

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, JANUARY 21st, 1926

No. 39

CONTENTS

The Great Toronto Protest Meeting

	Page
Chairman Urquhart's Address.....	2
Resolution on Prof. L. H. Marshall.....	5
Testimony of Student Pastors W. S. Whitcombe, Gordon Brown, and A. J. Fieldus.....	6, 8, 9
Rev. George W. Allen's Speech.....	11
Rev. W. J. H. Brown's Speech.....	13
Appeal for "Gospel Witness" Fund.....	14
Resolution on Responsibility for Present Situation.....	16
Speech of Rev. John Linton.....	17
Speech of Rev. Clifford Loney.....	21
Resolution on Baptist Ecclesiasticism.....	22
Rev. A. T. Sowerby's Speech.....	23
Rev. T. T. Shields' Speech.....	27
The Jarvis Street Pulpit.....	31
Editorial	38
Article from "The Evening Telegram"	41
The S. S. Lesson.....	43

**REPORT OF A MEETING HELD IN JARVIS ST. BAPTIST CHURCH,
TORONTO, THURSDAY EVENING, JANUARY 14th, TO PROTEST
AGAINST PROFESSOR L. H. MARSHALL'S APPOINTMENT
TO AND RETENTION IN THE CHAIR OF PRACTICAL
THEOLOGY AT McMASTER UNIVERSITY.**

(Stenographically reported)

Chairman: Mr. Thomas Urquhart.

CHAIRMAN: We shall open this meeting by singing hymn No. 11 on the hymn sheet,—

"All hail the power of Jesus' name!
Let angels prostrate fall;
Bring forth the royal diadem,
And crown Him Lord of all!"

CHAIRMAN: The Rev. Mr. Atkinson, Pastor of Christie Street Church, will read the Scripture lesson.

REV. W. E. ATKINSON: We shall read the second Psalm—Psalm No. 2.

"Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing?

"The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed, saying,

"Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us.

"He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision.

"Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure.

"Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion.

"I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.

"Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.

"Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.

"Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth.

"Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling.

"Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him."

CHAIRMAN: The Rev. John Dodds, of Wheatley, Ontario, will lead us in prayer.

REV. JOHN DODDS: Our Father, we thank Thee to-night that Thou hast given to us Thine own precious Word. We pray that Thou wilt help us to listen to it, and to keep it; because it is the only complete and final revelation of Thyself. We thank Thee that Thou hast been watching it down through the ages; Thou hast caused it to be written in our own language, so that we who are ignorant may learn, and may find Him of Whom it speaks, the Lord Jesus Christ. We rejoice to-night, our Father, for this great assembly; and we ask that the outcome of our gathering together may be that Jesus, Thy blessed Son, may be exalted, and the faith once for all delivered unto the saints retained in all its fulness, and preached in all its power. O God, there are some of us on this platform to-night who would give our very lives, if need be, for the defense of this precious Word: we are ready to count the cost to-night; we are ready to sacrifice friends; we are ready to undergo financial burdens; we are ready to go all the way with the Man of Calvary, so that the precious Word of God may be given to the peoples. O Lord, we have seen and read of the blighting blasts of the denial of the faith, and we pray that in the university of this Denomination Thou wilt preserve it from this infidelity. Guide us, O Lord, in all that we shall say to-night; give to the brethren who take part in this meeting, the guidance of the Spirit; give unto them the love of Jesus, so that as they speak the truth, they may speak it indeed in love. We thank Thee, our Father, for

the Pastor of this church; we thank Thee that we are not ashamed to be affiliated with him to-night; we thank Thee for his staunch defense of the Word of God through all these years; we thank Thee for the signal manner in which Thou art blessing his testimony in this church, and throughout this great Continent of North America. Now, Father, hear us; be present with us in great blessing; and all the glory shall be Thine, through Jesus Christ. Amen.

CHAIRMAN: The resolutions which are to be presented at this meeting have been printed, and I will ask the ushers to distribute them now; and while they are distributing these resolutions I have an idea that it might be a real good thing for us to take a census of this meeting, to know who is who, and who are here. It will be a very simple matter, and the distribution can go on at the same time. I am going to ask how many are in the meeting who are members of Jarvis Street Baptist Church—will you please rise? (A large body of people rose at this request). Thank you. How many in this meeting are members of Annette Street Baptist Church—will you please rise? (Approximately, sixty). Thank you. How many in this meeting are members of Walmer Road Baptist Church—will you please rise? Thank you. We are not going to put you out, you know! We are very glad to have you here (Applause). (Fifty). How many are here from Bloor Street—will you please rise? (Forty). Thank you. How many here from College Street Baptist Church—please rise? (Six or eight). Thank you. How many from Bedford Park—please rise? (Three). Thank you. How many are here from Calvary Baptist Church—will you please rise? (Ten). Thank you. How many from Castlefield Ave.—will you please rise? (Two). Thank you. How many from Mount Pleasant Road? (I stand with them myself). (Twenty-five). Thank you. How many from Danforth Ave.? (Seven). Thank you. How many from Christie Street—please rise? Yes, I see some in the gallery. (Eight). Thank you. How many from Danforth Ave.? (Twenty). Thank you. How many from Christie Avenue? (Twelve). Thank you. How many from High Park—will you please rise? (Fifty). Thank you. How many from Immanuel—will you please rise? (Seven). Thank you. How many from Indian Road—will you please rise? (Ten). Thank you. How many are here from Jones Ave.—now Temple Church—will you rise? (Twenty). Thank you, thank you,—there are others too. How many from Oakwood? (Five). Thank you. How many from Olivet Baptist Church? (Four). Thank you. Pape Avenue? (Several). Thank you. Ossington Avenue? (Twenty). (Prolonged applause). Boon Avenue Baptist Church? (Ten). Thank you, quite a number. Central Baptist Church? (Eight). Thank you. Century Baptist Church? (Seven or eight). Thank you. Runnymede Road Baptist Church? (Two). Thank you. St. Clair Avenue? (Five). St. John's Road? (Six). Thank you. It is difficult to see them through the audience. Waverley Road Baptist Church? (Ten). Thank you. Woodbine Heights? (Three). Thank you. Royce Avenue? (One). Thank you. I name these others now, because I did not take them in order: Dovercourt Road? (Seven). Thank you. Eastern Avenue? (Two). Thank you. Forward? (Two). Thank you. Humber Bay? (Two). Thank you. I think I have nearly all of them now. We have a very representative meeting here to-night. Oh, yes! I think we ought to think of the outside churches. Those of you who are here from Hamilton, please rise? (Ten or more). Now, how many are here from outside denominations,—Presbyterians, Methodists, United Church, Anglican, and such like—please rise? (Approximately, two hundred). (Applause). I discover I missed Fairbanks—will you please rise? (Two). Thank you. They say I missed Long Branch. It is out in the country. Will Long Branch representatives please rise? (Three). Are there any others?

VOICES FROM THE CONGREGATION: Boon Avenue, Etobicoke, Mount Dennis, Willowdale, Birchcliff, Parkdale, Bobcaygeon, Stouffville, Markham First, Southampton, Calgary, (applause), Winnipeg, Bethany, Silverthorne,—(Representatives were present from all these churches).

CHAIRMAN: I think it is a splendid thing that all these churches have the courage of their convictions, and have representatives here to take part in this meeting. We even have representatives here from Kentucky.

CHAIRMAN: The next item on the programme is the Chairman's address, which will be somewhat brief, and which I have written, so that no-

body could doubt at any future time what I said; because sometimes, you know, when a person speaks without having it written, somebody will say he said something that he did not say at all, so I took the precaution of having it typewritten for me.

This meeting has been called on behalf of a large number of members of Baptist churches, for the purpose of entering a protest against the manner in which the Governing Bodies of McMaster University have failed to carry out the trusts for which the University was founded; and to further protest against the appointment of Professor Marshall as a theological professor in the University; and to make it clear to the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec that his views, as heretofore published, are not in accord with the trusts upon which the University was founded, and which trusts the Governing Bodies of the University are legally and morally bound to carry out. It is, perhaps, wise to quote some of the most important trusts as they are set out in the deed of the University property, and in the Charter of the University.

The deed of the property which was conveyed to Toronto Baptist College, and which College was merged in McMaster University, clearly sets out that the lands and premises are to be used by the College "for the education and training of students preparing for and intending to be engaged in Pastoral, Evangelical, missionary or other denominational work in connection with the Regular Baptist Denomination whereby is intended Regular Baptist Churches exclusively composed of persons who have been baptized on a personal profession of their Faith in Christ, holding and maintaining substantially the following doctrines, that is to say: The Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and their absolute supremacy and sufficiency in matters of faith and practice, the existence of one living and true God, sustaining the personal relation of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the same in essence and equal attributes, the total and universal depravity of mankind, the election and effectual calling of all God's people, the atoning efficacy of the death of Christ, the free justification of believers in Him by his imputed righteousness, the preservation unto eternal life of the Saints, the necessity and efficacy of the influence of the Spirit in regeneration and sanctification, the resurrection of the dead, both just and unjust, the general judgment, the everlasting happiness of the righteous and the everlasting misery of the wicked, immersion in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, 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"; and the Charter of the University, Section 4, declares that: "McMaster University shall be a Christian school of learning, and the study of the Bible, or sacred Scriptures, shall form a part of the course of study taught by the professors, tutors, or masters appointed by the Board of Governors. And no person shall be eligible to the position of Chancellor, principal, professor, tutor, or master, who is not a member in good standing of an Evangelical Christian Church; and no person shall be eligible for the position of principal, professor, tutor or master in the Faculty of Theology who is not a member in good standing of a Regular Baptist Church"—(I wish you to mark that—no person shall be eligible for the position of principal, professor, tutor or master in the Faculty of Theology who is not a member in good standing of a Regular Baptist Church) "and the said Board of Governors shall have the right to require such further test as to religious belief, as a qualification for any such position in the Faculty of Theology, as to the said Board of Governors may seem proper"—now for those who are not Baptists who want to come to the University, this clause is put in—"but no compulsory religious qualification or examination of a denominational character shall be required from, or imposed upon, any student whatever, other than in the Faculty of Theology"—thus making it clear that the Faculty of Theology must be composed of those who are Baptists, and that the students taking a course in the Theological Department are students who are taking a course preparatory for the ministry.

It would seem to me that the first enquiry which the Governing Body of the University should make in appointing a professor in the Theological Department would be,—is he in accord with the doctrinal basis set out in the deed; and second, has he the qualifications set out in the Charter? Both of these questions will, no doubt, be dealt with by those who shall present resolutions

to this meeting, but I may be permitted to say here that I cannot see how a man who is a member of a church that does not require its members to be baptized can be said to be a member "in good standing of a Regular Baptist Church",—one of the qualifications provided in the Charter of the University.

It seems to me it would not be out of place just at this point to enquire, Who control the educational policy of the Denomination—who control the educational policy of the Denomination? First, the Board of Governors, sixteen in number, elected by the Convention; and second, the Senate of the University, which according to the report of 1924, consists of thirty-five members as follows: the Chancellor, sixteen members of the Board of Governors, the two Deans of the University, four chosen from the Faculty, the Principals of Woodstock College and Moulton College, five elected by the Arts graduates, and five elected by the graduates in Theology. It behooves us to enquire, From whence come these men so appointed or elected to govern the affairs of the University? The Chancellor, who is ex-officio member of the Board of Governors, and the sixteen members of the Board, come from the following churches: five from Walmer Road Church, Toronto; four, including the Chancellor, from Bloor Street Church, Toronto; two from Central Church, Toronto; one from Jarvis Street Church, Toronto—you all know who he is; one from Parkdale Church, Toronto; one from a church in Brantford; one from a church in Sarnia; one from a church in Brockville. From these figures it will be seen that two churches, Walmer Road and Bloor Street churches, Toronto, with a membership of under three thousand, control the educational affairs of the Convention, and of the Denomination.

The Senate, according to the report of 1924, is composed of the following representatives: eleven from Walmer Road Church, Toronto; eight from Bloor Street Church, Toronto; three from Central Church, Toronto; two from Parkdale Church, Toronto; two from Hamilton; one from St. Clair Avenue Church, Toronto; one from Jarvis Street Church, Toronto; and one each from Kitchener, Woodstock, Simcoe, Brantford, Ottawa, Belleville, and one other not accounted for. From these figures it will be seen that Walmer Road Church and Bloor Street Church, with nineteen representatives, control the Senate of the University. I do not intend to make any comment upon these figures, but they speak very loudly for themselves; and I have no doubt that some of the speakers will refer to those figures while dealing with the resolutions which will come before the meeting.

Now, we shall proceed with the resolutions, and I will give the order in which they will be presented: the first will be presented by Rev. George W. Allen, Pastor of Ossington Avenue Baptist Church, Toronto; and seconded by Rev. W. J. H. Brown, Pastor of Annette Street Baptist Church, Toronto. These two brethren will just simply move the resolution, but not speak to it. Following the reading of the resolution, three of the students will speak to the resolution; and then Mr. Allen and Mr. Brown will close the discussion of that resolution. I now call upon the Rev. Mr. Allen to move the first resolution. (As Mr. Allen rose, the great audience stood and greeted him with prolonged applause, ending with the singing of, "Blest be the Tie that Binds.")

REV. GEORGE W. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, brothers and sisters: I appreciate that expression of your sympathy and kindness. I was told last night by a man who studied for the ministry, and who claims to be very loyal to our Denomination—but who was not loyal enough to stay in the ministry—I was told by him that I could scarcely be recognized by my old friends. I am glad to see that there are some of my old friends who still recognize me. The only person whom I did not see take part in the singing of that hymn, and the only person I noticed who did not seem to be cheering, was a deacon from Ossington Avenue Baptist Church; and he was supported, I would judge, by one of our social service experts.

I would like to read to you the resolution on Professor L. H. Marshall. Perhaps you would like to follow as it is read:

On Professor L. H. Marshall.

WHEREAS the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec has frequently, by resolution, declared its adherence to the historic Baptist position in rela-

tion to the divine inspiration and authority of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and the cardinal principles of Evangelical Christianity, including the "total and universal depravity of mankind," and hence the necessity for regeneration by the Holy Spirit, repentance, and faith in the substitutionary and expiatory work of Christ; as well as such distinctive Baptist principles as believer's immersion in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost as a prerequisite to church membership and Communion;

AND WHEREAS Rev. L. H. Marshall, Professor of Practical Theology in McMaster University, since announcing his subscription to these principles at the Convention of Ontario and Quebec, held in Hamilton, October 21st, 1925, has, by a sermon preached in the First Avenue Baptist Church, Toronto, November 12th, and appearing in *The Canadian Baptist* of November 26th, made it evident that he does not really believe the theological position held by the Baptists of this Convention, which fact is confirmed by a sermon preached in England, entitled, "What Baptists Stand For," and also by an article appearing in *The Baptist Times and Freeman*, London, October 31st, 1924, entitled, "Baptists and Church Membership", and is still further corroborated by personal conversation with several whose testimonies we have heard to-night;

AND WHEREAS in all his published utterances since coming to Canada, dealing with the soul's relationship to God, Professor Marshall has failed to make any mention of the necessity of the cleansing blood of Christ in order to salvation, despite the fact that his silence respecting the blood was challenged at the Convention three months ago, and since;

AND WHEREAS the pamphlet entitled, "Professor Marshall Refutes Serious Charges," recently issued by Professor Marshall, contends that his reference to baptism in the article on "Baptists and Church Membership" related to membership in the "Church Universal" rather than to membership in the local church; and further, that his reference in the sermon entitled, "What Baptists Stand For," to "the Hebrew tradition about the creation" related to an alleged Hebrew interpretation of the Genesis account of creation, rather than to the account itself, which construction of his references to Baptism and the Hebrew tradition we believe is utterly disproved by the context of the article and sermon, in which, respectively, the references occur;

AND WHEREAS Professor Marshall's first citation of Scripture passages relating to the blood of Christ occurs in the said pamphlet written for his own justification, and without any interpretation whatever of his understanding of the meaning of the phrase, "the blood of Christ";

THEREFORE WE, members of Baptist churches situated within the bounds of the Convention of Ontario and Quebec, do now RESOLVE AND DECLARE Professor Marshall's explanation in his pamphlet to be utterly unconvincing, and therefore unsatisfactory; and that we believe his teaching to be subversive of the faith distinctively held by our Baptist people, and therefore a menace to the spiritual life of our churches and to the integrity of our Denomination; and that in view of all this we are compelled to declare our conviction that Professor Marshall, by his own utterances, has demonstrated that he is without qualification for the work of preparing young men for the future ministry of our Canadian Baptist Churches;

And that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Board of Governors, and to *The Canadian Baptist*.

Mr. Chairman, I move that we adopt this resolution.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Brown.

REV. W. J. H. BROWN: I second this resolution.

CHAIRMAN: The first person to speak to us in connection with this resolution will be Mr. Gordon Brown, of the Orangeville Baptist Church—or rather, Mr. W. S. Whitcombe, Vice-President of the Student Body, will speak first to this resolution (applause).

STUDENT WILL S. WHITCOMBE: Mr. Chairman, Christian friends: the motto of McMaster University is, "Ta panta en Christo sunesteken". To some, even to some people who are graduates and students of McMaster University, those words are only so many Greek characters appearing on the

crest of McMaster; but for me, it is something vastly greater than that. Those words are the motto of my life,—“All things in Christ consist”, cohere, hold together; and in this affair my whole aim, my whole motive, has been, to be loyal to Christ. To some, I know, this will be a mere rhetorical flourish; but to me it is the principle that has guided me in this whole business, to be loyal to the truth, and to Him Who is the truth; and I have His promise, “I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee.”

Possibly you do not realize what it means for me to take this stand. I heard one of the students pass the remark the other day, that it was a cheap way for us to gain notoriety—and I agree with him; for notoriety is a dishonourable counterfeit of fame, my dictionary tells me; and if that be so, then we are getting plenty of it! But I scarcely need remind McMaster students, if they think the motive that has inspired Mr. Brown and myself in this matter is seeking after fame, that there are many pleasant ways of gaining fame, other than disagreeing with the University's policy.

From one pulpit in this city I have been publicly denounced for the stand I have taken on this matter; and there are some here to-night who know whereof I speak. I have belonged to Jones Avenue Church—now the Temple Church—ever since I have gone to public school; and here just a few Sundays ago the Pastor, Mr. Hodgson, took the pains to devote a considerable part of his sermon to a denunciation of me and my attitude on this matter—

VOICES FROM THE FLOOR: “No!” “Yes, he did.” (Applause).

MR. WHITCOMBE: I challenge any man to disprove that statement. My own brother (interruption)—just a minute—my own brother was in the audience and heard it; and, according to his account, I am giving you a very mild interpretation of what took place. I give any man the lie who states that what I am saying is not true (Applause). I repeat it! I repeat it,—from one pulpit in this city I have been publicly denounced for the stand which I have taken on this matter; and there are some here to-night who know whereof I speak. I have belonged to Jones Avenue Church—now the Temple Church—ever since I have gone to public school. But here just a few Sundays ago the Pastor, Mr. Hodgson, took the pains to devote a considerable part of his sermon to a denunciation of me and my attitude on this matter, necessitating my removal to Annette Street Baptist Church, where I will be sure of a fair treatment at the hands of the Pastor, and of sound, scriptural teaching (Applause). But for me the pulpit is neither a Coward's Castle, nor a Fool's Paradise (Applause). I have been denounced,—but what for? For disloyalty to Christ? Is that the ground of the accusation? Or is it disloyalty to the truth? No!—not that, nothing of that sort; but for disloyalty to McMaster University. But to me Colossians 1:17 reads, “All things consist IN HIM”—in Christ; and I put loyalty to Christ above loyalty even to McMaster University (Applause).

And now, what of Professor Marshall? Let me say this: he is a gentleman, and a scholar, and a teacher (Applause),—I am glad you agree with me in one thing—and I speak from personal knowledge, for I have sat for four hours every week in the classes of Professor Marshall; and as far as his teaching ability and scholarship go, I regard him as a distinct accession to the Faculty of McMaster University (Applause),—I hope you will admit that I know as much about the other thing I am talking about, and clap for it too—but after all, it is not the ability of Professor Marshall that is the crux of the question: it is his theology. And in the statements that follow, I do not ask you to accept my conclusions; you may think, as others have, that it is not the proper thing for me to do, to express my opinion, or “to rush into print”; but be that as it may, all that I ask you to do is to take the facts and weigh them, and then come to your own conclusions,—for as Baptists, that is your privilege—yes, and your duty! (Prolonged Applause).

In the minds of many the Bible and science stand in direct opposition, telling two conflicting stories; but in our opinion they are one. The findings of modern science only confirm the age-long statements of the Bible. All truth is of God; hence it is harmonious whether it is found in nature or revelation. But we must remember that the work of science is far from being complete, and on that account, contradictions between its teachings and the teachings of the Scripture arise from time to time. In such cases we place

the Bible before science, and would accept its unchanging declarations rather than the varied pronouncements of scientific research.

But what of Professor Marshall's view? In a case such as we have described, where the teaching of science and the statement of Scripture are in direct opposition to each other, we enquired from him what his attitude would be. He unhesitatingly replied that under such circumstances he would choose science. He stated that he believed that he must accept truth from whatever quarter it came. We recall that the phrase he used was that he could not go to God with a lie in his mouth.

Most of our Canadian Baptist people will not believe that a man does go to God with a lie in his mouth if he accepts the plain teaching of Scripture, even though that be in contradiction to the teaching of modern science. To the dogmas of modern science they would reply with the Teacher of teachers, "It is written." (Applause).

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gordon Brown, of the Orangeville Baptist Church, will now speak to this resolution.

STUDENT GORDON BROWN: Mr. Chairman and Christian friends: I am a student of McMaster University—and I am proud of the fact. Last year I graduated in Arts; and at present I am pursuing the course for the degree of Bachelor in Theology. Nor do I come to you to-night because of any lack of loyalty to McMaster University: her halls have made upon my life, I trust, an impression for good; and in the words of our college song,

"When I end life's journey
And all my friendships part
May all my deeds—
(in the highest and hollest and truest sense)—
Increase her fame."

But for me, loyalty to McMaster University means loyalty to the high, and holy, and trustworthy principles of the charter of that University: it is not so much loyalty to an institution of bricks and mortar, nor loyalty to men, as loyalty to principles. The question before us to-night concerns our attitude, and the attitude of other Baptists, to the Word of God. My desire is "a whole Christ and a whole Bible, for the whole world" ("Amen!" "Hallelujah!") It is my determination to stand for the truth of God. I desire, in the words of the motto that I have chosen for the little church of which I happen to be Pastor, to put Christ first; all else must be subordinate to that.

Now, it is in accordance with what I am saying that I come to you to-night to tell something of what I happen to know concerning the theological position of Professor Marshall. With Mr. Whitcombe, my honoured colleague, I sit four hours a week in his classes. He does not ask us to take all that he gives us; but most of his practical ideas are excellent. Perhaps some of you preachers might do well to take a course from him on, "How to Run a Sunday-School"—and then you would do it like Jarvis Street does. Then Mr. Whitcombe and I have had, on two occasions, personal conversations which I do not regard as confidential, with the said Professor Marshall.

What have these things shown us? For one thing, they have shown us most distinctly and absolutely that he does not hold to belief in the plenary, and full, inspiration of the Word of God; that the Bible from cover to cover—not, of course, as it appears in the King James, but as it came from the sacred writers—is through and through inspired of God. An aspect of his attitude may be seen in connection with the synoptic problem. It is a problem, no doubt. We may see, however, his attitude if we take a particular case, the case which he used was that of the rich young ruler. Mark and Luke have it that when he came to Jesus he said, "Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" And Jesus said, "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God." Matthew has it that he said, "Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?" And Jesus said, "Why askest thou me concerning that which is good?"—or, I imagine it might be, he who is good—"there is none good but one, that is, God." Now the Professor regards these two accounts as containing between them "irreconcilable discrepancies"—what I would call, in common parlance, contradic-

tion. The Professor sat in my room in the college, with Mr. Whitcombe present, last Saturday, having in his hand a copy of our Annette Street and Orangeville paper, *The Prophet*, in which I had written an article on this matter, which Dr. Shields was pleased to reprint in *The Witness*. He said that I was wrong in using the word "contradiction"; and said that I should not have said that: I should simply have said "discrepancy". But I cannot see that, friends—*The Star* once said I was a student. (Applause)—I cannot see any very practical distinction between discrepancies which are not apparent, but which are regarded by the Professor as absolute fact and "irreconcilable"—I do not know why we should not say, on his authority, that those things contradict.

Dr. Farmer is our Professor in New Testament; and I sit in his classes and learn great and mighty things that I knew not. What is his attitude on this? I have seen him, in dealing with such problems, resolve into harmony things as utterly unharmonious to the ordinary surface reader as the case in point; and while I am not in a position to explain the depths of these things, for I have not had time to make a profound study of them, yet I believe the explanation is forthcoming which will reconcile these apparent discrepancies into just such harmony. In talking over this question with the Professor, he practically said—and clearly implied—that any man who holds a view such as most of us here to-night hold, that such discrepancies can only be apparent and not real, and that the Bible is verbally inspired, is brainless, and blind, and will not use his God-given wit. I regard this, friends, as a serious reflection upon the mentality of the Professor of New Testament in McMaster, Dr. Farmer; and I had half a notion to ask the dear Professor to fight it out with him!

Another matter: when we were talking about the article which I had written in *The Prophet*, the Professor said that what I had said about his attitude on the question of the historicity of the book of Jonah was quite right—mark that—quite right! He believes that that book is only allegory, and not history. But what did Jesus say? He said, "As Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly: so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth"—and I do not regard Jesus as a myth! "As Jonas was three days and three nights in the belly of the sea-monster; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth", that was what Jesus said. But suppose we grant, for the sake of argument, that that is only an analogy that the Jews knew about, and that Jesus did not necessarily mean that that was history?—grant that, but go on and read the rest of it. Do not stop with a little, take the whole dose.—that "the men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it"; that "the queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it." I suppose there were men who lived in Nineveh? that there was a real queen of Sheba? I believe there was a real Jonah who went down into the fish, and that by and by the fish vomited him out, and that he went on his way preaching the gospel as the Lord had given it to him. I prefer to take Jesus as an Authority on these questions; I would rather take His word than that of any theological professor. (Applause).

CHAIRMAN: Mr. A. J. Fieldus, Pastor of Fairbank Baptist Church, will also speak to the motion.

STUDENT A. J. FIELDUS: The reason I have a typewritten copy of all I have to say is so that some of my friends will not put in my mouth to-night words that I did not say.

Mr. Chairman and Christian friends: The statements that I have to make from this platform are not mere assumptions on my part: they are facts. I have nothing to say against Mr. Marshall as a man. He has always acted toward me as a gentleman, and during our conversation together on matters relative to the present controversy, he has spoken with the utmost frankness. In case my friends should charge me with being associated with any system of espionage in McMaster University, I wish to say that any conversation I have had with Professor Marshall has never been confidential; neither have I purposely sought it except on one occasion when my request for an interview with the professor was readily granted.

During a conversation with Mr. Marshall while on my way to the University, I stated to him that the study of biology gave me a deeper appreciation of the value of science and the Bible; and in the course of the conversation he referred to the Hebrew tradition. I asked Mr. Marshall if he was prepared to accept the teaching of science concerning the creation, or the simple statements of Scripture; and without any hesitation he replied, that while he did not think science and the Bible were inconsistent with each other, he could not accept the view of the obscurantist, but rather the facts of science as he UNDERSTOOD them. This was my first conversation with Professor Marshall, and was without any solicitation on my part.

On another occasion Professor Marshall greatly astonished me when he stated in my presence, that any man who accepted the historicity of the book of Jonah, and its literal interpretation, would find very few churches open to him in the Old Land, because he would be considered an uneducated fool! I state again that is what Dr. Marshall said to me; and I am prepared to stand to-night by that statement. (Applause). I would suggest to those who are in doubt about the question—do as I did: interview Professor Marshall.

After such a statement coming from the Professor, I did not publish it from the housetops, but, instead, interviewed the Dean in Theology. I told him exactly what Professor Marshall had stated to me, for I was greatly disturbed,—who would not be? Do you blame me? ("No! No!") I stated to Dr. Farmer that I could not accept Mr. Marshall's position; and furthermore, I could not conscientiously defend Mr. Marshall in this present controversy when he held such views. Again I ask, Do you blame me? My interview with the Dean in Theology left me sadly disappointed. I did not think that Dr. Farmer would adopt an attitude of tolerance toward a view of the book of Jonah which implicitly denies the authority of Jesus Christ. Our conversation was lengthy, and my confidence in the Dean was shaken when, in effect, he stated that he would rather fellowship with men like Dr. Faunce and Dr. Fosdick, than with men who are well known for their orthodoxy, but who manifest a bitter spirit. You can interpret that just as you like!

In the course of my conversation I told Dr. Farmer that I would be present on this platform Thursday evening, since I was involved in this controversy ("Praise the Lord!")—and I am not ashamed to be here to-night. He replied by saying that every man must face this issue for himself; but he did not think the issue important enough to split the Denomination. I faced the issue on my knees before God in prayer; and determined, before I lifted my voice in protest, that I would see Mr. Marshall once again.

I interviewed the Professor Tuesday afternoon of this week, and asked him in a straightforward way if he really believed that the book of Jonah was only an allegory and not an historical narrative; and he restated exactly what he said to me before, adding that the one who accepts the literal interpretation of Jonah becomes the laughingstock of the world.

I further referred to the fact that Jesus believed in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, to which he replied, he was not teaching the Old Testament, but he had made an extensive study of it; and asked me what proof I had that Moses was author of these books. (May I say here that he subscribed to the old Testament, and said he would accept the Charter?) This came as a further surprise, knowing that the Pentateuch closes with the statement, "Moses wrote this law." (Deut. 31:9); and that the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch was accepted by our Lord (Applause).

As one has said, "Personally, I am not concerned *per se* about the human authorship of the books attributed to Moses. When I find the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews saying of certain things in Exodus and Leviticus, "The Holy Ghost, this signifying", I could be content to ignore the human author, and listen to the divine word. But when I find that the life and times of Moses are so inextricably interwoven with the Pentateuch that it is impossible to eliminate Moses without invalidating the first five books of the Bible, the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch becomes a question of vital importance. Therefore I must bring this vexed question to 'the author and finisher of my faith', for settlement. And now let us hear"—not Professor Marshall, but Jesus Christ Himself—"let us hear Him!

"To the Sadducean naturalists of His day, He said: 'Do ye not, therefore,

err. because ye know not the Scriptures, neither the power of God? . . . Have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake to him?" (Mark 12: 24, 26).

"And again: 'Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father. There is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?' (John 5:45-47). And yet again, in that most solemn parable which is a prophecy of retribution beyond the grave, in answer to the once-rich man's request, that Lazarus be sent to warn his five brethren, Christ represents Abraham as saying, (and as saying it in the clearer light and fuller knowledge of the life beyond) 'They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them.' And when Dives replies, 'Nay, father Abraham; but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent', He puts into Abraham's lips these terribly solemn words: 'If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead' (Luke 16:27-31) (Applause).

"And when he has heard these words, surely for the man who acknowledges the Deity and consequent infallibility of Christ, the question of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is authoritatively and finally settled; and instead of spending time in idle speculation he will read it to hear what 'the Holy Ghost saith' therein."

This statement which I have prepared with my own hand, and read in your hearing, while not a verbatim report, is an accurate representation of Professor Marshall's views as he expressed them to me. Over against the changing pronouncements of modern science which denies the supernatural in the Scriptures, and over against the modern scholarship which denies the plain statements of the Word of God, I, Alfred John Fieldus, Pastor of the Fairbank Baptist Church, am prepared to accept the verdict of the Greatest of all authorities, Jesus Christ Himself, when He says, "The Scriptures cannot be broken."

"Should all the forms that men devise
Assault my faith with treacherous art,
I'd call them vanity and lies,
And bind the gospel to my heart."

I thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Rev. Mr. Allen, the mover of the resolution, will now speak to this resolution.—Mr. Allen.

REV. GEORGE ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the attention of the friends here, the Baptist people from the churches who are vitally concerned in this matter,—vitally because this is your University where this thing is going on; and try as we will, we cannot escape, as Baptists, our responsibility as to how that University is conducted,—I would like to ask you to notice that in the Charter of the University there is a statement concerning the "total and universal depravity of mankind"; and that has been our historic position in this Convention down through these years. Dr. Marshall signed—subscribed—to this statement in the Charter. We understand, from the Senate's report, that he did so before he left England to come to Canada. But since coming to Canada, he has been speaking on several occasions—and in the Senate's report we are assured, in two different places, that Professor Marshall "will preach what he believes": never mind what he signed, he "will preach what he believes"!

The first sermon—or address—that I heard Mr. Marshall give was on that Monday night at the Convention; and in that message he made this statement—I am quoting now from the Senate's report, page 49, beginning with line 26 from the top. Here is what he said—he has subscribed, remember, to the statement of "total and universal depravity of mankind"—but here is what he said:

"I believe that just as it is natural for a plant to turn toward the light, or the mariner's compass to point to the north, or a new-born babe to suck nourishment from its mother's breast—so I believe it is, in the best sense of the term, natural for the spirit of man to seek illumination, and strength, and inspiration, from the Spirit of God. I believe that it is very important

now-a-days to emphasize the fact that religion is really and truly perfectly natural."

I want to ask you to notice that he subscribes to the Charter—"total and universal depravity of mankind"—but I also call to your remembrance that in that report it is said that he "will preach what he believes"!

I want to call your attention to a sermon which Professor Marshall preached in First Avenue Baptist Church, and, which was reported in *The Canadian Baptist*: "He knew"—he is speaking of Jesus—"that at the heart and centre of man's being, planted there by the hand of God, was something divine, beautiful, radiant, deathless, indestructible"—remember that the charter says, "total and universal depravity"; but he preaches what he believes, and speaks about this "something divine"! Further on he says about this "something divine"—"It is there in everybody, even in the worst, and there it remains incorruptible in all its corruptness, undefiled in all his defilement, awaiting the day of its manifestation. . . . He saw it all, . . . an angel in fetters, the new man waiting the opportunity to throw the old man off." David did not recognize in himself anything divine, but rather cried out, "Create in me a clean heart, O God." Professor Marshall continues, "Beneath the ashes of collapsed human nature He knew that there were yet sparks of celestial fire." Quoting still further from Professor Marshall's sermon we hear him say: "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"; "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 can develop into the excellencies of Christ." Remember the statement in the Charter—and remember that he preaches what he believes!

I quote from another sermon which he has preached since coming to Canada, in which he says: "When a young person chooses a vocation in which the powers God has given are used to the utmost, then he can truly say he has come to Christ. To really come to Christ we must have less snobbishness; we must learn to regard man as man, not as a mercenary standard. When we can give service to humanity and help any organization laboring in the cause of Christianity, then we can say we have come to Christ."

I give you these quotations, and I say frankly, friends, that in reading these sermons over, it seems to me that these quotations fairly represent and sum up the gist of these messages, whereas our Convention stands by that statement in the Charter—the doctrine of "total and universal depravity of mankind."

I would ask you to remember, friends, over on the other side of this statement by Mr. Marshall, and these things which he has said in his sermons, what the Scriptures say, for after all we do well indeed to come back to the Book itself. We read in the book of Romans that, "There is none righteous, no, not one"; "There is none that doeth good, no, not one"; and will you remember that when the psalmist prayed, he prayed, "Create in me a clean heart, O God"? He looked to God, and he knew that it must be an act of creation: he did not recognize any "celestial fire" burning within, he did not see in himself any divine element that could "develop into the excellencies of Christ"; and therefore he asked God "to create in him". We remember that our Master, in speaking to Nicodemus on these great questions, said—which is contrary to what was said in these sermons by Mr. Marshall—our Master said, "Ye must be born again"—an absolutely new beginning—"Ye must be born again."

Now, friends, I do not want to take up much of your time, because there are other speakers that I would like to have you listen to; but I would like to call the attention of the Baptist people here to-night to something which, perhaps, has escaped your attention. Will you remember that Professor Marshall is a member, as I understand it, of both Faculties—the Faculty in Arts, and the Faculty in Theology. Now, as a professor in the Department of Theology, he has to deal, I suppose, largely, if not altogether, with Christian young people—it would be assumed that only Christian young people would be studying under that Faculty—but in the Faculty of Arts where he teaches the English Bible, he is dealing with young men and young women, some of

whom may not be Christians at all, but have just come to McMaster to get the Arts work, and are not Christians at all. Will you see, friends, just what that means, when a professor with these beliefs in his mind has to deal with young men and young women who, perhaps, are not Christians at all? I tell you that, because perhaps it has escaped your attention; but you can see the seriousness, and, therefore, the importance, of the fact that we should have the most evangelical and sound man in that chair (Applause).

In order to help you friends to decide, you Baptist friends, just where you ought to stand, I want to make it as simple as I can, and with this I will close. This ought to help you to decide whether or not you can support an institution that supports that kind of teaching, this ought to help you to decide your stand,—and we hope they will take note of our attitude and correct the problem that is there, so that we can support it, because we do want to support it. It is our University! But here is my illustration which may help you. You Baptist people, probably, have all been to one or more ordination councils, councils called by some church having a student pastor, perhaps, whom they wish to set apart in ordination to the gospel ministry. Perhaps you have been there as a visitor, or as a member of that council from some other church. Now I ask you this, "Suppose that Professor Marshall were the young man seeking ordination, and you people were members of the council, and you understood that he believed in the 'celestial spark' in everyone, even in you and me, even in the worst, that he believed that there was 'something divine' in us that could be developed into the 'excellencies of Christ'—if you understood that the man seeking ordination did not believe in the historical side of the book of Jonah, but that it was only an allegory—if you understood some of these things applied to the man asking ordination, would you be prepared to vote for his ordination into the Baptist ministry?" (Chorus of noes). Well, that ought to decide your attitude toward his teaching in an institution that is preparing other young men who will apply for ordination into the Baptist ministry. (Applause).

CHAIRMAN: The Rev. Mr. Brown, Pastor of Annette Street Church, will speak as seconder of the resolution.

REV. W. J. H. BROWN: Mr. Chairman and Christian friends: the words of these young men to-night remind me of a conversation that is said to have taken place between Henry Ward Beecher and Robert Ingersoll. When the subject of religion was introduced, Colonel Ingersoll waxed eloquent in defense of his infidelity. Beecher listened in silence until asked if he had nothing to say on his side of the question. "Nothing", he said, "in fact, I was just engaged in thought about a poor fellow who was slowly and carefully picking his way through a cesspool, when a big fellow—who was himself besmirched—rushed up to him and jerked his crutches from underneath him, and left him wallowing helplessly in the mud." "Where is the man?" cried Ingersoll, "what a brute he is." "That is the way I feel about it", said Beecher, "Robert Ingersoll—thou art the man. The human soul is lame, and Christianity has furnished it with crutches and is helping it through the cesspool of this life, and has promised it perfect soundness in the life to come. But by your teaching you are trying to rob men of their crutches, and leave them wallowing in the mud. If you like the business, ply it to your heart's content; but remember, it takes an architect to erect a building: an incendiary can reduce it to ashes!"

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask, Does not the teaching that Professor Marshall has given these young men, whether in class or privately, tend to take from underneath them the props of faith, and leave them wallowing in the mire of Modernism?

As for the Jonah case: the trouble seems to be, as one has said: if you open the door wide enough to let Jonah out, you will have great trouble in shutting it and leaving in any part of this divine revelation!

The thing that has stirred me most in connection with this whole matter is the question, What is Professor Marshall's attitude toward the substitutionary death of our Lord Jesus Christ, toward the efficacy of His shed blood to cleanse? We were utterly amazed at his silence for three whole months on this vital question in an hour like this, when salvation through the substitutionary death of Christ is so widely denied, and after he had been publicly challenged

to declare himself on this matter! And not only has Professor Marshall been silent concerning the blood of Christ, but if we interpret rightly the quotations that Mr. Allen has just made, and others that I might make, he is teaching a doctrine diametrically opposed to salvation through the shed blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. And I would like you to notice that while, in his last published statement, Mr. Marshall quotes Scriptures that speak of redemption, and of the blood, he did not give us one word of interpretation as to what those Scriptures mean. Mr. Marshall has not yet told us whether he believes in the efficacy of the shed blood of Jesus Christ to cleanse from sin, in the substitutionary death of the Son of God for sinners!

I think it is very evident that Professor Marshall does not regard it as necessary to loyalty to the Lord Jesus Christ to believe it. In a sermon he preached in the Old Land on, "What Baptists Stand For", he said, "Some of our people (speaking of our Baptist brethren) 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." I do not need to remind you of what the "broadest of the broad", theologically, believe about the substitutionary death of Jesus Christ, I do not need to tell you they deny the efficacy of the shed blood of Jesus Christ to cleanse from sin,—and yet the Professor says these men are "loyal" to the Lord Jesus Christ, and devoted to Him!

VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: "It is not true."

And after all, dear friends, if we have not an infallible Christ; if we can accept the statement of science rather than the Scriptures that Jesus said could not be broken, when there is a contradiction between them; if we cannot accept His plain declaration about the historicity of Jonah and about the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch,—if we have not an infallible Christ; will you tell me what virtue there is in His shed blood to cleanse poor sinners from their sins? If we have not an infallible Christ, then we have no Bible, we have no Saviour, we have no Star to light us through the darkness: we are left without God and without hope in the world. (Loud applause).

CHAIRMAN: You have heard the resolution read, and you have heard these addresses in connection therewith; now I am going to ask for a standing vote. All in favour of adopting this resolution presented by Mr. Allen, and seconded by Mr. Brown, will please rise. (Practically the whole congregation rose in favour of the adoption of the resolution).

That will do, be seated. All those who are opposed to the adoption of this resolution will please rise. Have the courage of your convictions, if you have any. I see a number in the gallery—about forty, I should judge, altogether.

The next item on the programme is a very important one—concerning the collection. Dr. Sowerby is going to speak for a moment or two concerning the collection.

DR. A. T. SOWERBY: I will be the spavined horse to come on later to speak on the third resolution. In the meantime, I felt it incumbent upon me to present this matter to you. Now, dear friends, you know as well as I do, that a great campaign like this in the interests of truth and righteousness, cannot be conducted without finances. Dr. Shields is not fighting the battle for Jarvis Street Church: it is a larger question than that; there are infinitely larger interests than that involved. He has made no complaint about the expenses, but I felt that if we were honourable men and women, and if we love truth and Him Who is the way, the truth, and the life, we would want to take a real practical part in this. Will we do it? ("Yes! Yes!") Of course, we will. We will be men and women, we all want to help.

You have in your hands an envelope. You can put your name on, and your address, the name of the church to which you belong, the amount of cash enclosed, \$10.00—what, did I say \$10.00?—well, we want a large collection. Let us have what you can honestly do in this work. Now friends, if you think this is a poor investment, don't you give a cent to it; but I believe that if you put your money into this great enterprise, it is the best investment that you can make in the world. If you want a part in this, give liberally. Don't be afraid of dollar bills, five-dollar bills, ten-dollar bills—and on up if you like.

There has been a great deal of expense in connection with *The Gospel*

Witness. Last week it was three times the regular size. Dr. Shields and the people are very glad to have you have this, but that costs money you know; and we are not going to be cowardly and selfish enough to allow him and his people to bear this burden alone. Then, a report of the proceedings of this meeting to-night is going to be published, and the expenses of two regular stenographers have to be met in this meeting. There is a vast amount of expense. It is going to be a heavy burden on this work here; and we are appealing to you as men and women of the Lord to take hold of this and give nobly and well.

Perhaps some of you are not prepared to "cash in" to-night. There is a provision made for this on the envelope: fill in the amount you will pay, and the date. Then, add to this, if you will, whether or not you are a subscriber to *The Gospel Witness*. You can scratch out either the "yes" or "no", so that we may know where you are. We want you to prayerfully lay hold of this. Let us have your offering, so that we can get on with the other important work that is on this programme. I don't know whether Dr. Shields wants to say a word or not.

CHAIRMAN: May I just add a word to that before the collection is taken? The issue of *The Witness* last week cost several hundred dollars more than usual, because of the extra size. And there is another point which Brother Sowerby has failed to mention, and that is, if we had not *The Gospel Witness* through which to obtain publicity, we could not obtain that publicity without publishing a separate paper of our own. *The Canadian Baptist* has refused in the past to publish the matters that are being dealt with at this gathering to-night; and it is necessary that sufficient money should be raised, so that we may meet all the expenses and not throw them on Jarvis Street Church at this time, notwithstanding their great liberality in matters of this kind. Perhaps Dr. Shields will have a word.

DR. T. T. SHIELDS: Just this word, dear friends: this paper was begun as a venture of faith; and thus far the Lord has supplied our needs. When the great decision was reached in the Ottawa Convention, of 1919. *The Canadian Baptist* gave a very incorrect report of the facts. When the London Convention was held, we had another misrepresentation. *The Gospel Witness* published the facts, and on that occasion compelled *The Canadian Baptist* to do likewise (applause), for the reason that the Convention, or the Publication Board, had accepted a resolution which I had prepared and had incorporated it in their report, and the authority of the Convention was behind my request; and I sent a statement to *The Canadian Baptist*, and they put it on the editorial page—and for one week I was the editor of *The Canadian Baptist* (Laughter).

Now, then, *The Canadian Baptist* sent out a magnificent report of the Convention in Hamilton, a verbatim report. Why did they send it out? Because *The Gospel Witness* had spent hundreds of dollars in getting a stenographic report; and they knew that from time to time it would be going forth, and, therefore, those of you who had a copy of *The Canadian Baptist* with that full report, received it only because *The Gospel Witness* was in existence. And furthermore, I remind you that the pamphlet issued by the students of McMaster, and other literature, is going out to the entire Denomination, flooding the Convention.—and so far as I know it is at the expense of denominational funds. Some of you do not like *The Gospel Witness*, possibly; but it is still alive (Applause)—and it is growing all the time.

It cost something to bring you here to-night, to announce this meeting, to advertise in the papers; but if you do not pay a penny, if you do not put five cents on the plate to-night, I am sure, so far as Jarvis Street is concerned, we would sing the doxology and go to sleep without any concern; because we have learned to live in a realm where nothing is impossible, in the realm where God reigns. ("Hallelujah!" "Amen!") And I want to tell you this great meeting is just the first of other great meetings which will be held all over our Convention territory. There is no doubt about it (Applause). Every word that has been uttered this evening, and that will yet be uttered, is being reported; and will be printed. We shall have a still bigger issue of *The Gospel Witness* next week, if we can crowd it in. But we want you to help. We do

not want anyone to give a dollar, or a five-cent piece, if you are not with us,—keep your money; we want God's money. If you have five dollars of the Lord's money in your pocket, or a thousand dollars of it in the bank, take that envelope and give us a pledge; and come to the help of the Lord against the mighty. Give us the biggest collection that was ever taken in any church in Toronto. It ought to be about two thousand dollars, at least.

CHAIRMAN: The collection will now be taken. Make it liberal.

VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: Mr. Chairman, people want to know what you are going to do with Mr. Marshall?

CHAIRMAN: That question will be answered some day in the future.

We will stand and sing the first and last stanzas of Hymn No. 3—"How Firm a Foundation."

Someone has asked the question, what is the subscription price to *The Gospel Witness*? For subscribers in Toronto, it is \$1.50 per year; for outside, the subscription price is \$1.00 a year—and it is worth \$20.00 to anyone who takes it and reads it, at least. (Applause). Hand in your subscriptions at the office after the meeting.

The next resolution, the second resolution on the programme, will be moved by the Rev. John Linton, of High Park Baptist Church, Toronto; and seconded by Rev. Clifford Loney, of Stanley Avenue Baptist Church, Hamilton. Mr. Linton will now speak to the motion.

REV. JOHN LINTON: Mr. Chairman and dear Christian friends: before I read this resolution to-night I just wish to make this remark. I think I overheard the Chairman say that there were forty who voted against the previous resolution. I would judge there are some two thousand people here—and forty people out of two thousand voted against the resolution. I want to say this, that I have the profoundest respect for the forty people who voted against that resolution. One of the first principles of our Baptist faith is individual liberty (Applause); and I would desire nothing better than to have a fair hearing by open-minded men and women. I think we ought to recognize that. It was very difficult at a recent Baptist Convention for some of us who had to speak, without any previous preparation, on a momentous subject, to be continually harassed by frequent interruptions, which interfered with a fair consideration being given to a matter of the utmost moment.

The resolution to be moved by the Rev. John Linton, of High Park Baptist Church—at least, I belong to it now—(Applause and laughter.) There are not many Scotch people here to-night—and seconded by my big brother, Rev. Clifford Loney, of Stanley Avenue Baptist Church, Hamilton, is this:

On the Responsibility for the Present Situation.

WHEREAS the teaching of Professor L. H. Marshall, of McMaster University, as represented by his sermons preached in Canada and by articles published in England, is so at variance with the doctrinal standards of our Canadian Baptist churches as embodied in the doctrinal statement in the Trusts of McMaster University and repeatedly expressed by resolution at our Conventions, as to be intolerable to such Baptists as already understand Professor Marshall's theological position, and as will be found, we believe, equally intolerable to the great majority of Baptists of the Convention of Ontario and Quebec when they shall have become more fully informed of the facts;

AND WHEREAS such a situation is disturbing to the peace of the Denomination, and hence destructive of that unity of spirit and purpose which is indispensable to any general co-operation in the missionary and educational enterprises of the Denomination,—and this at a time when such co-operation is imperatively necessary to enable us, as Canadian Baptists, to take advantage of the opportunities which face us, and to meet the obligations those opportunities involve;

AND WHEREAS it is important that our fellow Canadian Baptists should know where the responsibility for the present condition of denominational disunion and distrust in this Convention may justly be held to lie;

AND WHEREAS for at least more than fifteen years the Senate and Board

of Governors of McMaster University have pursued a policy which has repeatedly offended and defied the evangelical convictions of the members of the churches of this Convention, as evidenced specifically in the action of the said Governors in retaining for years on the Faculty of McMaster University Professor I. G. Matthews, whose teaching was subversive of evangelical faith; and in the further action of the then Chancellor and the two Deans, with certain of the Senate and Board of Governors, in opposing at the Ottawa Convention, 1919, the protest made against the Modernist editorial utterance of *The Canadian Baptist*; which utterance was repudiated by resolution of the Convention; and in the further action of the said Senate in recognizing with an honorary degree as a distinguished Baptist, the theological liberal leader, Dr. W. H. P. Faunce, which action the Convention refused to approve by rejecting the vote of confidence which was proposed at the London Convention, 1924; and now by the Senate's further action in the deliberate appointment to the Faculty of McMaster, in the person of Professor L. H. Marshall, one whose views we believe are, at many points, directly contrary to the views of our Canadian Baptist people;

AND WHEREAS the aforementioned actions of the said Senate, we believe, have had the effect of repeatedly disturbing the peace of the Convention, and of alienating the sympathy of a large part of our people from the University, and of undermining their confidence in the Governing Bodies;

AND WHEREAS through the incumbencies of four Chancellors the theological attitude of the University has been largely determined by the leadership of the present Dean in Theology, Dr. J. H. Farmer, who, while professing his personal sympathy for theological conservatism, has maintained an unvarying attitude of tolerance and defense of Modernism;

AND WHEREAS we have their own word for it, that the Dean in Theology and the Chancellor were chiefly responsible for recommending Professor Marshall's appointment;

AND WHEREAS the Senate, as a whole, refused to re-examine Professor Marshall's fitness to serve the churches of this Convention as a professor in McMaster, thus compelling those whose conscientious convictions forbade their acquiescence, publicly to appeal to the whole Denomination;

AND WHEREAS the aforementioned considerations prove that Professor Marshall's appointment is only an additional symptom of a deep-seated, persistent, and determined spirit of opposition to the principles in McMaster University which our Baptist people hold dear, and which are written into the instrument upon which the University is founded;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that this meeting of Baptists, who are members of churches within the Convention of Ontario and Quebec, declare it to be our conviction that the present condition of distrust and unrest in the Convention has been brought about by repeated acts of defiance of denominational conviction by the Senate and Board of Governors of McMaster University; and that, in the conviction that nothing short of a radical change in the Governing Bodies of the University can restore peace and confidence to the Convention, we urge all our fellow-Baptists throughout the Convention to whom the faith once for all delivered is precious to join hands in an effort to effect the necessary change;

And that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Board of Governors, and to *The Canadian Baptist*.

Mr. Chairman and Christian friends: in speaking to this resolution I would like to say, first of all, that we are not here because of personal animus against any brother-man; we are not met here to-night—either to speak or to listen—because we have not at heart the welfare of our University, and the unity and prosperity of our beloved Denomination: we are met here to-night, my friends, because these things lie on our hearts, and are the things which we most earnestly covet. It is to be deplored that the one real issue before our people to-day is being lost sight of amid personalities. The issue before our Canadian Baptist people is not personalities: the issue, my friends, to-night—this year—is Modernism.

The issue is not Dr. Shields: it was not Dr. Shields who brought Professor Marshall to Canada! (Applause). Dr. Shields did not examine Professor

Marshall, and discover that he accepted Dr. Driver's position regarding dates and authorship! Dr. Shields did not, after making that examination and discovery concerning Mr. Marshall, commend Mr. Marshall to us in the columns of *The Canadian Baptist!* (Applause). Dr. Shields did not refuse to re-open that examination in order that we, as a Denomination, might be saved from the very situation which confronts us to-night! Dr. Shields did not publish that sermon in *The Canadian Baptist*, entitled, "The Insight of Christ"! Dr. Shields did not preach that sermon in James Street Church, Hamilton, entitled, "Coming to Christ"! Dr. Shields did not declare that the man who accepted the literal interpretation of Jonah would be considered in England an "uneducated fool"! Dr. Shields did not say that he accepted Dr. Driver's position regarding dates and authorship (Applause), which position has rendered the Old Testament a mass of unreliability—Dr. Shields did not do that! It was not Dr. Shields who examined Mr. Marshall, and, with his eyes wide open to what Mr. Marshall believed, and well knowing that Mr. Marshall's views could not possibly find acceptance with our Canadian people, nevertheless brought Mr. Marshall with his family from England, and placed him in the humiliating position of coming to a strange country to be the storm centre of theological controversy in a Bible-loving Denomination—Dr. Shields did not do Professor Marshall that wrong! (Applause). Someone else did; but I contend, in all fairness, that Dr. Shields was not that man. Let me repeat it: the issue before us to-night, and at the coming Convention, is not Dr. Shields: it is the attitude of our Canadian Baptist Denomination toward Modernism.

Now, there are three attitudes possible toward Modernism: first of all, openly accept it; secondly, mildly tolerate it; thirdly, utterly resist it. ("Amen!" "Hallelujah!")

The history of our Baptist work in England, and in the Northern Baptist Convention, proves conclusively that an attitude of easy-going tolerance toward Modernism, on the part of Bible-loving Baptists, has resulted every time in the downfall of the historic Baptist position. In our own Convention, despite repeated resolutions declaring our repudiation of Modernism in any shape or form, we are yet being compelled by the inexcusable tolerance of our leaders, to spend our time and strength in contending for the faith. It is being borne in upon thoughtful men that only the strongest kind of stand and resistance will ever be effectual in saving the Baptists of Canada from the blight of Modernism. The rank and file of our Baptist people, thank God, are sound in the faith. I read in *The Star* to-night (Applause) that we are facing a split in our Baptist denomination. Now, if *The Star* reporter will call me up tomorrow morning—not before ten o'clock—I will tell him that it is the considered judgment of one minister, at least, who believes he knows our Baptist people, that there is not the shade of a shadow of a chance of a split in this Denomination ("Amen!"). That is my judgment. We are Baptists; we shall remain Baptists,—and in the Baptist ranks; and our people have far too much common sense, and Scriptural knowledge, and loyalty to Jesus Christ, and knowledge of what true Baptist principles mean, ever to fail to rise to the occasion when a clear issue is presented before them of Modernism versus Fundamentalism (Prolonged applause). When a compromiser with Modernism is out of arguments to defend his position, the easiest thing to say is—Dr. Shields!

If we can arouse the Baptist conscience to the meaning and menace of Modernism, we can save the day. This will require the facing of unwelcome facts; it will necessitate a courageous exposure, not only of Modernism in our midst to-day, but of that indefensible policy of compromise which for years defended and supported the modernist professor, Dr. I. G. Matthews, in McMaster University. Dr. Matthews' book proves him to be a modernist of the modernists. Dr. Matthews stands to-night where he always stood. He is in Crozer University, a hot-bed of Modernism and infidelity; and around him he has gathered a little group of our brightest graduates of McMaster. He represents the thing which has blighted every church it has ever touched; and which, if accepted, would paralyze the spiritual power of our Baptist work at home and abroad. What do Canadian Baptists think to-night of the policy of compromise which tolerated, for years, this modernist professor—and defends him to this very

day? Is it not evident, my friends, that only the most determined action on the part of our people will ever compel our leaders to recognize that the tolerance of Modernism will eventuate in the disruption of our work, and do grievous harm to the interests of the kingdom of God in our midst?

As for my friend Professor Marshall—and that in sincerity: on two counts I believe it can be proven to an open-minded Baptist that Professor Marshall is a modernist: first of all, on the confession of his own lips, in the denial of the historicity of Jonah; secondly, on the confession of Dr. Farmer, that Professor Marshall accepts Dr. Driver's position on the Old Testament regarding dates and authorship.

I am happy to think that not only are there some two thousand people here to-night, but there will be twenty thousand people who will read the words which are uttered to-night (Dr. Shields: "More than that.") Oh, how I would like to say this word to the Canadian Baptist men and women who shall read these messages: I believe in five minutes any Baptist can see what his duty is regarding our friend Mr. Marshall! If you will spend five minutes doing this with me: first of all, look at Galatians 3: 8. "And the scripture, foreseeing"—certain things. There is a predictive principle in the Word of God which "foresees". That is the first fact.

Fact number two of five facts which I want to present: I Corinthians 15: 3, 4. "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures: and that he was buried, and that he rose again, the third day according to the scriptures." The remarkable thing about that statement is that the Scriptures referred to are not the New Testament Scriptures—for they were not then written—but the Old Testament Scriptures; and the Apostle Paul said that it was prophesied in the Old Testament that Jesus would die for our sin, be buried, and rise again from the dead—when?—"on the third day according to the scriptures" ("Amen!" "That's the boy!") I do not want any praise, I did not write that.

Fact number three (I am speaking particularly to my forty friends and to my invisible hearers): Jesus Christ knew that there was an Old Testament scripture which prophesied, not only that He would be buried and rise again from the dead, but that He would rise on the third day. After His resurrection, in the twenty-fourth of Luke, He appeared to His disciples, and He read to them the Word of God. He said, "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled"—now listen—"which were written in the law of Moses"—Did you hear that, Brother Fieldus, the law was written by Moses, the Driver school says it was not—"which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me." And Jesus said unto them, "Thus it is written"—now listen—"and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day." It behoved Him to rise—and to rise on the third day. Why on the third day? Because He knew that in the Old Testament there was a prophecy which declared that He would be buried; that He would be entombed for three days; and on the third day rise from the dead "according to the scriptures".

Which Scriptures? Look at fact number four where our Lord tells us which scripture. "Then certain of the scribes and of the Pharisees answered, saying, Master, we would see a sign from thee. But he answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas: for as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth"—and I challenge you to produce any other scripture in the Old Testament which plainly tells us Christ would rise on the third day, than the Scripture concerning the resurrection of the prophet Jonah ("Amen!" and applause).

Fact number five: The book of Jonah begins with this verse: "Now the word of the Lord came unto Jonah the son of Amittai, saying"—Who was Jonah of the book of Jonah? He was the son of Amittai. Was he an allegorical character? Certainly not! Listen to this statement God has given us on the subject. In second Kings, an historical book, it is said Jeroboam "restored the coast of Israel from the entering of Hamath unto the sea of the plain, according to the word of the Lord God of Israel, which he spake by the hand of

his servant Jonah, the son of Amittai, the prophet, which was of Gath-hepher." There the Word of God declares that there was a prophet of God named Jonah; his father's name, Amittai; that he was born in the village of Gath-hepher, about half an hour's walk north of Nazareth; and that he prophesied the victories of king Jeroboam!

And so, on the authority of the historical book of second Kings, and on the verification of the Son of God Himself, we believe to-night the historicity of Jonah ("Hallelujah!" "Praise the Lord!") And, brethren, in all kindness, let me say this: that our Baptist people will never accept a man who denies that Jonah, as the Saviour declares, was in the belly of the fish—and Professor Marshall denies that. There is no doubt about that. He will deny having said some things with which he will be charged, but he will never deny that he disbelieves in a real Jonah who was in a real fish and who experienced a real resurrection. He does not believe that he has said so repeatedly, and when our Canadian Baptist people know that, I believe their duty will be clear.

Now the second count is this: Dr. Farmer declared in the Baptist Convention in Hamilton that Professor Marshall accepted Dr. Driver's views on the Old Testament, regarding "dates and authorship." Now, if that is true, Mr. Marshall is an out-and-out modernist. I tried to make clear at the Hamilton Convention that there was a world of meaning wrapped up in that phrase, "dates and authorship". My friends, every well-informed person who has read the writings of the critical school knows that the whole question of Modernism rests upon the matter of dates and authorship. One of the greatest conservative scholars of England on that subject says this:

"The critics knew from the first that all depended upon late authorship. Late authorship means dependence upon tradition, or upon legend, instead of upon observation. Instead of testimony at first hand, (as that of Moses or of Joshua would have been), we have now, according to the critics, nothing at all that any sane man can regard as worthy of the name of testimony. Between the time of Moses and the reign of Josiah, about nine centuries elapsed"—may I say, in passing, that the higher critical school denies that the books of Moses were written by him, or written in his day. The critical school—Dr. Driver among them—declares that these books were written in their present form in the time of Josiah, nine hundred years afterward—"Nine centuries from our own time will take us back to the year one thousand of our era, to the time of Canute of England and Malcolm the second of Scotland. Let us suppose that someone was now to write the story of these ancient monarchs for the first time, and to do his utmost to gather everything that floating traditions and local legends could supply, who would dream of regarding the result as history? And who would ever think of quoting it as a record of facts? The late date is the critical mine dug under the citadel of truth. Let it once be fired, and the whole structure subsides into irretrievable ruin."

Of course it does: dates and authorship are the pick and shovel with which Modernism undermines the authority of the Word of God! If Professor Marshall, as Dr. Farmer tells us, accepts Dr. Driver's position on "dates and authorship," then Professor Marshall denies the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, despite the fact that the five books of the Pentateuch declare themselves to have been written by Moses—and Jesus accepted that fact! It is on the ground of "dates and authorship" that Dr. Driver denies that Hannah said what the Scriptures declare she did say in her inspired song of rejoicing in the first book of Samuel. Dr. Driver says, regarding that beautiful, inspired, song, "The song of Hannah is not early in style, and seems unsuited to Hannah's position"! It was an exalted song; and he could not understand how a poor woman could rise to such heights of worship and praise; he did not know that out of the mouths of babes and sucklings God has perfected praise—so he denies that Hannah uttered this song, despite the fact that the song begins with these solemn words: "And Hannah prayed, and said, My heart rejoiceth in the Lord." It is on the ground of "dates and authorship" that Dr. Driver denies that Isaiah wrote the prophecy which bears his name—despite the fact that Jesus Christ, in the twelfth chapter of John, three times declared that Isaiah wrote the book. Well does Dr. John Urquhart say, "if this rag-basket is all

that stands for the Old and New Testaments, will Dr. Driver and his fellow-critics tell us where we shall find the oracles of God?" It is on the ground of "dates and authorship" that Dr. Driver denies the authority and the truth of the Old Testament Scriptures, and makes them a mass of unreliability. Dr. Farmer tells us that Mr. Marshall accepts Dr. Driver on "dates and authorship". Therefore Professor Marshall, by a hundred arguments from Dr. Driver's writings, is abundantly proven to be a Modernist.

At the Hamilton Convention when our people voted for Professor Marshall's appointment, they did not know the position of Dr. Driver regarding dates and authorship,—but some of our leaders did; and in spite of that, they supported and defended Professor Marshall. What does it all mean? It means that the voice of the Governing Body of McMaster is not the voice of the people, it means that some of our leaders do not share the attitude of the people of our Denomination toward Modernism; it means that if the conviction of our people on this tremendous question is to find expression, there must be placed upon the Governing Body of the University men who will truly represent the attitude of our people, and who will see to it that their will shall be faithfully carried out.

Brethren, this is the only wise solution of the problem that confronts us. It is the fair thing to do—and it can be done. Place a sufficient number of men on the Governing Body as will ensure the expressed will of the Denomination being made effective. Let our people join hands and work together prayerfully and courageously toward this end.

I move the adoption of this resolution (Applause.)

CHAIRMAN: Rev. Clifford Loney, of Hamilton, will second the resolution.

REV. CLIFFORD LONEY: Mr. Chairman and Christian friends: Owing to the lateness of the hour, and as other brethren are to speak, I will only outline my reasons for supporting this resolution. Before doing so, I wish to say that the issue is not a Dr. Shields issue. I would like to emphasize that fact. It goes back to the days of Dr. Elmore Harris; and as a student of those days I can well remember suffering and enduring, as the young men who have expressed themselves this evening.

I rise to second this resolution to-night first, as an act of allegiance to Jesus Christ. My allegiance to Jesus Christ, my Lord and Saviour, compels me to rise and publicly support this resolution. When I came as a poor lost sinner to the nail-scarred feet of the Man of Calvary, I found pardon and peace through His precious blood. Before the Cross I pledged my allegiance to the Man Who died for me! and I intend, so help me, God, to be true to Him, to His Word, to His cross, to His church, no matter what the cost. I therefore refuse to be a party to compromise with, or in any way aid or support, any man, church, or institution, that is not absolutely true to the fundamentals of the faith.

In this connection: I am still puzzled beyond expression to understand why it was Professor Farmer faced such a crisis on his knees last summer, if Professor Marshall was known to him to be true to the fundamentals of the faith.

Secondly: I support this resolution as an act of loyalty to my Denomination. I am a Baptist as a matter of conviction. It is because of the great principles for which Baptists have ever stood that I am within her fold to-day; and it is my love for her that brings me to my feet to-night in support of the truths that have given her a distinctive mission in the world (Applause).

Thirdly: I support it as an act of protest. I herewith register my solemn protest: (a) Against the doubtful and dangerous teaching that is being harboured in our University by the retention of Professor L. H. Marshall, whose teaching labels the story of Jonah an allegory; denies the total depravity of man; ignores the precious blood of Christ as the only remedy for sin; and the necessity for the new birth; (b) against conferring of honorary degrees on liberal theologians, such as Dr. W. H. P. Faunce, whose views are known to be diametrically opposed to the beliefs of regular Baptists; (c) against a policy that ignores the express will of the Baptist body, as exemplified in the retention of Professor I. G. Matthews on the staff of the University for years after the Convention had expressed its disapproval of his teachings; (d) against the

attitude of tolerance and defense of modernistic tendencies; and against the expressions of scorn and ridicule of those who dare to express themselves contrary to such ideas.

Fourthly: As an act of warning. As the pastor of one of the most loyal and self-sacrificing missionary churches of this Convention, I sound the note of warning. Dark clouds are gathering upon our denominational sky, and our whole missionary work is in grave danger of financial and spiritual shipwreck, unless the cause of all suspicion is removed from, and unqualified confidence established in, the Institution from which so many of our missionaries come. As I look into the faces of the Christless millions I see standing "on the broken steep at the edge of eternal doom" to-night, I say to you as Christian men and loyal Baptists, it is time that this thing was cleaned up. It is better that these compromisers should be dismissed, than that our great Baptist body be divided, and the countless millions perish for want of our united help:

"Only one life, it will soon be past,
And only what is done for Jesus will last."

Mr. Chairman, I second the resolution. (Applause.)

CHAIRMAN: This resolution has been read to you, we will deal with it just as we did with the other. All who are in favour of the adoption of this resolution will please rise. (Apparently the whole congregation rose to their feet). Those who oppose the adoption of this resolution, will you please rise? (According to the Chair, twenty-one rose in response to this request).

CHAIRMAN: The third and last resolution will be moved by Dr. A. T. Sowerby, and seconded by Dr. Shields.

DR. A. T. SOWERBY: I would be very glad, Mr. Chairman and friends, just to drop out at this juncture. This is a heavy meeting, and I feel perhaps you are getting tired; and I want Dr. Shields to have full swing on this issue,—it is consuming him. I am going to hue out a line of my own to-night. I have been playing Sherlock Holmes this week, and I will give you some telegrams before we are through. No one knew about them but Maggie, who lives in our house—Maggie has to know everything (Laughter).

Will you bear with me while I read this resolution? It is briefer than the others:

On Baptist Ecclesiasticism.

WHEREAS Canadian Baptists have always held that the autonomy and absolute independence of the local church is clearly taught in the Scripture, and that such independence is essential to the exercise on the part both of the individual member and of the church, of that soul liberty which is the inalienable right of every believer in Christ.

AND WHEREAS Canadian Baptists have held that while a co-operative witness to the truth of the gospel between churches is both desirable and practicable, such co-operation is possible only on a free and voluntary basis and absolutely without extra church authority or control;

AND WHEREAS such proposals as the appointment of a Convention Ordination Committee, whose counsel and consent must be obtained before ordination, and such suggestions as that reported in *The Canadian Baptist* some weeks ago as having been made at a certain Board Meeting, of the necessity of some central Committee to keep the churches in line with the rules of the Boards; are indications of a tendency to ignore the independence of the local church in an endeavour to impose upon the churches some outside authority or control;

AND WHEREAS, whether by design or otherwise, the present overlapping in the personnel of our various Convention Boards, constitutes an interlocking directorate which subjects the various departments of our denominational activities to a centralized control, impairing the independence of the Boards, and threatening the independence of the churches;

AND WHEREAS every department of our denominational work is becoming increasingly subject to the predominant influence of McMaster Univer-

sity, which subjection militates against the freedom both of our churches, and of our pulpits.

AND WHEREAS it is a matter of common knowledge that McMaster University in general, and the Dean in Theology in particular, have long made it a practice to endeavour to influence the decision of pastorless churches in favour of McMaster's own interests, often to the disadvantage of worthy men from other schools, or of other than McMaster training, and sometimes to the spiritual injury of the churches;

AND WHEREAS, we believe such practices constitute an unwarranted interference with the freedom of the churches, and the liberty of pastors, as well as a failure to recognize the administration of the Holy Ghost in the appointment of pastors to their charges;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED

THAT this meeting of Baptists protests against all these tendencies toward an unscriptural ecclesiasticism, and calls upon all our Baptist churches and pastors to assert their independence, and to resist to the utmost any and every attempt to interfere with the independence of the local church, or the liberty of its ministers.

And that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Board of Governors, and to *The Canadian Baptist*.

Now, dear friends, I want to tell you just why I am here to-night; and, with all due respect to the man I worked with in evangelistic meetings years ago, I may say it is not Dr. Shields—not at all. I want to tell you that I was with Dr. Harris in that great fight years ago, I was one of the tellers in the Convention at that time. I am a graduate of McMaster;—I am not an enemy of McMaster, although I have been regarded as such. There is not an enemy of McMaster University on this platform, not one (Applause).—I never have been an enemy of McMaster University. I am going to tell you when I graduated—but I am almost afraid to tell you! I graduated in 1886, forty years ago this first of May—quite a little while ago. I have preached forty-one years and two months. I am a Baptist from conviction; and I would not be a Baptist five minutes if it were not that I am held by convictions that are as strong as steel cables. That is why I am a Baptist—and that is the only reason. (Applause). I am jealous to my boot heels for these great principles that I believe our God has written in this Book, and which have found lodgment in my heart. I am not a bigob, but I have convictions—I have convictions which mean everything to me. Therefore I must speak out when I see things going on which I believe are subversive of the very best interests of the Denomination, and of truth.

I would have spoken out through our denominational paper—I tried to a few weeks ago, and I was not allowed. My manuscript was sent to *The Canadian Baptist* office—and I never heard from it since ("And you never will!") Well, to-day I looked over *The Canadian Baptist*, and I made up my mind that the letter of indignation that I wrote would make a good deal better reading than what I read in *The Baptist* to-day.—"Don't wear a truss"; or another one, "Gillett's Lye eats dirt"! I think that my letter would make better reading than that—I think it would. Now, they found room for those, but could not find space for my letter. I had to go to *The Gospel Witness* with it! (Applause).

I say it in love, we are the *real* friends of McMaster, and of the Denomination. Listen: had the Governing Bodies of McMaster listened to her *real* friends fifteen years ago, we would not have had this present condition of things. I want to tell you, they are in bad shape; they are like the man who went into a meeting up here in the north country. He was not very literary, but someone up there determined to have him make a speech; and at last he got up to speak, and he made up his mind to tell them a Bible story. And so he started out to tell them about Daniel being in the fiery furnace; and one person interrupted him and said, "John, you should not say that. Daniel was not in the burning fiery furnace: he was in the den of lions." "Well," said John, "I am not very well read in this matter, I have not looked it up very well; but wherever he was, I can say he was in a dicens of a fix!" (Laughter). And I think there are some people to-day in Toronto who are in a "dicens of a fix"! Had they listened in 1910, at the Bloor Street Convention, when Dr. Harris (one of the most God-fearing men that I ever knew) and others of us, took

action to remedy these matters—had they listened to him—shall I say “us”—and us; and acted upon suggestions offered and demands presented, there would be a different story now. Two weeks after that Convention, Dr. Elmore Harris was in my study; and he leaned his head on the desk, and cried tears of bitterness—broken-hearted over the condition of things. I have never forgotten it.

Now then, listen: Dr. W. N. Clarke, my New Testament Greek teacher; Dr. I. G. Matthews; Dr. George Foster; Dr. George Cross,—and now what? I am lost when I think of this long succession of men who have been practically away off the track. Have not the events since the 1910 Convention justified our action and our attitude then? They have all proved that we were right. **WE WERE RIGHT**, Mr. Chairman—we were right. There is no getting around it. Some of that Faculty, who were then very active in the defense of Professor Matthews, are now active along the same lines. They have not had a change of heart. I am sorry, and it breaks my heart, but what must we think of *their* orthodoxy—or *inconsistency*—you can call it what you like: I care not what a man may claim to be, if I find him continually defending the other party I must form a judgment as to where to place him. I cannot help it. Of course, he may be a wonderful acrobat!—there are fellows that can jump in and out, and on and off, and stand on their heads—he may do all that. Professor Matthews—let me say it, I will get to my point just now—Professor Matthews was the most expensive man that the Baptist denomination of Canada ever had. He has cost them more than they will ever dare reckon. By people withholding their contributions from the support of our educational institutions, he has been the most expensive man that our Denomination has ever had.

Now, this other matter: it is an easy thing to take a foul stomach and cleanse it—a little purgative will cleanse that. That is the easiest thing in the world. But I found out, as a school teacher years ago, that when you poison the mind of a growing child, or a young man—when you poison that young person's mind, it is quite another job to get that out. I could have filled the minds of my pupils with doubts about things sacred and divine, and have defied any school board to detect me in the thing. Let me say that John B. Gough had it right when he said in one of the last speeches he ever made—he held up his right hand and said, “Men, I was in the presence of a very foul-mouthed man once, when I was only sixteen years of age. I was only in his company about fifteen minutes, and,” he said, “I would gladly give my right arm if I could get out of my mind the foul thoughts which he put into it.”

That is why I am worrying about McMaster University. I have no animus against anyone. I want to reiterate it, I have no animus against anyone, I would not wrong anyone; but they must not wrong the church; they must not wrong the Denomination. They must not sow seeds of evil in the heart of our work. **I SHALL STAND IN THE GAP**. I may be considered a fool—that seems to be the word just now—well, “I am become a fool in glorying; ye have compelled me.” As an old Baptist, then, and as a graduate of McMaster, I see things moving toward a very dangerous situation, and I must protest.

Now for my part of it. First, **THERE IS THE CENTRALIZATION OF POWER**—have you not watched it?—there is a **CENTRALIZATION OF POWER**—everything being gradually brought in by and centred around a little group. The Chairman gave you an idea of that whole thing. Take the Board of Governors—I want just to repeat this, Mr. Chairman. There are seventeen on the Board of Governors: out of that number Walmer Road has furnished five; Bloor Street, four; Central Church, two. In other words, these three churches have eleven out of the seventeen. Is that right? (“NO!” “NO!”) Is that right? I am appealing to you as men and women—is it right? **NO, IT IS NOT RIGHT**. Now, come to the Senate. Of thirty-five members, Walmer Road has supplied eleven; Bloor Street, eight; Central Church, (meeting in McMaster University) three—i. e., twenty-two out of thirty-five. Is that right? (“No!” “No!”). It is not. There is a centralization process going on, which will prove to be very dangerous, indeed, to our denominational independence. I once thought that in the Baptist denomination the college and all these institutions were the **SERVANTS** of the body, and not the master—but the thing has been reversed. McMaster, to-day, is saying, “You little fellows out there in the small churches, do what we tell you. If you don't we will knock your head off!”

Now the second point is this **MEDDLING WITH VACANT PULPITS**. If I were the Chancellor—say, I wonder if they will ever let me be Chancellor? I don't believe Dean Farmer will ever let me be Chancellor (Laughter). If I were the Chancellor, at the graduation exercises I would hand each graduate his diploma, and then I would give them all a little address. I would say, "Gentlemen, we are handing you to-night a letter of recommendation. This is our testimonial as to what we think of you. Don't you ever look to any professor of this institution for a testimonial or a reference. We have handed you ours, we have treated you all alike; don't you come back and pull the coat-tail of this professor, or that professor, and ask him to write you a letter of recommendation to a church. You have received our testimonial, and we consider it to be a good one." When I get to be the professor—the Chancellor, I mean—when I get to be the Chancellor, I am going to absolutely forbid that any man on that teaching staff shall do any such thing. It is wrong, it is absolutely wrong (Applause).

Second: if I were on the pulpit committee of any church, I would tell the professor who meddled with our work in selecting a new pastor to mind his own business and attend to his Greek; and we on the pulpit committee would look after the local church. We have the brains to do that—let these fellows attend to their own affairs. Let us take an example of this (I have seen all these things). Let us take an example: here is a pulpit vacant, and I am a minister. Let us suppose that I have been in a church seven or eight years—there is no trouble at all in the church, but I have made up my mind quietly that possibly I would like to move somewhere else, that a little change might be good for me, and perhaps for the church as well. So I quietly write a letter to the pulpit committee of the said vacant church, putting myself before them. But there is a certain man (we will say seven of us have written to the committee), who has written to Professor ———, and asked for a recommendation, and Mr. Professor ——— has written a letter to the pulpit committee very highly recommending him. Now, Prof. So-and-So has recommended this man. That professor, in so doing, has done me an injury. In recommending one man, he has discriminated against the other six. You tell me that is right? No, it is not right. It is absolutely wrong, and never should be done. It should not be done at all. But they want to put in a faithful "trustee"—did you ever follow that word out: trust, trusty, trustee. Follow out the word—he wanted to put in a faithful trusty there; but he has wronged me. I would like to know where the chance for the operation of the Holy Spirit comes in in such a call to the pastorate. I don't see it. Often the man is put in to serve the purpose of the machine instead of the church. Many good men have been writhing under this thing for years. It is time for this matter to be presented, and I protest against this unholy activity with all my soul.

Now let me come to the "Sherlock Holmes" work. Let me give you a case that shows their activity along these lines. An item appeared in *The Gospel Witness* of December seventeenth—now listen. I want you to get this. Then I have a telegram and some other news items which will interest you. This is what Dr. Shields says. He does say something sometimes!—

"We have received a copy of the Calendar of the Talbot Street Baptist Church, London, dated December 6th, in which the following paragraph was marked:

REV. PROF. MARSHALL—Prof. Marshall's educational address at the Convention in Hamilton, gave us much joy. But his sermon in last week's 'Baptist' has caused us great grief. He asserts, without a particle of proof, that 'Christ Jesus knew, that, at the heart and centre of man's being, planted there by the hand of God, was something divine, 'sparks of celestial fire', like 'the germ of life in some seeds, which cannot be destroyed, without destroying the seed itself.' This means universal salvation.

'Christ taught the necessity of the new birth, of being 'born of God, of vital union with Christ by faith. That man has no life in himself—'That which is born of the flesh is flesh, that which is born of the spirit is spirit.' That the believer in Christ only, 'hath passed out of death into life'."

That was in the Calendar of the Talbot Street Church, and published in *The Gospel Witness*.

Now let me call your attention to something which appeared in *The Canadian Baptist*—they get things in once in a while! Here is an item in an inset:

TO OUR BAPTIST BRETHREN.

"Whereas a certain article was inserted in our Church Calendar of December 6th, and copied and commented upon by the '*Gospel Witness*' of December 17th, we, the deacons' of Talbot St. Baptist Church desire to say that such article appeared without the knowledge or sanction"—mark now—"without the knowledge or sanction of this church, but was the personal expression of the Calendar Editor.

(Signed) L. J. MUNROE,
Chairman.

(Signed) J. HOLMAN,
Secretary.

Editor's note—The article printed above is from the Board of Deacons of Talbot St. Baptist Church, London, Ont."

Well, knowing those good deacons as well as I did, I thought that that was kind of funny. Thinks I, there is a "nigger in the fence" somewhere; something is wrong; there is something doing; some person attempting to deceive the Baptist people; so I got busy and I wrote five letters to London, to five of the deacons there. I had been their minister for years, and knew them well. I called their attention to this item in *The Canadian Baptist*, and told them I was very sorry, for it sounded to me, as put in *The Canadian Baptist*, as if it repudiated the action of the Rev. James Hamilton, who looked after the Church Calendar. And I dared to say to them that Mr. Hamilton was right—MR. HAMILTON WAS RIGHT. I sent them all a copy of last week's *Gospel Witness*, to show the character of the fight that was going on, and how I myself had written twice to the Chancellor—taking no action behind his back, but to his face,—about the whole issue.

I received a letter from London only Tuesday of this week—this is not ancient history, only Tuesday of this week—with some very important things in it. Some of it was private; but I felt that you ought to see what is working at the centre, so I copied from that letter all but the part of it which was private and I sent that back to the writer, Mr. Hamilton, and I said, "Will you give me the privilege of reading the contents of that letter, excepting the private part of it, at a meeting on Thursday night?" I said, "Write at once, don't delay." Now he would get that letter Wednesday morning—he would not get it himself until Wednesday night, for he is down at his store all day. But this morning at nine o'clock I got this telegram from London (I want you to see that I am playing above board) saying:

"I give you permission to use letter as you please.

(Signed) JAMES HAMILTON."

I am going to read to you that part of that letter to support my contention here, that things are being centralized—and not always to the good of the Denomination. Now, what do you think it was? What do you think it was?

89 Oxford St. West, London,
January 11th, 1926.

"My dear Brother Sowerby:—

"Your kind favor of January 8th came to hand in due time. I appreciate your words of commendation re calendar article. I must say McMaster professors are willing to grasp at straws in support of their house of sand re Professor Marshall.

"Talbot St. Church does not authorize any article in the Calendar, and DR. J. G. BROWN, who secured that statement for *The Baptist*, was told the same.

"I think that not one of the deacons would repudiate the teaching of that item in the Calendar. But they do repudiate the conclusion and impression created by *The Baptist* editor (they sent the item of their own accord), that they are in sympathy with Professor Marshall's teachings.

THEY ARE NOT. . . . I have read your article in The Gospel Witness. They are strong and sound. The end is not yet.

Yours in Christian love and sympathy,

(Signed) J. HAMILTON."

Now I am through. Let me say this, and I am done; for Dr. Shields must have the floor. Listen: if they will rectify these wrongs—I will be fair—if they will rectify these wrongs, and stop this mischief, they will not find a more loyal supporter than I am; but I must stand foursquare with the teachings of the Old Book, and the teachings, principles, and practices of this Denomination.

In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, I move this resolution (Applause).

CHARMAN: Dr. Shields will second this resolution.

DR. T. T. SHIELDS: Don't be afraid, I will not keep you very long—I usually do, but I won't to-night. I have not had time to read the evening papers, but I have been informed by someone that there was an interview in one of the papers in which a certain prominent Baptist—I believe he was not named—said that it might be possible that the next Convention would refuse to seat delegates from Jarvis Street Baptist Church. Well, I challenge that brother and the entire Executive Committee, and all the Boards, to introduce that issue into the Convention! (Applause). I remind them that there are several months between now and the Convention,—and some of us are not going to spend all that time sleeping; and a great many things may happen between now and then. And if they are not careful the question of unseating Jarvis Street delegates may be a very serious one—and it may be a case of mistaken identity! Somebody else may be unseated! (Laughter and applause).

This resolution which I second has to do with the growing ecclesiasticism in the Baptist denomination. I congratulate my Brother Allen on his magnificent victory last night, (Loud applause). It was a victory, a tremendous victory. My heart rejoices as I see that God is raising up such men as Mr. Allen—and these three magnificent fellows, Whitcombe, Brown, and Fieldus. (I do not wonder that you could speak to-night, Brother Brown, with a son like that). But seriously, dear friends, I want to sound this note, and join with my Brother Linton in saying, there is going to be no split in the Baptist denomination—it is going to be a splinter (Applause), and the body of people we represent here to-night will not be the splinter!

I had the temerity to voice my protest several years ago, and because I crossed the path of the ecclesiastical powers, they came into this church—and I can see the brother now who walked down that aisle and stood here and moved that my pulpit be declared vacant "as from this date." It is not vacant yet! (Applause). It is true that we lost a great many people and only the "riff-raff" was left! But one of the "intellectuals" who was opposed to the Pastor, when the vote had been taken, and the issue had been decided—now listen, you reporters. Get this all down, will you? And don't make a mistake in the grammar of it)—one of the intellectuals on that occasion walked down the aisle, and said before the meeting was dismissed that he would like to speak a word, and he said, "It is my judgment"—his exact words—"that to-night Jarvis Street Church has wrote the blackest chapter in her history!"

Now, my dear friends, there are some other people attempting to write chapters in the history of this Denomination; and those of us who take this stand to-night are, of course, charged with being "disturbers of the peace," and responsible for all this unrest and disunion. I insist that we are writing history—but we are not writing black chapters, any more than this church wrote a black chapter when it decided it would have a free pulpit. (Applause). And this is the beginning of a new day for our Denomination ("Hallelujah!") There are brethren here to-night from another city where another great protest meeting will be held before very long, and similar meetings will be held all over the country. I may tell you further that we are not going to withdraw from the Denomination: we are going to stay in the Denomination, and this fight is only now beginning. Professor Marshall called me on the telephone on Saturday last, and registered his objection to my daring to publish his sermons, stenographically reported by expert chartered stenographers, without giving him an opportunity to revise them before they appeared in print. He

said, "I am getting tired of this campaign of misrepresentation." I replied to him, "It is not a campaign of misrepresentation. I can well understand you are getting tired; and I serve you with notice that you will be tired long before we shall,—for we are just beginning."

This is a serious business, my friends. If you look abroad upon the ravages of Modernism in England—what have we in England? I give you Mr. Marshall's own words as quoted by our Brother Fieldus: that any man in England who believes in the historicity of the book of Jonah, even on the authority of Jesus Christ, is regarded as an "uneducated fool." Well, I would rather be an uneducated fool and believe it, than an educated fool and not believe it! (Prolonged applause). Do we want that kind of teaching among Baptists in Canada? Do we desire the fruit of it,—a diminishing membership, dry baptistries, the churches losing their power, and the Denomination becoming a modernist instrument under the hands of Dr. Glover, and Dr. Shakespeare, and men of that sort? ("No! No!"). Is that what we want to import into McMaster University? Do we want that sort of thing propagated in our educational halls? I think not. I join with my brethren in their kindly sentiments toward Professor Marshall. I raised this question before anyone was named. I warned the Board of Governors to decide this issue before any personality was introduced, and I said, "I am talking about this when we are discussing, not the occupant of a Chair, but a vacant Chair; and insist that before you call anyone to fill this vacancy you shall be assured that he is absolutely in accord with our Baptist position." I am sorry for Professor Marshall. Mr. Linton was absolutely right when he said, or implied, that the Board of Governors, and Senate, of McMaster University did Mr. Marshall a wrong. They ought to have known that his protracted incumbency of any chair in McMaster would prove an impossibility. I am a friend of Professor Marshall; and I say it not unkindly, this church will gladly make a liberal contribution to pay his way back to England!

I tell you this, we do not expect to win this battle by making speeches. We know that we are facing an organized ecclesiastical power, interlocking directorates, the Senate of McMaster controlling *The Canadian Baptist*, the Senate and Board of McMaster largely influencing other Boards, and insidiously working to gain control of every solitary organization in the Denomination—and actually making the suggestion—it came from somewhere, I don't know whether a man on the Senate or not—that there be a central committee to control the churches, and keep them in line with the Boards! I delight to be Pastor of a church that is not subject to any such control. Is this a vain boast? I do not think so. Unless we awaken ourselves we shall find ourselves, very shortly, under the domination of some such centralized authority. This resolution refers to the Boards, and it refers to the interference of McMaster in the independence of the churches.

Now I am positive—and for once the papers say that I am right, when I say this, that the action at Ossington Avenue last night was not without direct influence from McMaster University. There is not the shadow of a doubt about it. And my good friend, Dr. McNeill, according to the interview in *The Evening Telegram*, implies that there is a possibility of this being repeated—a veiled threat, suggesting that churches all over the land should put the screws upon their pastors, and should forbid them liberty. Whether this is a symptom or not, he does not know. Read the report in *The Telegram* this evening. I hope every true man of God throughout this Convention will at last arise and challenge this power to do its worst. ("Let them do it!").

All over this land—I am not speaking of the local situation only—all over this land that condition is obtaining: there is Modernism on the one hand, and a growing ecclesiasticism which sponsors and protects it. There was a time, Dr. Sowerby, when the chief complaint against McMaster was that it interfered with the decision of pastorless churches: I charge that to-day it is not innocent of the attempt to unseat pastors where they are established, in order that they may put in their positions men who will do the behests of McMaster University, who will obey when the professors command! And I say kindly—I know I am charged with being bitter because I speak strongly; and Dr. Farmer, according to our Brother Fieldus, would choose Foadick, or Faunce, before this man—I have no bitterness, I love them all; but I hate some of the things they

stand for with all my heart—and I say there is no man in the whole Denomination that bears the same measure of responsibility for this deplorable condition as Dr. Jones H. Farmer, the champion compromiser of Canada. Brother Fieldus was confirmed in his fears when he talked with him, and saw Dr. Farmer's attitude. I repeat what I have before said publicly: in twenty years of acquaintance with him, he has always been in his personal utterances loyal, so far as I have ever known. I have never heard one unorthodox word from Professor Farmer's lips, nor have I never heard anyone else say that they ever heard Professor Farmer utter an unorthodox word; but I do say this, that Professor Farmer has never, in twenty years, offered any encouragement to those who have sought to maintain the faith, but he has always been fraternal and benevolently disposed to the Modernist enemies of the gospel, whose presence in this Denomination has cast a blight over our churches. He has been the friend of Dr. George Cross, he has been the friend of Professor I. G. Matthews.

Dr. Sowerby said that Professor Matthews was the most expensive man we ever had. Well, there is one who will be still more expensive, and that is Professor L. H. Marshall. And I warn McMaster University that it would pay them better to charter an ocean liner, and give Professor Marshall the freedom of the ship, and send him back to England—it would be cheaper to do that than to keep him here.

We are going to organize—we have already organized; and very shortly a call will go out to the entire Baptist brotherhood, and they will be invited to a great Convention in this church; when a solid body of men and women will come together to organize for defensive purposes; and they will go into the Convention year by year to cleanse the Boards of Modernist sympathizers. And what they do not do the first year, they will attempt the second, and what they do not do the second, they will attempt the third. We will go on and on. If this dear brother, whoever he is, wants to unseat the delegates of Jarvis Street at the next Convention, I promise him he will have to unseat scores, if not hundreds, of delegates from other churches. We will organize—I know it is a much-abused organization, but it has a basis of faith—we will organize a Baptist Bible Union; and I wondered when I read the paper this morning—or when I heard in the early hours of the morning—I wondered why Brother Allen was unseated. Then someone made a suggestion to me, and I said, "Praise the Lord!—that must be it: the Lord must have wanted to set him free to be the organizer of the Baptist Bible Union for Ontario and Quebec." (Applause). I am not afraid of the money, we have lots of money. The One Whom we serve owns the earth and its fulness; and He will stand with us in this matter.

Now, my brethren, it is against this ecclesiastical power we protest. I never asked anyone a favor in my life in the matter of introducing me to a pulpit. I do not care for all your Settlement Committees with Dean Farmer as the Chairman, if he still occupies that position. I do not care about these things. If I had been put out of this church, I would have got a soap-box and started another one somewhere. Our God is mighty ("Amen!" "Praise His name!"),—but I believe this, that it is possible for a man to interfere with the operation of the Holy Ghost. I have taken this matter up with Dr. Farmer, and I am not going to say a solitary thing about that that I have not said before. I can go back over twenty years, and I say again, that the Dean in Theology has taken upon himself to do that which properly belongs to the Spirit of God, in placing pastors; and he has endeavored to control the churches of this Denomination. The other day Mr. Horsman—I said it in *The Witness* this week—Mr. Horsman was not allowed to preach the second Sunday in Walmer Road Church, because of his erroneous views. Dr. Farmer was responsible, mainly, for putting him into the pastorate of Edmonton; he did his utmost to put him into the pastorate of an Ontario church; and Dr. Farmer was a deacon in Walmer Road Church when Mr. Horsman left on account of his views. Dr. Farmer knew exactly where Mr. Horsman stood, yet he recommended him, and sponsored him, and stood by him all the time.

I could tell you of case after case where Dr. Farmer has interfered with the church's independence; and turned the thought of the church away from what they would otherwise have done.

Now, my dear friends, this resolution merely calls upon Baptist churches, and Baptist ministers, to assert their independence, and to resist any attempted control from without; and I do appeal through the printed page—for all that I say will be printed, and even though it is a late hour and some have gone, still I speak to thousands; and I speak at this moment to more ministers than all the Baptist ministry of the Dominion of Canada put together—I call upon my brethren who read these words that I now speak, all over Canada and America, as God helps you, to stand in your position and die in your tracks, rather than surrender your liberty to any sort of ecclesiastical control.

Can we afford, as pastors and churches, to antagonize the Boards of the Convention, the University, the Alumni of McMaster University? I stand here and say to the praise of God, that I have learned, and in some small measure proved, that a man can do without McMaster; he can do without the favour of the denominational "leaders"; he can do without the fellowship of his brother-ministers, if he must—but he cannot do without the fellowship and power of God the Holy Ghost ("Amen!"). And if he has that, and stands true to this Book, and to the Lord of the Book, and to the administration of the Holy Ghost, he can defy McMaster, and the whole Denomination—and he'll itself; and gloriously triumph in the name of the Lord. (Applause).

CHAIRMAN: This resolution has been read in your hearing, and we will take the vote as we did on the other resolutions. All in favor of the adoption of this third resolution, please rise. (Again, as nearly as could be judged, the entire congregation rose). Thank you; sit down just a moment. All opposed to the adoption of this resolution, please rise. I see only three persons on their feet who were not standing before.

DR. SHIELDS: Opposition is diminishing. (Laughter).

CHAIRMAN: This brings us to the close of the meeting. Let us close in an orderly way in just a minute or two.

VOICE FROM THE GALLERY: Mr. Chairman, before you put the vote on the first resolution, you gave us a census, approximately, of the membership represented here. I was surprised to see how many outside the Baptist denomination rose; and many of you were possibly surprised also. I would say at least two or three hundred ("No, no")—well, that was my impression, and I stand to it. When you put your resolution without giving the opposition a chance to say anything, anybody and everybody were allowed to stand on their feet. Against it some forty, of which I happen to be one, stood—I think, all Baptists. Before you put the resolution, I think you might have suggested that those outside the Denomination would remain in their seats, as they are not interested as we are in this matter.

Chairman: They were interested enough to come to this meeting; and they were voting on the facts that were presented.

We will close the meeting in just a moment now. I will ask the Rev. Mr. Thomson, of Mount Pleasant Road Church, to close with prayer.

REV. ALEX. THOMSON: Our gracious Lord, in the name of Jesus Christ, we come unto Thee at the close of this meeting. We desire to thank Thee for the privilege of knowing Thee; and of contending earnestly for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints. We praise Thee, Lord, for Thy truth; we thank Thee for the manifestation of the truth in our Saviour Jesus; and we ask, Lord, that this evening the result of this meeting may be to His honour and to His glory. Thou hast heard everything that has been said. We thank Thee for Thy presence throughout the meeting; and we ask Thee, O Lord, that in every heart here the Saviour may be glorified. Guide us in the days that follow; guide us in everything about our beloved Denomination. O God, we pray Thee that everything may be so rectified that is wrong that our Saviour will be glorified in the salvation of many souls, and that there may be perfect liberty for the Holy Spirit to do His work. Bless all those who are here, and those who have gone. We commend the work of the whole Denomination to Thee, in our Saviour's precious name. May Thy grace, Thy mercy, and Thy peace, be with each one of Thy beloved children now and evermore. Amen."

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

HOW PROFESSOR PONTIUS PILATE DEALT WITH THE FIRST FUNDAMENTALIST.

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis St. Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, December 27th, 1925.
(Stenographically reported)

"And Pilate gave sentence that it should be as they required."—Luke 23:24.



THE Bible is the Word of the Lord which liveth and abideth for ever,—every precept, every promise, every prophecy of this Book is throbbing with life; every page of the Bible, whether of history, or poetry, or prophecy, is a page of ageless principles. The Cross is something more than an ancient instrument of execution: Calvary is not, like Waterloo, merely a field of ancient strife: all the characters related to the trial of Jesus—Judas Iscariot, Peter, Caiaphas, and the kindred of the high priest, Pontius Pilate, Herod, the mocking multitude, the disciples that forsook Him and fled—these are more than characters of history—although they are that—they are present, vital, personalities, all of them playing their part in the still-continuing tragedy of torturing and crucifying the Word of God.

I ask you to think again of a very familiar portion of Scripture this evening, as we turn our thought to some of the incidents related to the trial of our Lord which issued, as the text declares, in Pilate's giving sentence that it should be as the multitude required.

I.

I begin by asking, WHAT WAS THE ISSUE INVOLVED IN THAT DISCUSSION OVER WHICH PONTIUS PILATE PRESIDED? What was the controversy about? What was the cause of the conflict? Why did Pilate sit upon the judgment seat at all? Your answer will be, I suppose, that there was a human Personality Whose character and record were under investigation; and men were asked to form a judgment as to who He was; and as to the validity of the claims He had made in His own behalf. It is true that a Personality was involved, because it is impossible to discuss principles in the abstract: they always find their incarnation in some person; and it is when principles of right or wrong, of light or darkness, go walking through life on two feet, and working with two hands, and speaking with a human voice—it is when principles thus become vitalized and energized through an incarnation that they challenge attention, and command consideration. But back of all that, what was involved? Who was this Person, and what had He done? He claimed to be a Messenger from above; He claimed to be the Word of God; He claimed to be a special Ambassador to this rebellious earth; and in His teaching He taught as One having authority, and not as the scribes. The offence of this Man was that He endeavoured to bring divine authority to bear upon human life: He brought the Word of God, which was an expression of the will of God, to men, demanding that their lives be fashioned according to His precepts; and that their characters be based upon His principles; and that they yield themselves to be re-made by His power. In other words, the issue was the Word of God—whether God had really spoken by this Man or not, whether His testimony was the testimony of God,—that was the issue. Of course, out of that grew many other things as I shall show you in a moment, but the basal fact was this: that here was a Prophet Who claims to be authorized to speak for God, and, like all the prophets who had preceded Him, He encountered the same opposition as was always presented to the Word of God.

When, in all human history, was the Word of God spoken by any lips without awakening in human breasts a strenuous antagonism toward the principles and precepts involved in that Word? If we go back to the Eden story we shall find that, in principle, the trial of Calvary was enacted there: on the first page of human history we have the Word of God versus the word of the Devil, truth

over against untruth, light over against darkness, God over against the enemy who has rebelled against God—that was the issue in Eden. Carry it forward, and we have Abel with his acceptable sacrifice, and Cain who hated his brother, who murdered his brother. Why? For no other reason than that his brother offered to God a more acceptable sacrifice and received the divine favour, whereas the sacrifice of Cain was rejected. And all down through human history we have the same conflict, until Jesus Himself said that the blood of all the prophets, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zacharias—the blood of all the prophets—should be required of this generation, because they had rejected the accumulated testimony of all the prophets, culminating in the rejection of Him Who was Himself the Summary, the Incarnation of everything that God had ever said.

We repeat, it was the Word of God that was on trial. And, my friends, that lies at the basis of the spiritual conflict in your life. Why are you not a Christian? What would the acceptance of Christ involve in your case? It would involve the putting of another Authority on the throne, it would involve your surrendering to an Authority outside of yourself—a bowing of heart, and intellect, and memory, and judgment, and affection, and will—all there is of you—to divine authority, with all its implications. That is what it means to be a Christian, not merely to say, "I believe", and join the church, and forget all about it the next Sunday. I am speaking now of the human side, of course. On the divine side it means regeneration, quickening by the Spirit of God, and newness of life, and all on the ground of the Sacrifice of Blood, and the imputed righteousness of Christ; but so far as our part of it is concerned, that is the conflict that is going on: as to whether we will yield to the will of God as revealed in that Word, as to whether we will accept the claims of Jesus and make Him both Saviour and Lord—that is the issue.

Now, what lies at the basis of this world-wide conflict in the religious realm to-day—what is it? You have seen two names—one of which some people are afraid—"Modernism" and "Fundamentalism". I do not care whether you call me a fundamentalist or not; but I am not ashamed to be so called, for that is what I am. I believe in the fundamentals of the faith. What is the issue? What lies at the basis of it all? It is simply the trial of the Word of God over again. You will find a most interesting parallel between the circumstances of the trial of the Word Incarnate, and the circumstances which attend this great conflict of to-day over the written Word. The attitude of man toward the record God has given us of His Son is precisely the attitude of the natural man toward the Son Himself. That is what lies at the back of it. Do not run away with the idea that it is a movement in the scholastic realm, that we are troubled by some kind of intellectual malady, that we are the victims of an unrest because of the war, or a kind of intellectual ferment that has taken possession of the human mind, pushing us out for the exploration of fields from which, hitherto, we have been excluded—that is not the issue: the great question is, Has God spoken? Is there any divine authority in human life? Is there a word from God that will tell us of the other life, and of this, and that will teach us so to relate ourselves to God that we may go into the future without concern?—that is the great question. It is the same old story that you have here in the trial of Jesus Christ.

There are degrees of Modernism, you know! There are some people who like the "moderate critical view", there are some people who do not specially object to Modernism so long as you do not get too much of it,—they like it in a diluted form. I understand there are different kinds of diphtheria,—but I prefer not to have any kind. The best way to do is to keep out of bad company, to stay away where you will not get the plague. And there is not one man in a thousand who becomes a moderate Modernist, who does not become, ultimately, an extreme Modernist. When I was discussing the Faunce matter in the Senate of McMaster a certain gentleman got up and opened a book, and said as he began to read, "This is what Dr. Faunce said"—and he read it with great gusto. I said, "Will the gentleman please tell us the date of the book?" He replied that it was 1908. I said, "Exactly! Half the modernists of America were evangelicals in 1908. People travel far in that time, the disease develops very rapidly." What I am trying to point out to you this evening is that we had better

keep to the cardinal principles, and remember that wherever the authority of God's Word is impugned, whether it be in respect to Jonah, or the book of Deuteronomy, or the Pentateuch as a whole, or some of the Messianic Psalms—I do not care where the Devil gets in his denial, he will never stop until he has gone through the Book, and repudiated the authority of it all.

Again I say, that was the issue. It was upon that question Pilate had to decide, as to whether he would take his stand on the side of the Incarnate Word of God, or whether on the side of those who were determined to silence the Word of God—that was the whole matter.

But now I would like to remind you that that inevitably involved the Person of Christ: it was impossible to separate the message of Christ from the Person of Christ; it was impossible to divorce His teaching from the Master Himself. You could not reject one without the other, and the only way to silence His teaching was to crucify His Person. Hence, they denied His Deity, mocked at His claims to divine Sonship, and accused Him of blasphemy for telling the truth. The whole question of the authority of Jesus Christ was involved.

My friends, that is the question at issue to-day. To be very personal and direct, that is the question at issue in your life and mine: whether the Son of God is to have authority over us, whether He is to be, in the truest and completest sense, our Lord. That is a personal matter which we must all face this evening. And if there are some here who do not yield ready obedience to Christ, and who are disinclined to accept His claims, I ask you not to allow the Devil to deceive you, by persuading you that it is because of some mental difficulty, because of something you have read: at the foundation it is because you do not want to accept the authority of Christ, that is the only reason.

And then when we come to this larger trouble in the church at large—you ask me why I refer so frequently to this matter? My answer is that it is vital to the existence of the Christian Church, to every branch of the Christian Church. Here is a matter concerning which we cannot afford to be silent; we are recreant to our trust if we do not bear our testimony, for it is not merely a mutilated Bible we are offered: our choice is between the whole Bible, and no Bible at all. And that means our choice, ultimately, is between a divine Saviour Who was crucified for our sins, and Who rose again, and Who ascended, and Who ever liveth to make intercession for us, and Who is coming again—that is the evangelical position, and our choice is between that Christ and the Christ Who is reduced to the dimensions of a man, Who is without authority, without power to save. Everyone of us will have to take our side on that question; every believing man and woman here this evening—I do not care what church you belong to, you have to take sides; and the day is not very far distant when in all denominations there is going to be a realignment. Personally, I am not going out of this Denomination until I am put out! I am going to stay in and contend for the faith with all my might. I do not believe for a moment that our Baptist people are on the other side; and I want to give warning that so far as this Baptist denomination is concerned, so long as I have breath in my body and the Lord gives me health and strength, I am going to make it impossible that there shall be peace in this Denomination on the basis of the dishonouring of my Lord, and the putting aside of this Book, if I had to stand absolutely alone on the subject. But, thank God, we do not have to stand alone on the matter—but I have stated the issue.

II.

Let us look at that old story in some of its modern applications. I want you to think of the motives and methods of the prosecution as they brought the Son of God to the bar of judgment. Do you know that the modern ideal of a witness for Christ is a gentleman of whom all the newspapers speak kindly—if they speak at all? If he is a minister, he is a man who is welcome at all the clubs; he is a man who is honoured by the entire community in which he dwells; he is a man who never disturbs anybody's peace; who was never known to wake up a sleeper; a very amiable, dignified, scholarly, distinguished, and withal a very popular gentleman! The only fault I have to find with that gentleman is that he is not in the Book at all: there is not a line in the Word of God to suggest that it ever has been possible, that it ever will be possible, for a man

to be true to Jesus Christ in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation and shine as a light in the world, and at the same time enjoy the favour of the enemies of Christ—it is an absolute impossibility. Our friend Dr. Norris pointed out when he was here, that the measure of our power as individuals, and the measure of the church's power, is not the measure of its conformity to the world, but the measure of its difference from the world.

The Person being here opposed is none other than the Son of God; and will you remember that we have His word for it that they called the Master of the house Beelzebub, and he said, "How much more they of his household"? Do you expect to have an easy time as a Christian? Your Lord did not have an easy time; nor is it possible that you and I should have an easy time if we are faithful to our trust. What had He done? Whom had He injured? He had done nothing but insist on the authority of God in human life—that is all. Jesus had gone about doing good; but He had come to men and women without distinction of rank, or position; and He had insisted that they were answerable to God, and that they must bow to His authority. That was His testimony.

The moment you do that, that moment you will be a marked man. I have been very much amused by some of my brethren, unsophisticated as some of them are, who have come to me and said—a couple of men came to me about a year ago, and they said, "A great many people are terribly prejudiced against you, they hate the very mention of your name; and they will not line up with anything with which you are identified. Would you have any objection if we were to form an organization of some sort? Would you feel offended if we were to form an organization, having the same end in view, to fight quite independently of you—would you feel that we were not playing quite fairly when we were fighting for the same thing, if we just fight apart from you?" "Why," I said, "I think it about time you did something. So long as you fight for the faith, I do not care how you fight; it is quite legitimate to contend for the faith, and your method is none of my affair. This is a free country; you do just as you like. Only," I said, "I will give you a little bit of advice: just the moment you cross the path of Modernism, and unsheath your sword against it, and offer an effective resistance, if you are as white as an archangel, they will call you a devil that minute. The very moment you put your foot down and say, 'Here I stand, I can do no other', all hell will be let loose against you. It will make no difference. And then the next day someone will come in and say, 'Would you have any objection to our forming an organization quite independently of you?'"

You may carry that on for ever, and I want to prove it to you. I ask again, What was the issue? The issue was, whether Jesus Christ was the Son of God, whether He spoke with divine authority. What did they say? They said, "We found this fellow perverting the nation"—let me find it. I have a stenographic report of the proceedings of the Hamilton Convention that reads almost like this—"And they began to accuse him, saying, We found this fellow perverting the nation. . . . He stirreth up the people." And when Pilate tried to pacify them, they were more fierce, they said with more fury, "He is making a disturbance." That is what they said about Christ. And listen: under the awful stress of that hour there was not one solitary disciple who dared to go and stand beside Christ, and say, "Count on me in this conflict"—not one; He trod the winepress alone, and of the people there was none with him. Are you willing to stand alone? Why, they were ashamed of Him! Peter was ashamed of Him; while all the disciples forsook Him and fled. It was even a little bit worse than a Baptist Convention! Cannot you see the analogy? Cannot you see that it is the same age-long conflict over the Word of God, that it is no new thing at all?—their method, their instruments, their weapons of slander and misrepresentation, they were all the same. I am going to speak very plainly after a while. I have not said very much yet—I do not mean to-night, but I am going to speak very plainly after a while. There is hardly any calumny that could be invented that has not been circulated about this church, hardly any slander that could be invented that has not been spread abroad about this Pastor, all up and down the country.

I have a letter now in my possession, asking me to go down to Florida for a campaign in February, inviting me to go to several great Bible conferences, and

to the pulpits of some of the largest churches in Florida. Do you know why? Because they say, "You have been so terribly misrepresented in this part of the Continent, and we want you to come that the people may hear your message for themselves." A newspaper down there, among other things, said that this church did not make baptism a term of membership, that it had ceased to be a Baptist church, that it was an open membership church, an open Communion church. A denominational secretary took it up, and then they wrote two or three columns of attack. Where did they get it all? Where are they getting it all? My dear friends, it is the same old story: "Now the chief priests, and elders, and all the council, sought false witness against Jesus, to put him to death; but found none: yea, though many false witnesses came, yet they found none. At the last came two false witnesses." That is ever the method of the higher critic. I want to say very, very, carefully that the average higher critic has chloroformed his conscience, and ceased to make any distinction between the truth and untruth, and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred you cannot believe what he says. He can change his position as often as the chameleon, and use the most ambiguous speech; and when you put him in a corner, he says, "I did not mean that at all, I meant something else." I am calling your attention to this just to show you what good company we are in.

And at last we read that the chief priests—let me read it to you: "And the chief priests and scribes stood and vehemently accused him"—who were the chief priests? They were the religious leaders of the day, not the common people—the chief priests, and scribes, the learned men of the day, the doctors of the law! What did they do? All that this sacred record says is that they joined together and they stood and vehemently accused him, just like a rowdy mob, crying, "He is a seditionist, He stirreth up the people. Let Him be crucified." That is the weapon of those who are opposed to the Word of God.

III.

But I must give a little attention to this gentleman Pilate—a most interesting character. First of all, you are almost inclined to fall in love with him. He seems to have been a very open-minded man, and he quickly observed that it was for envy they had delivered Him up; and when the crowd came and said, "We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar", he said, "I do not agree with you. Personally, I do not agree with you; personally, I am on his side! I have examined him, and I find no fault in Him." You would almost think victory was won when Pilate said that, would you not? "Why", he said, "there is no occasion of death in Him, there is no reason why I should deliver Him up to you; I have found no fault in Him." Do you know that the men who are doing the most damage to the cause of Christ to-day are the men who take this Holy Book, and say, "I find no fault in it", and before they get through, deliver it up to the Devil and his angels? They are the men who, of all men, are most to be feared in this great conflict—the Pilates of our day.

If you find no fault in the Word of God, what do you find in it? There was no middle course so far as Jesus was concerned: He was either all that He said He was, or He was one of the worst men that ever lived. And Pilate, having examined Him, said, "I have no objection to Him; I can find no fault in Him at all."—"And they were the more fierce, saying, He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Jewry, beginning from Galilee to"—Hear Pilate:—"Beginning from Galilee? Oh, He is a Galilean, is He? Well, that is fortunate for me. I will send Him to Herod! I am relieved of the necessity of making a decision." I find men like that all over the land, men who say, "Personally—personally, I find no fault in Him. I almost got into the controversy myself; I found myself in a very awkward position one time!—and it really looked as though I would have to take a stand, but I have been able to pass it on to Herod"! O, no; it does not belong to the Dean—it belongs to the Chancellor. There is no necessity for my making a decision; that is somebody else's job!

Herod was rather interested. For a long time he had wanted to see Jesus, and had hoped to see some miracle wrought by Him. When Jesus came to him, he asked a great many questions; but Jesus made no answer. Has Christ ever been silent to you when you have asked Him questions? If He has, it is because He knew why you asked. Oh, He loves to answer our questions, He will solve

every problem of life, if we come to His feet like little children; but if we come to Him in the spirit of Herod, we shall get no answer from Him.

And they "set him at nought, and mocked him, and arrayed him in a gorgeous robe, and sent him again to Pilate. And the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends"! There is a saying to the effect that politics make strange bedfellows—so do ecclesiastical politics. The Scopes trial in Tennessee exercised a wonderful educational influence; it was very much like one of those star-rockets—or whatever they called them—sent up in wartime, which illuminated the whole landscape: it attracted Darrow, among others! I met Darrow, and talked with him for hours one time crossing the sea. He is a genial sort of man in many ways; but, in my humble opinion, tremendously overrated. At any rate, I do not consider Darrow a particularly able man; but the doctrine of Evolution was defended by him. And Potter, a Unitarian from New York, presumably at his own expense, travelled to Tennessee; and they came there from all over the country. One of the experts called to give evidence on the side of agnosticism and infidelity was one of whose ability our own university boasts, a Dr. Newman. I am ashamed that he came from our college. But my point is this, that wherever the authority of the Word of God is concerned, you will always find Pilate and Herod coming together, you will always find all the enemies of the truth of every realm uniting to crucify the Word of God. Jesus knew that Beelzebub was never divided against himself.

Pilate would rather have liked to let Jesus go—it was too bad that there should be so much controversy! He came back again and said, "I have examined this Man, and can find no fault in Him. I sent Him to Herod, and he can find no fault in Him—and He is back again on our hands here. Supposing we take a middle course? How would it do if I chastise Him and let Him go—will that suit you? Personally, I believe in His authority; and, on the other hand, I do not like to go as far as you do—and I hardly know where to draw the line!—supposing I chastise Him and let Him go?" Chastise Him for what—chastise Him for what?—chastise Him for WHAT? Is he worthy of death or chastisement?

If there is no fault in the Word of God, why do you not say so, and stick to it? That is the point. Why compromise with the enemies of the truth by saying, "I will not go all the way with you who reject it wholly; but I will not be called a Fundamentalist—not for the world. I could be! I believe all the fundamentals of the faith, I find no fault in it—but then you have a more liberal interpretation, a broader interpretation, supposing I yield something to you, supposing we chastise Him, and let Him go!"

The Church of Christ has been trying that principle for a long time—for a long time. It has been saying, "We do not find any fault with Him, but supposing we do not insist on the Virgin Birth—will that satisfy you? No? Well, then, supposing we do not absolutely insist on His Deity? No? Well, if you must have it—if you must have it, supposing we yield to you His substitutionary atonement? Not satisfied yet? Supposing we yield His physical resurrection then? Not satisfied yet? Supposing we do not insist that He will come again? Not satisfied even now?—they were the more insistent, and began to cry with loud voices, "Crucify him, crucify him". They revealed their true motive, which was to silence and bury the Word of God out of sight. And I repeat, the men who take the moderate critical view—they may not always be conscious of it, they may not deliberately do it—but when they say they want to rehabilitate the Book, they tell that which is absolutely untrue. It is the destruction of the Word of God the Devil designed.

What are you going to do, Pilate? "Well, I am exceedingly sorry. I have used my reasoning powers the best I know how. You will not let me chastise Him, you will not let me release Him altogether, you will not let me compromise—is there anything we can do?"—"And they were instant with loud voices, requiring that he might be crucified."

How many of you were at the Hamilton Convention, put up your hands? Well, go home and read an account of it in the twenty-third chapter of Luke. You will find it all there: "They were instant with loud voices, requiring that he might be crucified." And the voices of the multitude and of the chief priests, prevailed; and at last Pilate finds himself helpless, and he gives sentence that

it be as they required. What do you mean, Pilate? Did you not say you found no fault in Him? Did you not mean it? "Yes, that is my personal view"! Your conscience approves of it? "Yes". Your judgment approves of it? "Yes". You think Him worthy of death? "No". You think these men who mutilate the Bible are enemies of the truth? "Yes". What are you going to do? "Let them have their way; it is all I can do." And he gave sentence that it might be as they required. He violated every principle of righteousness, and of his conscience; he stultified himself; he became merely a creature of the crowd.

That is the modern character, that is just what is happening to-day. What are you going to do? I know what I am going to do. I know that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, begotten of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, that He was crucified, and that He died, and that He rose again, and that He ascended into the glory, and that some day He is coming back again; and I am determined that I will be on His side—not only now, but when He comes back again. ("Amen!" "Hallelujah!").

That is your choice, my friends, the choice of every one of us—whether we are going to please God or please men, whether we are going to seek standing with God or standing with men.

That is the choice that you unconverted friends must make to-night, as to whether you are going to put Jesus Christ first and take your stand against Pilate, Herod, the chief priests and scribes, and even against the cowardly disciples who ran away, and say, "As for me, my eyes have been opened: I know that He died for me, and I will take my stand with Jesus Christ." I repeat, I know what I will do. I will take my stand on the side of Christ, and will stand with Him as long as I live—and go down to the grave with Him—if I have to stand absolutely alone. Oh, it is glorious to be with Him; it is glorious to be in His company; it is the highest honour of all to have His favour. If we have Him on our side, we need fear no other on earth, or in hell either. Shall we take our stand for Christ to-night, fearlessly on His side?

SUNDAY'S SERVICES.

Sunday was another experience of full tide. Dr. Ragland preached a great sermon to a full house in the morning on, "Nevertheless at Thy Word." Many responded to the invitation. In the evening the church was crowded in every part, and the pastor preached on, "Allelulia: for the Lord God Omnipotent Reigneth." Fourteen were baptized, and something over twenty came forward in response to the invitation. The attendance at the School was 1,160, including 423 in the Pastor's class.

DOES YOUR "WITNESS" REACH YOU REGULARLY?

We have heard of an Irishman who wrote a friend requesting him to be sure to let him know if he did not receive his letter. We would follow his example! If at any time your *Witness* fails to reach you let us know. The paper is issued punctually at the same hour and mailed at the same time every week. The only way by which we can know of its failure to reach a subscriber is by subscribers informing us of the failure.

THE YEAR'S END.

The Jarvis St. Church year will end March 31st. It has been a year of unprecedented blessing in many ways. Every department of our work has shown a very large increase. While it promises to be financially the best and biggest year in the Church's history, it must be remembered that our expenses have been very heavy, especially on account of our new building and extensive alterations in the main building. This is to suggest that every member should begin at once to take stock to see how much we can each do for all funds between now and March 31st.

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

Editorial

A GREAT PROTEST MEETING.

We publish in this issue a verbatim report of a great protest meeting held in Jarvis Street Church, Thursday evening, January 14th. The addresses speak for themselves. It is impossible, however, to convey in cold type an accurate impression of the electric thrill experienced by participation in such a meeting. In the first place, there was an enormous audience—every inch of space was occupied everywhere, and crowds of people stood about the wall upstairs and down. From the beginning it was evident that the great congregation was made up of serious and determined people. Every Baptist church in Toronto was represented. The largest vote opposed to any resolution was forty—a mere nothing in comparison with that great assembly. That fact showed that the great host of Baptists who came, came to protest against the University's violation of her trust in appointing and retaining Professor Marshall on the staff. There was no levity: it was evident that the people appreciated the gravity of the situation.

One of the special features of the evening was the spontaneous ovation which was accorded Mr. Allen, when the whole company rose to meet him. It made it evident that the policy of McMaster in attempting to punish him by stirring up trouble in his church, must inevitably cause McMaster to lose the favour of the people at large. It is useless for McMaster to deny the large measure of responsibility for the Ossington outrage. We propose to publish, at an early date, proof of McMaster's despotic attempt to impose its will upon other organizations. At this writing we do not know what the ultimate outcome of the Ossington Avenue conflict will be; but we are sure it will react unfavourably upon those responsible for it.

At an early date *The Gospel Witness* will announce and report other meetings of protest throughout the Convention territory. The splendid addresses of students Whitcombe, Brown, and Fieldus, afforded overwhelming proof of Professor Marshall's modernism, and of the Senate's betrayal of the Denomination's best interests.

THE SPEECH OF ASHDOD.

"In those days also saw I Jews that had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab; and their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews' language, but according to the language of each people." This interesting passage is found in the thirteenth chapter of Nehemiah, the twenty-third and twenty-fourth verses. It tells the story of the influence of two peoples; and of certain children whose speech was a mixture of two languages, so that it was difficult for a stranger to know whether they were Jews or Philistines: their speech was neither one thing nor the other, so that anyone might be excused for being unable to identify their nationality.

These verses illustrate a situation which obtains in the theological world to-day. Simple evangelical believers, who believe the Bible to be the Word of God, who accept its teachings, and frankly witness to its truths, are often perplexed by the ambiguity of the language employed by many who call themselves Evangelical Christians. And when an old-fashioned believer asks one of these gentlemen of double speech to be good enough to explain himself, and to tell us frankly whether he comes from Ashdod or Jerusalem, he immedi-

ately charges us with being unjustly and unnecessarily suspicious. Our modernist friends demand that we produce proof of their Modernism. We admit that it is sometimes difficult to find a statement in clear and unequivocal terms by which some such teachers can be proved to have departed from the faith. Our Modernist friends then insist that the burden of proof rests with those who charge them with a want of loyalty to the truth. On the face of it, their contention is plausible enough. We have sometimes seen in the papers an account of some offence discovered by the police, when it has been said that the police found difficulty in placing the responsibility for the crime. And then we are told that a certain person has been detained as a "material witness". Generally speaking, in such cases the facts are, that while the police are unable at the moment to name the offender, the so-called "material witness" is equally unable to give a satisfactory account of himself and his movements.

We are disposed to ask our modernist friends why they do not use the Jews' language; and why in their books and their public addresses their speech should be half of Ashdod. It is, of course, just that everyone should be regarded as innocent until he is proved guilty. But when people speak half in the speech of Ashdod, there is in that fact a strong presumption that they are not wholly without some association with Philistia. Is it unreasonable not only to expect, but to demand, that one who assumes the position of a religious teacher should express himself in clear and unmistakable language? Surely there is a duty resting upon every true disciple of Christ to make a clear confession of his faith in Christ! Every regenerated person is required to be a witness for Christ. There is certainly no necessity for such an one's using a mixed language, having in it somewhat of the Jerusalem dialect, with an accent suggestive of the speech of Ashdod. And if such obligation rests upon Christians in general, how much more is it the duty of Christian preachers and teachers to learn to speak plainly! One of the first requirements of a bishop or pastor is that we should be "apt to teach". But how is it possible for one really to teach who is unable to make himself clearly understood? It should not be difficult for a man, even in a few sentences, clearly to state whether he believes the Bible to be the Word of God or not. The English language is sufficiently rich to enable a man, without the slightest ambiguity, to declare in a few words his view of the virgin birth, the Deity of Christ, His vicarious atonement, His resurrection, and ascension, and His coming again. If, in the discussion of these great questions, men choose to use the language of Philistia, they have no right to feel aggrieved if one should doubt their loyalty to Jerusalem. It is not difficult to differentiate between a Creationist and an Evolutionist; a Creationist uses the Jews' language; but an Evolutionist speaks half in the speech of Ashdod.

We enter a plea for a little more outspokenness. "We having the same spirit of faith, according as it is written, I believed, and therefore have I spoken; we also believe, and therefore speak." Meanwhile, we do well to study Nehemiah's example with respect to those whose language was a conglomeration of the dialects of Ashdod and Jerusalem. He says, "I contended with them." There is, indeed, an urgent necessity for our contending, not only for the "faith once for all delivered to the saints," but for a pure language by which that faith may be expressed. One thing is certain: the rebuilding of Jerusalem can never safely be entrusted to the hands of those who cannot speak in the Jews' language, but whose speech is half of Ashdod.

CANADIAN BAPTIST, PLEASE COPY!

The following note appeared in the editorial columns of the *Toronto Evening Telegram*, Saturday, January 16th:

MAKE FUNDAMENTALISTS AND THEIR FOES SURE OF FAIR REPORTS.

"Fundamentalists and modernists should have their attacks and answers fully and fairly reported in the news columns of the secular press.

"All combatants in a great controversy should be given equal publicity in the news columns and equal neutrality in the editorial columns of daily newspapers."

EDITOR KIPP EXPLAINS!

Many people have wondered at the strange course of *The Canadian Baptist. The Toronto Daily Star*, of January 16th, reports an interview with the Rev. L. H. Kipp on the Marshall controversy as follows:

"The shortest expression of opinion was given to *The Star* by L. H. Kipp, Editor of *The Canadian Baptist*. It was directly to the point: 'I am blind, and deaf, and dumb', was all he said!"

NOTHING TO SAY!

The Gospel Witness has received no word from Dr. W. T. Graham. The erstwhile orthodox pastor of First Avenue Church, Toronto, having yielded his pulpit for the proclamation of thoroughly unscriptural teaching, has offered no explanation. We renew to Dr. Graham our former offer: our columns are open for an explanation of his strange behaviour in listening to such teaching as Professor Marshall's without protest.

CIRCULATE THIS ISSUE.

Canadian Baptist readers of this issue of *The Witness* will recognize the importance of having this number widely circulated throughout the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. This issue of *The Witness* will cost us about 10c. per copy. We make a special request of all our subscribers who are interested in this great warfare, to assist us in spreading the information contained in this issue abroad. We ask for help also in bearing the expense. An enormous quantity of printed matter has been issued by McMaster University, and has flooded the Denomination. All this, we believe, has been paid out of denominational funds. For this purpose some of the money contributed for "Christian" education has been used. What is *The Gospel Witness* compared with this organization? and what is our treasury compared to the treasury of the University? But we believe many will come to our help in this matter.

Pastors and others can help by sending for copies of *The Witness* to be sent them in bulk, at the rate of 10c each; or, if they will send us lists of names, we will mail them direct from our office at the same rate, 10c per name. We suggest that every pastor who is in full sympathy, should endeavour to associate several of his men with him and raise the small amount necessary to put a copy of *The Gospel Witness* in every family in his church. It would perhaps be most effective if, in such case, the names were sent to us for mailing direct from our office.

The first edition of this issue is the largest we have ever printed of any single number of *The Witness*, except the issue of the Norris number which reached sixty thousand.

THE EVENING TELEGRAM ON PROFESSOR MARSHALL.

We print below an article which occurred in the Toronto *Evening Telegram*, Saturday, January 16th. We publish this article to show the bearing of modernist views upon law and order. We believe *The Telegram* is quite correct when it describes Professor Marshall as the "well-meaning" Professor Marshall. We do not suggest that Professor Marshall has any intention of doing other than serving the best interests of the individual and of organized society. The fact remains, however, that Professor Marshall's philosophy is, in the nature of things, an enemy of both. Some years ago we heard an address by a distinguished American lawyer on the subject, "The Theological Liberal a Reactionary in Fact." Modernism aims at the destruction of all objective authority, and makes a man a law unto himself. Modernism, when it is finished, bringeth forth anarchy. Pacifism also leads to anarchy inevitably.

Modernism, in its religious expression, repudiates the authority of the Bible, and the authority of Christ. It is consistent, therefore, that Modernism should reject the principle of expiation in the Atonement. On the other hand, the rejection of the expiatory principle inevitably makes one a pacifist. Thus the principles of Modernism make for confusion in all realms, in the church, in the home, in the state. We believe *The Telegram's* discerning article will amply repay a thoughtful perusal.

BRITISH CHIVALRY FAILED TO AVERT WAR OF 1914-18

Give British Common Sense a
Chance to Prevent
Next War

FINE FEAST OF FREE
SPEECH

Has Empire Club Ceased to
Believe in the Truth of
Hun-made War?

WHO ELSE WANTED WAR?

Hun Rulers and People Unit for
War in 1914

PEACE TALK AID TO WAR

Address by Prof. L. H. Marshall
Left Empire Club in Dark as
to Great Historic Facts

God grant that the grandsons of members of the Toronto Empire Club may not be doomed to go forth to the battles of the next war as these members or their sons were called to the battles of the last great war.

BRITISH CHIVALRY was favorably mentioned by Prof. L. H. Marshall of McMaster University in Prof. Marshall's address to the Empire Club on Thursday.

BRITISH CHIVALRY was misdirected by pacifists and professors and perverted into a preparation of the free nations of the world for conquest at the hands of Germany in 1914.

PEACE TALKERS PROVED TO BE
SURE WAR MAKERS.

BRITISH CHIVALRY sent the ill-armed, unprepared youth of Britain, with two machine guns to a battalion, long gaps between batteries and a supply of three shells per cannon per day, into battle with conscript battalions that had two hundred machine guns per battalion.

BRITISH CHIVALRY prior to 1914

urged Britain not to expect war or to prepare for war.

At the battle of St. Julien the untried Old Country-born or native-born Canadians of this country's expeditionary force were thrown in all the glory of the valiant youth of an untried soldiery upon a German army supported by cannon, wheel to wheel, along the whole battle front of St. Julien.

CHIVALRY HURLED ILL-ARMED
BOYS AGAINST WELL-
ARMED FOE.

BRITISH CHIVALRY doomed these boys and hundreds of thousands of other British and allied boys to die in the unequal combats of the Great War.

BRITISH COMMON SENSE sought to prevent that war and would have prevented that war.

BRITISH CHIVALRY insisted that Lord Roberts was a babbler, that the German peril was a myth.

BRITISH CHIVALRY demanded that the teachings of history must be contradicted and the facts of human nature ignored in all estimates of Germany's probable course of dealing with the free nations.

SAME OLD TYPE OF SPEECH
THAT FAILED TO AVERT
WAR IN 1914.

BRITISH CHIVALRY has poor exponents in the leaders who invited members of the Toronto Empire Club to listen to the well-meaning Prof. L. H. Marshall talk platitudes in unintentional preparation of Germany's way to conquest in the next war, as too many university professors talked platitudes in preparation of Germany's way to conquest in the last war.

Toronto Empire Club must uphold the best traditions of BRITISH CHIVALRY in its patronage of free speech. These vindications of free speech are usually — and Prof. Marshall's address was no complete exception to the rule — accompanied by an equal display of:—

Free misinformation;
Free blindness to the facts of history;
Free prejudice;

Free iteration of Gladstonian pedantry;

Free twaddle;

Free phrases;

Free platitudes.

GLADSTONIAN CREED THE CURSE OF BRITAIN.

Canadians have good cause to believe that the effects of the Gladstonian creed are still to be seen and felt throughout the length and breadth of the British Empire. That creed has proved itself the Moloch of modern British history in its effect of spreading war and bloodshed throughout every area of Britain's attempt to apply the teachings of the Gladstonian creed.

It was the same old Gladstonian theories that Prof. L. H. Marshall talked to the Toronto Empire Club. Old Country-born and Canadian-born Britons were asked to accept Prof. Marshall's distinction between the Kaiser's war party and the German people.

The whole united German people were THE KAISER'S WAR PARTY in the Germany of 1914. Prof. Marshall was in Germany in 1914. Prof. Marshall states that the war party had deceived the German people:—

"And from this point of view, the fierce fanaticism the German people displayed during the war can be in a measure understood."

GERMAN RULERS AND PEOPLE ONE IN DESIRE FOR WAR.

There is one other great historic fact that Prof. Marshall failed to understand or mention. That fact does not isolate "the fierce fanaticism the German people displayed during the war" or localize that fanaticism in the years of the war, 1914-18, was a continuation of the fierce fanaticism of equally fierce fanaticism of 1869-1914. Under the trees of Germany in summer and beside the firesides of Germany in winter the whole people of a united Germany, growing to a strength of 80,000,000, had talked war and gloried in armies. War and conquest were to the German people all that football and cricket were to the Old Country people. War and armies were recognized by Germans as football and cricket are recognized by Britons, as the most glorious of all games to be talked about or played all winter and all summer. The whole united German people were THE KAI-

SER'S WAR PARTY. That party made war upon an unwilling Britain and other nations in 1914. These people had spent their years from infancy on in listening to boasts that Germany had conquered Austria in three weeks, had conquered France in six weeks, and could conquer the world in three months.

GERMANS ALONE LOVED WAR AND TALKED WAR.

The whole 80,000,000 German people talked war and wanted war. All the people of Britain wanted peace. Too many of the people of Britain talked peace. If all the people of Germany had talked peace, the Kaiser and his war lords would have never started the war. If the people of Britain, as well as the people of Germany, had talked war, even the Kaiser would have feared to rush Germany into the hazards of a world war.

Toronto Empire Club leaders are entitled to ask why Prof. L. H. Marshall left his hearers in the dark as to great facts of history. These facts prove that THE KAISER'S WAR PARTY IN GERMANY included a united German people of 80,000,000 strong. A war party made up of the entire German people forced the great war upon an unwilling Belgium and France, an unprepared Russia, and all the peace-loving, war-hating British nations.

BLOOD GUILT OF WAR BELONGS TO GERMANS.

The terrible blood guilt of exclusive responsibility for the outbreak of war belongs to the whole German nation, people and leaders. A small share of that responsibility may be truthfully fastened upon the Gladstonian traditionalists of England and all the scoffers at the German peril in the press and on the platforms of the British Empire.

Toronto Empire Club did a poor service to the strength of Canadian nationality and the safety of British unity when the leaders of the club invited an assembly of Canadians and Britons to listen to Prof. L. H. Marshall in speeches that must make the next war probable just as surely as the same sort of speeches made the last war inevitable.

WAS PROF. MARSHALL WISER IN 1926 THAN PRIOR TO 1914?

Where is the proof that the speeches, if any, of Prof. Marshall prior to 1914 were freighted with a

wisdom that might have tended to prevent the coming of the last war?

Where is the proof that Prof. L. H. Marshall spoke to the Toronto Empire Club words of wisdom that may prevent the coming of the next war?

Can Prof. Marshall produce proof that his silence or his speeches were wiser than the silence or speeches of other Old Country Gladstonians and university professors prior to 1914? The proofs of before-the-war wisdom would enable Prof. Marshall to speak with the authority of an after-the-war oracle.

BRITISH CHIVALRY NEEDS NO MAN'S PRAISE.

BRITISH CHIVALRY hath its dwelling place in the souls of all the sons and daughters of the world-wide British household.

The secret of BRITISH CHIVALRY is in the hearts of all who love the Union Jack. These hearts hate the scholastic conceit, the selfish love of ease, the sordid love of gain that puts its trust in the BRITISH CHIVALRY that failed to avert the last war instead of building up a BRITISH COMMON SENSE that might avert the next war.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

VOL. 1.

T. T. SHIELDS, EDITOR

NO. 1.

Lesson 8

FIRST QUARTER

Feb. 21, 1926.

Application for entry as second-class matter is pending.

THE MIRACLE-WORKING POWER OF JESUS

LESSON TEXT: Eighth chapter of Matthew.

To be studied in harmony with lesson text: Mark 1:40-45. Mark 4:35 to 5:21. Luke 5:12-16. Luke 7:1-10. Luke 8:23-40. Luke 9:57-62.

I. THE HEALING OF THE LEPER.

1. Leprosy is a type of sin. The leper did well to come to Christ, as sinners do well to come. 2. He loathed himself, and sought to be made clean. Salvation is more than the forgiveness of sin: it involves cleansing from sin. When men truly repent they desire to be made clean. 3. Jesus touched him, and he was immediately made whole. Salvation consists in the touch of God. It is not enough to resolve to do our best, to endeavour to follow the example of Jesus: we must actually have the touch of God upon our spirits; and when He touches us, immediately we are made whole. 4. Here our Lord bade him tell no man, but first offer for his cleansing the gift that Moses commanded. He was first to recognize God and to give God thanks,—he could tell men afterward. So also the soul's relationship to God is the first and most important consideration.

II. THE CENTURION'S SERVANT HEALED.

1. Wherever He went, Christ attracted to Himself all who were in trouble. It was for this He came into the world, to bear our griefs and to carry our sorrows. 2. In this case it was a man whose servant was ill who came to pray for his healing. It would be well for employers to pray for their employees, and to bring their palsied servants to Christ, especially to seek the salvation of their souls. 3. When Christ said He would come and heal him, the centurion said he was not worthy to receive Him under his roof. (Such a spirit is the beginning of true prayer. Those who thus humble themselves are sure to be exalted.) 4. We have here a fine illustration of the meaning of faith: the centurion said, "Speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed". And in illustration of what he meant he explained that he was a man under authority, having soldiers under him; and when he commanded a man either to come or go, he was instantly obeyed. And so he argued that as his soldiers were subject to him, so all powers were subject to Christ, and He had only to speak the word and the miracle would be accomplished. This is the faith that brings salvation, that believes absolutely in the Word of God. And why not? It was by the Word of God the worlds were framed, at God's command the light came, and all this universe of wonder sprang into existence; and if the Word of God could make man, the Word of God can remake him. The principle is, that we take

God at His word. 5. Jesus expressed His admiration for the centurion's faith. Though he was a Gentile, and an alien from the commonwealth of Israel, he had shown a greater faith than Christ had found within Israel's pale. It is often so that those who daily wait upon the ministry of the Word are put to shame by the stranger who is brought from an utterly irreligious life to the feet of Christ. And Jesus said it shall be so in the last day, that they shall come from all quarters and sit down in the kingdom of God; while those who might reasonably have been expected to enter, shall be cast into outer darkness. 6. Jesus honoured the centurion's faith: "Go thy way; and as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee". And his servant was healed in the selfsame hour. When Jesus says, "Thy sins are forgiven thee", that ends the matter; and we are safe.

III. PETER'S WIFE'S MOTHER IS RAISED UP.

1. Peter took Jesus home with him. This is a great privilege—to know Him not merely in the place of public assembly, but in our own house. 2. He took Him home with him notwithstanding there was sickness in the house. There are guests which only add to the burdens of the household; but when Jesus comes He bears our troubles away. 3. Peter's mother-in-law was made whole by the touch of Christ; and that in his own home. We ought to see our prayers answered at home. He healed all who came. The lesson being that nothing is too hard for Jesus; and again, His ministry fulfilled the prophecy of Scripture (*vs. 16, 17*).

IV. THE PRICE OF FOLLOWING JESUS.

Multitudes thronged Him, but Jesus knew there were comparatively few who would follow Him all the way. Therefore He tested them severely. We must be careful not to lower the standard of discipleship. 1. Jesus answered the scribe who said he would follow Him whithersoever He went by warning him that he would have less comfort than the foxes, and be more homeless than the birds. Nakedness, peril, and sword, are often the price of discipleship. The reward is not here, but hereafter. 2. The second volunteer was told that he must put Christ before even his duty to his father (*vs. 21, 22*).

V. THE STILLING OF THE TEMPEST.

The ship in which Jesus sailed was tossed with storm and tempest, but notwithstanding the storm He slept! His disciples seemed to think that the inactive Lord was careless. How often is it so that when the storm breaks upon us and God does not immediately intervene, we think that He does not care! The Master rebuked them for their little faith, their fearfulness: the implication being that His presence with them was the guarantee of safety. Surely this is true: if the Lord be with us, whether He speaks or is silent, whether He stills the waves or allows them to increase in fury, we may be sure no harm can come to us while He is with us. In His own time, He rebuked the wind and the sea, and there was a great calm—and the disciples wondered. So does He in human life to-day.

VI. CASTING OUT DEVILS.

1. Here the Scriptures teach that devils do take possession of the human spirit. Human nature is bad enough in itself; yet there are superhuman powers that possess it. 2. The devils recognized Christ, and knew that they were under judgment to be tormented in due time: The devils believe and tremble. 3. Our Lord cast the evil spirits into the swine, and the swine ran into the sea and perished. And notwithstanding the miracle of grace wrought in the men that had been possessed of the devils, the people besought Jesus to depart, because the miracle had involved the destruction of the swine. And still there are people who are more interested in saving swine than in saving souls.

Published quarterly in weekly parts by the UNION GOSPEL PRESS for the BAPTIST BIBLE UNION OF NORTH AMERICA—Publishing office, 2375 Thurman St., Cleveland, Ohio.

TERMS: Each set, a quarter, 4 cents; a year, 16 cents.

ADDRESS UNION GOSPEL PRESS, P. O. Drawer 680, CLEVELAND, OHIO