say that the study of Evolution must be excluded from "education"? If it were necessary to include this clause on education, surely it would have been advisable in the body of the report to make some statement in respect to the doctrine of Evolution.

We might make the same observation respecting Clause 19, on Peace and War, or on Civil Government. We believe they properly belong where they are placed; but we defy anybody logically to prove that they should be included and Evolution excluded. There must have been in Dr. Mullins' mind and that of the committee some special reason for not desiring to have an anti-Evolution clause contained in the statement of faith.

WHY NOT NAME "EVOLUTION" IN CONFESSION?

We come now to an examination of Dr. Mullins' contention that it would be improper to put it in the main body of the Confession and preamble, but better to include it as a supplementary statement under the head of science and religion. But how ever this paragraph on "Science and Religion" passed the Southern Baptist Convention in Kansas City in 1923, we are at a loss to understand. The paragraph says, among other things, "The evolution doctrine has long been a working hypothesis of science, and will probably continue to be, because of its apparent simplicity in explaining the universe." This clause implies that the evolutionary hypothesis is the simplest explanation of the universe we have. We should flatly deny that statement. An hypothesis that, after years of experimentation, is absolutely unproved, but is still a guess without any certain foundation, explains nothing at all, except the credulity of those who accept it. We still prefer to accept Gen. 1:1, "because of its apparent simplicity in explaining the universe."

Again this clause says, "But its best exponents freely admit that the causes of the origin of species have not been traced, nor has any proof been forthcoming that man is not the direct creation of God as recorded in Genesis." We ask, is that as far as we can go? Do we believe the Bible only because science has not yet succeeded in demonstrating its untrustworthiness? Is it not possible to be so established in the truth of God's Word that we shall be able to say, not only that no proof has as yet been supplied "that man is not the direct creation of God as recorded in Genesis," but that being absolutely sure that Genesis is the Word of God, we are equally certain that it never will be disproved?

After the discussion, one pastor told us he talked with Dr. Mullins, and said that he was sure no facts would ever be adduced that could establish the theory of Evolution, and that Dr. Mullins replied that he would not say that; he would only say that no facts had been produced as yet. We found ourselves

utterly unconvinced by Dr. Mullins' specious reasoning. The one question is, Do Southern Baptists believe in Evolution? If they do not, what possible reason can be given for their refusing to say so in plain and unmistakable language?

DR. MULLINS A GREAT MAN.

Dr. Mullins is undoubtedly a very great man. He is generally regarded as a very great scholar, and he may be. One thing we know, he is one of the shrewdest politicians we have ever observed. His speech at Memphis was not an argument at all. It was a piece of special pleading of a very low order. Perhaps some of his auditors were hypnotized by his reputation for greatness. We confess ourselves to have been amazed at the gullibility of his audience. Either Dr. Mullins is an intellectual dullard, or on this occasion was woefully wanting in frankness. We believe no one will doubt Dr. Mullins' intellectual power. If language means anything, with the printed report of the Confession before us, what Dr. Mullins said in respect to the content of the Confession was not strictly according to fact. We can only hope that his mind was somewhat fatigued and that he really believed himself what he said. We feel sure that a large number of those whom he addressed did not accept his reasoning. The impression Dr. Mullins made upon us was that had he been a horse-dealer, he could persuade himself to sell a spavined horse as one certain to win the Derby; or had he been a motor-car salesman, he could sell a second-hand car as the newest of all models; had he chosen to be a lawyer, he might have gone into partnership with Darrow of Chicago, as a special pleader for the lawless, and if, instead of a Baptist, he had been a Roman Catholic, nothing could have prevented his gaining the headship of the Jesuit Order.

Educational institutions seem to produce a type peculiar to themselves. They produce men who become obsessed with their own importance; and so persuade themselves of the paramount value of their particular work that they come at last to believe that the end justifies the means. Doctors Mullins and Scarborough are conspicuous examples of this tendency. Dr. Barton is a typical secretary, an inconsequential official with whose continuance in the duties of a secretarial office, no pastorless church of any importance would ever be likely to interfere. We should judge he is a very excellent and amiable gentleman who, by training and association, was admirably fitted to move the "previous question" in the interests of "fair play."

ANOTHER ASPECT OF THE BATTLE.

There is one side of this battle for the Book that many have observed, but which is seldom publicly discussed, and that is the spirit of those who are in open opposition to the Word of God, and the spirit which their defence engenders in others who are themselves quite orthodox.

We venture now to record an observation in this connection. On the platform of the Baptist Convention we observed a distinguished southern preacher whom we have long held in the highest esteem. We counted it a very great honor a few years ago to have him in our pulpit in Jarvis Street. So highly did we esteem him that when opportunity was afforded us, when in England in 1918, to observe Britain's great war effort under government direction, finding this preacher in London we introduced him to the Ministry of Information, and succeeded in having him included in our party. We travelled to Ireland, all over England, and to France, that we might observe what Great Britain had done and was still doing for the maintenance of the world's liberty. We found this preacher a most delightful companion. We were, at the time, supplying at Spurgeon's Tabernacle; and introduced this great preacher to that church by inviting him to take the morning service one Sunday. We conducted the service while this great southern preacher preached in the morning; and in the evening we reversed the order, and preached while this preacher conducted the service. His morning sermon was a great message, and stirred the people to the depths. Our liking for the brother in question seemed to be reciprocated; for he gave us the warmest possible invitation to visit both the Southern Convention and the Baptist Convention of Texas. Again and again he said, "You are our sort: you would love to meet our southern people, and they would be delighted to meet you." We

parted company with him in England, and did not meet him again until two years ago. On that occasion we went as a stranger to speak at the Christian Fundamentals Association held at the First Baptist Church of Fort Worth, Texas. We had never met the Pastor of the First Church, Dr. J. Frank Norris, up to that time. We now plead guilty to having entertained some suspicion of him. He had indeed written us a very cordial letter about a certain matter that had come under his observation; and not wishing to have any connection with him we had been guilty of the discourtesy of not replying to his letter; frankly, we were afraid of him. We went, however, to Fort Worth, not as his guest but by invitation of the Christian Fundamentals Association, which happened to be meeting in the First Church at Fort Worth. On that occasion being in the neighborhood of the brother concerned, we telephoned him, and later met him at Kansas City. If it could be admitted for the sake of argument that Dr. J. Frank Norris is rather an unusual man, even indeed were it to be admitted that he was exceedingly faulty, one would suppose that under such circumstances as we have related, it would not be an unpardonable offence to stand in his pulpit. But we discovered in Kansas City that the great southern preacher with whom we had been on such cordial terms in Europe, did not welcome our visit to the South. It is no exaggeration to say that while there may still be some question as to whether Dr. Cook discovered the North Pole, when we met the brother in question in Kansas City, we discovered it in very truth.

It seems to us a great pity that brethren should allow their spirits to become so embittered in controversial matters. We saw the brother to whom we have been referring on the platform in Memphis; but we had so completely faded from his memory that he did not even recognize us. The one whom we regarded as the embodiment of orthodoxy and graciouslyness no longer acknowledged even a nodding acquaintance with us, because, we presume, we were in the company of the Pastor of the First Baptist Church at Fort Worth. Personally we find it difficult to understand how this distinguished brother could invite Dr. Shailer Mathews to his pulpit, and recommend his books to his hearers. Certainly we should never think of inviting to Jarvis Street a man who so openly denies all the fundamentals of the faith as does Dr. Shailer Mathews. Still, while we think it irregular to bring such a man to an orthodox Baptist pulpit, we did not hold it against our dear brother; and we would gladly have shaken hands with him had he desired. It is but one more evidence of the devisive influence of the plague of modernism. We observed that when the vote was taken on Dr. Stealey's amendment, Dr. George W. Truett voted against the anti-evolution amendment.

WHY PROTECT EVOLUTIONISTS?

We are led now to inquire whom are these leaders afraid of offending? In the main this Confession passed by the Southern Convention is orthodox. Dr. Mullins, as we have observed, said that they had endeavored to satisfy all groups. Obviously he was of the opinion that, in general, the Convention must be orthodox; for they had endeavored to meet the opinion of the majority. But some concession must be made to evolutionists. We have already shown that the paragraph on Science and Religion is not a pronouncement against Evolution at all. In effect it says that it is too early to teach Evolution as an established fact. But the implication of the whole paragraph is that science may at length succeed in proving its hypothesis; and the clause we have before quoted in the preamble, clause 5, is one of the safeguards attached to the Confession of Faith to ensure that teachers of science shall not be hindered in their attempts to prove the evolutionary hypothesis, even though they be engaged as professors in Baptist schools.

In other words, it appears to us that the Committee felt that while it was prudent not to leave in their statement of faith a hole large enough for the public to see, it was necessary, under present circumstances, to leave an aperture small enough for an evolutionist to crawl through. We are afraid there will be a great day of reckoning when southern Baptists wake up to see how cleverly they have been tricked.

WHAT WILL BE THE RESULT?

We now come to ask what will be the probable result? We were greeted by hosts of southern Pastors; and from their remarks we judge that Southern Baptists are suffering from almost the worst possible leadership; practically all funds are almost hopelessly in debt. What is the cause? We do not believe that it lies with the rank and file of the people; but that it is an indication of the declining confidence of Southern Baptists in their present leadership. Not that the leaders are not great men, for they are. Certainly not that they are not good men. The cause of this decline we believe to be in the reluctance of these denominational leaders to deal heroically with the infidelity that is creeping into their schools. They have thought to save the situation by discrediting the man, or men, who have sought to turn the light upon the evolutionary teaching of some of their professors and leaders. In this they temporarily succeeded. As all America knows, Dr. J. Frank Norris has, for some years, been the storm-centre of the Southern Baptist Convention. We met him in May, 1922, in Fort Worth, and a week later in Kansas City at the first meeting of the Baptist Bible Union, just prior to the Southern Convention. At that time it seemed that the Southern leaders had all but accomplished their purpose, for it was abundantly evident that the overwhelming sentiment of the Southern Convention was antagonistic to Dr. Norris. Comparatively few of his brother ministers seemed to be willing even to recognize him. But what a change has taken place in the last two years! Blessing has continued to rest upon his ministry in Fort Worth: wherever he has gone God has set His seal to his testimony; and churches have been revived, and their work laid upon new and stronger foundations. We gladly bear testimony to the great and abiding blessing resulting from Dr. Norris' mission in Toronto. As we write we are at the end of a fifteen years' ministry in Jarvis Street Church; and in all that time we have never been visited by anyone who made such a rich and lasting contribution to our church life as Dr. Norris. The same has occurred in San Antonio, and Houston, Texas; while his own great church from week to week becomes greater still. This is a testimony which cannot be ignored. Some men of implacable spirit, who are concerned more for their own honor than for the work of the Lord, may continue to hate Norris; but the rank and file of the people, and especially of the pastors, having no personal grudge, but having been temporarily influenced by hearing only one side of the story, when the great truth is borne in upon them that the blessing of God is attending Dr. Norris' ministry, and that he has been cruelly maligned, will inevitably revise their judgment and turn whole-heartedly to him as a man of God whose ministry God is honoring.

In Memphis it seemed to us that Dr. Norris was the most popular of all men in town. We were much in his company; and from time to time desired to make passage to some place of conference rapidly, so that we found it a great embarrassment to be stopped hundreds of time on the street by pastors and others with such words as these, "Dr. Norris, I cannot let you pass without speaking to you: we thank God for the fight you have put up: we are reading *The Searchlight* and praying for you all the time." This we heard in literally hundreds of cases. Educational leaders ought to know enough about psychology to know that when they abuse a man as a kind of revolutionary or ecclesiastical outlaw, if the people find out they have been misled, they will make atonement for their unjust judgment by giving their hearts to the man traduced, and turning with fury upon his traducers. This is beginning in the Southern Convention, and there are great days ahead.

Great Baptist Bible Union Meetings

We turn now to a consideration of the Baptist Bible Union meetings held in Memphis Monday and Tuesday, May 11th and 12th. We were all greatly disappointed that on account of illness, from which happily he is now recovering, Dr. Benjamin Cox was unable to give the address advertised. We were, however, delighted that he was sufficiently convalescent to be able to be at the meeting. His place was taken by Dr. W. L. Pettingill, who gave a great exposition of the second Psalm. We advise all our readers whenever Dr. Pettingill

comes their way to insist that he shall speak to them on the second Psalm. It was worth going to Memphis for this address alone.

DR. J. W. GILLON OF KENTUCKY.

In the afternoon the first address was by Dr. J. W. Gillon, of Winchester, Ky. We had heard of Dr. Gillon and were prepared for a great message,—but the half had not been told. What pulpit giants are to be found among the Baptists of the South! In these days when strong men are so urgently needed, what a joy it is to make the acquaintance of one of God's mighty men! Dr. Gillon spoke on the "Inspiration of the Scripture." His address lifted his audience into the heavenly places, so that they were able to look down upon the modernists and see them as a company of tiny ants trying to destroy the Rocky Mountains.

We were happy immediately at the close of this service to be able to secure from Dr. Gillon the promise that he would preach for us in Jarvis Street the first two Sundays of July.

DR. A. H. AUTRY OF ARK.

Dr. Gillon was followed by Dr. A. H. Autry, Little Rock, Ark. We cannot describe this address. It was like a whole battery of artillery going off at once. Dr. Autry is one of the staunch defenders of the faith from Arkansas; and he refuses to bow the knee to Modernism in theology or ecclesiology.

DR. RILEY ON EVOLUTION.

We have already referred to Dr. Riley's great address on Evolution in the auditorium on Monday night. It was an inspiration to that great crowd to see this great soldier of the Cross in all his fighting form, notwithstanding his long illness now apparently as vigorous as ever. While in the ranks of Baptist orthodoxy there is great gladness over Dr. Riley's recovery, they do not hail his return to battle in Gath, nor publish it as good news in the streets of Askelon, nor do the daughters of Philistia rejoice on account of his recovery.

DR. R. K. MAIDEN.

On Tuesday morning Dr. Maiden delivered a most able address on "Supernaturalism vs. Naturalism in Religion." It was a great utterance worthy of the occasion and the man; and we are glad that it was in printed form, so that the majority of those present were able to take a copy with them.

DR. J. W. PORTER.

In the afternoon Dr. J. W. Porter gave one of his characteristic addresses on Evolution. His bow abideth in strength and the arms of his hands are made strong by the mighty God of Jacob.

It was the writer's privilege, following Dr. Porter, to give to the assembled brethren a very simple message based upon the text: "And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved."

In all these services the Spirit of the Lord was manifestly present, and the hearts of all seemed to be much warmed toward Christ.

DR. NORRIS' MEETING THE CLIMAX.

The great congregation that greeted Dr. Norris in the evening—to which we have already referred—was an eloquent testimony to the place he holds in the lives of Southern Baptists. Whether any of them came to criticize, we do not know; but we are sure there were very few who did not applaud before the meeting ended. The argument was absolutely convincing. Dr. Norris' address was the talk of the Convention still when we left Memphis Thursday night. The fact is, Evolution is eating like a cancer at the very vitals of the Southern Convention. How many were turned away from the doors when Dr. Norris spoke we do not know; but judging by the fact that the church was packed to capacity nearly an hour before the advertised time to begin, we should judge that at least as many were turned aside as gained admission, in which case more than four thousand tried to hear him on that occasion.

350 PASTORS JOIN BAPTIST BIBLE UNION.

During the two days of our Bible Union meetings, about three hundred and fifty Southern Baptist pastors joined the Union. The enthusiasm of that great fellowship seemed to know no bounds. So successful were the meetings that it was decided to make a pre-Convention Conference of the Baptist Bible Union in the South an annual event: that is to say, the Baptist Bible Union will meet for one or two days each year before the Southern Baptist Convention. This decision, we feel sure, was eminently wise. There were some pastors of influence solidly with us in doctrine who, even after Dr. Norris' great address, did not join the Baptist Bible Union; but after the vote on the Confession of Faith, and after observing the significant attendant circumstances, declared their determination to unite at once.

WHAT WILL BE THE EFFECT OF THE VOTE?

What will be the effect of the vote taken at the Southern Baptist Convention? Certainly it will not bring unity to that great body. The nine hundred and fifty who voted for Dr. Stealey's amendment represent a great host of men and women who will yet be heard from. The political application of the "gag," shutting off all discussion of one of the most important questions probably ever submitted to that great Convention, is bound to have a serious reaction. One of the leading pastors of the South who serves a great and influential church, a thorough denominational man, said to us: "I am going back to my church with the determination to see that after the decision of this afternoon it shall not give one dollar to educational purposes under Southern Baptist control."

WHAT WILL THE 950 DO?

What about the nine hundred and fifty? After the clever application of the gag, did these nine hundred and fifty messengers surrender their faith? They did not surrender their faith in the Word of God; but we greatly fear that they did surrender their faith in their leaders. We venture to believe that Dr. Barton will have to live many a day, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance all the time, to regain the people's confidence in view of the part he played in Dr. Mullins' argument for "fair play."

Beyond doubt, that shattering of confidence will seriously affect the treasuries. It is regrettable that this should be; but when loyal Baptists are tricked in Convention their only resource is to refuse to provide the sinews of war. Were we a Southern Baptist, under the circumstances, we should use great discrimination in making our contributions; and until we had some guarantee that our money would be used only for the furtherance of the gospel, we would give nothing to be administered by such leadership as we observed.

DR. C. P. STEALEY THE HERO OF THE CONVENTION.

At the Memphis meeting Dr. C. P. Stealey was the hero of the hour. We have had enough experience of denominational life to know that Dr. Stealey has been through a furnace heated seven times hotter than it is wont to be heated. We are sure he will be abundantly compensated for his heroic stand. The nine hundred and fifty, and the tens and perhaps hundreds of thousands they represent, will be true to their vote; and will support him by prayer and effort to the end. Dr. Stealey is editor of *The Baptist Messenger* of Oklahoma City. His paper ought to be supported by those who stand for the faith. We shall be greatly surprised if his stand does not result in a very large increase of his circulation.

THE SEARCHLIGHT.

And what about *The Searchlight*? We were in the different galleries of the great Auditorium, and also on the platform—but it made little difference where one sat, everybody seemed to have a *Searchlight*." The Baptist messengers might almost have dispensed with their badges, for each could be identified by a copy of *The Searchlight* sticking out of his pocket. We predict an enormous increase in the circulation of *The Searchlight*. It would be a pity for any Southern Baptist to allow the springs of benevolence to dry

up. We venture to suggest that if they were to turn their contributions for education, temporarily, into a great Searchlight Fund, they would be accomplishing a great ministry for the South. If, for instance, one hundred thousand dollars were put at the disposal of *The Searchlight* to send the paper to every Baptist in the South for a year, what a tremendous effect it would have!

We are more than ever in love with Southern Baptists. The Confession of Faith as passed will hearten the fundamentalists of the North and of Canada. It will advertise to the world the orthodoxy of Southern Baptists as a whole, for the reason that a document, prepared for acceptance by the rank and file of the people, is sound in all that it says, and is weak only in its omission of that which would have locked and double-barred the door against Evolution. The discussion and vote on the Confession of Faith at the Southern Baptist Convention resulted in the beginning of a tremendous victory for the truth.

Report of Committee on Baptist Faith and Message

(Presented to the Southern Baptist Convention, in session at Memphis, Tenn.,
May 14, 1925).

Your committee beg leave to report as follows:

Your committee recognize that they were appointed "to consider the advisability of issuing another statement of the Baptist Faith and Message, and to report at the next Convention."

In pursuance of the instructions of the Convention, and in consideration of the general denominational situation, your committee have decided to recommend the New Hampshire Confession of Faith, revised at certain points, and with some additional articles growing out of present needs, for approval by the Convention, in the event a statement of the Baptist faith and message is deemed necessary at this time.

The present occasion for a reaffirmation of Christian fundamentals is the prevalence of naturalism in the modern teaching and preaching of religion. Christianity is supernatural in its origin and history. We repudiate every theory which denies the supernatural elements in our faith.

As introductory to the doctrinal articles, we recommend the adoption by the Convention of the following statement of the historic Baptist conception of the nature and function of confessions of faith in our religious and denominational life, believing that some such statement will clarify the atmosphere and remove some causes of misunderstanding, friction, and apprehension. Baptists approve and circulate confessions of faith with the following understandings, namely,

(1) That they constitute a consensus of opinion of some Baptist body, large or small, for the general instruction and guidance of our own people and others concerning those articles of the Christian faith which are most surely held among us. They are not intended to add anything to the simple conditions of salvation revealed in the New Testament, viz., repentance towards God, faith in Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord.

(2) That we do not regard them as complete statements of our faith, having any quality of finality or infallibility. As in the past so in the future Baptists should hold themselves free to revise their statements of faith as may seem to them wise and expedient at any time.

(3) That any group of Baptists, large or small, have the inherent right to draw up for themselves and publish to the world a confession of their faith whenever they may think it advisable to do so.

(4) That the sole authority for faith and practice among Baptists is the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Confessions are only guides in interpretation, having no authority over the conscience.

(5) That they are statements of religious convictions, drawn from the Scriptures, and are not to be used to hamper freedom of thought or investigation in other realms of life.

THE SCRIPTURES.

1. We believe that the Holy Bible was written by men divinely inspired, and is a perfect treasure of heavenly instruction; that it has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth, without any mixture of error, for its matter; that it reveals the principles by which God will judge us; and therefore is, and will remain to the end of the world, the true centre of Christian union, and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds and religious opinions should be tried.

GOD.

2. There is one and only one living and true God, an intelligent, spiritual and personal Being, the Creator, Preserver and Ruler of the universe, infinite in holiness and all other perfections, to whom we owe the highest love, reverence and obedience. He is revealed to us as Father, Son and Holy Spirit, each with distinct personal attributes, but without division of nature, essence or being.

THE FALL OF MAN.

3. Man was created by the special act of God, as recorded in Genesis, "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." (Gen. 1:27.) "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." (Gen. 2: 7.) He was created in a state of holiness under the law of his maker, but, through the temptation of Satan he transgressed the command of God and fell from his original holiness and righteousness; whereby his posterity inherit a nature corrupt and in bondage to sin, and are under condemnation, and as soon as they are capable of moral action, become actual transgressors.

THE WAY OF SALVATION.

4. The salvation of sinners is wholly of grace, through the mediatorial office of the Son of God, who by the Holy Spirit was born of the Virgin Mary and took upon him our nature, yet without sin; honored the divine law by his personal obedience, and made atonement for our sins by his death. Being risen from the dead, he is now enthroned in Heaven, and, uniting in his person the tenderest sympathies with divine perfections, he is in every way qualified to be a compassionate and all-sufficient Saviour.

JUSTIFICATION.

5. Justification is God's gracious and full acquittal upon principles of righteousness of all sinners who believe in Christ. This blessing is bestowed, not in consideration of any works of righteousness which we have done, but through the redemption that is in and through Jesus Christ. It brings us into a state of most blessed peace and favour with God, and secures every other needed blessing.

THE FREENESS OF SALVATION.

6. The blessings of salvation are made free to all by the Gospel. It is the duty of all to accept them by penitent and obedient faith. Nothing prevents the salvation of the greatest sinner except his own voluntary refusal to accept Jesus Christ as teacher, Saviour and Lord.

REGENERATION.

7. Regeneration or the new birth is a change of heart wrought by the Holy Spirit, whereby we become partakers of the divine nature and a holy disposition is given, leading to the love and practice of righteousness. It is a work of God's free grace conditioned upon faith in Christ and made manifest by the fruit which we bring forth to the glory of God.

REPENTANCE AND FAITH.

8. We believe that repentance and faith are sacred duties, and also inseparable graces, wrought in our souls by the regenerating Spirit of God; whereby being deeply convinced of our guilt, danger, and helplessness, and of the way of salvation by Christ, we turn to God with unfeigned contrition, confession,

and supplication for mercy; at the same time heartily receiving the Lord Jesus Christ as our Prophet, Priest and King, and relying on him alone as the only and all-sufficient Saviour.

GOD'S PURPOSE OF GRACE.

9. Election is the gracious purpose of God, according to which he regenerates, sanctifies and saves sinners. It is perfectly consistent with the free agency of man, and comprehends all the means in connection with the end. It is a most glorious display of God's sovereign goodness, and is infinitely wise, holy and unchangeable. It excludes boasting and promotes humility. It encourages the use of means in the highest degree.

SANCTIFICATION.

10. Sanctification is the process by which the regenerate gradually attain to moral and spiritual perfection through the presence and power of the Holy Spirit dwelling in their hearts. It continues throughout the earthly life, and is accomplished by the use of all the ordinary means of grace, and particularly by the Word of God.

PERSEVERANCE.

11. All real believers endure to the end. Their continuance in well-doing is the mark which distinguishes them from mere professors. A special Providence cares for them, and they are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation.

A GOSPEL CHURCH.

12. A church of Christ is a congregation of baptized believers, associated by covenant in the faith and fellowship of the gospel; observing the ordinances of Christ, governed by his laws, and exercising the gifts, rights and privileges invested in them by his word, and seeking to extend the Gospel to the ends of the earth. Its Scriptural officers are bishops or elders and deacons.

BAPTISM AND THE LORD'S SUPPER.

13. Christian baptism is the immersion of a believer in water in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. The act is a symbol of our faith in a crucified, buried and risen Saviour. It is prerequisite to the privileges of a church relation and to the Lord's Supper, in which the members of the church, by the use of bread and wine, commemorate the dying love of Christ.

THE LORD'S DAY.

14. The first day of the week is the Lord's day. It is a Christian institution for regular observance. It commemorates the resurrection of Christ from the dead, and should be employed in exercises of worship and spiritual devotion, both public and private, and by refraining from worldly amusements, and resting from secular employments, works of necessity and mercy only excepted.

THE RIGHTEOUS AND THE WICKED.

15. There is a radical and essential difference between the righteous and wicked. Those only who are justified through the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and sanctified by the Holy Spirit are truly righteous in his sight. Those who continue in impenitence and unbelief are in his sight wicked and are under condemnation. This distinction between the righteous and the wicked holds in and after death, and will be made manifest at the judgment when final and everlasting awards are made to all men.

THE RESURRECTION.

16. The Scriptures clearly teach that Jesus rose from the dead. His grave was emptied of its contents. He appeared to the disciples after his resurrection in many convincing manifestations. He now exists in his glorified body at God's right hand. There will be a resurrection of the righteous and the wicked. The bodies of the righteous will conform to the glorious spiritual body of Jesus.

THE RETURN OF THE LORD.

17. The New Testament teaches in many places the visible and personal return of Jesus to this earth. "This same Jesus which is taken up from you into Heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into Heaven." The time of his coming is not revealed. "Of that day and hour knoweth no one, no, not the angels in heaven, but my Father only." (Matt. 24: 36.) It is the duty of all believers to live in readiness for his coming and by diligence in good works to make manifest to all men the reality and power of their hope in Christ.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

18. God alone is Lord of the conscience, and he has left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are contrary to his word or not contained in it. Church and state should be separate. The state owes to the church protection and full freedom in the pursuit of its spiritual ends. In providing for such freedom no ecclesiastical group or denomination should be favored by the state more than others. Civil government being ordained of God, it is the duty of Christians to render loyal obedience thereto in all things not contrary to the revealed will of God. The church should not resort to the civil power to carry on its work. The Gospel of Christ contemplates spiritual means alone for the pursuit of its ends. The state has no right to impose penalties for religious opinions of any kind. The state has no right to impose taxes for the support of any form of religion. A free church in a free state is the Christian ideal, and this implies the right of free and unhindered access to God on the part of all men, and the right to form and propagate opinions in the sphere of religion without interference by the civil power.

PEACE AND WAR.

19. It is the duty of Christians to seek peace with all men on principles of righteousness. In accordance with the spirit and teachings of Christ, they should do all in their power to put an end to war.

The true remedy for the war spirit is the pure gospel of our Lord. The supreme need of the world is the acceptance of his teachings in all the affairs of men and nations, and the practical application of his law of love.

We urge Christian people throughout the world to pray for the reign of the Prince of Peace, and to oppose everything likely to provoke war.

EDUCATION.

20. Christianity is the religion of enlightenment and intelligence. In Jesus Christ are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. All sound learning is therefore a part of our Christian heritage. The new birth opens all human faculties and creates a thirst for knowledge. An adequate system of schools is necessary to a complete spiritual program for Christ's people. The cause of education in the Kingdom of Christ is co-ordinate with the causes of missions and general benevolence, and should receive along with these the liberal support of the churches.

SOCIAL SERVICE.

21. Every Christian is under obligation to seek to make the will of Christ pregnant in his own life and in human society; to oppose in the spirit of Christ every form of greed, selfishness and vice; to provide for the orphaned, the aged, the helpless, and the sick; to seek to bring industry, government and society as a whole under the sway of the principles of righteousness, truth and brotherly love; to promote these ends Christians should be ready to work with all men of good will in any good cause, always being careful to act in the spirit of love without compromising their loyalty to Christ and his truth. All means and methods used in social service for the amelioration of society and the establishment of righteousness among men must finally depend on the regeneration of the individual by the saving grace of God in Christ Jesus.

CO-OPERATION.

22. Christ's people should, as occasion requires, organize such associations and conventions as may best secure co-operation for the great objects of the

Kingdom of God. Such organizations have no authority over each other or over the churches. They are voluntary and advisory bodies designed to elicit, combine and direct the energies of our people in the most effective manner. Individual members of New Testament churches should co-operate with each other, and the churches themselves should co-operate with each other in carrying forward the missionary, educational and benevolent program for the extension of Christ's Kingdom. Christian unity in the New Testament sense is spiritual harmony and voluntary co-operation for common ends by various groups of Christ's people. It is permissible and desirable as between the various Christian denominations, when the end to be attained is itself justified, and when such co-operation involves no violation of conscience or compromise of loyalty to Christ and his Word as revealed in the New Testament.

EVANGELISM AND MISSIONS.

23. It is the duty of every Christian man and woman, and the duty of every church of Christ to seek to extend the gospel to the ends of the earth. The new birth of man's spirit by God's Holy Spirit means the birth of love for others. Missionary effort on the part of all rests thus upon a spiritual necessity of the regenerate life. It is also expressly and repeatedly commanded in the teachings of Christ. It is the duty of every child of God to seek constantly to win the lost to Christ by personal effort and by all other methods sanctioned by the Gospel of Christ.

STEWARDSHIP.

24. God is the source of all blessings, temporal and spiritual; all that we have and are we owe to him. We have a spiritual debtorship to the whole world, a holy trusteeship in the Gospel, and a binding stewardship in our possessions. We are therefore under obligation to serve him with our time, talents and material possessions; and should recognize all these as entrusted to us to use for the glory of God and helping others. Christians should cheerfully, regularly, systematically, proportionately and liberally contribute of their means to advancing the Redeemer's cause on earth.

THE KINGDOM.

25. The Kingdom of God is the reign of God in the heart and life of the individual in every human relationship, and in every form and institution of organized human society. The chief means for promoting the Kingdom of God on earth are preaching the Gospel of Christ, and teaching the principles of righteousness contained therein. The Kingdom of God will be complete when every thought and will of man shall be brought into captivity to the will of Christ. And it is the duty of all Christ's people to pray and labor continually that his Kingdom may come and his will be done on earth as it is done in heaven.

Since matters of science have no proper place in a religious confession of faith, and since it is desirable that our attitude towards science be clearly understood, you committee deem it proper to submit the following statement on the relation between science and religion, adopted in 1923 by this convention at Kansas City, and request that it be published in the minutes of the Convention.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

1. We recognize the greatness and value of the service which modern science is rendering to the cause of truth in uncovering the facts of the natural world. We believe that loyalty to fact is a common ground of genuine science and the Christian religion. We have no interest or desire in covering up any fact in any realm of research. But we do protest against certain unwarranted procedures on the part of some so-called scientists. First, in making discoveries, or alleged discoveries, in physical nature, a convenient weapon of attack upon the facts of religion; second, using the particular sciences, such as psychology, biology, geology and various others as if they necessarily contained knowledge pertaining to the realm of the Christian religion, setting aside the supernatural; third, teaching as facts what are merely hypotheses. The evolution doctrine has long been a working hypothesis of science, and will probably

continue to be, because of its apparent simplicity in explaining the universe. But its best exponents freely admit that the causes of the origin of species have not been traced, nor has any proof been forthcoming that man is not the direct creation of God as recorded in Genesis. We protest against the imposition of this theory upon the minds of our children in denominational or public schools as if it were a definite and established truth of science. We insist that this and all other theories be dealt with in a truly scientific way; that is, in careful conformity to established facts.

2. We record again our unwavering adherence to the supernatural elements in the Christian religion. The Bible is God's revelation of himself through men moved by the Holy Spirit, and is our sufficient, certain and authoritative guide in religion. Jesus Christ was born of the Virgin Mary, through the power of the Holy Spirit. He was the divine and eternal son of God. He wrought miracles, healing the sick, casting out demons, raising the dead. He died as the vicarious, atoning Saviour of the world, and was buried. He arose again from the dead. The tomb was emptied of its contents. In his risen body he appeared many times to his disciples. He ascended to the right hand of the Father. He will come again in person, the same Jesus who ascended from the Mount of Olives.

3. We believe that adherence to the above truths and facts is a necessary condition of service for teachers in our Baptist schools. These facts of Christianity in no way conflict with any fact in science. We do not sit in judgment upon the scientific views of teachers of science. We grant them the same freedom of research in their realm that we claim for ourselves in the religious realm. But we do insist upon a positive content of faith in accordance with the preceding statement as a qualification for acceptable service in Baptist schools. The supreme issue to-day is between naturalism and super-naturalism. We stand unalterably for the super-natural in Christianity. Teachers in our schools should be careful to free themselves from any suspicion of disloyalty on this point. In the present period of agitation and unrest they are obligated to make their positions clear. We pledge our support to all schools and teachers who are thus loyal to the facts of Christianity as revealed in the Scriptures.

Signed by the Committee.

E. Y. MULLINS, Chairman,
S. M. BROWN,
W. J. McGLOTHLIN,
E. C. DARGAN,
L. R. SCARBOROUGH,
Z. T. CODY (acting for R. H. Pitt).

One member of the committee, Dr. C. P. Stealey, of Oklahoma, who has agreed to everything in the report as submitted, wishes to substitute the article below for the third article in the doctrinal statement. The other members of the committee object to the substitution because the matter contained in it is taken care of in the statement given on "Science and Religion," and because matters of science should not be included in confessions of religious faith, and, still further, because the declaration as given that man was "created by the special act of God" is explicit and leaves no necessity for references to biology. Dr. Stealey's article is as follows:

THE CREATION AND FALL OF MAN.

We believe that man came into this world by direct creation of God and not by evolution. This creative act was separate and distinct from any other work of God and was not conditioned upon antecedent changes in previously created forms of life. Gen. 1: 27: "God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him." Gen. 2: 7: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."

Man was at first in a state of holiness under the law of his Maker, but through the temptation of Satan, he transgressed the command of God, and fell from his original holiness and righteousness, whereby his posterity inherit a nature corrupt and in bondage to sin, are under condemnation, and as soon as they are capable of moral action, become actual transgressors.

THE NEXT FIVE SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS.

Our lessons for some weeks to come will be in the book of Psalms. The greater part of this portion of Scripture was undoubtedly written by David; and in the next five lessons we shall deal with the Psalms which are undoubtedly of Davidic authorship. David's full and varied life would admit of a very minute analysis; but for the purpose of our Sunday School study it will be sufficient to name five distinct periods in his history, and these five periods will form the next five lessons. The history to which the Psalms in these lessons relate will be found in the first and second books of Samuel, and in the first book of Chronicles. In connection with the periods named, we give the particular Scriptures which form the historical background of these Psalms. We would recommend both teachers and scholars to review the historical studies we have covered in months past, by a careful reading of the first and second books of Samuel and the first book of Chronicles.

LESSON I. From David's First Appearance to Saul's Death.

Historical Background: First book of Samuel, chapter 16, to II Samuel, chapter 1.

First Chronicles, chapters 1 to 10.

Psalms Relative to the Period: 7, 11, 13, 18, 22, 23, 34, 35, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59.

LESSON II: From David's Coronation to His Great Fall.

Historical Background: II Samuel chapters 2 to 11.

I Chronicles, chapters 11 to 20.

Psalms Relative to the Period: 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 26, 29, 36, 58, 60, 68, 101, 108, 110.

LESSON III: From His Great Sin to Absalom's Rebellion.

Historical Background: II Samuel, chapters 12 to 15.

Psalms Relative to the Period: 5, 6, 32, 38, 39, 40, 41, 51, 55, 64.

LESSON IV: The Period of Exile.

Historical Background: II Samuel, chapter 16: 1 to 20: 3.

Psalms Relative to the Period: 3, 4, 27, 28, 31, 61, 63, 69, 70, 143.

LESSON V: From His Triumphant Return to Eventide.

Historical Background: II Samuel, chapter 20: 4 to end of chapter 24.

I Chronicles, chapters 21 to 29.

Psalms Relative to the Period: 37, 103, 139.

The Jarvis Street Whole Bible Sunday School Lesson Course

Lesson IX.

May 31st, 1925

I. How David Kept His Spirit Sweet Amid Bitter Experiences.

Psalm 7, according to the title, was inspired by certain words spoken by an enemy. If Saul is intended in the title, there is no record of the particular words to which the title refers; but the historical background is to be found in the record of Saul's jealousy of David. Though David was unjustly persecuted, instead of embittering his spirit by human injustice, he puts his trust in God and sings of the divine righteousness.

Psalm 11. His faith here inspires him to sing, and to scorn the advice of the enemy to flee as a bird to his mountain.

Psalm 12. Though he sees wickedness abound and lying prosper, the certainty of the just judgments of God leads him still to sing.

Psalm 13. He sings himself out of a state of depression into one of abounding gladness: "I will sing unto the Lord, because he hath dealt bountifully with me."

II. David is Vicariously Fitted for the Prophetic Office.

The 22nd Psalm is a messianic prophecy; yet it found its basis in David's own experience. Probably it is to such a Scripture as this Peter refers in I Peter, 1: 10-12.

III. David's Experience As a Shepherd Inspired His Immortal Prophecy of the Good Shepherd, Psalm 23.

IV. David Blesses the Lord for Bread and a Sword.

Historical Background: I Samuel 21: 13.

Relative Psalm: No. 34: David's song of praise for the providential supply of his need.

V. **David Cries for Help When His Enemies Conspire Against Him.**

Historical Background: I Samuel 26: 1.

Relative Psalm: No. 54.

VI. **David's Praise in the Midst of His Enemies.**

Historical Background: I Samuel 21: 11.

Relative Psalm: No. 56: Surrounded by foes, his trust is still in God.

VII. **David in the Cave of Adullam.**

Historical Background: I Samuel 22: 1.

I Samuel 24: 1-3.

Relative Psalm: No. 57.

VIII. **David is Once Again Delivered from His Watchful Enemies.**

Historical Background: I Samuel 19: 8-17.

Relative Psalm: No. 59.

THE LATE MR. H. H. LEAVENS.

Jarvis Street sustained a very great loss when on Wednesday morning, May 13th, Mr. H. H. Leavens, who for nearly twenty-three years had been the faithful janitor of Jarvis Street Church, departed to be with Christ "which is far better". Mr. Leavens' health had been declining for some time; but when the Pastor saw him May 5th before leaving for Memphis, he little thought that he would see him no more in this life.

Mr. Leavens was of a very quiet and retiring disposition; but his faith in Christ was simple and steadfast. He entertained clear views on the essentials of the gospel of Christ.

The Editor of this paper has had opportunity to see many churches, and to observe the work of many janitors. He believes no church did ever have a more faithful servant than Jarvis Street had in Mr. Leavens. He was laid to rest on the fifteenth anniversary of the beginning of the present pastorate in Jarvis Street. In all that time the service Mr. Leavens rendered the church was about as near perfection as human service could ever be. The position of janitor of a large church is proverbially difficult; but Mr. Leavens filled it with a degree of satisfaction that we have never known equalled in any other church: no duty was ever neglected; and the thoroughness with which the entire building was cared for was the source of gratification to the officers of the church, and the entire congregation.

We believe that Mr. Leavens loved Jarvis Street, and did his utmost to contribute to its prosperity. The Pastor found in him an ever ready helper whose memory he will always cherish as of a fellow-labourer in the gospel of Christ. The entire church sympathizes with Mrs. Leavens, who was always a quiet but sympathetic and faithful helpmeet. Mr. Leavens' place will be very hard to fill.

LAST SUNDAY'S SERVICES.

The Pastor returned from Memphis on Saturday. Sunday was a day of blessing in all services. At the morning service the Pastor began the sixteenth year of his pastorate. On reaching his office on Saturday, the Pastor found a very gracious letter written in behalf of the Deacons and Deaconesses, and signed by Mr. Geo. Greenway. These faithful friends had hung within view of the Pastor's desk a fine portrait of his father, the late Rev. T. T. Shields. A fine bouquet of flowers, also, had been placed upon the desk.

On Sunday a magnificent bouquet of flowers was placed in the pulpit, and before the sermon Deacon Brownlee came to the platform and read the following address:

"Dear Dr. Shields:

"We, the members of Jarvis Street Church, Bible School, and congregation generally, wish to extend to you this morning our most sincere and hearty greeting on the occasion of your entrance upon the sixteenth year of ministry in this place. We could not permit the day to pass without expressing our esteem for you personally and our appreciation of

your able and indefatigable work in our midst. We are deeply indebted to you, in view of your outstanding and always helpful pulpit ministry. We rejoice in the plan of salvation made plain, and in the message of comfort, caution, and counsel, consistently given to the people of God. Your preaching is always a blessing to us. Your insight and vision have often pointed the way to paths we otherwise might not have known. Your leadership has prompted us to lines of endeavour from which, without it, we would have shrunk. Your fearlessness has inspired us with a confidence which otherwise we would not have attained. We wanted you to know that now, after all these years, you occupy, more than ever before, a large place in the affection and regard of your people; hence these brief lines. We would unitedly assure you of our loyal support and co-operation as you continue your ministry among us.

"On behalf of the church and congregation,

(Signed),

Geo. Greenway,

Jas G. Hyde,

Chas. Brownlow,

Fred Turney,

Harold G. Humphries,

L. F. Shields,

E. A. Brownlee."

The Pastor replied, expressing his joy at being home again in the best church, and among the most affectionate people, in the world. The text was from Acts 26: 22-23: "Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should shew light unto the people, and to the Gentiles." At the close of the service twenty-four responded to the invitation.

In the evening the church was packed to its utmost capacity with large numbers of people standing, while large numbers were turned away. The sermon of the evening appears elsewhere in this issue. Seven believers were baptized.

PRICES OF SERMONS AND LECTURES.

There has been a great demand for the sermon on "Church Union". *The Witness* mail is becoming heavier every day. Hitherto we have advertised that any special sermon would be sent prepaid for 10c. We are finding, however, that the clerical work involved in sending these individual orders is enormous. Having taken all the circumstances into consideration we find it necessary to charge 15c for individual orders. The lectures will not appear in *The Witness*, but will be published separately. These may be obtained at the church office for 10c per copy, or, if sent by mail, for 15c per copy. Those desiring to have the three sermons and the three lectures, if sent under one cover when the lectures are completed, may obtain them for 75c; if sent week by week as they are issued, 15c per copy. Send your orders at once.

SERMONS ON CHURCH UNION.

Dr. Shields will preach the third sermon on Church Union next Sunday evening, May 24th, the subject being:

"The United Church of Canada in No Sense a New Testament Church."

LECTURES ON THE METHODIST PAMPHLETS ENTITLED "THE CHRISTIAN HOPE".

Dr. Shields will deliver three, and possibly four, lectures on these pamphlets, beginning this week, Thursday evening, May 21st. Each lecture will be stenographically reported and printed.

THIS ISSUE OF THE WITNESS.

On account of the greatly increased size of this issue of *The Witness*, we are compelled to charge 10c for single copies.