

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION MEETINGS	Page 7
A BAPTIST EDITOR ON THE BAPTIST BIBLE UNION....	" 9
THE HOME MISSION BOARD RESOLUTION	" 11
THE NORTHERN ASSOCIATION	" 14
THE S. S. LESSON	" 15

The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

IN THE INTEREST OF EVANGELICAL TRUTH, AND SENT FOR \$2.00 PER YEAR (UNDER COST), POSTPAID, TO ANY ADDRESS, 5c. PER SINGLE COPY. TO NEW SUBSCRIBERS DURING 1926 \$1.00 FOR ONE YEAR. RENEWALS \$2.00.

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. 5. No. 8 TORONTO, JULY 1st, 1926 Whole No. 218.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

WHEN WILL THE GREAT REVIVAL COME?

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Sunday Morning, June 27th, 1926.

(Stenographically reported.)

"Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in mine house, and prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it.

"And I will rebuke the devourer for your sakes, and he shall not destroy the fruits of your ground; neither shall your vine cast her fruit before the time in the field, saith the Lord of hosts.

"And all nations shall call you blessed: for ye shall be a delightsome land, saith the Lord of hosts."—Mal. 3: 10-12.



HIS text is frequently used when a collection is in prospect, but I have no intention of employing it in that way this morning. I have observed that some of the higher critics who seem to have serious doubts as to the inspiration and authority of Scripture, are quite convinced that this is authoritative when they are about to take a collection! I have sometimes said in the United States that there is at least one portion of Scripture about whose divine inspiration and authority certain modernists have not the shadow of a doubt—and that is this text; for they are very fond of talking about bringing the tithes into the storehouse.

I shall not speak particularly about the duty of tithing this morning; but rather, about the privilege of thus recognizing the Lord. Nor shall I have time to discuss the principle of the tithe. I think I may take it for granted that you remember that God demanded of His people in ancient times one-tenth of all He gave them. The Levites were separated to the service of the Lord, and were given no inheritance or lot among their brethren in the land of Canaan. All the other tribes had a portion of land, but the Levites had none; they were separated to a spiritual service, to serve the tabernacle; and they were maintained there in that service by the tithes of the people; being themselves, however, required to tithe the tithe, for they also were commanded to bring tithes into the storehouse. Abraham paid tithes to Melchizedek; and in the epistle to the Hebrews that fact is referred to, in order to show the greatness of Melchizedek, "Consider how great this man

was, unto whom even the patriarch Abraham gave the title of the spoils."

Thus our tithing recognizes God. And it is on that principle of the recognition of the Divine in human life that I speak especially this morning; and on that recognition as a term, as a condition, of spiritual blessing.

I.

Well then, to begin: the rendering of the tithe to the Lord involves A RECOGNITION OF GOD IN THE REALM OF THE MATERIAL AND TEMPORAL; it takes God into the workshop, and into the office, and into the counting-house, and into the kitchen, into the family counsels—it takes God into every department of life, and recognizes His Lordship over temporal and material things. The temple was a symbol of the presence of God, it was called the house of God, it was a prophecy of that condition of life whereof it shall be said, "The tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them." And the maintenance of the temple, and of the tabernacle before it, was recognized as the maintenance of God's house, it was a place where God dwelt in the midst of His people. And the church is spoken of as "the house of God": it is the place where He particularly and peculiarly dwells. Of course He is everywhere, and we cannot escape the divine Presence. He does not dwell "in temples made with hands"; but He does dwell in the midst of His believing people, and where two or three are gathered in His name there He is in the midst.

The very presence of the church in the earth is in itself a recognition of God; and this payment of the tithe is a recognition of God in the material and temporal realm. Nowadays God is too largely forgotten even on Sundays—but, very generally, religion is a sort of Sunday experience. But the payment of the tithe brings God to a daily recognition on the part of every man and woman who believes His name, not merely in spiritual things, in the affairs of the spirit, but it has to do with our bodies, with the clothes we wear, with the food we eat, with the houses we dwell in, with the cars we ride in, with our pleasures, our recreations—with all the material concerns of life. When we come to a recognition of our obligation to God in the matter of the tithe, there is no expression of life, in a material way, that does not require the recognition of God.

What sort of a God is yours? Nowadays, you know, He is almost elbowed out of the material universe; or, if He is there at all, then He is shut up in the cosmic order. Science has achieved its purpose—science falsely so-called—and has pushed the great First-Cause back as far as possible, has pushed Him so far back, indeed, that we cannot see Him, nor know Him, and He cannot hear us when we pray. Surely there never was a day when it was more necessary that God's people should recognize that He is Lord of the material world, that He does control material things, and that it is still true that all things—including the material,—that all things,—my tools, my clothing, my food, my money, all these things are a part of the universal order upon which His sovereign hand is placed, and which by the beneficent wisdom of the counsels of His gracious will, are made to work together for good to them that love God.

I say, that the payment of the tithe is a recognition of God's proprietorship in the realm of the material. What is your money? How did you get it? "Well", you say, "I worked for it"—I think that is probably true so far as this congregation is concerned. A great many people get money for which they do not work; but what do you mean by your work? "Well", some man says, "I wrought with my hands." Some other man says, "I wrought with my brain"—and he thinks he has the monopoly of brains! But there has got to be a brain behind the manual worker, or his work will not be of much value. What is money? It is the product of your life, your thinking, your physical labour, all there is of you. But remember, it is the Lord thy God that giveth thee power to get wealth. If you have a mind to think, and physical strength to labour, if you are able by the output of your life to make some contribution to the world's weal for which you receive a certain remuneration, then it is God Who has made you worth something to somebody in this world. There are people who are worth nothing, physically or mentally, they are a burden and a care; and if you are able to maintain yourselves honestly, to earn your daily food and clothing and shelter, then give God thanks for that fact, and recognize Him in that fact.

I know these are but commonplaces, but they are the important elements in life after all, for to-morrow we shall not be in church; we shall be in our various places of business,—the shop, the office, or wherever we are employed. Is your God a God Who is with you seven days a week? Does He go with you to work in the morning? And do you recognize that your time—for time is an element in all this—that your time belongs to God, and all the product of the day's labour? Are you going to bring your tithe to God, and as an act of worship, of recognition of His proprietorship, as well as an expression of your gratitude to Him for His goodness, are you going to say, "Lo, this I have earned by my labour; and I recognize that in Thee I live and move and have my being, that my breath came from Thee, that my heart continues to beat at Thy command, that Thine are all my ways, that all that I have is Thine—for every good gift and every perfect gift is from above—and of this which Thou hast given to me, in accordance with Thy Word, I yield back to Thee that which is Thine own; for I will not be numbered among those who rob God of that which is His due"? There is a blessing in the daily recognition of God in material things!

II.

Then, in the next place, this giving of the tithe RECOGNIZES GOD AS A MIRACLE-WORKING God. Our rendering of the tithe is an act of faith. As I speak to you of this this morning, some of you will say, "Well, Pastor, that is all very well if you have a certain income, so that you can see clearly that when you have deducted the tithe you still have enough to live on. If I could be sure that the nine-tenths would pay my way—well then, I should have no objection. But the fact is, I cannot make ends meet as it is." That is why you cannot make ends meet! "Oh", but you say, "it is nonsense to talk like that—ninety cents cannot be made to go as far as a dollar." Quite true; you cannot make ninety cents go as far as a dollar, but our God can. Our sovereign God can make one cent buy as much as a million if He wants to. What does He say here?—"I will rebuke the devourer for your sakes. I will look after your fields, you farmers, I will go into partnership with you, and the devourer shall not destroy the fruits of your ground; neither shall your vine cast her fruit before the time in the field, saith the Lord of hosts." He says, "I am Lord of the locusts, and the canker worm, and the palmerworm; I want you to recognize Me as Sovereign in this world which I have made; and I can make the earth bring forth and bud, and yield seed for the sower and bread for the eater. If you will only take Me into partnership, and trust Me, I will bless you; but I demand as a recognition of My partnership that you yield your tithe to Me, and let Me look after your fields."

I wonder how far you and I do really believe in the supernatural, you orthodox Baptists? I was saying to someone last night that it is one thing to put that Bible up on the shelf and say, "I believe the Bible from cover to cover."—What do you believe about the Bible? "I do not believe anything about the Bible—I believe the Bible." Well, what do you mean by that? "I mean it is the Word of God; I mean it is a supernatural Book, that it is full of promises of supernatural power; it tells me that God comes into human life, and He does things that could not be done by any other power." Very well, it is not difficult to put the Bible upon the shelf and argue like that; and there are tens of thousands of supernaturalists in the sense that they believe these things intellectually, in whose life the Bible has no authority at all. You may profess to believe the Bible, and be as orthodox as Paul in an intellectual way, and yet bring dishonour to the Word of God every time you speak about it. It is quite another thing, however, to take the teachings of the Bible and apply them to our own lives; and to carry it with us into the workshop, and into the home, and everywhere else, and say, "I believe that Bible so implicitly that its principles shall be the law of my life; and whenever I find that Bible teaching me to do a certain thing, I will do it if it costs me my life, because I believe that it is the Word of God; I will obey like Abraham when he said, 'I will give even my son, my only son in whom all the promises for all the future are wrapped up. I will offer him up, and I will go down into death itself trusting in the naked word of God.'" Can you do that?

Well now, you fathers and mothers, let me make it very plain; very, very simple. It is a great problem nowadays for many parents to know how to clothe their children, how to feed them, and how to educate them—is that

not so? When the children are in bed, the godly father and mother sit down and say, "Well now, look here, this is all we have; and Johnny needs boots"—and so on. An inventory is taken of the family resources, and of the family needs. "How shall we do it? How can we make ends meet?" Literally, sometimes that piece of cloth simply will not meet at all. When the children grow out of their clothes—they do not grow out of their boots—they wear them out; and I suppose they mostly wear their clothes out too; but how shall the family needs be met? These are simple things; but if our religion does not come into the family and into the every day life, it is not of much use; if it does not help the mother who has to face the problem of caring for her children, it is of very little practical use. You remember the Lord companied with fishermen, with men who sat at the seat of custom; He went into their homes, visited their sick: He was not aloof from them; He went about doing good. And He is going about doing good still, and I believe our religion is intended to help in all these family problems, the problems of business, and of every other realm.

The question is this, my dear friends, when you sit down with these problems before you, have you learned to say, "We will put God first"? But some anxious mother—or is it a father—will say, "If we take that tenth, where shall we be? We shall be worse off than ever!" But the one who has learned to trust, says, "We will let God look after that, we will put God first. We will put Him first, because the tenth is not ours anyway. Simple honesty requires that we recognize God in the tenth, for until we have done that we are not even honest, we are robbing God. We must be honest to begin with, so we will put God first. Now then, here we are with reduced resources—what shall we do? We will take God at His Word; and we will dare to believe that no one did ever suffer in the long run, no one was ever defeated by obeying the Word of God. We will obey the Word of God no matter what comes, and we will trust to Him to look after the nine-tenths." Do you not see how that kind of thing brings us to our knees? Do you not see how that requires that we trust God to work a real miracle?

"Well", you say, "I do not see how I can do it. You know, I have a big doctor's bill." Perhaps if you had recognized God you would not have it,—I do not know. But in some way or other that I cannot explain, He rebukes the devourer. If I could explain it, we should be able to walk by sight. But we are to walk by faith; and we are thus to recognize God by faith. For of this I am sure: he who robs God of His tithe must bear the responsibility of meeting his need with his ten-tenths; but he who honours God with the tithe transfers to God the responsibility for making ends meet with nine-tenths.

And you see, also, dear friends, how that principle, if literally and faithfully applied, will enter into our pleasures, into our daily life, the food we eat, the clothing we wear; sometimes of course it will humble our pride. We spend a lot of money unnecessarily—we all do. It is surprising what we could get along with if we had to—there is not one woman in a hundred needs the hat she buys: last season's hat was not worn out; it just got out of fashion! And as for motor cars: people spend a lot of money in that direction too that perhaps might be given to the Lord; that is a matter that we have to deal with ourselves. But I say this, that when thus we recognize God we sometimes have to be willing to forego certain pleasures. But what if the Lord should say, "Then I will stay home with you"! I have not taken a vacation for I think seven years, and while I get a little bit tired, somehow or another I do feel that I am a great deal healthier than when I used to take a couple of months' holidays each summer. I have a conviction that if we take the path of duty we shall never take it alone, the Lord will go with us; and He will make possible to us that which without His presence would be impossible.

Our God is not an absentee God, remote from us, dwelling in the heavens; He is not a mere historical Person of Whose doings I read in the Bible: I can bring Him into my family, into my home, into my business; I can say to those about me, "Let me tell you what a wonderful experience I had to-day: when the ten-tenths would not do, God, in some way that I cannot explain, stretched the nine-tenths until it was bigger than the ten-tenths; He did the thing He promised He would do; and I closed the day with a great song of praise in my heart that God had seen my difficulty and had done the thing that I could not do". Thus every thought becomes an act of worship when God is

recognized in all the walks of life. Therefore our choice is between ten-tenths minus God, and nine-tenths plus the Almighty.

III.

Now then, very simply: thus to recognize God in the payment of the tithe is TO FURTHER THE WORK OF GOD IN THE WORLD: "Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in my house." Bring ye all the tithes—where? Into the storehouse. The tithe was dedicated to the maintenance of divine worship. Oh, no; it is not what you give to the poor, that is not the tithe; it is not what you spend on the needy relative, that is not the tithe—the tithe must be brought into the storehouse. It was brought into the temple; it was the proportion of a man's income that was dedicated to the maintenance of divine worship, to the recognition of God as God.

Do you think we need that to-day? Money spent on the churches, in the estimation of some people, is money wasted. I referred to an article I read last night, in my class this morning, entitled, "My Religion", where an ex-minister found his religion outside of the church altogether, turning his back upon the church and devoting himself to the uplift of society, with no need of God at all. And yet there is nothing this world needs so much as God; that is where we need to lay the emphasis to-day, upon man's obligation to God: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment." And the first and great commandment is still the first. When thus we give our money to the work of the Lord, we recognize God in that sense, "that there may be meat in my (his) house"; we further the work of the Lord; we give of our money to the propagation of the gospel, that we may bear witness to God to the uttermost parts of the earth.

One dear sister, who has set us all an example, came with her tenth, and with the arrears of the tenth back to the time she was converted; and then after a couple of years she came to me again and said, "I have found out I was all wrong, I found out that I owe the Lord a great deal more money than I thought." I said to her, "How did you find that out?" "Well," she said, "I have a needy cousin whom I have been helping to support for a long time, and I thought that I was justified in devoting a part of my tenth to that purpose. But", she said, "I have come to see that I am to bring all the tithes—not part of it—all the tithes into the storehouse, that there might be meat in His house—not someone else's house—but that there might be meat in His house, it is for His work. So", she continued, "I have got some more to make up."

IV.

So, my friends, we are to trust God in this matter. What follows? You are so familiar with the passage that I need not stay to expound it to you. It is really A CHALLENGE TO PUT GOD TO THE PROOF, as though He said, "Now, I have given you something in My Word. You read it, and you say that you believe it; but I ask you to take that Word out of the realm of the theoretical into the realm of the practical, reduce it to practice and put Me to the proof—you never saw Me, you never heard Me with the outer ear; but you have My Book, you have My Word: I challenge you to obey that Word, and let Me prove to you that it is true,—prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts." Do you know what it is to put God to the proof? Just try it. "Oh, but", you say, "I have"—yes; I know all about your "buts" and "ifs". Never mind your "buts" and "ifs"—*shall we prove God?* Shall we take His Word at its face value and actually reduce it to practice, and then awaiting His blessing say, "Now, Lord, open the windows, let the blessing come. So far as I am concerned, I am not stopping it. Here is my tithe; Thou art my witness that I have brought it all, I lay it on Thine altar; and I for one, in faith, expect the windows of heaven to be opened—and if it does not come it is not my fault. I am proving God up to the hilt." Will you do it?

When will the revival come? The revival will come when we make Jesus Christ Lord, that is when it will come. I was speaking to the brethren in the prayer meeting last night about desiring to speak of some other thing than the message which God would have us speak. I had no idea I was going to speak in this way this morning; I was going to speak on the subject announced—"When Will The Great Revival Come?"—but in another way and

from another text; but very clearly, it seemed to me, the Lord laid this upon my mind, saying, "You do not need to speak to Jarvis Street people about the theatre, about the dance, and the card-table—you have spoken about those matters before, they have made their surrender in these respects—you go and speak to them about that deeper thing, that thing that lays hold of the entire life; and challenge them in My name to make a complete and absolute surrender to God, and to make Him Lord. Go and tell them that I will bless them if they do that." Can we do that? What is our faith? What is the measure of it? If God is faithful, He will keep His word.

How many of you believe that the Old Testament is worn out? When I was speaking in the class this morning about the fact that the Old Testament is still in force, and that it relates to the coming of the Lord, some of you almost said, "Amen" and "Hallelujah". Will you say "Amen" and "Hallelujah" to this text? Come on, will you? ("Amen!" "Hallelujah!")—not to some other text, but will you say "Amen" to this text? Some of you said it, but some of you do not speak out loud ("I have proved it"). There is a lady who says, "I have proved it." I used to preach sermons, but I have got over that: I just try now to get at your heart and conscience, because I want to make you so uncomfortable, that if you do not surrender this morning, you will have the most miserable week you ever had in your life. I really mean that!

Shall we put God's faithfulness to the proof? Shall we put His power to the proof? "Oh", you say, "I do not doubt that God will keep His Word; I do not doubt His faithfulness"—that is all right, but do you doubt His power? "Well, you know," one may say, "that will mean much to me; that will touch my savings account in the bank, to surrender in this matter will not only mean my interest, it will mean my principal." "Well, if you have any principal, go home and thank God; for there are many people that have no principal. It may take you a week to settle that. All I can say is that it will be a week well spent, if that is so. "But", you say, "I should be so much poorer!" Then you do not believe God! He does not want your money; He does not need your money. I wonder what you would do if, meeting a man like John D. Rockefeller, you were to attempt to make him a present of any kind? What sort of a present would you buy for him—a really worth-while present? Supposing he were a friend of yours, how much would you pay for it? I think you would say, "I cannot give a present to a man like that; if I could spend millions it would be nothing to him." Let us be delivered from the idea that we are giving God anything: we are not giving Him anything, for this is what He says, "If I were hungry, I would not tell thee: for the world is mine, and the fulness thereof." He would not ask you for anything.

What can we give to God? My friends, you cannot give Him anything; the whole earth is His, and you can only render back to Him that which is His, and recognize Him and His proprietorship. And I am here to tell you, in His name, that you are as poor as Job himself; no matter how you may be rated in Bradstreet's, you do not own a dollar, you do not own a foot of land, you are not the proprietor of enough land to bury yourself in, you have not a thing, you are just a steward of a little bit of God's property—and it is required of a steward that he be found faithful.

If we put Him to the proof, we will trust His faithfulness, and His power; and I am sure we shall be partakers of His abounding grace: "I will open the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it." Your cup will run over, there will be an overflowing benediction if you will put Him first.

I wonder if we can do that this morning? There are some of you here, perhaps, who have never yet received Jesus as Saviour. What has He done for you, you boys and girls? You young people, are any of you rather set upon the pleasures, upon the enjoyment of life? I remind you that "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son"—He kept nothing back, all that He had He gave for you. I went into a home one day some years ago where there was considerable wealth. They had had one son, and he had been suddenly taken from them. As I sat down beside that stricken mother and tried to comfort her, I did not know what to say until she helped me. She was very rebellious, and she said that there were plenty of women around

who had many children. I tried to tell her that perhaps the Lord wanted her boy—his name was Louis, a little chap of about ten years, the pride of their life, the only child they had. They had made great plans for him, as parents do; and now she was left desolate—and I said, "Perhaps the Lord wanted Louis". And she said, "Why did He not take some other woman's child?" And then she began to tell in her distraction of certain other women who had many children, and she said, "I had only one! Why did He rob me of the only one I had?" Then I quoted John three and sixteen as I had never quoted it before. I said, "Mrs. So-and-So, listen to what God says: 'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life'—He had only one Son, and He gave all that He had for you. Can you not trust Him?" And she said, "I never thought of that." Well, He knows what bereavement is; He knows what it is to have Heaven itself darkened by the absence of His Well-Beloved; while all the myriad angels wondered when Jesus bowed His head, and gave up the ghost—He gave His only begotten Son!

Talk about the tenth? Someone may say, "But that is not the New Testament way." No, that is but the minimum in the Old Testament—what is the New? The New is that all the tent-tenths belong to God, and all you have, and are, belong to God: "Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price." And, young people, you are robbing God when you keep yourself back from Him. Jesus died to wash your sins away; and He lives, not to take away your pleasures, but to make you happy in the Lord. I wish that some this morning who have never given themselves to Christ would yield to Him today; and that God's people—all of them—who have faced this issue will this morning say, "Lord, the battle has been fought, and the victory has been won; it has been won by Jesus Christ. Here I am—He shall be Lord henceforth."

(Several came forward seeking Christ, and to the invitation publicly to declare their decision faithfully to give God His tenth, about three hundred came forward or crowded into the aisles, or, when the aisles were full, raised their hands).

FINE BAPTIST BIBLE UNION MEETING AT WINGHAM, ONTARIO.

The first of a series of meetings under the auspices of the Baptist Bible Union was held in Wingham, Friday, June 25th. This particular meeting was arranged by the Walkerton Association Branch of the Baptist Bible Union, of which Rev. J. F. Holliday, of Kincardine, is President; and Rev. W. E. Smalley, of Tiverton, Secretary-Treasurer. The Walkerton Association is almost unanimous for the Baptist Bible Union, apparently. Nearly all the churches of the Association were represented; the meeting was held in the town hall.

A company of twenty-five went from Toronto in one of the magnificent T.T.C. buses, being joined at Guelph by the Rev. C. J. Loney, President of the Ontario and Quebec Branch of the Baptist Bible Union, with one of the members of Stanley Avenue Baptist Church. This made a company of twenty-seven from Guelph to Wingham.

Mr. Holliday presided; and the meeting, which lasted over three hours, was occupied with the discussion of the McMaster controversy. Students A. J. Fieldus, W. S. Whitcombe, and W. Gordon Brown, in the order named, gave evidence as to the teaching of Professor Marshall—the last two having been students in his classes since the beginning of his work in McMaster last October.

Following this convincing testimony, Rev. C. J. Loney delivered a most able and inspiring address. (Incidentally, the Editor of *The Gospel Witness*, desires to express his personal opinion that it is doubtful that if, in all the Dominion of Canada, a man more suited for the Presidency of the Ontario and Quebec Branch of the Baptist Bible Union could have been found than the Rev. C. J. Loney.) He gripped his audience from the beginning, and held them until the close. He reviewed the history of the controversy in Ontario and Quebec, showing that it went back to the days of Dr. Elmore Harris; and then pointed to the necessity for the Union covering the entire Convention, with sectional Unions in every part of the Convention, in order that we may

present a united front to the present modernistic influences which threaten our Baptist life.

Mr. Loney was followed by Pastor James McGinlay, of Ailton, who, as usual, set his audience on fire. He was followed by the Editor of *The Gospel Witness*, who endeavoured to sum up the evidence submitted, then appealed to the people for a verdict. We hope to see a very strong branch of the Baptist Bible Union built up in the Walkerton Association; and we have no doubt that this Association will give a good account of itself at next Convention.

The most encouraging feature about the Wingham meeting was its representative character: seven carloads had come from Kincardine, and fine delegations from many of the other churches.

ANOTHER GREAT MEETING IN OWEN SOUND.

Another Baptist Bible Union meeting was held in the Savoy Theatre, Owen Sound, Tuesday, June 29th. This also was of a very representative character. People were there from places from forty to fifty miles away. The theatre was practically filled downstairs, nearly four hundred people being present by actual count.

When the meeting had been called to order, the Chair was taken by the Rev. C. J. Loney, of Hamilton. Mr. W. Gordon Brown, of Orangeville, again presented his evidence; and Rev. W. E. Atkinson, Secretary of the Baptist Bible Union of Ontario and Quebec, made a magnificent speech for the Baptist Bible Union (Here also the Editor of *The Witness* would like to express an opinion about Mr. Atkinson. In the first place, he is a magnificent platform man: he has a splendid voice and presence, knows how to marshal his facts, and how to present them in a convincing fashion. He has taken hold of the work in the Secretaryship of the Ontario and Quebec Union with a zeal and ability that are extraordinary. The selection of these two brethren, Mr. Loney for the Presidency and Mr. Atkinson for the Secretaryship of the Baptist Bible Union, strikes us as being a signal evidence of the divine favour which is resting upon this Movement. These men seem to have been born for the task that has been laid upon them, and which they have so cheerfully accepted. Under their leadership, the Ontario and Quebec Baptist Bible Union will rapidly become an organization to be reckoned with.)

Following Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Loney spoke with the same strength and conviction which characterized his splendid address at Wingham.

The Editor of this paper concluded the meeting with an address on, "The Lordship of Christ", showing that even in the matter of Old Testament criticism, Christ is the supreme Authority; and that Professor Marshall's attitude toward the Bible implicitly denies the infallibility of Christ.

Altogether, the Owen Sound meeting was a great meeting. Invitations were received to hold meetings in other places, and so far as time and strength will permit, these invitations will be accepted. We are certain the Owen Sound meeting did great good.

There must be something radically wrong with our Baptist churches. We learned at our meeting in Owen Sound that although the membership of that church is over two hundred and fifty, the meeting at which the present pastor was called to the pastorate, was attended by only twenty-seven persons. Surely we need a revival!

PREPARATIONS FOR A GREAT MEETING IN HAMILTON.

A great Baptist Bible Union meeting is to be held in Hamilton, Thursday evening, July 8th, in the Gospel Tabernacle. An organization has already been effected, and it is expected that hundreds will be added to the membership of this Niagara-Hamilton Branch of the Baptist Bible Union at this meeting. Great preparations are being made for next Thursday's meeting, and expectation is running high. Brief addresses will be given at this meeting, it is expected, by Revs. W. E. Atkinson and C. J. Loney, Students W. S. Whitcombe and W. Gordon Brown; and the Editor of this paper will speak on the subject, "McMaster's Present Course an Implicit Rejection of the Authority of Christ".

A full report of this meeting will be given two weeks hence. Already arrangements have been partially completed for meetings in other places, announcement of which will be made from time to time.

Editorial.

EDITOR THROGMORTON ON THE BAPTIST BIBLE UNION.

Prejudice has a terribly blinding effect upon the mind affected by it. Nathanael did not believe any good thing could come out of Nazareth, nor could he ever have been convinced by argument, had he lacked the fairness to accept the invitation to "Come and see". The advocates of weak causes, and of causes which are worse than weak and cannot bear the light, in their attacks upon their opponents, invariably resort to the practice of calling names, thereby creating a prejudice against their critics.

When the Baptist Bible Union was an infant "not a span long," and therefore having done neither good nor evil, the modernists, the ecclesiastics, the middle-of-the-rovers, the pacifists, and others, began calling names. They did not argue; they endeavoured to prejudice people against the Baptist Bible Union by representing the organization as "a divisive movement", as being led by "extremists" and "trouble-makers" and "place-seekers."

Notwithstanding all this, the Baptist Bible Union, being well born, and obviously having come into being by divine ordering of events, has grown so rapidly that it has long since attained such strength as to be, by modernists, the most feared as well as the most hated organization in existence. But with some people its name is still a name of reproach.

The Editor of The Illinois Baptist.

Dr. W. P. Throgmorton, Editor of *The Illinois Baptist*, in his issue of June 19, quotes at length from *The Religious Herald* an article dealing with the full resolution passed by the Southern Baptist Convention, and which called for individual subscription to the anti-evolution resolution passed at the opening session of the Convention.

The quotation from *The Religious Herald* is, in part, as follows:

Some of the Southern Baptist papers are intimating that the Rev. Mr. Tull was in consultation with representatives of the so-called Baptist Bible Union and got their endorsement of his resolution before he presented it to the body. We do not know whether this is true or not, but it seems to us that Mr. Tull owes it to his brethren, in view of the persistent intimations to this effect, to give a frank and full statement concerning it.

On this matter, Editor Throgmorton makes the following remarks:

Remarks.

Well, suppose Brother Tull was in consultation with Baptist Bible Union representatives, and suppose he and these Bible Union representatives agreed on what was thought to be right. Brother Tull may be a member of the Baptist Bible Union himself. We do not know. If he is he is entirely within his rights. We know many loyal Southern Baptists who do belong to the Baptist Bible Union, and in our judgment they are better and stronger all round Baptists than is the Editor of *The Religious Herald*. Let us be understood. We do not regard the Baptist Bible Union as superior to the Southern Baptist Convention. Too many of its leaders are like some think *The Religious Herald*—a little too loose. Too many of them are alien immersionists. Too many of them are too ready to fall in with Inter-denominational movements. But considering where they are and what they have had to meet, we cannot wonder so much. So we believe in treating them right and in giving them good fellowship and the glad hand as far as possible. It is strange to read occasionally where some brother not as sound all the way through as he might be, wants to read the Baptist Bible Union people out of the denomination.

We appreciate these sensible words from Dr. Throgmorton. It is reported that a certain Southern educator said he would vote against the Ten Commandments if they were proposed by the Baptist Bible Union. A defender of Modernism at the Toronto Association publicly stated that argument on certain subjects was a waste of time because many—we believe he spoke for his side

of the house—had come to the meeting with their minds already made up. And this sort of thing comes from men who boast that they are open-minded to the truth, from whatever source it may come. Alas! alas! many of them are intellectually stone-blind with the cataract of prejudice.

When the Germans made their terrific drive upon the Allied lines in March, 1918, and the British line gave way, a Brigadier got together cooks and fatigue parties—the bob-tail of the army—and stopped the gap and saved the day. Let anyone read the Old Testament or the New without prejudice and he will see that God has frequently, indeed generally, turned the tide by raising up a man or men who will dare to defy officialdom both in the political and religious realms, and go up to the help of the Lord against the mighty. What matters it who rings the fire alarm if there be a real fire, or whose handkerchief is used to tie up the limb of one who is bleeding to death?

But when this is said, in acknowledgment of his truly brotherly and Baptist words, we venture to ask Dr. Throgmorton to whom he refers when he mentions Baptist Bible Union "leaders"? We suppose we are included in that word. Therefore we are constrained to make a confession of faith, and we believe *The Illinois Baptist* will be in agreement with us.

First, we hold the great essentials of evangelical faith. Of principles held distinctly by Baptists, we believe in an immersed membership, and we abhor the principle of open-membership as inevitably working the destruction of Baptist churches as such. Moreover, we are a convinced and confirmed restricted Communionist. We believe open Communion is almost as pernicious in its practical effect as open membership—that, indeed, it almost invariably leads to open membership. As to "alien immersion", it has never been an issue in our part of the world, because immersion is so little practised by other bodies. But we are sure that were we face to face with Campbellism as in the South, we should take precisely the position which Southern Baptists take.

We do not know in what respects any of the Baptist Bible Union leaders are "loose." So far as we know them, theologically and ecclesiologically, they are all in the truest sense "strict" Baptists."

Inter-Denominationalism.

As to "inter-denominational movements," we share Dr. Throgmorton's fear of such. The only inter-denominational organization with which we have any connection is the World's Christian Fundamentals Association. The perils of the hour have called true believers of every name into that organization to stand together for the common faith against the common foe. Generally, and for years, we have refused to participate in inter-denominational movements, especially in so-called "union" evangelistic campaigns. The Baptist goes into such campaigns, with a tacit agreement that he will withhold a part of his testimony, otherwise he is unwelcome. Baptists have nothing to gain and everything to lose by such partnerships—they do not spell co-operation, but, from the standpoint of Baptist interests—by which we mean the interests of New Testament truth,—they always spell compromise.

But the World's Christian Fundamentals Association is another matter. This is rather like the coming together of the nations in the World War. They each retained their identity even to language and uniform, but joined forces against the enemy of the world's liberties. This writer is essentially British and is proud of the fact. But during the Great War he found he had a thousand-fold more in common with other nationals who, under other flags than his, were loyal to the cause of Freedom based on Righteousness,—and that even unto death, than with a traitor like Sir Roger Casement, who betrayed our cause to the enemy; for the fact that Casement was a British citizen only intensified his infamy.

Thus in the Army known as the Fundamentals Association, we find the choicest fellowship, because we are with loyal subjects of the King. Some of them have not been baptized. We are sorry. We wish they would journey to Jordan and be buried beneath its waters. But though they may not see this duty, we have more in common with these lovers of the Lord and His Word, than with such arch-traitors to the Lord and the cause of evangelical Christianity as Drs. Fosdick and Faunce and Shailer Mathews, and others of their school. We have more fellowship with unimmersed Christians than with im-

mersed pagans. We cannot conceive of any World's Fundamentals Association Convention, squarely facing, recognizing, and acknowledging, a plain scriptural requirement, and then deliberately voting to disregard it, as was done by the Northern Baptist Convention in Washington.

Dr. W. B. Riley is the President of the organization we have referred to, and he is a Baptist through and through. Though he does associate and work with men of other denominations, the world holds no more loyal and courageous Baptist than Dr. W. B. Riley. And we believe with this sentiment *The Illinois Baptist* will agree; for the editor recognizes and acknowledges the special exigencies and urgency of the present situation when he says: "But considering where they are and what they have to meet, we cannot wonder so much. So we believe in treating them right and in giving them good fellowship and the glad hand as far as possible."

But the Baptist Bible Union as an organization has absolutely no inter-denominational affiliations. Recently, Bro. Boyce Taylor, of Murray, Ky.—for whom and his work we always thank God—recently said in his paper that he did not belong to the Baptist Bible Union because it was an inter-denominational organization. This was a mistake. The Baptist Bible Union is Baptist and Baptist only. If his fear of inter-denominationalism is Bro. Taylor's only reason for not belonging to the Baptist Bible Union we shall expect him to join forthwith. Meanwhile, thanks, Brother Throgmorton for you kindly words which have suggested this editorial—and may we say, respecting the Baptist Bible Union—presidential confession of faith.

THE HOME MISSION BOARD'S RESOLUTION.

There has been a great deal of discussion about the resolution passed at the semi-annual meeting of the Home Mission Board in April, expressing the Board's desire that the pastors of Home Mission churches should refrain from all discussion of the controversy now before the Convention. It has been insisted by some that the resolution was designed, or was intended, only as a very mild word of advice. Of course, the obvious answer to all these attempts to defend the resolution is the enquiry, Why was the resolution passed at all if it was not expected that the Home Mission pastors would be directed thereby?

We believe the members of our churches ought to be apprised of the "spirit" that lay behind the resolution in question. We hear a great deal about the "spirit" of those who oppose McMaster University—it is assumed that no one having any other than the spirit of the evil one could possibly conceive of anything objectionable issuing from that source of Baptist infallibility! Some years ago we had part—and we may, without immodesty, say, a fairly influential part—in a moral reform movement in Toronto, when our action brought us into conflict with the very agents of the pit itself in this city; but in that whole warfare our opponents behaved as gentlemen in comparison with the conduct of the defenders of McMaster University. Three times the Editor of this paper has been accused by the Pastor of Walmer Road Baptist Church of having committed the unpardonable sin. To say the least, is it showing a very charitable "spirit" for a minister of the gospel publicly to declare that a fellow-pastor has passed beyond the limits of divine mercy, thus consigning him to perdition? The Chancellor, the Dean in Theology, and others, have accused *The Gospel Witness* of having made false statements; but in every single instance they have failed utterly to produce the proof. Furthermore, we have challenged them to an open debate on this subject in Massey Hall or elsewhere; to select their strongest men, and produce all their evidence—in one debate, or in a series of debates—and if they can, thus publicly to prove their case and disprove the statements of *The Gospel Witness*. We did not expect them to accept our challenge, for they know perfectly well that before the bar of public opinion they would be so overwhelmingly defeated and so utterly humiliated as to be without prospect of any recovery. They are afraid of the light, and will not come into the light, lest their deeds should be reprov'd.

We now give a sample of the "spirit" behind the Home Mission Board's resolution. It is well known that the resolution written by Mr. Duncan, Secretary of Education, and adopted by the Home Mission Board, was a substitute for a resolution proposed by the Rev. Hugh McDiarmid, which was described to us as being "positively vicious." Mr. McDiarmid's resolution was discussed for a long time, but was neither moved nor seconded, and therefore was not

incorporated in the minutes and no copy of that resolution is available. We hereby dare Mr. McDiarmid to give publicity to that resolution. We should be glad to publish it in *The Gospel Witness*; if he will not accept our offer, we challenge him to publish it in *The Canadian Baptist*. Let the Denomination know what was in his heart as expressed in this resolution. Meanwhile, and to assist him toward this end, we publish below an extract from the minutes of the Home Mission Board. This copy has been furnished to us by a member of the Home Mission Board. We ask our readers to weigh this letter from Rev. Hugh McDiarmid, and we have no doubt they will "understand the spirit" of his communication. Here follows Mr. McDiarmid's letter:

LETTER FROM REV. HUGH McDIARMID TO SUPERINTENDENT SCHUTT.

Mr. Webb, the chairman, introduced the question saying that he had received letters from three members of the Board—Mr. McDiarmid, Mr. Burrell, and Mr. Green—in reference to the appointment of students who had protested against the engagement of Professor Marshall by McMaster University. Mr. McDiarmid had also written the Superintendent whose letter was laid before the Board and is as follows:

"Knowing that both Mr. Ryrie and yourself were absent I took the liberty of writing the First Vice-President, yesterday, to protest against the appointment to summer fields of the twenty-three McMaster students who have so publicly gone on record as opposed to the retention of Prof. Marshall.

"In my judgment, their ill-advised action reveals them to be quite unworthy the confidence or support of our Board and their appointment to any field at the present time would, I fear, cause us to lose the confidence of many of our best churches, and quite probably, the continued contributions of some of our best givers. I have arrived at this conclusion, only after prayerful and prolonged consideration, thinking only in the interest of our Board in its relation to the Convention.

"I have taken the liberty to suggest to Mr. Webb that, in view of the present crisis the Examining and Stationing Committee could well afford to share the responsibility of the appointment of these particular students with the Executive, or even better, with the whole Board. In fact, I even went so far, not in a spirit of presumption but in a spirit of deep concern, as to register a pronounced personal protest against their appointment unless they were first examined or their case fully considered by the whole Board, or, at least, by the Executive. I am profoundly convinced that the case is so serious that all proceedings relative to their final appointment should be stayed, or withdrawn if already accomplished, until after our general Board meeting.

"I am sure you will understand and appreciate the spirit prompting this protest and bear with me in this expression of personal conviction relative to a matter which comes under the control of a committee on which I have not the honor to serve. In so doing I have no wish to reflect upon the integrity or ability of that committee; I have only admiration for the efficiency with which they have done their work in the past. In the present crisis, however, it has seemed to me that the responsibility should be shared by the whole Board inasmuch as the reputation of the Board and the confidence, in which it is held by the Convention, is at stake."

Mr. McDiarmid actually proposes that the students who protested against Professor Marshall's teaching should be refused any appointment under the Home Mission Board. Of course, if the "spirit" of Mr. McDiarmid's letter could prevail, and if its principles could find any general application to our denominational life, it would mean the expulsion from the Denomination of such orthodoxy as had the courage to express itself. We think Mr. McDiarmid's letter is not merely contemptible: it is beneath the contempt of honorable men; it breathes a "spirit" of which the most rabid political partisans

would be ashamed. But Mr. McDiarmid's letter is a revelation of the "spirit" that lay behind the Home Mission Board's resolution. If that spirit would forbid the appointment to any field under the Home Mission Board of the protesting students, it would also, if it had the power, dismiss such as were already appointed.

As a further revelation of the "spirit" of the members of the Home Mission Board supporting this resolution, we quote from the speech of Rev. H. B. Coumans delivered at the Toronto Association. Mr. Coumans said:

"I do say we have the right to say to the students who are going out that there are certain limits to the opinions they can express; I say we have a right to advise with them concerning the message they have to carry. Mr. Urquhart has told you of a resolution that was brought up with a view to restricting controversy on certain matters. If I had been there and a resolution had been offered to this effect, that these men who are talking, who are seeking to destroy confidence in the action that was taken by the Convention, should be denied fields and denied support, I would have been inclined to support something stronger even than that."

Mr. Coumans' idea, apparently, is that the Convention has legislative authority, and that when the Convention has spoken, no one may dare to call his soul his own; he must not question the decisions of the Convention—if he does, he "should be denied fields and denied support." And then Mr. Coumans adds, "I would have been inclined to support something stronger even than that." The persecuting "spirit" which, for so long, found no place among Baptists, now flaunts itself unashamed. These are the principles that are being hatched in the McMaster incubator.

But our objection to the resolution of the Home Mission Board is on this ground: the churches of the Denomination entrust certain funds to the Home Mission Board for convenience of disbursement and administration—that is to say, independent Baptist churches who are strong enough to do so, supply funds for the nurture of other independent churches which are not quite strong enough to support themselves; but it was never intended, for example, that Jarvis Street's contribution to Home Missions should be put into the hands of men like Mr. McDiarmid or Mr. Duncan, and used as a club to beat faithful missionaries—over the heads of their wives and children—into acquiescence with McMaster's modernistic programme. While the Home Mission Board allows that resolution to stand on its books, it must be held responsible for aiding and abetting McMaster University in its present course. The conduct of Mr. McDiarmid of Stratford, and Rev. J. R. Webb of Kitchener, from the viewpoint of any free Baptist who stands for the time-honoured principle of liberty of conscience, is absolutely indefensible, and therefore intolerable. In this respect, these gentlemen are, in no true sense, Baptists. The resolution under discussion is a disgrace to our Home Mission Board, and cannot fail to impair the confidence of the Convention in the Board.

So far as the Editor of this paper is concerned, long ago he took our Home Mission work to heart, and has ever been an enthusiastic supporter. We believe it is fundamental to all Baptist progress in this country: if children are allowed to die for want of nourishment, by and by there will be no adults; if the weak churches are not supported, there will be no strong churches. Jarvis Street has not withdrawn its support from the Home Mission Board. We strongly advise all other churches to continue their support of the Home Mission Board up to Convention time; but we frankly say that if the Home Mission Board meets the Convention with this iniquitous resolution to which we have referred still upon its books, we shall thereafter urge Jarvis Street Church to refuse to contribute another dollar to Home Missions until such time as this resolution is rescinded—and *The Gospel Witness* will do its utmost to persuade other churches to take the same course. In the event of our being forced to such action, it will not mean that we shall cease doing Home Mission work; but we shall do it independently—for it would be difficult to imagine a church less competent to administer its own funds in the interests of Baptist Home Mission work than the present members of the Home Mission Board have by this resolution proved themselves to be. We do not suggest that such men as Mr. McDiarmid and Mr. Duncan are modernists; but merely that they are the puppets of McMaster University:

THE STRANGE TALE OF THE NORTHERN ASSOCIATION.

We have received a very interesting account of the Northern Association, which met with the Timmins Church, of which Rev. Morley Hall is pastor. The Moderator of the Association was Rev. George Simmons.

During the course of the Association Rev. Morley Hall introduced a resolution bearing upon the action of the Home Mission Board in passing a resolution which could only have the effect of muzzling the Home Mission pastors. Mr. Hall's resolution, we understand, respectfully requested that the resolution of the Home Mission Board referred to should be rescinded. After a thorough discussion of the subject, Mr. Hall's resolution carried by a vote of thirteen to eleven; whereupon the Moderator expressed deep concern that such a resolution should have been carried, as he had hoped there would be no division. Subsequent events show that the Moderator would have offered no objection if such a resolution had been defeated by a vote of thirteen to eleven! Of course, there would have been a sharp division of opinion in such a case, but apparently it would not have been called a "division." It was a very strange method of presiding, after a vote had been taken, for the Moderator of the body virtually to censure the body for passing the resolution, and to reopen the question by discussion from the chair after the question had been settled by vote.

Rev. C. R. Duncan, Secretary of Education, was present, and was on his feet much of the time. Mr. Duncan acknowledged responsibility for writing the Home Mission Board resolution under criticism, and therefore claimed that he alone was competent to interpret its intention; and insisted that it was not intended to restrict the liberty of the missionaries. In the name of common sense, we venture to ask, Why was it passed at all if the missionaries of the Board were expected to pay no attention to it? Furthermore, when such a resolution has been adopted, people cannot be expected to read into its terms an intention which its words do not express. When a law is put upon the statute book, it is no part of the court's duty to interpret that law in the light of what somebody supposes was in the mind of the original proponent of the measure: the court must interpret the actual words in which the law is expressed.

Elsewhere in this issue we publish an article on this subject which throws a great deal of light upon the motive behind this much-discussed Home Mission Board resolution. But we here raise a question as to whether the secretaries of our various Boards visit Associations to present the work of their respective Boards, or have they at each Association the full right of delegates to discuss every subject that comes before the body?

After the Moderator had expressed his profound regret at the action of the Association in passing Mr. Hall's resolution, a gentleman from the South, who had not voted, suggested that the resolution be rescinded, and that a committee be appointed to try to reach some common ground upon which all could agree. This brother reminded the Association that a motion to rescind the resolution could be proposed only by one who had voted for it. In view of the Moderator's great distress, an amiably-disposed brother moved that the motion be rescinded. For some time there was no seconder—until Secretary Duncan had had a whispered conversation with the wife of the brother who moved the rescinding of the resolution, whereupon she timidly seconded it. This, of course, transferred two votes from the thirteen to the eleven, and the resolution was rescinded.

A Committee of four—two from each side—was then appointed, and a suggestion was made that the Moderator might meet with the Committee. Mr. Hall objected that this would be unfair, inasmuch as the Committee would be loaded and would be given a majority of three to two. The Moderator explained that he was not on the Committee, and that the Committee consisted of four only. The Committee was appointed—but the Moderator did meet with the Committee as though a member. The Committee was so long occupied with their discussion that the Association was, for some time, without a Moderator; and the brother from the South was asked to make a few remarks in order to occupy the time.

The time of adjournment was reached and the friends gathered for tea. While the people were at tea, the Moderator told them that he regretted that the Committee had been unable to reach an agreement. Thereupon Mr. Hall

moved that the resolution as carried in the morning should stand. An amendment to this was moved which undertook to interpret the resolution of the Home Mission Board, and commended the Board for passing it. Secretary Duncan spoke twice on this occasion also in support of the amendment.

During the discussion of this amendment and of the original resolution, both Mr. Nichols of First Church, Sault Ste. Marie, and Mr. Munroe of Sudbury, took their stand in support of the muzzling resolution. The amendment was voted upon at the tea table while the delegates from the Timmins church were absent. The amendment carried. Another resolution was proposed by Mr. Hall expressing disapproval of the appointment and retention of Professor Marshall, and it was decided to resume the discussion of business at the close of the evening service. Somewhere about half-past ten the discussion was continued until well on toward midnight. The delegates from the Timmins church were miners and had to leave for the night shift before the vote was taken, and on this account only was the resolution defeated by two or three votes.

There are several points of interest in connection with this Northern Association worthy of note. One is the way a Moderator can throw a meeting into confusion by forgetting his duty to preside with impartiality. That is what a Moderator is for, as his title implies. But to bring up a question after the Association had passed upon it in a regular way, to drag out the discussion of it, and ultimately to pass a resolution at the tea table, was surely a most irregular procedure!

Another interesting aspect of this matter is found in the attitude of such men as Mr. Nichols of Sault Ste. Marie and Mr. Munroe of Sudbury. Mr. Nichols is undoubtedly personally a fundamentalist; and we know where the First Church, Sault Ste. Marie, stands on the present issue before the Denomination: we should be surprised to find the First Church in agreement with the attitude of its pastor at the meeting of the Northern Association. Mr. Munroe, we are informed, is an evangelistic preacher, and has been blessed in his ministry to the salvation of souls. In this, we greatly rejoice. But Mr. Munroe takes sides with that which is destructive of all true evangelism; and which will, if continued, effect the spiritual paralysis of the Denomination. We assume, however, that Mr. Nichols and Mr. Munroe will be glad to have all the world know exactly where they stand on this issue; but we can most charitably explain the fact of their voting for that which was, in its practical bearing, an endorsement of the religious twins, Modernism and Ecclesiasticism, on the supposition that they did not understand the issue. In any event, Mr. Nichols and Mr. Munroe threw their influence on the side of Professor Marshall and his modernism, and on the side of the ecclesiasticism that sponsors and defends him.

This record of the Northern Association is a most unseemly one. The Moderator violated all rules, and complained of the lack of unity when he could not have his own way; and when, by conscienceless jockeying for position, in the absence of some of the delegates, they managed to pass a resolution which was exactly to the opposite effect of that which had been regularly passed in a parliamentary way at an earlier session, the Moderator had nothing to say about dividing the body! He no longer complained of lack of unity. He was only sorry to have it divided against him. The cause that can save itself only by such methods as those which nullified the one fair expression of opinion at Timmins is doomed to ultimate failure. We have no doubt some will complain of the severity of this article, but such disgraceful procedure as that which characterized the Northern Association, and for which the Moderator, Rev. George Simmons, was chiefly responsible, ought to be exposed.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON

THE RESURRECTION AND THE COMMISSION.

LESSON TEXT: Matthew, chapter 28.

1. THOSE WHO CAME TO SEE THE SEPULCHRE.

1. From time immemorial, women especially, but others as well, have come to see the grave of their beloved (vs. 1). It is a perfectly natural desire to look upon the sepulchre which holds the form of one beloved. 2. Thus, too, these women thought to see a grave that would be like all other graves; and

if the grave had never opened, Jesus had been as other men. What a dark picture if these women had found the sepulchre sealed! And if through all successive ages the story had been told that Jesus was buried, but never rose again! Then there had been no hope of the opening of other graves, then we should have been of all men most miserable. 3. But these women saw in the sepulchre of Jesus what mortal never saw before. This was a new thing under the sun: "Now in the place where He was crucified there was a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid. There laid they Jesus". How appropriate it was, for His grave was to be different from all other graves; and by that difference He was to make the graves of all believers different in the future. This is the message of the Gospel: God "hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel". And now when we come to see our sepulchres we look upon the grave in a new light: "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep", etc. (I Thess. 4: 13-18).

II. THE DIVINE ATTESTATION OF THE RESURRECTION.

1. There was an earthquake, and an angel descended from Heaven and rolled back the stone from the door of the sepulchre. The resurrection of Christ is everywhere represented in the New Testament as the supreme manifestation of Divine power, and here principalities and powers were spoiled, and the rulers of this world's darkness were put to rout. 2. The soldiers set to watch the sepulchre were so filled with fear at the sight of the angel that they became as dead men. Thus the truth of the resurrection has ever been, and ever will be, a terror to evil-doers. But in sharp contrast to this, the angel answered and said to the women, "Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified". The resurrection of Christ, and the promise of the resurrection of the body, is a message of joy to all believers always. 3. The resurrection is a fact to be proclaimed quickly (vss. 7 and 8). No message was ever more needed in a world where unnumbered millions lie buried, and where other millions are ripening for the grave, than the fact that now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first-fruits of them that slept. 4. The further details of the resurrection given by Mark, Luke, and John, should be studied with care. Mark, like Matthew, relates only the story of the women's visit to the sepulchre: Luke tells of Peter's visit to the grave; while John records that the sepulchre was visited by both Peter and John.

III. AFTER THE RESURRECTION.

1. Jesus met those who went to tell. It is in obeying the Divine command that we find a fuller and completer revelation of the will of God. 2. An examination of the Scriptural records will show that no single person was convinced of the fact of the resurrection of Christ until he had seen Jesus for himself. No one was persuaded by hearsay, but only as Christ appeared to him. So we believe it is still, there is a sense in which the risen Christ by His Spirit manifests Himself to every true believer; and until that personal interview has taken place, no one will ever say, "I know whom I have believed." 3. The fact of the resurrection is here denied. The enemy was quick to see that the resurrection of Christ would validate all His claims, and prove Him to be the Son of God. The importance attached to the resurrection by the enemies of Christ should teach us that it is a doctrine cardinal to the whole Christian revelation. The devil who planned the denial of the resurrection as soon as the report of it was heard, has been doing the same thing ever since. A Scripture descriptive of the course of many theological professors is this: "So they took the money, and did as they were told". 4. Christ showed Himself alive after His passion by many infallible proofs. In addition to the chapters parallel to Matthew's account in Mark, Luke, and John, the first chapter of Acts and the fifteenth chapter of I Corinthians should be carefully studied.

IV. THE GREAT COMMISSION.

Ere He returned to the Father our Lord asserted, (1) that all authority in Heaven and on earth had been given to Him; (2) He commanded His disciples, therefore, to make disciples of all the nations. That is the first business of the believer and of the Christian Church; (3) to baptize them; (4) to teach them all things whatsoever He had commanded; (5) and on this condition He promises His abiding presence to the end of the age.