

# The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

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

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

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

Address correspondence: THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto.

Vol. 4.

TORONTO, MAY 6, 1926.

No. 54.

## The Jarvis Street Pulpit

ADDRESS BY THE PASTOR

Delivered in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Friday Evening, April 30th, 1926,  
 Before the Eighth Annual Convention of the World's Christian  
 Fundamentals Association.

"And the king of Israel said unto his servants, Know ye that Ramoth in Gilead is  
 our's, and we be still, and take it not out of the hand of the king of Syria?"

"And he said unto Jehoshaphat, Wilt thou go with me to battle to Ramoth-gilead?  
 And Jehoshaphat said to the king of Israel, I am as thou art, my people as thy people,  
 my horses as thy horses.

"And Jehoshaphat said unto the king of Israel, Enquire, I pray thee, at the word  
 of the Lord to day.

"Then the king of Israel gathered the prophets together, about four hundred men, and  
 said unto them, Shall I go against Ramoth-gilead to battle, or shall I forbear? And  
 they said, Go up; for the Lord shall deliver it into the hand of the king.

"And Jehoshaphat said, Is there not here a prophet of the Lord besides, that we  
 might enquire of him?"

"And the king of Israel said unto Jehoshaphat, There is yet one man, Micaiah the  
 son of Imlah, by whom we may enquire of the Lord: but I hate him; for he doth not  
 prophesy good concerning me, but evil. And Jehoshaphat said, Let not the king say so.

"Then the king of Israel called an officer, and said, Hasten hither Micaiah the son  
 of Imlah.

"And the king of Israel and Jehoshaphat the king of Judah sat each on his throne,  
 having put on their robes, in a void place in the entrance of the gate of Samaria; and all  
 the prophets prophesied before them.

"And Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah made him horns of iron: and he said, Thus  
 saith the Lord, With these shalt thou push the Syrians, until thou have consumed them.

"And all the prophets prophesied so, saying, Go up to Ramoth-gilead, and prosper:  
 for the Lord shall deliver it into the king's hand.

"And the messenger that was going to call Micaiah spake unto him, saying, Behold  
 now, the words of the prophets declare good unto the king with one mouth: let thy word,  
 I pray thee, be like the word of one of them, and speak that which is good.

"And Micaiah said, As the Lord liveth, what the Lord saith unto me, that will I speak.

"So he came to the king. And the king said unto him, Micaiah, shall we go against  
 Ramoth-gilead to battle, or shall we forbear? And he answered him, Go, and prosper:  
 for the Lord shall deliver it into the hand of the king.

"And the king said unto him, How many times shall I adjure thee that thou tell me  
 nothing but that which is true in the name of the Lord?"

"And he said, I saw all Israel scattered upon the hills, as sheep that have not a  
 shepherd: and the Lord said, These have no master: let them return every man to his  
 house in peace.

"And the king of Israel said unto Jehoshaphat, Did I not tell thee that he would  
 prophesy no good concerning me, but evil?"

"And he said, Hear thou therefore the word of the Lord: I saw the Lord sitting on  
 his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him on his right hand and on his left.

"And the Lord said, Who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead? And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner.

"And there came forth a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said, I will persuade him.

"And the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go forth, and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said, Thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also: go forth, and do so.

"Now therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee."—1 Kings 22: 3-23.

(Stenographically reported.)



THINK I should not have complied with Dr. Riley's request to speak this evening were it not that I shall have no opportunity on Sunday; and I have to go away for a couple of weeks, and there are a few things that need to be said just now! Last night Mr. Clinton Howard told you that his address had been prepared especially for that occasion: my address is very much like that—except for the fact that it has not been prepared at all (Laughter). Long ago I learned that it is a good thing to take, when driven, a good big slice of Scripture, so that if you have not much worth while to say yourself, you can at least give the people a good piece of the Word of God.

Dr. Brown has been telling us that the Bible is really a scientific Book, that it is, in every part, in strict accord with the demonstrated facts of science. It is difficult to understand how the Word of God could be otherwise: once we believe that the Bible is the Word of God we are, of course, compelled to believe that it is true; and if the Bible be not true, then whatever it is, certainly it cannot be the Word of God. I do not know of any better, any more reliable, text book in psychology than the Bible. I have no doubt many of you have read with interest and profit the works of Charles Dickens. One of the reasons for the hold that great writer has always had upon the popular mind is that his characters are so true to life: we have all met Mr. Pecksniff, and Uriah Heap, and Barkis, and a great many others—they have passed under other names, but their characters are familiar to us all. Sometimes, perhaps, there are slight exaggerations, but we have had a feeling that we have walked these streets before, and we have had dealings with these men. The Bible is very largely a collection of biographies—of the lives of men, some good, and some evil; but they are written by the pen of Inspiration, and even their secret motives are frequently laid bare. If you want to know what human nature really is, you should study not merely the epistles, but study these biographical sketches and see how men lived and acted under the eye of God.

I refer you to an Old Testament scripture this evening with which you are very familiar, in the first book of Kings, and the twenty-second chapter. I wish I had time to read the entire chapter to you, because I feel sure you would agree that it is strictly up-to-date, that it might almost have been taken from some periodical issued to-day. It shows how men respond to the Word of God, and how some reject it. It is the story of Ahab and Jehoshaphat. When the orthodox Jehoshaphat paid a visit to Ahab, king of Israel, the idolater—of whom it was said, "There was none like unto Ahab, which did sell himself to work wickedness in the sight of the Lord, whom Jezebel his wife stirred up"—Ahab said to his servants, "Know ye that Ramoth in Gilead is our's, and we be still, and take it not out of the hand of the king of Syria? And he said unto Jehoshaphat, Wilt thou go with me to battle to Ramoth-gilead?" Now Jehoshaphat, although a strictly orthodox man, was a very polite gentleman! (Laughter)—and when that proposal was made by Ahab, he found it very difficult to say, "No". The story of Jehoshaphat is an interesting study

to me—for he reminds me of some preachers! Jehoshaphat was a good man, and when he moved in his own circle as king of Judah where he could make his own circumstances and provide his own atmosphere, in the realm in which he was supreme, Jehoshaphat was a good man—just as some preachers are perfectly orthodox when at home in orthodox churches. But when Jehoshaphat left home and went to the Convention (Laughter), when he associated with equals, with others who were engaged in the same piece of business as that which occupied himself, then he was as pliable and plastic as a piece of putty.

There are a great many churches who can never understand how it is that their orthodox pastor is so true to the Bible at home, and so far from being true when he is on a visit to Ahab. Now Jehoshaphat endeavoured to bear his testimony, and he said to Ahab, "Well, I think we had better pray a little about this, we had better enquire of the Lord." And Ahab said, "I have no objection to that." You know, there are some Ahabs who are quite willing to attend a prayer meeting. (I know a certain city in your country, Dr. Riley, you are familiar with it too, where there was a fighting preacher—at least, people thought he was—and they expected that they would have rather a hard time in getting through their modernistic programme. And so the dear brother assembled the brass band to lead the army into battle, and he expected that the hosts of modernists, when the band began to play, would run. But when the modernists did not run, he ran! And he went back home and announced that he was going to hold a series of prayer meetings!) In this place we have nothing to say against that—I think of all churches in the world, there are few that have had more reason to praise God for the wonders wrought by prayer, but sometimes we ought to pray on our feet.

Jehoshaphat said, "You talk to the Lord about it", and Ahab assembled all the prophets, and he told them what he wanted to do. With one voice they said, "Go up; for the Lord shall deliver it into the hand of the king."

Let me pause for a moment or two, for we are brought face to face with a great principle which is always at issue in this conflict. Jehoshaphat said, "Enquire, I pray thee, at the word of the Lord." And Ahab said, "I have four hundred preachers, splendid fellows, and I will hold a Convention; I will call them all together, and I will put to them this question, Shall I go up against Ramoth-gilead to battle, or shall I forbear?" And with one voice, with absolute unanimity, they said to Ahab, "Go up; for the Lord shall deliver it into the hand of the king." There are people—I suppose it would be true to say that people generally desire some sort of religious sanction for the lives they live: they do not care to be called irreligious—Ahab was a very religious man—and they pretend to have some religious authority for the course they pursue.

Whenever you touch this present conflict, you will always find that the Word of God is at issue. The question for us to decide always is, Has God spoken at all? Have we any word from the Lord? Here was a crisis in a human life. Two men come together for concerted action, and they are agreed on this principle, that before they take that course they ought to listen to see what God has to say. And yet how different they were, as we shall see! The battle always is between the Word of God on the one hand, and the wisdom of men on the other; between the will of God as revealed in His Word, and the will of man; always between naturalism and supernaturalism. You have Cain and Abel; you have Ishmael and Isaac; and "the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other", not only in your heart and mine, in your life and mine, but in all religions. They may, after all, be classified as religions of the flesh and

religions of the Spirit,—the religion that allows a man to have his own way, that requires no repentance, no revolution of life, no reformation of character, no change of course, that is purely naturalistic all the way; and the religion that demands repentance, right-about-face, a revolution, submission to the will of God. That was the issue here; and, my brethren in the ministry, that is the issue we have to face in our ministry, as I shall try to show you in a few moments. That all leads up to one great principle—you have had it from so many points of view during this Conference, we have heard so many addresses, all of them interesting and instructive, on the divine inspiration and authority of this Holy Book—and you know that all that is spoken in the New Testament is summarized in that ultimate, complete, revelation of the will of God in Christ: "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth."

And then you will remember how Jesus said that the blood of all the prophets should be required of this generation, even from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zacharias. There is an accumulation of rejections of the divine Word which finds its culmination and climax in the rejection of Jesus Christ, and wherever you touch this controversy you will find that at last it involves the rejection of the supernaturalism of the Lord Jesus, His virgin birth, His Deity, His supreme authority. If we have an infallible Christ, we have an infallible Bible. We have an infallible Bible, I say, if Christ be infallible; and wherever you begin you will always come at last to lodge your protest against the authority of Him Who said, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." So that the great problem, after all, is this:—whether Jesus Christ is to be Lord, whether the full-orbed message, the revelation of the will of God in Christ, is to become the supreme authority in human life. That is the great question, is it not, in the ultimate analysis?

Now look at this case before us. It is from the Old Testament, I know, but there is no contradiction between the Old Testament and the New: the New Testament fulfils the Old just as the noonday fulfils the dawn, the roots of the New Testament are in the Old. How easily tricked our Baptist brethren were in the Northern Convention! I can understand how, in the heat of controversy, men did not see through it easily, but many of the brethren were easily tricked when Dr. Cornelius Wolfekin moved that the New Testament is our only ground of faith and practice, and we need no other statement. I do not see how anyone with his wits about him could quite believe that, because the New Testament, for me at least, has absolutely no authority if the Old be proved to be untrue: the Bible is our authority. The great principles of human life and conduct and character which obtain in the New Testament are set forth in the Old; the moral law does not change, God is ever the same, the Lamb was slain before the foundation of the world; the terms of entrance into the divine Presence are always the same.

Now what of Ahab? What did he want? He had an ambition in life, he had set before him a certain clearly-defined plan and purpose; he said, "I am going to Ramoth in Gilead, and I am going to take it out of the hand of the king of Syria." And he asked Jehoshaphat if he would help him; and Jehoshaphat agreed, on condition that they receive the sanction of the Word of the Lord. Then Ahab got the sanction of four hundred prophets! What did it involve? In essence, what was that religion of Ahab? Every man of them said, "Go up; for the Lord shall deliver it into the hand of the king";—they said, "Ahab, our religion is in perfect agreement with your natural desires, you are able to believe our testimony without repenting of your plans or changing your purposes, without any kind of disturbance in your natural life. All you have to do is just to believe what we say, and do as you want to do, and all will be well."

Now, I venture to say that that is the philosophy of Evolution. Why the popularity of their doctrine?—I heard a man say once, that every natural man is a Roman Catholic, by which he meant that Roman Catholicism was fitted to the requirements, to the desires, of the natural man; that a man could be a Roman Catholic without regeneration, without reformation, without any change of life at all—he could go right on. Whether that be true or not I shall not stop to say; but I do insist on this, that every natural man is an evolutionist. Why? It is agreeable to everything that is in us. If you can tell me that I

have advanced upon all my predecessors, if you can tell me that that which the Bible calls "sin" is not sin at all, but that in the moral and religious realm these qualities which the Bible calls sin, are nothing more than "vestigial remains"—and that I am gradually emerging from my animalistic condition and growing up to be somewhat of an angel—well, I should be highly complimented by your doctrine and feel like going to hear what you say again next Sunday! You will readily see how Ahab was pleased—and that is the demand of to-day: it is the carnal nature that protests against divine interference, and Modernism is an agreeable philosophy of life. Dr. Fosdick is fond of the phrase, "self-expression"; he preaches it in season and out of season, that what is needed in our day is opportunity for "self-expression". But I am afraid that if self is given full freedom of expression we should no longer be in doubt as to whether there is a hell, for we should find it here upon earth.

Over against that, put this simple truth: Ahab invariably endeavours to associate some orthodox men with himself. Modernism does not want to expel orthodoxy altogether! Most of our modernist colleges are quite willing to have one or two orthodox professors in them, because they use these orthodox professors as a sort of human credential. (Is that not so, Dr. Riley? "Yes, it is.") What have we in McMaster? "Why", they say, "you are a suspicious lot down there in Jarvis Street, and a few others that are associated with you." They have said it for years: "McMaster cannot be such a bad place—look at Professor Campbell." Yes, look at him, there he is! (Applause). "Why", they say, "as long as Professor Campbell is there it cannot be a bad sort of place." And then they say, "Look at Professor Keirstead; he is a thoroughly orthodox man, is he not?" I do not know what they do when the Jehoshaphats speak out; but it is Modernism's invariable practice to credential itself by association with orthodoxy.

But Jehoshaphat was somehow or another dissatisfied with this prophetic unanimity. He said, "They are rather too much in agreement, cannot we check over that verdict somehow? Is there not here a prophet of the Lord that we may enquire of him? Do you think it is quite safe to put men who are all of one type on the Board? Don't you think we had better put someone else on it? Had we not better consult another preacher?" And Ahab said, "Oh, yes! These are not the only preachers in town. There is another man but I hate him (Laughter), for he does not prophesy good concerning me but evil." He said, "I never go to hear that man preach but he makes me uncomfortable; I have talked with Micaiah a good many times, I have consulted him about a good many things, and he always has had the habit of saying, "No" when I say, "Yes": he makes me uncomfortable."

Well, that is what they say about orthodoxy to-day, that it is a gloomy, pessimistic, sort of thing, a long-faced religion. One of my deacons in the old days—not so long ago—came to me and said: "Do you know what some of our young people say?" I said, "No, what do they say?" "Why, they say they can go to such a church and come away feeling that, after all, life is rosy, and that they are not such a bad sort; they can go to a certain other church and be inspired and say, 'Life is glorious'; but when they come to your church they say they are uncomfortable for a whole week" (Applause). A few years ago a building was burned down at the corner of Gerrard and Yonge Streets next to Brother Davis' mission, the Yonge Street Mission; and the firewall between that and the Yonge Street Mission stood. By God's good providence the Young Street Mission was preserved; and Brother Davis thought it would be a good thing to put a text on the wall, and he put this text, "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." There was some business man, I don't know who he was, registered a strong objection to that text: he said he had to go down Yonge Street every morning to business, and that text made him uncomfortable all day. ("Praise the Lord!") You see, my dear friends, the Word of God always runs counter to our plans and purposes, "for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God"; and there is no possibility of our accepting the testimony of Micaiah without repentance, without an entire change of life. And that represents—I think I could preach a sermon on that—the naturalist's attitude toward revealed religion. What is it? "There is yet one preacher, there is yet one Book; but he or it doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil; therefore I hate it."

The Bible is a most uncomfortable companion under some circumstances. Ahab had four hundred preachers to keep him straight, and when a man needs as many pastors as that I have a suspicion that he is naturally a pretty crooked stick. But that is the trouble to-day. Why is it that men are so determined in their assaults upon this Book? What has the Book ever done to them? What is the explanation of it? My great predecessor in this pulpit, Dr. B. D. Thomas, was a very gracious personality, he did not often say severe things; but once, touching upon this tendency to discredit the Book, in one of his rare periods of indignation, I remember to have heard him say, as he thumped the table, "The fools! What do they think they are going to accomplish?" Well, I cannot help asking myself, Why is it that men are so resolutely opposed to the Word of God—because of its literary structure? because it is unscientific? because it runs counter to their intellectual life? Is that it? I have gone to ministerial associations for years—I don't attend them any more (I used to go, Brother Loney, when I was pastor in Hamilton twenty years ago.) I used to attend the General Ministerial Association in Hamilton, and I have heard men of all denominations gather there and spend Monday morning tearing God's Book to pieces; and I had to do one of two things: either get up and protest, fight every time I went; or go away feeling I had been untrue to my Lord. So after a while I did not go at all. I have been to a few of the ministerial meetings in this city, General Ministerial Meetings, and it is just exactly the same: our friend Dr. Bland, and some others, are always working away on God's Book as though it were the worst enemy of the human race. And I ask myself, Why is it? What is back of all this opposition to the Word of God, and to the Christ of the Word? This is the philosophy: "Is there not here a prophet of the Lord besides, that we might enquire of him? Is there not at least one Book of which I may enquire? Is there not amid all the Babel voices of earth, one voice that will give me unerring direction in all the problems of life?" And the answer of every Ahab is, "Yes, there is. There is a Book, there is a Prophet, there is a Voice; but I hate it, for it doth not prophesy good concerning me but evil."

*It is a very dangerous thing when an orthodox man gets an invitation to preach to Ahab.* That was a great day in Micaiah's history when the messenger came from the king saying, "You are wanted at court; the king has sent for you; he is very desirous of getting your judgment upon a very important matter!" And Micaiah was highly complimented! I have seen a great many preachers in my day tripped up by being invited to preach an anniversary sermon; I have seen some preachers ruined by being put on a Convention programme, or by being elected to a denominational office. Oh, when Ahab condescends to pay any attention at all to Micaiah, Micaiah had better get down on his knees and say, "O Lord, help me to be true." (Have you not seen that, Dr. Riley? "Yes.") I think of a man who never did stand for anything but orthodoxy, and he was made one of the Vice-Presidents of the Northern Baptist Convention. From the day that he was elected to the Vice-Presidency he lost his testimony—he had to be good now! Then they invited him to preach at one or two colleges; and suddenly he began to feel he was very important, and he turned absolutely to the other side, not as to his preaching but in his fellowships and influence. I say, it is a dangerous thing when an orthodox preacher is invited to preach before Ahab.

Now, what would you have done had you been in Micaiah's circumstances, I would like to ask you that? The messenger came and said, "Look here, the king has already submitted this question to four hundred prophets, and if you are going to be guided by the majority you will say what they have said. Let thy word be like the word of one of them. Don't make yourself singular; don't advertise yourself as being a crank. If you don't exercise your utmost arts as a diplomatist when you preach this sermon you will never have another chance. Now be careful, you have got the chance of your life, Micaiah, and if you will just be diplomatic—just be diplomatic, who knows but that Ahab will make you his chaplain!" Oh, the diplomatic preachers we have, these men who say, "But you don't understand the circumstances, my brother, you don't know anything about it. If you were in my place you would know; I have to be very careful!" I want you to note this: perhaps it was in God's plan that Micaiah should preach only one sermon. Certain I am of this, that the sermon

he was now asked to preach was to be the last sermon that Ahab would ever hear, this prophet is given just one opportunity to be true to his Lord. Look at Stephen: Stephen had never studied homiletics at the feet of a learned professor; Stephen never would have preached as he did if his sermon had been submitted to a class for criticism in any theological seminary in the land—it would have been condemned absolutely. And Stephen never preached but one sermon: he preached that one sermon, and that was the end of his ministry!

Now, my friends, these are simple considerations, but if we believe in a God above us, if we believe in the great Head of the Church—and I am speaking especially to my brother ministers—if we believe in the great Head of the Church, and we believe that He orders our course, then we cannot afford, on one single occasion, to withhold our testimony to the truth (“Amen!” “That’s true!”). “Let thy word . . . be like the word of one of them.” That is the temptation which faces the ministry to-day. There is a wonderful word in the first book of Samuel, where the Lord sends a prophet to tell Eli that the priesthood is to pass from his house because of his unfaithfulness, and he predicts the day when Hophni and Phinehas shall be slain, and when there shall be but a poor remnant of the once great house of which he was the head. And he said that in that day when God shall raise up another great priesthood which will recognize its responsibility to God, he says that that rejected priesthood—time-serving, carnal-minded men—that they shall come crouching to the real priesthood saying, “Put me, I pray thee, into one of the priest’s offices, that I may eat a piece of bread.” And I declare to you that we are living in a day when we have some men who literally talk like that. Oh, it is the most difficult thing in the world to be a minister, it is the most responsible position in the world; and I do not see how any man can exercise the office of the Christian ministry unless the power of God rests upon him. But if we receive our commission from above, if it be so that we go to a church believing that the Holy Ghost has made us overseer, then we can stand in the place where God has put us, and be true to our Lord, and challenge all hell to put us out (“Amen!” “Hallelujah!” and prolonged applause).

It is only five years ago yesterday, the 29th of April—it was on a Friday—that we had a great business meeting here; and on that occasion the Pastor was supported. Then the friends that were defeated cut off their subscriptions; the supposed wealth of the church, all “the principal givers,” practically all the office-bearers, thirteen out of eighteen deacons, the entire finance committee, thirteen out of twenty deaconesses, all the choir, two-thirds of the Sunday School teachers, the Church Treasurer, the Church Clerk—the entire official body with the exception of five deacons and seven deaconesses, all stood up in opposition to the testimony of this pulpit. Then after six months of open warfare, when we were given the front page in all the newspapers nearly every day, they came here to declare this pulpit vacant, “as from this date.” I shall never forget seeing that deacon walk up that aisle, take his place, unfold his resolution, and read it out: “That the pulpit of this church is hereby declared vacant as from this date . . . that the Deacons, Trustees, Finance Committee and House Committee of this church are authorized and instructed to forthwith take any and all such steps as shall be necessary to see that the above expressed will of the church is carried out.” Then it was seconded, and with the seconding the previous question was moved, that there might be no debate; and when the resolution was put by ballot it was defeated. They said in the papers the next day, “All the money has left Jarvis Street; all the important people have left Jarvis Street; there is just a little handful of people left who cannot do anything, and they are going to close up in two or three months.” Later they said, “Just wait two or three months, that is all.” They went out, three hundred and forty-one of them, and they organized a church with three hundred and forty-one, or, rather, three hundred and forty-eight; and they have increased in the four years something like twenty or thirty. In the same time, the Lord has given us about seventeen or eighteen hundred additions here.

You will see the application of that, because I am not talking to this congregation alone to-night, I am talking to the whole Baptist denomination. Every word I am saying is being reported and will be printed: I want to give some of my brethren a word or two before I go South just to keep them interested in these important matters!

And just as God stood by His prophets, He will stand by His Word; and I challenge my brethren in the ministry this evening—I have some important things to communicate to you of some recent developments in our local controversy before I get through—but I here challenge all my brethren in the ministry to take Micalah's stand, and when the messenger comes and says, "Now the majority are on the other side, and they have all told the king that he may have his own way, and to go and prosper, and if you are a wise man you will agree with them all," to say with Micalah, "As the Lord liveth, what the Lord saith unto me, that will I speak." ("Hallelujah!" and applause).

So Micalah came, the stage was set, the king was present, and he pounded his question and said, "Shall we go against Ramoth-gilead to battle, or shall we forbear?" And Micalah preached the same sermon that the four hundred prophets had preached, he said, "Go, and prosper: for the Lord shall deliver it into the hand of the king." And Ahab leaned forward and said, "What did you say? How many times shall I adjure thee that thou tell me nothing but that which is true in the name of the Lord?" He did not say that to the four hundred prophets; he accepted what they had to say! But his own conscience told him that he ought to receive a different message from God's true prophet than from his four hundred hirelings. How is it that some preachers can sanction the dance, and the card table, and the theatre, and every other form of worldliness, without remark; while, if some other preacher dares to drop a word that seems to favour this thing, suddenly men challenge him and say, "Why do you say that?" After all, people are not wholly deaf to the Word of the Lord: God has His witness in these breasts of ours.

I come now to a portion of Scripture that for years I was afraid to read in public, it is one of the most solemn portions of Scripture that I know. When Ahab adjured the prophet to tell the truth, Micalah answered, "I saw all Israel scattered upon the hills, as sheep that have not a shepherd: and the Lord said, These have no master: let them return every man to his house in peace." And immediately Ahab turned to Jehoshaphat and said, "Did I not tell you? I knew I should get that kind of a sermon from him. Did I not tell thee that he would prophesy no good concerning me, but evil?"

And Micalah said, "Hear thou therefore the word of the Lord: I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him on his right hand and on his left. And the Lord said, Who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead? And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner. And there came forth a spirit and stood before the Lord, and said, I will persuade him. And the Lord said unto him, Where-with? And he said, I will go forth, and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said, Thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also: go forth, and do so. Now therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee." "But," some modernist says, "there is a proof that the Bible is not inspired—a lying spirit from the God of truth!" Is it possible that the Lord has put a "lying spirit" into the mouth of all His prophets? What are you going to make of that? That is the passage, I say, I was afraid to read in public for many a year, until I saw it enacted in human life; then I said, The old Book is true to the facts of nature always. What are the facts?—follow me carefully. What was Ahab's record? His record was this, that he had refused to hear the Word of the Lord; he had done everything in his power to silence every voice that dared to tell him the truth. And if Ahab had had his way there would not have been left alive on the earth a single man that would dare to tell him the truth. Ahab had spent his whole life—doing what? Asking for a lie!—rejecting the truth, living a lie, asking for a lie! And now at last God says, "Ahab, I am going to answer your prayer; I am going to let you have your way; I am going to give you the testimony you want"; and He released a lying spirit from the Lord.

But that is the Old Testament! Is it? Is it? Is it the Old Testament? Let us see a minute. You know the passage, you have anticipated me already, but I will read it from the Book. Listen: "And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming; even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceiv-



ableness of unrighteousness in them that perish"—Why? listen—"because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." My dear friends, the worst judgment that can befall any one of us is no judgment at all: when at last God allows any man to have his own way, that way leads at once quickly, inevitably, to hell—that is where he goes.

"A strong delusion"! Ahab believed a lie and rejected the truth; and yet how wonderful that in that last hour, in that great crisis, Ahab's last chance for the judgment, side by side with the testimony of the false prophets, God raised up a man who dared to tell him God's truth! And what did he do? Before I touch that, my brethren, let me say that that is where we are to-day. It is possible for men to reject the truth of God until they have what they want. Do you know God answers prayer in judgment sometimes?—"He gave them their request; but sent leanness into their soul." You had better be careful what you pray for, you had better be careful what you ask God for; for He may, in judgment if not in mercy, at last let you have what you want; and in the day that He permits us to have what our carnal natures demand instead of what His wisdom and grace decree, in that day we sound the lowest depths of hell. Sometimes I am almost amazed: men listen to arguments such as we have heard in this Conference, arguments from every point of view—how is it possible for any man to listen to that address, for instance, of Dr. Munhall this afternoon, Dr. Brown's addresses, the address of Dr. Clinton S. Howard last night, and others, and not respond to the truth of God's Word? Those of you who love the truth, did not your hearts leap to those messages? Did you not find yourself saying, "Amen," and "Hallelujah," "I know that Word is true"? Why is it that when men are playing fast and loose with God's Word, they are able to do so without fear? There has gone forth a lying spirit from the Lord! In this battle for the Book we are face to face with principalities and powers and the rulers of this world's darkness; we are not dealing with college professors merely. We have it in Canada, in the United States, in England, the whole world around; we have it on mission fields, in educational institutions, in churches, and in all other places. Why? The answer is that Beelzebub determined on the principle of unity of command long ago, he is never divided against himself; and he is the strategist who is planning this whole campaign. When we enter this conflict, we are fighting against the superhuman; and only as we are clothed with power from on high have we any hope of victory.

Now what happened? Ahab heard the testimony, but he did not believe. I sometimes have said—but let me tell you a story first. It sounds almost egotistical in the beginning, but suffer it a moment, for it illustrates what I am about to say. I do not subscribe to it: it was something someone else said. I was speaking one afternoon in Winnipeg, in a theatre, about a year ago; and at the close of the service a group of women met me as I was going down the aisle. They seemed to be women of importance, strong characters apparently, and one of them stepped forward and shook hands, and introduced me to her friends, and said, "I am very glad to meet you, for I have heard a great deal about you and have wanted to hear you and see you for a long time." Then she said, "I am going to tell you what I have heard about you." "Oh," I said, "perhaps I can stand it, I don't suppose it is very complimentary, but tell me anyway." "Well," she said, "I have heard this, that you are so shrewd and so astute that you can beat, single-handed, any combination of lawyers to be found in Canada!" She said, "They say that you anticipate them at every turn, that you arrive at the corner before they get there, and that all their plans are frustrated by your superior astuteness." "Well," I said, "that is very funny, I have heard that all over the country. I do not deserve the compliment, but I can explain the thing psychologically. I have had to do with lawyers, some of them gentlemen of distinction, and I have seen them, in religious matters, play the simpleton; I have had to deal with some men who, in business matters, held responsible positions, yet in religious matters I have seen them act like little children belonging to the kindergarten class. I have seen them all play the game so foolishly that it has been true I could see in advance that their cause was lost—but I have had nothing to do with winning. The explanation is simply this: the penalty a liar pays for his habitual lying is not that

no one will believe him, but that he finds it impossible to believe anyone else! It is possible so to love a lie, so to court a lie, so to covet untruth, that by-and-by it is impossible for one to receive the truth."

In my own little experience in every move I have made in this battle it has been my way to announce to the enemy exactly what I was going to do—and I am going to announce to-night another move before I get through—and I have always dealt with absolute truthfulness and frankness, outlined my every move, and said, That is what I am going to do. When I tell them that, they say, "Now, what dark scheme is behind that announcement?" And they hold their committee meetings and put all their heads together—and, as our Scotch John MacNeill would say, "What a lot of wood there is in one place then!"—they put their heads together in an effort to discover what dark scheme is about to be put into operation. When I tell them I am going up the front steps and right in the front door, they say, "He is not going to do anything of the kind". They mass their forces at the back door—and I just walk in the front door, as I said I would (Laughter). You do not need to be clever to outwit a deceiver—you only need to be truthful! You do not need to be clever to deceive a modernist—you only need to be truthful! And when you try the arts of diplomacy with the modernist, you are going to be beaten every time.

I have a communication here from my dear friend Dr. Straton, of New York City. I put an article in *The Gospel Witness*, and *The Canadian Baptist* replied this week and said that the Editor of *The Gospel Witness* expressed astonishment that he should be forsaken by men like Straton of New York, and Hoyt of Chicago, and Massee of Boston; but that really these brethren were only following the example of the late Dr. A. C. Dixon, who withdrew from the Baptist Bible Union some time before his death; and that the brethren were getting tired of the campaign of misrepresentation and bitterness conducted by Drs. Riley, Norris, and Shields. (You are in it, Brother Riley). So I had something to say about that this week, and said that I expected we should hear something more about the Chicago Conference where seventy-five brethren came together, and reporting which, *The Baptist* of Chicago said that modernists and fundamentalists came together in beautiful agreement. I have a long article here which I shall publish next week, it is too long to give to you now. It says just what I expected I should hear. I had a telegram from Dr. Straton first, in which he charged *The Baptist*, of Chicago, with being absolutely untruthful and their whole report a misrepresentation; and expressed the fear that the fundamentalists have again fallen into the modernists' trap, and that what they supposed was a gentlemen's agreement is about to be broken. And I said this week that I am convinced that Dr. Straton will yet learn that a gentlemen's agreement with a modernist is an impossibility. My dear friends, if you are going to deal with Modernism I offer this little bit of counsel—take it for what it is worth: if you are going to fight Modernism, put aside all your diplomacy and unsheath the sword of God's Spirit, and go straight forward without compromise. ("Hear! Hear!" and applause).

Ahab said after Micaiah had delivered his message, "Put this fellow in the prison, and feed him with bread of affliction and with water of affliction, until I come in peace." *It has ever been the way of the religion of naturalism to endeavour to silence the testimony of revealed religion.* Cain began it by shedding Abel's blood; Ishmael mocked at Isaac; and all the way down through the sacred record until the day they crucified the Incarnate Word, the carnal mind has been "enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." And I tell you, my brethren, we are facing to-day something that would rekindle the fires of Smithfield if it could. I have seen enough of Modernism to know that there is absolute murder in its heart; it is ever conducting a campaign of slander and personal abuse; and I have come to the place where I can scarcely accept the word of a modernist on any subject. That is an extreme thing to say, but I have seen men so often play the chameleon—say one thing and do another—that I have come to the conclusion that when a man yields himself to that philosophy of deceit and untruth, that he becomes himself untrue, incapable of receiving the truth, and always acting in opposition to the truth. I do not know how far it is profitable to discuss these things with men who have abandoned themselves, like Ahab, "to work wickedness in the sight of the Lord." My heart rejoiced as I heard Dr. Munhall's

address this afternoon, as he described the certain triumph of the Book over all such matters.

And before I come to a simple application of this to our local affair, I want to lead you to the conclusion of the story. Ahab had a majority, he won the vote of the Convention; and he sent Micaiah back to prison discredited, perhaps; and everyone said, "Ahab has won a great victory to-day. This singular, fanatical prophet who told the king that he could not have his own way is yonder in prison." But ere he went Micaiah said, "If thou return at all in peace, the Lord hath not spoken by me. And he said, Harken, O people, every one of you." And you know that when the king went up to Ramoth-gilead to battle "a certain man drew a bow at a venture, and smote the king of Israel between the joints of the harness: wherefore he said unto the driver of his chariot, Turn thine hand, and carry me out of the host; for I am wounded." And about the time of the sun's going down he died, and they took his chariot down to the pool of Siloam to wash the royal blood away; and as they did it, dogs licked the blood of Ahab "according unto the word of the Lord which he spake." God is going to have His way, and we are going to be on the winning side. I would rather be with Micaiah, or be like Micaiah, and be in a cell, bound hand and foot, with a conscience void of offence, than I would be with the four hundred prophets any day. (Prolonged applause).

How many Baptists are there here to-night, put up your hands? Stand up and let me see you. (A large number rose). How many Jarvis Street members are here? (Three or four hundred rose). Well, you are working in shifts this week, I suppose. That will do, sit down. I want to talk to you Jarvis Street members for a minute, I want you to do something. I have discussed the present controversy from this platform so often that I need not discuss it again, except just to go over it in a few words as I did at Brantford the other night. I thought I would like to do that for the sake of the brethren who are outside. This is *The Canadian Baptist*—I did not edit it (Laughter); but because I edit another paper we have got it, we never would have had it otherwise. I want to read Professor Marshall's confession of faith, because I want to refer you to an action taken by the Home Mission Board of Ontario and Quebec only yesterday—so we are right up-to-date. Then I am going to propose a resolution, or someone else is, to give Jarvis Street members a chance to vote on it. There are brethren here of all denominations. I called the attention of the Denomination, back in October, to the fact that we had a new professor whom the Dean in Theology said adopted the Driver view of the Old Testament; and when I said that I supposed our ministry knew enough about this question to know that any man who adopted the Driver view was a modernist. (Was I right in saying that, Dr. Riley? "Absolutely"). Any man who adopts the Driver view will take the priestly code out of the Pentateuch, will give it a post-exilic date, will teach that the blood sacrifices and all that belongs to them were copied from Babylon and did not come down from heaven—and I have never known any man yet adopt that view who did not repudiate the priesthood of Christ. Fosdick has no priest, absolutely no priest. "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world"—Glover says that is true, for there is less sin in the world than there used to be! Social application! He says, in effect, that there used to be slavery, and the Lamb of God has taken that away; and there used to be harder conditions of labour—and the Lamb of God has taken that away—and a great many other things.

If that is not handling the Word of God deceitfully I do not know what it is. Yet Dr. T. Reavely Glover is the chief sponsor for our own professor, L. H. Marshall—a very excellent gentleman, I have nothing to say against him as a man, but I abhor his teaching. I want you to put yourself, you Baptists who were not at the Convention, I want you to put yourselves back and imagine yourselves at a great Convention where there is a very tense interest, and a man rises and makes this confession: "I believe in God the Father, Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth; I believe in the Deity of Jesus Christ His Son our Lord; I believe that on all the great questions of morality and religion the absolute and final word is with Jesus Christ our God and Saviour"—nothing wrong with that, is there? Well, I want to revise it: I believe that on ALL questions, in ALL realms, the absolute and final word is with Jesus Christ our God and Saviour. What does Professor Marshall's confession mean?

It means that when Jesus bore testimony to the Old Testament, He did not know what He was talking about; he meant that notwithstanding what Jesus said about Jonah, anyone who accepts its literal historicity would be regarded (listen, Brother Carter) would be regarded in England as "an uneducated fool." But you see how that would carry with the Convention—"I believe in the virgin birth"—and it ought to be said that this professor is not an extreme modernist, I do not think an extreme modernist would say that. Let us be fair and say he is only beginning in the way of Modernism. He still believes, by some curious process of reasoning—I do not know how he arrives there—in the Deity of Christ, and yet that He is supremely authoritative only in matters of morals and religion. But now listen—"I believe in the vicarious suffering of Jesus Christ as effecting the atonement between man and God"—so does Harry Emerson Fosdick, and he says so: he believes in the vicarious suffering of Christ—and he believes in the vicarious suffering of the mother for her child, and the soldier for his country. He believes that the vicarious principle is a law of human life, and that men suffer one for the other—"I believe in the glorious resurrection of Jesus Christ, in the empty grave—remember that, in the empty grave on the first Easter morn"—that is all right, is it not? That is a negative testimony. Read your gospels and find me one man who was ever convinced of the resurrection of Jesus by seeing the empty grave. They saw the grave, they saw the angels, but Him they saw not. And nobody ever believed without seeing Jesus Himself. In another place Professor Marshall says, "He showed himself alive by many infallible proofs."

But I want to read to you, over against that, to show you how subtle this thing is, this gem from Doctor Glover, Prof. Marshall's sponsor, in his book, "Jesus in the Experience of Men":

"Can we today say with Paul: 'But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept' (1 Cor. 15: 20), or have we to trim our speech to come a little nearer Athens? We have to consider the resurrection of Christ side by side with what we are coming to know of the facts of psychology, and we have to be as sure of our psychology as of the Christian story. We have to consider the tricks the mind plays upon itself and the part of the physical nature in suggesting them and joining in the play. We have to ask whether the disciples were not just at that stage of culture when the mind fails to realize it is playing such tricks; and whether we must say that Christ did not rise from the dead, but that certain psychopathic temperaments thought he did and suggested it to others. We cannot shirk such questions; and, in the present stage of knowledge, we shall not get, if we are in a hurry, any very encouraging answer."

Allow me to make another quotation before I come to the matter before us. This is what Dr. Farmer said referring to Professor Marshall's attitude toward the resurrection:

"Now I can quite understand some people might talk with Mr. Marshall himself about the resurrection and misunderstand him altogether. He believes in the resurrection of Jesus, but like an honest man—I stated to the Senate at the time—he said, now of course the resurrection of the body, just the nature of it, may be incomprehensible. We have to interpret that in the light of Paul when he said that. But the empty grave, you believe Jesus rose in a real sense, and there is the spiritual body. He said 'Yes' quite emphatically. I can understand some persons"—Listen, this is the Dean in Theology speaking—"I can understand some persons if they were talking with him would go away with the idea that he did not believe in the resurrection of the body, which is not true."

Now, why on earth should any man so discuss that great principle as to leave the impression with anyone that he did not believe in the resurrection of the body? That is the question—and we have the authority of the Dean in Theology for stating that.

We have had a good deal of discussion in this Convention over this matter, and I am glad that we organized last week an Ontario and Quebec

Branch of the Baptist Bible Union of North America, and we are going to organize sections of that Union in every Association in this Convention. Our Brother Loney was elected the President of this Branch, and we are going to carry the war right into the enemy's camps. There are five or six months between now and next Convention time, and we propose to give a good deal of information.

Well now, what follows? Our dear brother, Professor Campbell, has made his statement; twenty-six students, was it, ("Yes") signed their protest; three of the students, from their personal conversation with Professor Marshall, have confirmed overwhelmingly the suspicions of many that we have now received into our midst a modernist. What has followed? The fear of the denominational organization has been put into the hearts of a good many pastors—let me pause here to say to my brethren in this Convention who are here this evening, and to those who read what I say: I beg of you in the name of the Lord in this great controversy to put Jesus Christ first, and stake everything upon His faithfulness. You can afford to be independent of McMaster University, and of the whole denominational organization: if you will but stand with God, God will stand with you; and you can afford to defy hell itself to displace you. I am weary of this spirit of compromise, this angling for position, this care for what a few denominational leaders will say—half of them are mere pigmies, that is all they are. I am weary of it. When a man has pretty nearly led a church into bankruptcy and has nothing in him as a pastor, he is put into some denominational position, and he arrogates to himself all the authority of a pope. I believe Dr. Dixon was right when he said once, "I know how the papacy began. I believe the first pope was a denominational secretary. That is how the thing began" (Laughter).

What do Baptists stand for? (You Methodists, and Presbyterians, and the rest of you, may listen in for a minute). What do Baptists stand for? We stand for the great principles of Evangelical Truth, and for the freedom of the individual and his responsibility to God. And out of that great doctrine comes the doctrine of the autonomy of the local church, the independence of the church from all extra-church authority; we refuse to be governed or controlled by any sort of hierarchy, I don't care where it is. I have said it so often, and I like to say it, because I mean it more deeply every time I say it: I want to challenge McMaster and the whole aggregation of them to interfere with this church, or with those who are standing for the fundamentals of the faith—we will be here long after they are gone. The more I see of McMaster, the more convinced I am that from top to bottom, through and through, the entire business needs cleaning out, with the exception of these two or three professors.

I believe in our Home Mission work, and rejoice in the fact that our Home Mission pastors are preaching throughout these two Provinces, in the main—all of them, so far as I know—sound doctrine. They are heroic men. And I want to say this for the printed page too, that for nearly fourteen years—I was Vice-Chairman for I forget how long—but certainly for fourteen years I was a member of that Board; and for many years gave more time to our Home Mission work than I did to my own pastorate. I will take second place to no pastor in this Convention in my knowledge of the Home Mission situation: I know the fields; I know the men; I know their difficulties—and I love every one of them. I have never measured a man by the size of his church. I think we ought to get away from that idea of measuring pictures by their frames, because there are a good many pictures that don't deserve framing! And a good many pastors get into prominent churches that I am afraid when God's day comes, and His books are opened, will not show up so well beside some of their brethren who have served in humbler spheres. I love this Home Mission work. I am a convinced Baptist; I would love to see a Baptist church in every town in the country, especially since the Methodists and Presbyterians have united; I think in most places where the United Church is, they need a Baptist church; I would love to see one in every town. But I do believe that when the Board puts these churches wherever they can, the minister ought to be free to declare the whole counsel of God.

But what happened here yesterday? The Home Mission Board met in this city and passed a resolution. It was moved by the newly-appointed Secretary of Education, an official now of McMaster, who happens to be on the Board by courtesy more than anything else. He represented Brantford and his place has not been filled, and therefore he sat on the Board after he transferred to Toronto—I question seriously the legality of the motion moved by one who, I believe, ought not to have been on the Board at that time. But here is his resolution:

"In view of the fact that the present controversy disturbing the Churches must be dealt with by the Convention which sanctioned the appointment to which some exception is now being taken, the Home Mission Board instructs the Superintendent to confer personally or by letter with all missionaries of the Board and make it clear to them that the Board does not desire any Pastor supported by Denominational funds and under their direction to bring this controversy into the churches or influence the members of the Churches in a manner which may interfere with the loyalty of the Board to the work of the Convention as a whole."

What does that mean? It simply means that the Home Mission Board receives the funds of this church, and other churches, and, having these funds to administer, they put a muzzle upon the Mps of our Home Missionaries, and tell them that the Board does not desire them to bring this controversy into the churches! Let me stop to ask, What is this controversy about? It is this: as to whether we have an inspired and infallible Word of God. Do you think Home Missionaries ought to discuss that? Another thing: as to whether we have an infallible Christ; as to whether the miracles of the New Testament are true, whether the record of the miracles be true, that is the question, as to whether we have a Saviour Who "died for our sins according to the scriptures", and was buried, and rose again. Now, if the Home Missionaries can preach without discussing these questions, then they do not deserve to be missionaries, that is all. I don't believe my Brother Riley can preach any single sermon without, directly or indirectly, discussing the question of the authority of the Scriptures, the Deity of Christ, and the Saviourhood of Christ. Every sermon ought to be shot through with these great doctrines. Yet this gentleman who comes from Brantford after a very distinguished career, and accepts the Secretaryship of McMaster, has the audacity to move in the Home Mission Board that all its faithful missionaries throughout these two Provinces shall hold their peace and not dare to influence their churches in the direction of Evangelical Truth. There are some people who are not going to stand it, that is all.

What happened then? It was moved by Mr. Thomas Urquhart, and seconded by Mr. Hall:

"That all words after the word 'view' in first line be struck out and the following inserted so that it will read, 'In view of the discussion before the Board the Superintendent be instructed regarding students taking summer work on Mission fields to carry out the policy which has been in force in other years and give the student Missionaries such instruction as he has been in the habit from year to year of giving them before going to their fields.'"

Mr. Urquhart's resolution—his amendment rather—was voted down seventeen to two. There were nineteen present, and the resolution which I read as moved by Mr. Duncan, seconded by Rev. Elmore Green, Pastor of the Wentworth Street Church, Hamilton, passed seventeen to two. The Superintendent of Home Missions has received instructions from the Board to tell all the missionaries on the Home Mission field to get out of this controversy, or to keep this controversy out of their churches. (Voice from the floor: "There is one brother that is not going to do it.") Brother Fieldus is pastor of a Home Mission church. Stand up a minute, will you? (Applause). Now Brother Fieldus, when you get this instruction from the Home Mission Board what are you going to do about it? (A voice: "Throw it out!"). Let Brother Fieldus speak for himself.

MR. FIELDUS: "I am going to keep on going. The fact of the matter is,

we are, at the present time, not a Home Mission church. In view of that resolution we will still remain a self-supporting church."

Oh, you have been doing without Home Mission support? Well, you are just outside it; this does not quite reach you.

Now I want all the members of Jarvis Street Church to stand up for a minute (May I consider myself in the Chair for a moment, Dr. Riley?). Deacon Brownlee has a resolution to read. Will you Jarvis Street members remain standing a moment?

DEACON REV. E. A. BROWNLEE: Mr. Chairman, I rise as a member of Jarvis Street Baptist Church, and what I have to say is addressed particularly to the members of this church. I wish to read a resolution which later I desire to move:

"WHEREAS the Home Mission Board of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, at its meeting held April 29th, by vote of seventeen to two, passed the following resolution:

'In view of the fact that the present controversy disturbing the Churches must be dealt with by the Convention which sanctioned the appointment to which some exception is now being taken, the Home Mission Board instructs the Superintendent to confer personally or by letter with all missionaries of the Board and make it clear to them that the Board does not desire any Pastor supported by Denominational funds and under their direction to bring the controversy into the churches or influence the members of the Churches in a manner which may interfere with the loyalty of the Board to the work of the Convention as a whole.'

AND WHEREAS the issues involved in the present controversy in the Baptist denomination of Ontario and Quebec relate to the vital and fundamental principles of Evangelical Christianity;

AND WHEREAS the action of the Home Mission Board is an implied command of the said Board to its missionaries to take up a neutral attitude toward a matter involving the essential doctrines of the Christian religion and is an unwarranted interference with the missionaries' liberty to declare what they believe to be the whole counsel of God;

AND WHEREAS the resolution was moved by the Rev. C. R. Duncan, Field Secretary of McMaster University, thus showing that the Home Mission Board is subject to the influence of McMaster;

AND WHEREAS the said resolution of the Home Mission Board is an implied threat which jeopardizes the position of every missionary of the Board who dares to give expression to his conviction of truth;

AND WHEREAS by this action of the Home Mission Board the trust funds committed to its hands by the churches of the Convention for the propagation of the Baptist interpretation of Evangelical Religion are employed to support McMaster University in its defense of Professor Marshall;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Jarvis Street Baptist Church respectfully urges all the sister churches of the Convention immediately to communicate with the Home Mission Board protesting against their unwarranted interference with the liberty of the missionaries, and calling upon the Home Mission Board immediately to rescind the resolution in question.

AND FURTHER that this church reminds all missionaries of the Home Mission Board that to ignore the issues involved in the present controversy is to ignore the very fundamentals of the Christian faith, and that we therefore humbly urge all the missionaries of the Board, in this particular, respectfully to decline to be guided by the Board's instruction, and that this church announces to the said missionaries that if the liberty of any one of them is interfered with by the implementing of this resolution, the Jarvis Street Church is prepared to divert more or less of its Home Mission funds, as need may demand, from the Home Mission

Board to the support of such missionary, provided that the course of such missionary in the presentation of the case has been characterized by reasonable wisdom and good judgment."

That, men and women, is the resolution I beg leave to move. And in moving this resolution, may I say that I am myself a McMaster man. It was my privilege to spend six of the most happy years of my life as a student resident in McMaster; it was my privilege to graduate from that institution in both Arts and Theology. I feel, therefore, that I have at least some right to speak as a graduate of that institution. I shall for ever be thankful for the influence McMaster University has had over my life, and for the privileges I had while a student there; but, at the same time, things have occurred in connection with the administration of McMaster in recent years that have not met with my approval, and against which my voice, in accordance with the principles of truth, must, of necessity, be raised.

I want to say another thing: there is an impression abroad—and that impression has been voiced on not a few occasions, and sometimes in print—that there are, throughout the Convention, quite a number of puppets who are prepared to dance whenever Dr. Shields pulls the string. I want to declare that to be untrue. I speak to-night, for one, from the conviction of my soul, and I am persuaded that there are, throughout this Convention, a large number of men and women, some of them graduates of McMaster, who stand for the things for which Dr. Shields stands, and who are prepared to back him in the movement in which he is now engaged. But they do not do so at his dictation—or even at his request: they do so because they agree with that for which he stands. I say that emphatically. No one knows better than Dr. Shields himself that I have not followed his leading just because he is a leader: where I have agreed with him it has been because the conscientious conviction of my soul led me to agree with him. I do not speak to-night as a disciple of Dr. Shields or anybody else, but out of the conviction of my own heart.

Dr. Shields has explained what this resolution means. What does it mean? It simply means that the Baptist Home Mission Board of Ontario and Quebec is presuming to—I was going to say dictate, and perhaps that is not too strong a word—dictate to the Baptist Home Missionaries in these two Provinces the course they are to follow with reference to their attitude toward the present controversy in our Denomination. It surely is a threat held over the young men—and older men—who are serving on our Home Mission fields; and as a Baptist who believes in Baptist liberty, I resent the resolution passed yesterday by the Home Mission Board of Ontario and Quebec for reasons which I cannot, at this late hour, more fully state.

I beg leave to move the resolution which I have just read.

DEACON JAMES G. HYDE: "I take pleasure in seconding the resolution."

DR. SHIELDS: The resolution has been seconded by Deacon Hyde. Will the members of Jarvis Street Church who approve of this resolution signify their approval by raising your hands? Is there a contrary vote, does anyone oppose? I do not see any. I wonder how many other Baptists there are here in this meeting who would like to join with us in this expression? (A large response) Thank you.

Just a word and I have done: this resolution means that we are going to stand by our Home missionaries who will declare the whole counsel of God; and if the Home Mission Board dares to lay a finger on any one of them by cutting off their supplies, then this church will divert from its Home Mission funds a sufficient amount to make up that grant, and we will support the Home missionaries ourselves; and furthermore, it may mean, if that sort of thing is continued, that many other churches will do the same. ("They will.")

Well, I am done. Let us stand by the Book, and by our Baptist liberty; let us declare the whole counsel of God. You must make the best of this impromptu speech.



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

### MORE ABOUT THE CHICAGO CONFERENCE.

In our issue of April 29th we quoted the following paragraph from *The Canadian Baptist* of the same week:

"The Editor of *The Gospel Witness* is left speechless by the seeming desertion of such fundamentalist leaders as Doctors Masseur, Straton and Hoyt, who are really but following the lead of the late Dr. A. C. Dixon, who nearly a year before his death, resigned from the Baptist Bible Union. Such men are apparently separating themselves from the divisive type of fundamentalist represented by Drs. Shields, Riley and Norris. The un-Christian campaign of misrepresentation and slander carried on by these latter leaders is beginning to bear its fruit. Fair-minded fundamentalists are deserting the Baptist Bible Union's ship. Members of our denomination in Canada will do well to mark carefully the importance of standing true to the real Baptist fundamentals."

In connection with our comments on the above, we printed a telegram from Dr. Straton expressing his fear that the brethren had been victimized by another "modernist trick"; and said, "We are certain we shall hear more of the Chicago Conference." We print below communications received from Dr. Straton: the first is a copy of his letter to *The Baptist*, of Chicago; and the second, an article by Dr. Straton. What has *The Canadian Baptist* to say now?

#### DR. STRATON'S LETTER.

April 28, 1926.

Editor of *The Baptist*,  
2320 Michigan Avenue,  
Chicago, Illinois.  
Gentlemen:

I am handing you herewith corrected copy of my article on "Chicago Conference". I regret exceedingly that my name was used in *The Baptist* account of the "Conference" without the word "conditionally" following it, in connection with the record of my vote. The secretary of the "Conference" assured me that my vote would so be entered, and I call your attention to the fact that the *Watchman Examiner* in their account of the meeting, and their record of the vote added the explanation that I had voted for this resolution only conditionally.

I also regret exceedingly that my participation in that "Conference", and my conditional vote for the resolution should have been used by *The Baptist* as a part of the foundation for your very unfair and untruthful editorial on the "Chicago Conference".

I have, therefore, once more to enter my earnest and emphatic protest against the treatment of myself and other Fundamentalists at the hands of *The Baptist*. In connection with the incident at the Atlantic City Convention, *The Baptist* was utterly unfair and partisan in its statement concerning myself, and I was denied any opportunity of correcting your misstatements in your columns.

If we are to see any real progress made toward unity within our ranks, for which *The Baptist* professes to be so eager, it certainly cannot

come about on the basis of unfair and even dishonest treatment by *The Baptist* of those from whom it differs.

I hope, therefore, as a matter of simple justice that you will print the enclosed statement from me in an early issue, and that you will give it as much prominence as you gave the account of the "Conference" in your columns.

Regretting that I cannot honestly wish you well, but hoping that we may even yet make progress toward the reunion of the Baptist brotherhood on the basis of fair dealing and submission to the authority of God's Word, I am, sincerely yours,

(Signed) JOHN ROACH STRATON.

## HAVE THE FUNDAMENTALISTS BEEN TRICKED AGAIN?

The Chicago "Conference", And What May Be Done At The Washington Convention.

By Rev. John Roach Straton, D.D., Pastor of Calvary Baptist Church, New York.

The meeting of April 13th, now known as "the Chicago Conference", composed of a group of men who were described as being "representative of all shades of opinion within the Northern Baptist Convention", was interesting to those who attended, and it may prove in the end really valuable and useful.

The resolution that was finally adopted and printed in *The Baptist* and *The Watchman Examiner*, with the names of those who attended appended, did not really seem to satisfy either the Modernists or the Fundamentalists in the Convention. So far as my own vote on it was concerned, I will say that I requested that the word "conditionally" follow my name in the printing of the report.

This was done in *The Watchman Examiner* account of the meeting, but it was not done in *The Baptist* account. This despite the fact that I was at pains to telegraph the secretary of the conference, and he telegraphed assuring me that the matter would be so given in *The Baptist*.

Dr. Brounger, chairman of the meeting, had urged us all to try to stand together for the sake of harmony and peace, assuring us that even if we did not adhere to any action taken, it was desirable to try to get some expression from the group there assembled.

The resolution was finally brought into the meeting by the committee late in the afternoon, when some of us were on the eve of leaving in order to catch trains, and there was really no time for an adequate consideration of the form in which it was reported.

I voted for it, pairing off against Mr. James Colgate, who, in the beginning of the meeting, had taken a strong stand for the admission of the Park Avenue delegates to the Washington Convention, regardless of the newly-adopted attitude of that church (and Dr. Fosdick, their pastor), on the matter of immersion, requirements for church membership, etc. I voted for this resolution only because I took the utterances of Mr. Colgate and other representatives of the Park Avenue Church, and the expressions in a letter from Dr. Fosdick himself, read to the conference by Dr. Charles W. Gilkey, as assurances that the Park Avenue Church would not try to force its delegates upon the Convention if they were not desired.

The Chicago "Conference" was declared by the chairman to be so representative that it might be regarded as a cross section of the Northern Baptist Convention,—a sort of miniature convention. When the roll was called in the vote on the resolution, Mr. Colgate voted before I did, and remarked, as he voted for the resolution, that he did not believe in it but would vote for it anyway. I took this remark of Mr. Colgate at the time he cast his vote, as I had taken his previous remarks in speaking to the conference, to mean that he and his associates who represented Park Avenue Church would abide by the expressed wishes of the conference there assembled, as a reflection of what the wishes of the denomination would be at Washington. If the expressions of the Park Avenue representatives were intended to form the basis for a

"gentleman's agreement" that the Washington Convention and the denomination would be saved the distress and embarrassment of a fight over the injection of unbaptistic principles and practices by a church, then I was favorable to a resolution even as weak as the one finally presented.

If it is true that the Park Avenue Church will refrain from sending delegates this year to the convention, then the adoption of the proposed standing resolution (though even that should be strengthened and clarified) would safeguard the situation and give time for the formulation of a permanent amendment to the by-laws, which would fully define and limit membership in the convention. If the matter does not take this course, however, and an effort is made to seat the delegates from the Park Avenue Church, then, it would seem that the only right and proper course to pursue is for those who stand on the Bible as truly God's Word, and who are loyal to our age-long Baptist principles and practices, to take the minority report of the law committee as a basis, and endeavor at the Washington Convention to so amend the by-laws as that only delegates coming from churches that are truly Baptist Churches shall be admitted as delegates to the convention.

It would seem an utterly impossible and preposterous proposal that a Baptist deliberative assembly should not have the right to decide and declare who should constitute its members. And certainly if the principles recently advanced in connection with the admission of the Park Avenue Church, and the proposed reorganization of the convention, prevail, then we are at an end of all true Baptist procedure in the northland, and our great historic mission to the world will have to be acknowledged as having failed.

Since the foregoing was written *The Baptist* of April 24th has just come to hand containing an editorial on the "Chicago Conference". This editorial conveys the idea that there was "unvarying unanimity" in the "Chicago Conference", and that those of us who represented the Fundamentalists came to peace and a good understanding with the Modernists. There are also in this editorial expressions which convey the idea that because of the action taken at the "Chicago Conference" the Park Avenue Church will be allowed to seat their delegates in the meeting of the Northern Baptist Convention at Washington.

So far as this editorial is concerned, I wish to say that the idea conveyed that the "Chicago Conference" was characterized by "unvarying unanimity" is utterly untrue. We were as wide as the poles apart in our ideas and convictions there. And at best the resolution adopted can be truly regarded only as a temporary make-shift, accepted provisionally by those of us who stand for the faith of our fathers and only with the inference mentioned above that the Park Avenue Church will save the denomination the embarrassment of sending delegates to Washington.

The whole purpose of the "Conference", as stated to some of us before the meeting, and as stated by the chairman of the law committee in his long address and explanation during the "conference", was to decide on some means of safe-guarding our Baptist principles and practices by shutting out the Park Avenue delegates without immediately amending the by-laws, which the law committee has advised would be doubtful as to its regularity. The chairman of the law committee himself, there declared that a standing resolution which he himself suggested would accomplish the same thing as the proposed amendment to the by-laws, and would avoid the threatened legal difficulties. It was upon the ground of these assurances, added to the statements of the representatives of the Park Avenue Church that they did not desire or propose to try to hold on to their places in the denominational organization if they and their money—the money was mentioned three specific times—were not wanted, that I voted conditionally for the resolution.

I wish, therefore, emphatically and unequivocally, to declare that I have never been, nor am I now, in harmony with the politics championed by *The Baptist* in these matters. If their interpretation of the "Chicago Conference" is that those of us who hold to the faith will lamely submit and allow the Park Avenue Church to seat its delegates in the Northern Baptist Convention, they are reckoning without their hosts. As I understood that "harmony meeting" at Chicago, the action taken was consented to as a means by which we would be saved the embarrassment of a fight at the Washington Convention over the treasonable action of the Park Avenue Church in deserting our Bap-

tist principles by their newly-adopted program under the leadership of the radical Dr. Fosdick.

If it should prove that those of us who attended that "Conference" at some sacrifice have been again tricked, then it will but make us all the more determined to battle against the sinister forces that have usurped the centers of power in our brotherhood.

This article is sent to *The Baptist* as well as *The Watchman Examiner*. Watch for its appearance (?) in *The Baptist*.

### THE HOME MISSION BOARD'S RESOLUTION.

As part of the address by the Editor, and printed in this issue, delivered Friday evening, April 30th, we give a resolution passed by the Home Mission Board, together with a resolution passed by a great company of Jarvis Street members who were present in the World's Christian Fundamentals Conference.

The Home Mission Board's resolution speaks for itself. The only fair construction that can be put upon it is that it was intended to silence all Home Mission pastors respecting the present denominational controversy. We have been informed that the Rev. J. R. Webb, the Vice-Chairman, has written a covering letter which is to accompany this resolution when sent to the Home Mission pastors, and that this covering letter is an interpretation of the resolution. The Editor of this paper preceded Mr. Webb in the Vice-Chairmanship of the Board, a position he occupied for a number of years. He was a member of the Home Mission Board for about fourteen years in all, and therefore knows something about its work. The Vice-Chairman is without authority or competency to interpret the Board's action. When a resolution is passed, it must be assumed that the text of the resolution, and not any individual's interpretation of it, expresses the Board's considered judgment. It is folly therefore for Mr. Webb, or anyone else, to endeavour to explain away this utterly unbaptistic action.

The resolution which was passed, it would appear, was mild in comparison with the resolution proposed by the Rev. Hugh McDiarmid of Stratford. Mr. McDiarmid wanted the Board to deal with "treason"! Surely this is something new under the sun: that when an individual missionary or minister exercises his God-given right to express the deepest conviction of his soul and protest against McMaster's surrender to modern infidelity, he becomes guilty of "treason". The suggestion is so silly that perhaps it need not be seriously discussed. Perhaps our dear brother is making a further effort to earn that honorary degree from McMaster to which we referred some time ago. There is a somewhat hackneyed quotation to the effect, that whom the gods would destroy they first make mad. This seems to apply to a certain proportion of the members of the Home Mission Board.

Does our Brother McDiarmid and his associates imagine that the churches of this Convention will long continue to contribute to Home Missions if the funds committed to the Board's hands are to be used as a cudgel to silence the testimony of faithful Home Missionaries against the modernist iniquity that is now being foisted upon our Denomination? We have been already besieged with applications for copies of the resolution passed by Jarvis Street Church on Friday evening last; and we have no doubt that great numbers of churches will immediately follow our example. If the Home Mission Board does not desire a shrinkage in its funds, it will be well advised to lose no time in rescinding the iniquitous resolution which it passed at its last meeting. Efforts will be made to soften the effect of the Board's action—but will someone be good enough to tell us why the resolution was passed, if the resolution was not intended as an instruction implying an order to our Home Missionaries?

The war against the curse of Modernism must go on, and true men will not allow personal friendships to stand in the way of their doing their full duty. We venture to inform our brethren who are Home Mission pastors that the Vice-Chairman of the Board has no constitutional authority to "instruct" the Superintendent of Home Missions. Certain brethren on the Home Mission Board appear to be taking themselves very seriously. We observe from the

Year Book that the Rev. J. R. Webb's term of office expires with the next Convention. It will, we feel sure, be a great Convention, when some hitherto prominent brethren will sing their swan-song. We think it is very probable that the Convention will decide that Brother J. R. Webb's high-handed assumption in recent days of an authority which does not belong to him, has entitled him to a period of retirement from the Home Mission Board in order that he may qualify, by the successful leadership of his own church, to "instruct" other pastors, and thus deserve the front seat at the Convention which he so habitually occupies.

### DRESS SUIT SERMONS.

We quote the following from a letter from Mr. J. A. Paterson of Montreal, which appeared in a recent number of *The Canadian Baptist*. The phrase, "dress suit sermon" is a very happy one. The quotation speaks for itself:

In the first place that Prof. F. S. Campbell is a man respected and loved by all who know him, and is in every sense a true Christian scholar and gentleman, which fact none can deny. That the statements made by Prof. Campbell are true, notwithstanding the attempts at camouflage by the Chancellor. That Prof. Marshall was a Modernist and is still a Modernist, is the conviction of many others besides Prof. Campbell, who have arrived at the same conclusion by the same means as Prof. Campbell, viz., his sermons and personal talks as given to the press and to others, and which have since been reinforced by the protests of 23 students, who have nothing to gain and everything to lose materially through their protest. There are many of us who cannot be deceived by dress suit sermons made to order for the occasion, and as regards personal interviews, some of us have found Modernism resembled Jesuitism so much that we are chary about personal interviews with votaries of either one or the other.

### THE BAPTIST BIBLE UNION OF ONTARIO AND QUEBEC.

Its organization as a Branch of the Baptist Bible Union of North America has made a great beginning. Referring to the invitation sent out for the Baptist Bible Union Convention, *The Canadian Baptist* of April 15th said:

"In spite of an eleventh hour appeal by lettergram sent to many of the pastors in the Convention the call has gone out to the churches signed by only 31 pastors out of a total of 355 ministers in the Convention. It has been signed by laymen from 17 churches out of a total of 502 in the Convention. It has been signed by 163 laymen out of 62,234 Baptists in the churches of Ontario and Quebec."

It will interest our contemporary to know that of the 355 ministers in the Convention, 110 have joined the Baptist Bible Union, or 31 per cent. The total enrolment of lay-members for the two provinces is 908, or a total of 1,018. This is not bad to begin with, and we expect to grow. A movement that can start with nearly one-third of the ministers of the Convention is not to be wholly despised.

### WORLD'S CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALS CONVENTION

This great Convention was a success from every point of view; and, we believe, brought large blessing to Toronto. Dr. Riley addressed a great meeting in Massey Hall on Saturday night, preached to a full church Sunday morning in Jarvis Street, spoke to great audiences in Massey Hall Sunday afternoon and evening, while the Pastor preached in Jarvis Street as usual Sunday evening to a great congregation. The aggregate attendance at the two Jarvis Street services and the two Massey Hall services on Sunday could not have been far short of seven thousand, by a conservative estimate.

## BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

VOL. 1. T. T. SHIELDS, D.D., Editor, Toronto, Ontario, Canada No. 2

Lesson 9. SECOND QUARTER May 30, 1926.

Application for entry as second-class matter is pending.

### THE TRIUMPHAL ENTRY.

**LESSON TEXT:** Twenty-first chapter of Matthew.

To be studied in harmony with the lesson text: Mark 11:1-33; 12:1-12.

Luke 19:29-49; 20:1-19; 21:37, 38.

**GOLDEN TEXT.**—"If ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in Heaven forgive your trespasses" (Mark 11: 26).

#### I. THE TRIUMPHAL ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM.

1. Our Lord's omniscience is here revealed. He directed His disciples where they would find a colt tied, and what to say in order to secure him. Such incidents as these disclosed the fact that everything was open to His eyes. 2. His deliberate and sovereign fulfilment of prophecy. Some would assume that He deliberately fashioned His life to run it into the mould of Scripture. But this only increases the difficulty. Only one who was Sovereign of His circumstances could possibly so form His life. What mere man could do so? We are thus shut up to an acceptance of the truth that, knowing, and being a part of the redemptive purpose of God, as revealed in the Scripture, He sovereignly fulfilled the Scripture to the letter. 3. Whoever obeys the Word of Christ will find things turn out exactly as He says. So did these men who went for the colt. 4. The multitudes unconsciously and involuntarily also fulfilled prophecy (Ps. 18:19-26). How near they came on this occasion to recognizing Jesus as the Messiah for whom they were waiting!

#### II. CHRIST CLEANSSES THE TEMPLE.

1. Both the material temples in which men worship, and the hearts of men themselves, are frequently made houses of merchandise. Churches and denominations depart from the purpose of their foundation, and become centres of a kind of commercial religion. Money is necessary to the Lord's work; but when the material interests of a church or a denomination are not subordinated to its spiritual mission, always the house of God becomes a house of merchandise. 2. The severity of Christ. In a time when evil and error would obtain exemption from judgment by insisting upon the gentleness and love of Jesus, we must remind ourselves that "severity" as well as "goodness" is ascribed to God. Who of us does not need His chastening hand, in order that our hearts may be cleansed, that they may be made the temples of the Holy Ghost? 3. Yet the blind and lame found Him in the same place where He wielded the whip of cords; but they found Him infinitely tender. 4. Our Lord was never without His critics; and they were invariably found among the religious leaders. There is a religiousness which becomes jealous of Christ rather than jealous for Him (vss. 15, 16). 5. But our Lord finds in what has just occurred in Jerusalem a further fulfilment of prophecy: "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings, Thou has perfected praise" (incidentally another sidelight on Christ's view of the inspiration and authority of Scripture). God will always find some one to praise Him: He will do it to-day as always. If professors and doctors of divinity have no Hosannas for the Son of David, God will raise up little children, out

of whose mouths He will perfect praise, that He may still the enemy and the avenger. If great cathedral churches are converted into pagan temples where the great verities of the faith are denied, God will raise up humble men who on street corners, and in mission halls, and in tabernacles which will hold the multitude, will take the place of the wise and prudent; and in obedience to a revelation from Heaven will cry, "Blessed is He that cometh in the Name of the Lord". What a lesson is here for children and young people; and how we ought to emphasize the place God has for little children in His plan!

### III. THE WITHERED FIG TREE.

1. Christ went to Bethany. Nothing is told us here of what occurred at Bethany; but we know there was a home where He was always welcome. It is significant that it is said, "He left them", as though the bitter criticism of His enemies had almost wearied Him; and He went to Bethany where He was wanted. He said to His disciples: "In Me ye shall have peace; in the world ye shall have tribulation". Can we say to Him, "Though the carnal minds of men are enmity against Thee, our hearts shall be a Bethany where all shall be in harmony with Thy Spirit"? 2. Yet we are constrained to believe that on this occasion He must have lodged in Bethany elsewhere than in the home of Martha; for she would not have suffered Him to leave her house hungry. Do we welcome the Lord, and yet in any sense fail in showing Him true hospitality? Do we ever permit Him to be hungry for that which we can supply? 3. The fig tree had leaves but no fruit. It was a type of a religious professor who has a form of godliness without its power; and perhaps true of a nation which has an abundance of religion, but no spiritual life. How disappointing to find a leafy tree and no fruit under the leaves! 4. It is not said that Christ cursed the fig tree, but only that He declared its day of opportunity to be ended. So "every branch in Me that beareth no fruit, He taketh away". 5. The fig tree withers, and the disciples wonder. Our Lord replies that the smallest degree of true faith shall remove mountains. Recently we met with a missionary who had had long and large experience of the Divine faithfulness in supplying the need of the work in which he was engaged; and he told us of a time when this passage was laid upon his heart and he felt that the Holy Spirit wrought in him what he called "a commanding faith". How many of us are able to take God absolutely at His Word, and command things to be done in His Name? 6. Here is a most gracious promise, that God will hear us in all things when we pray (vs. 22). This frequent mention of the privilege of prayer, the reiteration of the promise that God will hear us, should teach us the tremendous importance of the subject.

### IV. THE QUESTION OF AUTHORITY IN RELIGION.

1. Some people care less for the fact than for the philosophy of the fact. The fact is, Christ has ever been a Worker of miracles. We cannot avoid, however, the question of whence His power comes. By what authority does He command the allegiance of millions still? 2. Our Lord's perfect knowledge of the constitution of the human mind is revealed in His answer. He asked His critics a question which they could not answer without condemning themselves; hence, they declined to reply. He will never answer our questions when they are aimed at self-justification, or when they are prompted by an inherent antagonism toward Himself. 3. In the parable of the two sons (vss. 28-32), Christ teaches us that the only proper understanding and appreciation of His authority will be found in yielding a practical obedience to Him.

## V. THE PARABLE OF THE HOUSEHOLDER AND THE VINEYARD—Vss. 33-46.

Under this figure the Jewish nation is described. The servants sent by the lord of the vineyard are the succession of prophets from righteous Abel down to Zecharias and John the Baptist. The husbandmen in the parable recognized no obligation to their lord; and slew the servants whom he sent to receive the fruits. Last of all the son came and received the same treatment. Thus Christ is God's last Word to a rebellious world: He is the Divine Ultimatum. But He, too, was slain, and therefore judgment must come. The people against whom the parable was told, judge themselves (vss. 40, 41) as David did. It is so easy to judge others; it is so difficult to judge ourselves. These people predicted what was really in God's plan; for the vineyard has passed from Jew to Gentile. See Acts 13:44-48. Here our Lord predicts that the rejected Stone will become the Head of the corner. Thus the veil falls upon Jewish minds. How wonderful is this prophecy in the light of the Acts of the Apostles: The Pharisees perceived that He had spoken against them, and were deterred from laying hands on Him only for fear of the multitude.

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. Printed in U. S. A.  
ADDRESS UNION GOSPEL PRESS, P. O. Drawer 680, CLEVELAND, OHIO.

## CHURCH NEWS.

### THE TWO CONFERENCES FINANCIALLY.

Our readers will be interested to know that the total receipts of the two Conferences held in Jarvis St., Baptist Bible Union Conference, April 22 to 24, and the Eighth Annual Meeting of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association, April 25 to May 2nd, amounted to nearly \$4,000.00, both Conferences closing with all expenses met and showing some balance.

### THE EDITOR OUT OF TOWN.

Dr. Shields left this afternoon (Wednesday) for Houston, Texas, where he is speaking, May 9th to 12th, at the Pre-Convention Conference of the Baptist Bible Union of North America. Dr. Shields will return for his services Sunday, May 16, and will leave immediately to attend the Annual Meeting of the Bible Union at Washington, D.C., May 19th to 24th.

### AT WHEATON COLLEGE.

On June 16th the Editor of this paper will be the special speaker at the Commencement Exercises of Wheaton College, Wheaton, Ill.

### PASTOR JAMES MCGINLAY TO-DAY.

In the absence of Dr. Shields, Pastor Jas. McGinlay of McMaster University will preach in Jarvis Street both morning and evening, May 9th.

### THE SCHOOL LAST SUNDAY.

In spite of the fact that we changed to daylight-saving time Saturday night and a great many of our people forgot to fix their clocks, there was an attendance at the School of nearly eleven hundred. Dr. Carter, of England, who was one of the speakers at the Fundamentals Conference, taught the Pastor's Class.