

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, DECEMBER 10th, 1925

No. 33

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

McMASTER ABSOLUTELY PROVED TO HAVE BETRAYED HER TRUST.

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, Dec. 6th, 1925.

(Stenographically Reported)

"Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints."—Jude 3.



ANNOUNCE again this evening a very well-worn text. I have announced it perhaps for a dozen addresses or more—you all know it—Jude, third verse: "Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints", as this version has it, but literally "which was once for all delivered unto the saints".

Somebody told me last night that some good friend had said to him, "Why do you Jarvis Street people persist in this controversy?" I suppose a good many people ask that question, Why contend for the faith? The answer to that will depend very largely upon what you understand to be intended by "the faith". Is it something that men have discovered for themselves? Is it a set of human opinions? Our text says that it is something delivered—not discovered; something that came down from God—not something that was evolved out of our religious consciousness; it is a divine treasure committed to the trust of such as believe. And the faith "once for all delivered unto the saints" is what God says about man's natural state. It is not what man thinks about himself: it is the divine Physician's diagnosis of that fatal malady called "sin". This Book tells us where and how it originated in human life, what it has already accomplished, and what it will certainly bring to pass in days to come.

"The faith once delivered" consists of a divine prescription, too. It tells us how we may be delivered from sin,—not man's way of being delivered, but God's way. It tells us of a Saviour virgin-born, begotten of the Holy Ghost; it tells us of One Who was the fulfilment of what God had promised from the beginning, and that He died for our sins according to the Scriptures. The faith "once for all delivered" has that as its central truth, that He died the

Just for the unjust to bring us to God. It tells us of the resurrection of Christ, of the necessity of being born of the Spirit; it tells us that it is all contained in the Holy Scriptures: "For ever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven." The Bible is a copy of the word that is settled in heaven.

Now, this text tells us that it was delivered "once for all". There is to be no amendment, no improvement of any kind: it is God's last word on this subject. It is, indeed, the final revelation of God's purpose of grace; it is God's ultimatum to a rebellious world: "Last of all he sent unto them his son."

If you read military history you will find many of the bloodiest battles of history have been fought for the possession of a spring. Why contend for a bubbling spring? Because it meant life. Hundreds of lives were sacrificed for the possession of that fountain of life. You will find, too, that many bloody battles have been fought for the possession of rich mineral deposits of great potential wealth. Nobody could see them on the surface, but they were there; and for the enrichment of the nation the blood of its citizens was poured out. And the faith of the true believer represents to the believer all there is of abiding worth, either for time or for eternity. If God has really spoken to me in His Word, I have the truth concerning the subjects upon which He has spoken, and I cannot afford to part with it. We are admonished to earnestly contend for the faith. I could stop now and turn this into a testimony meeting, and I think I could get hundreds of testimonies from this congregation to-night right up-to-date, dating back, in some cases, fifty or sixty years, but in hundreds of cases only two or three or four years. And if I were to say to some of you, What does the faith "once for all delivered" mean to you? you would say, It means to me more than everything else in life; I would part company with everything I have rather than surrender my faith. I could call upon representatives of families here to-night, and say to you, What has the faith done for you in your family? Father and mother would say, It has changed our home from hell into heaven; that is what it has done.

"The faith once for all delivered" is so precious that—and I say it advisedly—some of us would rather shed the last drop of our blood than we would yield one solitary word that God has spoken; and when men have been blessed by the truth of God, and that faith is attacked, we say to those who attack it, You have a fight on your hands. ("Amen! Hallelujah!") Somebody said to me—I will not tell you who—only yesterday, "We are tired of the whole business." And I said, "I expect you will be tired long before we are. I am not a bit tired." I have been preaching twice a day, and sometimes three times a day for the last three weeks in Lexington, Ky., but if we had not a great Communion Service after this service I should feel good for two or three hours to-night, especially with such a subject.

But, my dear friends, I never expect to see the day when we shall not have to contend for the faith, unless it be that the Lord Himself shall come in our time, and then the father of all destructive higher criticism will be chained and cast into the bottomless pit,—that is where higher criticism came from; that is where it belongs; and that is where it is to go some day, consigned to the bottomless pit, to the everlasting praise and glory of God.

Why should we contend for the faith? Because we can see what has been the result of surrendering it. I want to call your attention to three or four instances—I think I have referred to one before.

I remember a little less than twenty years ago when the Rev. George Jackson came from England to become pastor of Sherbourne Street Methodist Church. I was not in Toronto at the time, I was pastor in London; but I remember he had a Bible class, and he gave a course of lectures on the first eleven chapters of Genesis which produced something like an earthquake in the Methodist Church. The Methodist church had some religion twenty years ago—they had some real religion then; and that great man of God, Dr. Carman, was the General Superintendent. If he had been twenty-five years younger, under God, he might have saved the day. But he protested, and a great company of Methodists protested against Dr. Jackson's teaching. That matter was discussed at a General Conference of the Methodist Church, I believe it was in Vancouver—I do not recall the exact year—and a resolution was passed approving of Dr. Jackson. He subsequently became a professor in Victoria College; and from that hour the Methodist church went over the

hill, and down the toboggan-slide—and it has been going ever since, until to-day a man—a very excellent gentleman I have no doubt, I am saying nothing about him as a man—but it is a sign of the times when a man like Dr. Salem Bland can teach what he does without protest. And more recently Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick preached in the same church where Dr. Geo. Jackson was pastor. He was brought to Toronto, I understand, as a guest of the alumni of Victoria College; and so far as I am aware there was not left in the Methodist Church of Canada one man who dared to lift his voice publicly against his heresy.

Now I will take you into our Baptist ranks. What happened in the Northern Baptist Convention? Fortress after fortress has been carried by the enemy; Chicago University, built up by perhaps the greatest educational genius of modern times, Dr. W. R. Harper, who conceived the idea of the standardization of education, has brought every theological seminary under its influence: Rochester, Colgate, Crozier, Newton Centre. Two or three new institutions have arisen, but as a rule as soon as they become beneficiaries of the educational fund they become like the coloured porter, brushing you off and putting out a hand for a tip—shaping their policy so as not to offend the powers that be; until, with the possible exception of two or three of these younger theological seminaries, in the Northern Baptist Convention there is not one that is not shot through with Unitarianism. And that is the most complimentary term one could apply, for in many cases it is nearly agnosticism, and in some cases very nearly infidelity. In Milwaukee during the meeting of the Northern Baptist Convention in 1924 one leading speaker who had occupied the platform of the Northern Baptist Convention for one whole evening, the next Sunday morning preached in the Unitarian church of that city. I have a stenographic report of the Unitarian minister's introduction in which he said that when the Unitarian churches found it difficult to find a supply, they could always find a supply acceptable to the Unitarians from Newton Theological Seminary! I myself saw a great Convention vote to receive delegates from the Fosdick church—a church which had announced a policy of "inclusive membership." It is true that Dr. Fosdick has not assumed the pastorate yet, and will not until a year from next fall, but he has accepted the pastorate of the church on condition that they do away with baptism as a condition of membership—you can be immersed if you want to, or sprinkled if you want to, or come in without any form of baptism if you so desire: those are the terms. And the church that announced a programme of that sort sent delegates,—and its delegates were seated in a Baptist Convention.

As far as the Northern Baptist Convention is concerned, it looks to me as though the case is almost hopeless. There will happen in the Northern Convention what happened to Congregationalism in the nineteenth century, when Unitarianism laid its paralysing hand on that denomination and stripped it, converting nearly all the Congregational churches into Unitarian churches; for to-day in the United States, Congregationalism is almost a synonym for Unitarianism,—the cult that denies, as its fundamental, cardinal, principle, the essential Deity of Jesus Christ.

And then I want you to go across the sea with me to England. Let me address you students of McMaster, if you are here. I know something about English Baptist life: I have been there year after year; I have touched some of their leaders; I know something about the condition of their churches,—and I am not ashamed to say that I am an Englishman. It is a pretty good land to belong to. I see some of you are smiling, but why don't you say, "Amen"? It will not hurt you. ("Amen!"). It is a good country, a place where every prospect pleases; and, like Canada, only man is vile. Human nature is the same there as here—let us go back to about the year 1890. Do not charge me with being old enough to remember everything that happened then, but I have read. When the great C. H. Spurgeon challenged the tendencies in his own denomination in what was called "the down-grade controversy," he was opposed by many men of prominence in the Baptist denomination. And what was it about? It was all on this issue, only the thing against which Spurgeon contended in that day was a very mild form of Modernism. The men whom he would have denominated modernists, although that term was not in current use, he would have called them down-graders, would be regarded

as conservatives to-day. There were comparatively few modernists who had gone to such extremes as Shailer Matthews, of Chicago University; or T. Reavley Glover, of Cambridge, ex-President of the Baptist Union of Great Britain—very few men would have taken such extreme positions then as the men I have mentioned now take. But Spurgeon protested against it, and withdrew from the Baptist Union. He was absent from a certain meeting, and they passed a resolution censuring him. I have had some resolutions passed against myself sometimes. It does not hurt, I care nothing about resolutions. I was down in Richmond, Va., a little while ago, and I went into the church where Patrick Henry made his famous speech: "Give me liberty, or give me death." An old coloured man tried to describe it to me. I said, "Can you recite his speech?" "No, I am not the main man here. When he is here, he can give you his whole speech; but I can't." And I said, "Can you give me part of it?" "Oh, yes." I was standing at the end of a pew on which was a brass plate, and he said, "Patrick Henry stood just there, sir, where you are standing; and he said, 'Give me liberty, or give me death.'" That was all he could remember; but in explanation he said, "You know that was about the time of the revolutionary war!" And I felt quite at home, because I had been in a good many "revolutionary wars" myself. Resolutions do not hurt very much: they are merely an expression of opinion, and, like the measles rash, I suppose if it is in the blood it had better come out.

Well, they passed a resolution condemning Spurgeon—the greatest preacher who has ever lived since apostolic times, beyond all question—and Spurgeon withdrew from the Baptist Union. And I suppose if Spurgeon had been discussed—the man who had preached in his lifetime, as Dr. Pierson estimated, to more than three hundred millions of people—if Spurgeon had been discussed in an Ontario and Quebec Convention, some little country preacher would have got up and said, "I shall not hesitate to give him an intellectual threshing." And I suppose Spurgeon would have been thrown out of court by so great an authority! Spurgeon withdrew from the Baptist Union,—and while I am at it, I may mention that the Rev. W. M. Robertson, of Liverpool, withdrew from the Baptist Union for the same reason as Spurgeon withdrew.

I think I will read you a letter from Mr. Robertson. He tells about his college course. He has received a copy of *The Gospel Witness*—I do not know how *The Gospel Witness* gets about, but he knows all about it. I shall read from his letter:

"Concerning Mr. Edgar"—(you students, have you got your note books out? Well, put this down and talk about it to-morrow—) "concerning Mr. Edgar—he did not study with me in Glasgow. His imagination must have been overwrought when he made that statement. The only thing I can think of is that at one examination he sat at the same table with me! He never took the course at the Bible Training Institute—went into the ministry straight from the workshop—all honour to him. But it is cruel of him to rise and misrepresent me as he has done; and I am grateful to you for your treatment of the matter. He came to Liverpool when out of a pastorate and called upon me to see if I could help him find a place. Mrs. Robertson and myself did all we could for him, as well as for his son who came to work in Liverpool—finding lodgings for him, etc.—and this is how he repays our kindly interest! He spoke to the children at a morning service and at one or two prayer meetings, but never preached. I can only smile at his 'intellectual threshing' whatever that means. My great sin was in leaving the Union, and the fact that a well-known church of long and high standing stood unanimously behind me roused the ire of the Modernist leaders who would attempt to silence anyone who dares to challenge the ecclesiastical juggernaut. Our Lord's test still stands, 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' While we have His smile and blessing we can go forward fearlessly. We have no worldly amusements of any kind at the Tabernacle, no Scouts, Guides, or anything of the sort; yet we have a splendid band of young men and women who undertake open-air work, etc. The testimony of the missionary you quote and the Ontario pastor is true. To His name be the glory."

And in this connection I think I will make an announcement: Next June, or sometime during the summer, the World's Christian Fundamentals Associa-

tion Conference will be held in this church, and if not before, on that occasion among the speakers will be the Rev. W. M. Robertson, of Liverpool! (Applause) And he is not the only one that is coming from England, let me tell you, some others are coming from England—and we will invite the gentleman from Peterboro on that occasion to stand on this platform, and to say over again what he said about Mr. Robertson in Hamilton (Applause). I am sorry to mention Mr. Edgar, because perhaps he has received more attention than he deserves.

Dean J. H. Farmer on the Scriptures.

Now, my dear friends, I have an unpleasant task but I am going to perform it to-night: I am going to specially speak to you about the Dean in Theology at McMaster, Dr. J. H. Farmer. All I say is being stenographically reported. It will all be printed in the next issue of *The Gospel Witness*, so that I shall say nothing to which Dr. Farmer will not have ample opportunity to reply; and I promise you that all the country shall know what I say, and he will have full opportunity of defence.

I want to quote some things Dr. Farmer said at the Convention. How many of you take *The Canadian Baptist*, put up your hands. Stand up and let me see you. How many of you read it? I am assuming that more people read it than subscribe for it. How many of you read *The Gospel Witness*, put up your hands. I am sorry you do not take *The Canadian Baptist*. I recommend you to invest in it. Here is an excellent report, a stenographic report, of Dr. Farmer's speech. The reason I asked whether you take *The Canadian Baptist* is that I do not want to do Dr. Farmer an injustice, but in the nature of the case I cannot quote his whole speech. It is reported in the issue of *The Canadian Baptist* of November 26th, 1925, the full report; and even other speeches—for there is actually one of mine in it! That is unusual for *The Canadian Baptist*, but it is there.

I want you to know what Dr. Farmer says about the two views of Scripture. On page three, second column, he says:

"There are two views; one is that Scripture from cover to cover, through and through, every word, every sentence, every thought, is infallibly inspired; it is the word of God through and through. Now I have no hesitation in saying that my sympathies have been with that strong view of the Scriptures; I have stated it in my classes."

I have yet to hear anyone suggest that Dr. Farmer's own personal views are other than sound; I have never heard anyone say that they ever heard a solitary word from Dr. Farmer anywhere in his teaching that was not true to the Book. I want to bear him that testimony. I have always believed that Dr. Farmer's own personal views were in accord with our Baptist position. That is what he says, that he takes that conservative view of the Scriptures: "Now I have no hesitation in saying that my sympathies have been with that strong view of the Scriptures; I have stated it in my classes." You students know Dr. Farmer and will bear him witness that that is what he teaches in his classes; which is all to the good, and for that we may well praise God.

But now listen:

"But mark you there is another view which a great many people who are just as good Christians as I am, and vastly better, whose sandals I am not fit to loose, there are a great number of other men who believe it is the religious content of scripture, it is the whole religious message that in its ministry to our spiritual life, is all of God infallibly sure, and you can bank on it and commit yourself to it."

Now that includes every higher critic in the world. I do not know one who does not say that he bows to the religious message of Scripture—it may not be scientifically true in parts; it may not be historically accurate, but so far as its religious content is concerned, that is all right; it is the Word of God! I point out to you, and I challenge contradiction on that point, that that second definition of the other view of Scripture, will admit Fosdick, Glover, Shailer Mathews, all the destroyers of the faith. I think even Dr. Salem Bland could get in on that, for he will tell you that there is a great religious message in the Bible. Very well, then, Dr. Farmer takes the view that while personally

he holds the conservative view, on the other hand a great many people better than he—that is very commendable humility; that ought to be our attitude—and he is not going to excommunicate, or withdraw the hand of fellowship from men who hold that more liberal view. That is about Dr. Farmer's position.

Dean Farmer and the Dr. Elmore Harris, Matthews Case.

I want now to go back for twenty years in the record of the Dean of McMaster University. I will not keep you long on that point. Years ago we had a controversy in which Dr. Elmore Harris of Walmer Road was the leader. Dr. Harris had made a great contribution to the life of this Denomination: he built Bloor Street Church; and then later resigned from it and built the Walmer Road Church—paid for it himself, or his family, and opened up that part of the city. If I am not mistaken it was under his leadership that the Centre Street Church, St. Thomas, was built. There were at least these three great churches that that man built for the Lord. His was an evangelistic ministry: notwithstanding his wealth, he was a humble disciple of Jesus Christ who gave himself unsparingly to the work of leading men to Christ. And when we had a man in McMaster, Professor I. G. Matthews, who was the enemy of the truth, as his later book has shown, and when Dr. Harris challenged his position, and brought it to the Senate of McMaster University, they appointed a committee that whitewashed the professor and condemned Dr. Harris. They abused Dr. Harris like a pickpocket; and all over this country the issue was drawn over Dr. Harris,—for or against Dr. Harris. He was no bolshevist: he had wrought nobly, hand in hand with the fathers of this Denomination, and had stood true to the great fundamentals of the faith. But where was Dr. Farmer in that controversy? Where was he? He was on the side of Professor Matthews, notwithstanding what he believed. He took Professor Matthews' side against Dr. Harris.

Dean Farmer at the Ottawa Convention.

At a later time we had a controversy at Ottawa, and I was then Pastor of this church. I challenged an editorial appearing in *The Canadian Baptist*. I carried it to the Convention at Ottawa and submitted a resolution; and the Lord gave us on that occasion a great victory. But in this speech at the Hamilton Convention a few weeks ago, what does Dr. Farmer say? Of course, I knew what he would do, because the night before—this editorial utterance was the rankest expression of Modernism imaginable—the night before my resolution was to come before the Convention, Dr. Farmer took me aside and asked me if it was not possible to withdraw this from the floor of the Convention and appoint a committee. I said, we had had committees enough; and that this one time it must go to the floor of the Convention. And it carried on that occasion. But listen to what Dr. Farmer says:

"I was at that Convention (meaning Ottawa). Because of the correspondence before I thought possibly the resolution to be offered might be calling for absolute inerrancy." He thought I was going to propose a resolution like that. Well, what if I had, would it have been a great crime? Would it? Would it? Dr. Farmer was prepared—listen: "Whatever my own personal opinion might be upon that I made up my mind that I could not endorse an amendment like that, that it would not be the fair thing to all our Baptist Brotherhood to undertake to do it"—always taking that position: do not charge Dr. Farmer with being unsound—"Whatever my own personal opinion might be upon that," he says, thus saving himself,—"I made up my mind that I could not endorse an amendment like that, that it would not be the fair thing to all our Baptist Brotherhood to undertake to do it, and I went there with an amendment prepared in my pocket, but when I saw that the resolution was simply a reaffirmation of the Bloor Street resolution, I did not offer my amendment."

In that controversy when Dr. Farmer thought I was going to propose a resolution committing the Convention to a view of the inerrancy of the Scriptures, he went to the Convention, by his own acknowledgment, with a resolution in his pocket prepared to defeat it. Why? Because he wanted to make room for the brotherhood of the other sort,—"whatever my own personal

views may be"—he says,—do not say he doesn't believe in the inerrancy of the Scriptures—he is going to make an asylum for the other folks. It would not be fair to the Baptist Brotherhood. That is the position he took then, fighting for the modernists as in the former instance.

Dean Farmer and the Faunce Case.

Some time ago, not very long ago, I contended with the University on the question of honouring Dr. Faunce, one of the arch-modernists of America. They conferred an honorary degree upon him. What was Dr. Farmer's position then? He took the side of the University. He defended the University to the last ditch in the London Convention, pleading with that Convention to endorse the University's action; and on that occasion the Convention voted down Dr. Farmer and the whole faculty by refusing a vote of confidence. There are three historic instances where Dr. Farmer, while professing orthodoxy and I do not question his profession, yet, practically, always voted on the other side.

Dean Farmer and the Marshall Case.

One other case: the Hamilton affair and Prof. Marshall. Again Dr. Farmer takes the conservative side in everything, but in this controversy did we get any help from him? Read his speech. Get that issue of *The Canadian Baptist*, and you will find that he is fierce in denunciation of the man who merely called for caution. I asked the Senate to be cautious, and to re-examine their position in the light of further knowledge—and they practically told me to mind my own business, although I was a member of the Senate. Dr. Farmer lines up his vote and influence on the side of modernists, while in his personal views he professes to be on the other side. I call attention to the fact that in all our denominational affairs in twenty years the Dean in Theology, while personally orthodox, has been defending modernism—or if not modernism,—perhaps I had better correct that and say, modernists, which is about the same thing.

Prof. Marshall and the Scriptures.

Let us now examine the Marshall case. Dr. Farmer in his speech quoted the standards, the theological standards, of McMaster University: "The divine inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and their absolute supremacy and sufficiency in matters of faith and practice." He goes on to say, "Mr. Marshall told me that the first chapter of Genesis was one of the proofs to him of the inspiration of the Bible and the general historicity." I printed in *The Gospel Witness* a couple of weeks ago a sermon by Mr. Marshall preached in England where he spoke of the Genesis account of the creation as "the Hebrew tradition." He says: "Thus it comes about that in the Baptist Churches there is a remarkable spiritual unity in spite of a great diversity of thought. Some of our people are theologically the narrowest of the narrow, while others are the broadest of the broad, but all are one in personal loyalty and devotion to Christ. We hold, for instance, that the Christian disciple is free to adopt the Hebrew tradition about the creation if it satisfies him, or the teaching on that subject of modern science. He is free to interpret the Scriptures by any method which commends itself to his judgment as true—he can follow the so-called orthodox method or the method pursued by modern scholarship"—"What does that mean but that it is not a divine revelation at all: it is really a Hebrew tradition! But Mr. Marshall signed a statement that he believed in the divine inspiration of the Old and New Testaments, and in his own writing called the Genesis account of creation a mere "Hebrew tradition"; and sets it over against the conclusions of "modern science," plainly indicating that the two are not in agreement.

"The Total Depravity of Mankind."

Another thing: in the McMaster statement you have these words, "the total universal depravity of mankind." I frankly say that I am ashamed of your theological training as Baptists if you could hear Mr. Marshall's first address at Hamilton without instantly detecting that he does not believe anything of the kind. I hope you young students will not be offended when I say to you that I do not expect that young men in their second or third or fourth year at college will be as discerning as they will be when they have

had larger experience; and I am not going to blame students—and some ministers who ought still to be students; we ought all to be students for ever, but I mean men who have not thought things through—I am not going to blame them for being carried away by the sophistry of that speech. But the argument at the Convention was this: Mr. Marshall signed that statement. But Mr. Marshall does not believe the statement he signed. Let me show you. Here is a sermon in which Mr. Marshall uses this illustration:

“Some time ago a French professor tried a series of remarkable experiments on some seeds. His aim was to see if the germ of life could be destroyed without destroying the seed itself. He kept naked seeds of lucerne, mustard and wheat for three weeks at a temperature of liquid air and then for 77 hours at a temperature of liquid hydrogen, viz., 250 degrees below zero. He then put them in a vacuum for a whole year. He deprived them of their internal gases by subjection to an air pump; he kept them for a long time under mercury, in nitrogen and in carbon dioxide. After all these hardships most of the seeds still sprouted when sown in the usual way!”—now listen—“The germ of life in a seed seems, therefore, to be tough. So it is with the divine element in the human soul. Whatever the rough and tumble of life it abides indestructible.”

What do you think of that,—is that total depravity? Is that an acceptance of the scriptural doctrine? Does that square with the scripture, “And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins”? What is the seed? What is that divine element in man? We are begotten again by the Holy Ghost through the Word. The Word of God is the seed which liveth and abideth for ever; and it is the touch of God stooping down to a dead soul that makes that dead soul live, that makes a man a Christian. Tell me that the divine element is in every man, and that sin cannot destroy it? and that the business of the church is to fan that flame, to uncover that wealth, and produce it? That is not the gospel of my Lord Jesus Christ.

Here is another: “He (Jesus) knew that at the heart and centre of man’s being, planted there by the hand of God, was something divine, beautiful, radiant, deathless, indestructible.” Of course, I know in the first part of the sermon he tells us we are a bad lot!—he is perfectly sound on that point. But side by side with that description of man’s natural evil he says there is a natural goodness. I insist that that is contrary to Scripture: he cuts the very foundation out of all true evangelism, and makes man’s salvation a mere matter of culture rather than of regeneration. “It makes all the difference in the world”—mark—“it makes all the difference in the world”—and it does; he is right there—“it makes all the difference in the world to the spirit, and quality, and persistence, and hopefulness of our service if we undertake it in the strong faith that our task is simply by the grace of God to rouse into activity high and holy powers which God has made an inalienable part of human nature!” And again: “How wonderful and how beautiful it is to think that in all of us, in you and me and in every human being, there are moral and spiritual potentialities, divine powers, which, under proper stimulus and encouragement from on high can develop into the excellencies of Christ.” I say to you that there is not a Unitarian in America who could not preach that sermon, not one,—there is nothing about the regenerating power of the Holy Ghost, nothing about the cleansing of the precious blood of Christ, nothing about the new birth from above: it is, indeed, as alien to the gospel of the grace of God as anything could possibly be. But he signed that McMaster statement—he signed that statement!

Prof. Marshall on the Ordinances.

There are many other things in that, but here is one point to which I want to call your attention: included in the McMaster statement is this word: “Immersion in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, the only gospel baptism; that parties so baptised are alone entitled to communion at the Lord’s Table and that a Gospel Church is a Body of baptised believers voluntarily associated together for the service of God.” That is in the McMaster Trust Deed, that is what a Regular Baptist Church is. Do you see,—member-

ship restricted to immersed believers, and the Communion restricted to immersed believers, too. Now Dr. Farmer says in that connection, "I beg of you to remember that Mr. Marshall expressed before he came out at all, and in his coming to us he expressed his acceptance of that declaration. In all our conferences that was in the back of my mind, naturally in the mind of the Chancellor and all of us. There is one thing I am perfectly sure of about Dr. Marshall; he is an honest man. He is not going to say he believes that when he does not."

Dean Farmer on the Ordinances.

I am going to turn to another passage. Dr. Farmer said this, "I have sometimes tried to frame a creed on which we could work together and I have about settled down to this that any man that will take the Christian ordinances and the truth that they symbolize and enshrine, I think I can work with him, I think I could work with him." I want to pause here to say I do not see why we should endeavour to build our Christian structure on a minimum of faith. I do not see why we should be forever trying to provide a platform that will exclude no one, on the ground that the less we believe the more people we shall bring with us. Surely we ought to establish our work upon a basis of a maximum of faith—not a minimum. We ought not to consider how little we can believe: we ought to see how much we can believe, and how firmly we can hold to "the faith once for all delivered unto the saints." But let us accept Dr. Farmer's minimum of faith for the moment. He says that any man who will accept the ordinances in their spiritual significance—but perhaps I had better give his exact words for if I resort to free translation someone will say I misrepresent,—yes, here we have it: "Any man that will take the Christian ordinances and the truth that they symbolize and enshrine, I think I can work with him." That is Dr. Farmer's minimum basis. Very well. There is something I have already published, but I will say it over again: in the meeting of the Senate Dr. Farmer said this: "Mr. Marshall stated as his own personal conviction that he believed in a membership restricted to baptized believers"; Dr. MacNeill, of Walmer Road, said: "I remember I referred especially to that and asked him especially if, finding himself here in Canada—of course we know many of the English churches are open membership—if in spite of the fact that that obtained in the Old Land, he would be thoroughly in accord with our position. He said absolutely he would, and that was his own conviction."

A Baptized Membership.

Have you got it? The McMaster statement says the membership of a church is restricted to baptized believers: Dr. Farmer says, "I asked Mr. Marshall if he believed that and he said, 'Yes, I do.'" Dr. MacNeill said, "I asked him the same thing, and he said it was his personal conviction." All right. I have a copy in my hand of *The Baptist Times and Freeman*—I am not quoting from *The Gospel Witness*, I am quoting from *The Baptist Times and Freeman*, published in London, England. And here is the third of a series of articles by the Rev. L. H. Marshall, B.A., B.D., of Coventry. This article is entitled, "Baptists and Church Membership." The McMaster Standard says membership should be restricted to baptized believers. Dr. Farmer says Mr. Marshall signed that statement: Dr. Farmer says whatever else may be said, Mr. Marshall is an honest man and he would not say he believed that if he did not believe it; in the minutes of the Senate meeting Dr. Farmer said he asked him and he said it was his personal conviction; and Dr. MacNeill said that not only would he conform to the practice here, but that that was his own conviction. That was in July of this year, and this article in the London paper is dated October 31st, 1924. This is what Mr. Marshall said in England; and mark, it is not an incidental remark, but a considered article written for the Baptists of England and entitled, "Baptists and Church Membership." That is what he is talking about, membership in the local church, and this is what he says: "To regard baptism as essential to salvation or even to membership in the Christian Church is to ascribe to the baptismal rite a crucial importance for which there is no warrant in the New Testament, or in any truly spiritual interpretation of the Gospel, or in common sense." In England eight months

ago this new professor wrote under his own name that the practice of this church, and of all other Regular Baptist churches—and of McMaster University and of the standard of McMaster—with respect to believer's baptism as a condition of church membership, has "no warrant in the New Testament, or in any truly spiritual interpretation of the Gospel, or in common sense."

Has Prof. Marshall Changed His Mind.

Now reconcile that if you can: Mr. Marshall says one thing in England, and another thing here. Someone said to me last night, "Perhaps he has changed his mind." I do not wish to do the gentleman any injustice, but I say this—I remind you that Professor Marshall is a man who has had a long and distinguished academic career; he studied in England, and in Germany too; and Germany produces great scholars. He accepted the pastorate of two open membership churches, and for years ministered in Liverpool and in Coventry. He comes to this country a young man, a man in his prime, a man somewhere in his forties, with, I suppose, at least twenty years of training and experience behind him. He comes as Professor of Practical Theology, to teach preachers, to make preachers, and to mould the thinking of men who are going to lead our Baptist churches in this generation—and I say this: that if, with all that training, a man can change his mind on a vital matter of that sort, under special circumstances, in the short space of eight months, then you had better send him out to grass somewhere until he has had time to mature. He is not mature enough to teach ministerial students.

McMaster Betrays Her Trust.

Perhaps that is enough for to-night. I have plenty more—I am only beginning—but I say this—I am not going to blame the Faculty, or the Board of Governors, or the Senate of McMaster, unduly, for making this appointment; but I think they ought to have been more careful. I would be willing to forgive their blunder—but I say this deliberately, that if the Governing Bodies of McMaster University, in view of Mr. Marshall's own statement on the great fundamentals of the faith—for not one word has Canada heard yet from him, so far as I know, about the cleansing blood, not a word. His sermons have been printed in *The Canadian Baptist*. It is not from *The Gospel Witness* I have been quoting to-night, but from *The Canadian Baptist*. That is authoritative surely.—but I say with that record before me of the fact that they admitted to the halls of McMaster, to the Chair of Practical Theology, a man whose position is absolutely at variance with the views held by this Denomination, if they retain that man in his position, then I charge that the Chancellor and the Deans, and the Senate, and the Governors, are absolutely betraying the trust, not only of the Denomination, but of the honoured man of God who gave the product of a long life of industry and faithful, consecrated business energy to the founding of a Christian institution that would propagate the principles which he believed.

I have proved my case. I would not be afraid to go before any jury in the land with a case like that. It is absolutely a betrayal of trust if they retain Mr. Marshall in McMaster University.

Dr. MacNeill and Walmer Road.

Last summer a gentleman came to preach in Walmer Road Church, and he preached a sermon Sunday morning that was not in accord with the standards of that church—either Sunday morning or Sunday evening, I do not know which it was. The deacons met, and they told him that they would not permit him to preach a second time, and they cancelled the engagement for the next Sunday. He wrote to the pastor of that church—several of the deacons of that church are Governors of McMaster University—he wrote to the pastor of that church, and Dr. MacNeill stood by his deacons—very properly; and in an admirable letter supported the position taken by his deacons, and said that inasmuch as the visiting minister had preached that which was at variance with the things commonly believed among our people, the deacons had acted with wisdom and justice in refusing to allow him to preach the second time. I now ask Dr. MacNeill, and Dr. Farmer, and the other members of the diaconate of Walmer Road Church who are members of the Board of Governors of McMaster, by what principles of logic they refused to allow a man

to preach one more sermon to disturb the peace of Walmer Road Church, and then impose upon this Convention a man whose views are directly opposed to the things for which we stand, and ask us to support an institution that supports him? That is logic, is it not?

Dr. MacNeill was eminently right in refusing to allow the peace of his church to be disturbed in that way; and the Governors of McMaster University have no right to disturb the peace of the Denomination by foisting upon us a man whose teaching is destructive of the very foundation of our faith. And I ask you to bear me witness,—I am not the disturber of the peace. Dr. MacNeill took that position. He said to Mr. Horsman, in effect, The deacons are not the disturbers of the peace: you would be the disturber of the peace were you to stay. And I say to you that those of us who stand by the standards of McMaster, by the great doctrines written into the Trust Deeds of that university and of this church, will die rather than surrender them; and we are not the disturbers of the peace. We say to men outside that we will not submit to this evil.

And I say to you Baptists who are here this evening, the time is coming when we shall have to line up on this thing. I am not going to submit to it, not for a moment; nor am I going to run away. I am here to stay (applause). If any of you want to give me a Christmas present, buy a lot up in Mount Pleasant Cemetery, and get it all ready for me; I will stay here until I need it. It is not because I could not go, but there is no church on earth that could tempt me to leave this place—especially when this fight is on. Not that I love fighting, but I love the thing I am fighting for. There is a world of difference between the two. I ask you Baptists who are members of other churches to stand solidly for the great verities of the faith. I had two brethren come from another city this morning to ask me what they should do. They represented two different churches; and I want to tell my McMaster friends, if they think they are going to win an easy victory in this matter, they never were more deceived in their lives. There will be something doing when our Baptist people wake up. Other conventions are coming, if the Lord tarries; and if He comes, He will settle things. That will be a great Convention. In that day I would rather be on the side of "the faith" than on the side of those who destroy it.

We are going to have a merry time from now on. I wish you a merry Christmas in advance, and a happy summer. We shall have a glorious summer, although it is a long way ahead. We shall have Mr. Robertson here, and several other men whom I am not going to name just now at our great World's Christian Fundamentals Conference. We shall have some of the greatest scholars in the world at that meeting, who will challenge any one in McMaster, or anywhere else who denies the faith.

Well now, I have done. I have said this in the presence of you who are unconverted. We were a bit controversial this morning, and nearly sixty went into the enquiry-room. The Lord bless you! How many unsaved are there here to-night? Do you know why we talk like this? It is because we have such a great Christ that we cannot bear that anyone should suggest He could be wrong. He is the last revelation of God to us. I believe that He died on the cross for my sins, and after that tremendous prayer, "Let this cup pass from me"—as though He would say, "Is there no other way—is there no other way"—when He said, "Let Thy will be done", He offered Himself as a Lamb without blemish for this poor soul of mine—after that prayer, after that sacrifice, I would die before I would allow any man in my presence to say there is any other way of salvation. I come to you as a poor, guilty, sinner, to tell you that there is no other salvation. You know there is nothing good in you, or you would have found it out long ago. If any good comes out of you, it has to be put in you: "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." He puts His power, His grace, His virtue in you,—"Born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever"; "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Many of us have tested it these many years; many of us have gone down to the river with those we love, and have seen them pass triumphantly into the realms beyond,—and we know Whom we have believed.

Oh, I wish you would come to Him to-night. I am not afraid of controversy

turning people aside. Ask the man on the street, and he will say that the average church has nothing worth fighting for, or contending for. The truth is always worth contending for; and so I bid you come.

I do not know what time it is, I have not looked at my watch. I believe all you members of the church are going to stay to the Communion, and other baptized believers, I trust, are going to stay with us. We shall praise the Lord as we take again the bread and wine, and say, We do not want any other salvation; we are satisfied with the salvation we have through His blood "until he come." We will live for Him, we will die for Him, blessed be His name for ever! It is a glorious gospel, it is a blessed salvation. I have no time to urge you to-night, but they came streaming up the aisles this morning, about sixty of them,—why not to-night?

(Many responded to the invitation).

NOTE:—The pages of "The Gospel Witness" are open to Dean Farmer to reply to this address.

The Baptist Bible Union Missions Department

The following information is published in response to many enquiries. The action taken by the Baptist Bible Union in Chicago, has brought great joy to a multitude of people. We shall have more to say on this subject in the near future.

All contributions to the Russian Missionary Society should be sent to the Baptist Bible Union, 340 Monon Bldg., 440 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

When making a contribution to missions, and also to the general work of the Baptist Bible Union, it would simplify book-keeping very much if two separate cheques were sent.

A Missions account has been opened at the First National Bank of Chicago. All missionary contributions will be deposited to the credit of this account, and disposition made in accordance with the request of the donor. This department is now in a position to receive contributions. Some have asked when they should begin to send their missionary gifts to the Baptist Bible Union. The answer is "at once."

If any one desires to contribute to other missionary enterprises, and will designate to whom they desire the money sent, the Baptist Bible Union will be pleased to forward same. All undesignated contributions to foreign missions, for the present, will be credited to the account of the Russian Missionary Society.

Copies of the Missionary Statement unanimously adopted by our Chicago Conference, November 1-4, are available at the headquarters office, free of charge. We solicit the co-operation of sympathetic Baptists in the distribution of this pamphlet.

If any further information is desired, please communicate with the Baptist Bible Union, 340 Monon Bldg., 440 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

The Gospel Witness for a Christmas Present

The Gospel Witness is offered for the year 1926 (to new subscribers only) for one dollar. It will contain the usual Sermon, Editorials on the War on the Fundamentals, forty-eight Bible Studies covering the Life of Christ in the four gospels, church news, and other articles.

Invest five, ten, twenty or fifty dollars in sending *The Witness* to as many friends for Christmas, or send it at least to one or two. *The Gospel Witness* will advise those to whom the gift is to be sent by Christmas card that a friend has subscribed for a year, and sending our Christmas greetings. Subscribe at once.

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

WHEREIN McMASTER UNIVERSITY HAS VIOLATED ITS TRUST.

THE CONVENTION OF ONTARIO AND QUEBEC stands four square against open membership. According to its act of incorporation only Regular Baptist Churches can send up delegates. Regular Baptists do *not* stand for baptismal regeneration but they do stand for the immersion of a believer in water on profession of his faith in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit as a prerequisite to membership and as a prerequisite to communion.

WHAT PROF. MARSHALL, the new Professor, says. In the issue of *The Baptist Times and Freeman*, the denominational paper of the Baptist Union in England of October 31, 1924, he says:

"TO REGARD BAPTISM AS ESSENTIAL to salvation OR EVEN TO MEMBERSHIP IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH IS TO ASCRIBE TO THE BAPTISMAL RITE A CRUCIAL IMPORTANCE FOR WHICH THERE IS NO WARRANT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, OR IN ANY TRULY SPIRITUAL INTERPRETATION OF THE GOSPEL, OR IN COMMON SENSE."

WHERE DR. FYFE STOOD. In addressing the Bond Street Church in 1875 he said:

"The Constitution of this Church has ever been sound and Scriptural. None but converted members were received into the ordinances and thus spiritual character always came first. Those only who were professedly regenerated by the Spirit of God and who exercised faith in the Lord Jesus Christ could be received for baptism; and none but those who had been baptized on a profession of their faith could be received to the Lord's Supper. *And in passing I deliberately affirm that it is this last mentioned position which alone gives us the logical right to organize a church separate from our pedo-Baptist friends. Let the Baptists give up 'close Communion', and with this surrender, they yield up their logical right to have a Baptist Church at all.* This church was 'close Communion' from her foundation, and her strength and compactness this day are largely due to her consistent position which she has always held on this subject."

WHERE SENATOR McMASTER STOOD. In the trust deed in which he conveyed the land on which McMASTER HALL stands he declares it is for work

"In connection with the Regular Baptist denomination whereby is intended Regular Baptist Churches holding immersion in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, the only Gospel baptism, that parties so baptized are alone entitled to communion at the Lord's Table, and that a Gospel Church is a body of baptized believers voluntarily associated together for the service of God."

WHERE DR. TRUETT STANDS. The life of Dr. Truett is now being published in *The Canadian Baptist*. In Dr. Truett's sermon on "The Supper of our Lord" he says:

"May I say it modestly, my Baptist people keep this ordinance as is demanded by the Holy Word. They believe that God's word does plainly teach that men must be born again, and then be scripturally baptized, and then maintain an orderly church membership, in order to be scripturally entitled to observe this ordinance. For these prerequisites my Baptist people unwaveringly stand."

WHAT IS MEANT BY A REGULAR BAPTIST CHURCH. This was determined more than 70 years ago when the Convention declared:

"That churches which restrict their communion to baptized believers, and administer the ordinances generally through ordained elders, should be considered *Regular*."

THE ACT INCORPORATING OUR CONVENTION SAYS that a delegate to be elected to that Convention

"Must be a member of a Regular Baptist Church situate within the territorial limits of the convention."

WHAT THE CHARTER OF McMASTER UNIVERSITY SAYS:

"No person shall be eligible for the position of principal, professor, tutor, or master in the Faculty of Theology who is not a member of a Regular Baptist Church."

PROF. MARSHALL, SO FAR FROM BEING A REGULAR BAPTIST, was pastor of an open membership Church at Princes Gate, Liverpool, from 1911 for eight years, and pastor of another open membership Church at Queen's Road, Coventry, from 1920 till he came to a chair in McMaster. *It will be noted that after 13 years of pastorates of open membership Churches he deliberately places himself on record in unmistakable language as above set out.*

HIS APPOINTMENT WAS A VIOLATION OF THE TRUST AND CONTRARY TO THE STATUTE, for the statute says:

"No person shall be eligible for the position of principal, professor, tutor or master in the Faculty of Theology who is not a member of a Regular Baptist Church."

DR. FARMER is the head of our theological faculty and no appointment would be made in that faculty without his approval. Placed in a position of responsibility with a duty to perform and a trust to fulfill, the hard fact is that he recommended Mr. Marshall to this Professorship and has been strenuously supporting his retention. He in like manner stood by Prof. I. G. Mathews who was charged by the late Elmore Harris in 1910 with being a MODERNIST. That Dr. Harris was right and that Prof. I. G. Mathews was a modernist is conclusively established by Prof. Mathews' own book entitled "Old Testament Life and Literature," where the reader will find his specious attack on the supernatural in the Old Testament. The retention of Prof. I. G. Mathews upon the staff caused widespread distrust among our people and lack of confidence in McMaster University, and now the DEAN in Theology, Dr. Farmer, perpetuates and increases the distrust by retaining Mr. Marshall on the faculty. If a Dr. Fyfe—who was no "middle-of-the-road Baptist"—had, with his convictions, his courage and loyalty, been at the head of our theological work there would have been no retention of Prof. Mathews and the matter would have been dealt with without the whole denomination being upset by the struggle to retain Prof. Mathews nor would Dr. Fyfe have stood one moment for the appointment of Mr. Marshall, a pastor of an open membership Church whose views are as quoted above. The denomination has the right to expect that the head of our theological work, the Dean in Theology would be, as Fyfe was, in his day, in the forefront in advocating and safeguarding the Regular Baptist position and not only advocating but maintaining it by example and consistent practice. The same applies to the present Chancellor who is jointly responsible for placing and retaining Mr. Marshall. *Is it weakness on their part or are they drifting from the faith and practice of our denomination so*

clearly and firmly upheld by Dr. Fyfe in his day? McMaster commenced with strong leadership and the rafters fairly rang with enthusiasm as our educational leaders of that day pictured the institution as a citadel of the faith and portrayed the future of the University as a powerful auxiliary to our denominational activities. The position to-day is deplorable. Mr. McMaster was a pronounced fundamentalist and a Regular Baptist. Does any one think that he would have given a dollar to the institution if he could have foreseen what has taken place after he was dead and gone? The University is sadly in need of money and if it had the whole-hearted confidence of the denomination would naturally receive large testamentary gifts from year to year. The course being pursued by those in present control is assuredly cutting off in large measure that source of benefaction. The full amount already lost will probably never be known.

AN EDITOR'S TASTE.

The following choice bit is from the editorial page of the November number of *The McMaster University Monthly*. We ask our readers to read it very carefully as a fine example of "the McMaster spirit".

MORE STUDENT OPINION.

"Real student opinion is again expressed in the article 'Jarvis Street,' by the Editor of *Around The Hall* in the literary section for this month. It, too, has had no inspiration but the initiative of the author; and is moderate in the extreme. Lest we be accused of descending to Shields' methods of controversy, we may say that in future we hope to have more inspiring matters to write about in *The McMaster Monthly*. We do not go in for stenographic reports, our corps of highly-paid specialists finding their interests in less sordid fields of endeavor. The danger in stenographic reports is that they may finally grow to be an obsession, and we abhor obsessions. That reminds us of a card received by this office the other day:

New York City, November 5th, 1925.

Dear Subscriber:

We regret to inform you that we are unable to mail you the "Parisian Number" of *Judge*, dated November 7th, 1925.

To our way of thinking, it is conceived and edited in the best taste throughout and is utterly without offence. But, much to our astonishment, the Post Office Department has declared it unmailable.

JUDGE will extend your subscription one issue beyond the date of its expiration to make up for the omission.

Yours faithfully,
JUDGE.

We rejoice that *The Gospel Witness* has not been martyred by the Post Office Departments of either Canada, or the United States in this 'Czaristic' fashion. Its great work must be allowed to go on."

From *McMaster Monthly*, Oct., 1925.

It will be observed that something reminds the Editor of *The Monthly* of a card received the other day from the publishers of *Judge*. We do not know whether the Editor wanted the "Parisian Number" of *Judge* for himself or for his files, whether he had heard of it and for that reason was interested in it; but it is evident that he wrote particularly for a certain number of *Judge*, which the Editors declare, "The Post Office Department has declared unmailable", and ironically expresses its satisfaction that *The Gospel Witness* has not been treated in the same "Czaristic" fashion.

We are sorry to find McMaster so interested in the "Parisian Number" of *Judge*, or in any other thing which the not-too-careful Post Office Department of the United States declares unmailable. Our readers will rightly appraise that excellency of spirit which resides in McMaster, and which is being so constantly recommended to us for our emulation—and which compares *The Gospel Witness* with the "unmailable"—"Parisian Number" of *Judge*.

USEFUL PUBLICATIONS.

We have just received copies of two pamphlets, one entitled, "Proceedings of the Educational Session of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, held in Hamilton, October 16-22, 1925. Stenographically reported by E. J. Bengough, C.S.R. Issued by authority of the Senate of McMaster University." It is exactly the size of *The Gospel Witness* and contains ninety-one pages. We are delighted that this has been issued, because it will enable every member of every church to obtain a full report of all that transpired on that memorable occasion.

In the same envelope with this pamphlet is one entitled, "McMaster Advertises *The Gospel Witness*", containing a reprint of an article published in *The McMaster University Monthly*, together with two introductory pages by one of the students. This is the pamphlet which the students attempted to distribute to the Jarvis Street congregation November 22nd, and which the police forbade them to distribute on the sidewalk. The Pastor would have had no objection whatever to the distribution of these pamphlets, for the more of that sort of thing there is distributed the more thoroughly will the true spirit of McMaster University be revealed.

This latter pamphlet is marked with a rubber stamp as follows: "Copies for further distribution may be obtained from F. F. Bennett, 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto 5." We hope all our readers will write to McMaster University and to Mr. Bennett to obtain copies of these pamphlets. They are very informing; and we want everybody to read them. We do not pretend to be unselfish in recommending these publications, for they all bring subscriptions to *The Gospel Witness*. The second pamphlet has a fine heading, "McMaster Advertises *The Gospel Witness*." Naturally we desire that the highest success shall attend their venture! So highly do we prize these pamphlets, especially the report of the Convention, that we have written the Secretary of Education, saying that we should be glad to receive two thousand copies to enable us to put one in the hands of every member of the church.

MORE ABOUT AN "ESTEEMED CONTEMPORARY."

The *McMaster University Monthly* concluded its article in the October issue by saying, "The lid's off. We can maintain diplomatic relations no longer." Ever since then we have been waiting for the booming of the guns. Has *McMaster University Monthly* run out of ammunition so soon? or did the one charge burst the gun? or was it a backfire? Was somebody hurt by it? What is the matter with that McMaster gun anyway? Of course, we are using the metaphor of *The McMaster Monthly*, for when "diplomatic relations" are severed, the next thing is war; but, as we said some time ago, so far we have heard nothing but fire-crackers! We hope *The McMaster University Monthly* is not showing the white feather already. It boldly takes the field to champion its new professor, and its Faculty in general, and announces to all the world that war is declared. Where are the sharpened swords? Where are the bristling rifles? Where are the machine guns, and the sappers, and the heavy artillery, and the cavalry? We expected to be overwhelmed before this, but we have not heard so much as a sentry's "Who goes there?" We rather suspect that *The McMaster University Monthly* had a bad dream; and girded itself for the battle without having counted the cost. But we invite McMaster University to emerge from its dugout, and open fire.

Meanwhile *The Gospel Witness* ammunition dump is growing enormously. We are only afraid that *The McMaster Monthly* gun is nothing more than a wooden dummy! In any event, the students are all fine fellows; and we forgive *The Monthly* for so valiantly proposing to take up arms without having the remotest idea what the war is about. A man with "trench feet" is to be commended for having "done his bit" in the war, but one with "cold feet"—well,—put him to bed in the blankets till the war is over.

FUTURE ISSUES OF THE GOSPEL WITNESS

When we were children we used to play at hiding things. We are not sure what it was, but we will call it "Hiding the Something." After the article had been hidden the other parties to the game were called in; and they were helped in their search by being told that they were getting "warm" or "cold," as the case might be. And when they got very near to the place of hiding they were really "hot." We are sure that in its search for the cause of the dissension in our Denomination, *The Gospel Witness* is not only getting "warm," but it is getting "hot." We confess to being absolutely impatient. We wish someone would give us some thousands of dollars, so that we could double the size of *The Gospel Witness* at once, in order that we might not have to wait so many weeks to publish all that we want to publish. But things are becoming increasingly interesting.

Of course, we regret profoundly the necessity of having to discuss these matters: it is, to use the title of the McMaster article "an unfortunate necessity"; but that it is a necessity there can be no reasonable doubt.

WHO WILL PUT UP THE MONEY?

We are wondering what would happen if those who would have been Senator McMaster's heirs had he not diverted his fortune to the endowment of McMaster, should sue the Board of Governors for possession of his estate, on the ground of their having betrayed their trust? We remind the Board of Governors that a case has recently been decided in the Massachusetts courts on a somewhat similar issue. We shall publish particulars of this interesting judicial decision at a not very distant date. But if that situation should arise, will the Governors responsible for the present deplorable betrayal contribute the money themselves to reimburse the Denomination for that which their mal-administration will have thrown away? So strongly do we feel on this Marshall affair that we say deliberately, it would be infinitely better for the Denomination that it should have no educational institution at all than that its own university should become the fountain of such poison as the new professor is pouring forth.

The Jarbis Street Whole Bible Sunday School Lesson Course

Lesson XXXVIII.

December 20, 1925

GOD'S PROMISE TO THE BACKSLIDER, Hosea, chapter 14.

Hosea was contemporary with Isaiah (see Hosea 1: 1 and Isaiah 1:1). The historical background of Hosea's prophecy will be found in II Kings 15:1 to 20:21; II Chron. 26:1 to 32:33. Hosea, like Jeremiah, predicted the certain reaping the terrible fruits of idolatry. His prophecy is an Old Testament commentary on the New Testament text: "Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." His prophecy relates chiefly to Israel, but partly to Judah as well. It was in the days of the first king of Israel after the division, Jeroboam the son of Nebat, that calves were set up, one in Dan and one in Bethel, for Israel to worship, as representatives of God, that they might be saved the necessity of going up to Jerusalem to worship. By this political move Jeroboam made Israel to sin; and everyone of his successors walked in his footsteps, until Hosea sees the ripe fruit of idolatry in the utter destruction of Israel as a nation when he cries (chap. 8:5) "Thy calf, O Samaria, hath cast thee off." In the sweep of his vision he looks down the ages to the long period from Israel's ceasing to be a nation until the day their ultimate King shall gather them again: "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim: afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king; and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days." The prophecy concludes with an appeal to

Israel to return to the Lord. It is a gracious word which belongs to us as truly as to God's ancient people, for such as believe are also the children of Abraham; and the teaching of the whole Book is that however far God's people may wander from Him, it is always possible to return:

"While the light holds out to burn,
The vilest sinner may return."

I. Here are Heirs of the Covenant in Bondage.

1. The name "Israel" is significant: it was the name that was given Jacob when he prevailed with the angel, and it was said: "As a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed." Notwithstanding his new name, however, Israel are in bondage again. The New Testament equivalent of "Israel" is the term "Christian." To be sure, it was given originally, possibly as a reproach, yet "the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch." And it does mean that when a soul is saved he becomes partaker not only of the name but also of the nature of Christ; and from henceforth he is one with whom God has entered into covenant through His Son Jesus Christ. 2. Even Israel, however, may fall by his iniquity, and so may the Lord's own dear children stray away. Examples abound in both the Old and New Testaments of how children of God would sometimes stumble and fall. Sin will bring anyone down. 3. But God bids all such return unto Him. He will not cast away any of those who have been washed in the blood of Christ: "They shall never perish," saith He, "neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." But He does invite us to turn from our iniquities and return to Him.

II. How to Return.

1. "Take with you words, and turn to the Lord." We are invited to turn to the Lord and to address the Lord. It is well that He should hear our voice. 2. "Take away all iniquity." This involves the acknowledgment of sin. For an illustration of this principle read Psalm 32, also Psalm 51. Our prayer should be one for cleansing, not merely immunity from punishment: "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." 3. "Receive us graciously"—"Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." 4. "So will we render the calves of our lips." This is a strange saying, but it is another way of saying, So will we render the sacrifice of our lips. For the truth is, no other sacrifice is now needed than the Cross; and it is to the period after the blood was shed this prophecy relates. Thus in the epistle to the Hebrews 13:15 we are exhorted, "By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to his name." 5. Repudiation of all other healers: "Asshur shall not save us." It was Israel's folly as well as her fault that for long years she resorted to various political expedients, thinking to avert the threatened judgment. She went down into Egypt and through to Assyria, but now she has learned the folly of it all and she has come to say, "Asshur shall not save us." So if the backslider comes to God, he may well bring such words with him, declaring that he will no longer trust in human saviours. "We will not ride upon horses"—"Some trust in chariots, and some in horses: but we will remember the name of the Lord our God." Neither will they say any more to the work of their hands, Ye are our gods. Among backsliding Christians there may be none who actually make idols, yet they do say to the work of their hands, "Ye are our gods," and trust in works of righteousness which they have done instead of casting themselves unreservedly upon the work of God.

III. God's Promise to the Penitent.

1. "I will heal their backsliding." How significant the phrase, "heal." How torn and lacerated by sin the backslider is! How he bleeds because of his iniquity! How broken is his heart! How urgently he needs divine healing! There all this is promised to us. 2. "I will love them freely." When the prodigal returned he felt that it was all that could be expected that he should be given a place among the servants and supplied with bread: he did not

dare to hope that the love against which he had rebelled had survived his sin and his folly. But on his return he found that his father loved him freely still. Thus God blots out the past and treats us as though we had never sinned. 3. His anger is turned away. His anger against His children spent itself at the Cross: there all our sins were expiated, there the wrath of God for us was ended: and whoever comes trusting in the Cross will find that His anger is turned away. 4. "I will be as the dew unto Israel." He will come to us as refreshing showers, and as the gentle dew of heaven refreshing and indispensable to our spiritual life. What a wondrous figure,—the Almighty condescending to say, "I will touch you with such gentleness as the dew"! 5. He promises abundant growth: (a) first, growth in beauty: "He shall grow as the lily." The grace of God makes us beautiful. (b) Growth in strength: "Cast forth his roots as Lebanon." Returning to God, it is important that we should be rooted and grounded in the things of Christ. It is promised that His influence shall extend: "His branches shall spread." And his beauty shall be the beauty of usefulness: "His beauty shall be as the olive tree." He shall provide even the atmosphere: "And his smell as Lebanon." 6. The restored backslider shall become a shelter to others: "They that dwell under his shadow shall return" etc. (v. 7). 7. And Ephraim at last shall be utterly separated from his idols: "Ephraim shall say, What have I to do any more with idols?" Thus a complete deliverance is promised to all who return to the Lord.

LAST SUNDAY'S SERVICES.

Sunday morning was the Pastor's first Sunday home from Lexington. There was a great congregation practically filling the great auditorium in every part. The sermon title was, "The Contagiousness of Evil, and the Untransmissibility of Goodness." This sermon will be printed at a later date. Nearly sixty responded to the invitation and went into the enquiry-room. At the evening service the building was packed in every part with people sitting down the steps of the gallery, large numbers standing, and a considerable number turned away. The sermon printed in this issue was preached by the Pastor. Seventeen candidates were baptized, twelve responded to the invitation at the close of the sermon; and although the great Communion Service did not begin until practically ten o'clock, the ground floor of the auditorium was practically filled, when forty-seven new members were received.

***Begin a Systematic Study
of the Life of Christ with
us on January 3rd, 1926***

See Announcement on Last Page

1 YEAR'S

S. S. STUDIES IN LIFE OF CHRIST
EVANGELISTIC SERMONS
NEWS OF RELIGIOUS WAR
FUNDAMENTALISM vs. MODERNISM
VIGOROUS EDITORIALS In Defense of
FAITH ONCE FOR ALL DELIVERED

All for ONE DOLLAR

The Gospel Witness

edited by **Dr. T. T. Shields**, Pastor Jarvis St. Church, Toronto, Canada, published weekly, contains all the above.

Nothing in Modern Times surpasses the miraculous transformation of Dr. Shields' church from a formal, aristocratic, church into one of the greatest centres of Evangelism on this continent, where conversions occur at every service; or the growth of the Bible School, in three years, from less than 400 to the greatest School in Canada. This revolution took place in the eleventh year of Dr. Shields' pastorate, and the great revival which followed the withdrawal of 341 members has in four years added more than 1,500 to the church, and the revival still continues.

Next-best to living in the spiritual tropics of this great church is to read the sermons (stenographically reported) through which scores are converted and which appear weekly in "The Gospel Witness." This Paper, less than four years old, now circulates all over the world and is already being read by more than 1,000 preachers weekly.

Beginning in January, "The Witness" will contain a weekly exposition in the **Whole Bible Course of the Baptist Bible Union** by Dr. Shields, and which will cover the **Life of Christ in one year.**

Regular subscription to "The Gospel Witness" is \$2.00 per year. To introduce the "Witness" to new readers, it is now offered with above special features from **January 1 to December 31, 1926 for One Dollar.**

All subscriptions at this rate must be received by December 20th at **The Gospel Witness Office** (please mark envelope "Special Offer"), 130 Gerrard St. E., Toronto, Canada. Mail this with order. If money is sent by cheque, 25 cents must be added for exchange. Postal rates compel us to charge \$1.50 for this special offer in Toronto. Send your order at once.

ORDER BLANK

"The Gospel Witness," 130 Gerrard St. E., Toronto, 2, Canada.

Please send "The Gospel Witness" to the undersigned for one year beginning with the first issue in January, 1926, for which find enclosed one dollar, as per your special offer:

NAME (Rev., Mr., Mrs., Miss)

ADDRESS.....

N.B.—No subscription can be accepted for less than the year at the special dollar rate.