

THE COMING CONVENTION	Page 9
S.S. LESSON	" 13
BIBLE UNION MEETINGS	" 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. X⁵ No. 19. TORONTO, SEPT. 16th, 1926 Whole No. 229

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

IS THE FUNDAMENTALIST-MODERNIST CONTROVERSY A PETTY QUARREL ABOUT NON-ESSENTIALS, OR IS IT A LIFE AND DEATH STRUGGLE BETWEEN ANTAGONISTIC RELIGIONS?

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis St. Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, September 5th, 1926.
(Stenographically Reported.)

- "All these are the beginning of sorrows.
- "Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you: and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake.
- "And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another.
- "And many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many.
- "And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold.
- "But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved."—Matt. 24:8-13.



Y address this evening may perhaps more accurately be termed a lecture than a sermon, for I shall not attempt an exposition of this particular text; but I shall rather discuss with you the differences between Fundamentalism and Modernism. I would have you consider whether this conflict is, as the announced subject inquires, anything more than a petty quarrel about things that do not matter, or whether it is a battle, a life-and-death battle, between religions that are antagonistic to each other.

There are many religious pacifists abroad, there are many who, while not fighting themselves, are full of criticism of those who, rightly or wrongly, are doing what they can to stem the tide of unbelief. Meanwhile the pacifists fold their arms and say, "I am with him (or with them) but I don't approve of their methods; I don't believe in contention, I don't believe in controversy." And, having said that, they will go to a political meeting and get as mad as the proverbial "hatter"—whoever he is. But some of these pacifically disposed gentlemen who say they don't believe in controversy, ought not to say that in the presence of their wives, for, in some cases, they know the contrary to be the fact. They object to controversy only on the subject of religion. I grant you that there is a contentiousness that is contemptible, and I enter no plea for, nor defence of, a quarrelsome spirit. I have heard of a church not a hundred miles from here which once had rather a sharp controversy as to where they would put the organ: some wanted it at the back of the church, and some

wanted it at the front—wherever the front may be; some wanted it at one end, and some at the other; so they compromised and put the thing up in the corner of the gallery! I have heard of people in some quarters, even in this day, who think it terribly irreligious to drive in a buggy with a top on it. I have heard of people making matters of dress subjects of contention. But our question this evening is, as to whether these matters which have precipitated throughout Christendom this great controversy, are really non-essentials, or is it a battle for the very life of Christianity? That is the question. Are there some things which we may, without loss to our faith, or injury to the cause of Christ, or without dishonour to our Lord, surrender? Or do these matters involve principles which are of the very essence of Christianity? That is the great question.

Now I call your attention—and I shall come back at the end of my address to the text I have announced—I call your attention to certain clearly-defined lines of difference between what is known as Fundamentalism, and what is known as Modernism.

I.

Between these two, in the first place, there is involved the question of AUTHORITY IN RELIGION. Where does authority reside? By what standard shall our religion be measured? In what scales shall our opinions be weighed? The question of authority is always an important one in any realm. Sometimes it intrudes itself upon the political realm, and many fierce wars have been waged to settle this question of authority politically. There was a time when men contended that the divine right to rule was vested in the king, and much blood has been shed in opposition to the doctrine of the "divine right of kings". Then again the question sometimes arises as to whether authority should rest with all the people, or with a part of the people. The American Civil War was fought to settle this question of authority, governmental authority. Primarily, the Civil War was not waged to liberate the slaves, that was a by-product, that was, of course, one of the results of it; but the cause of the war was this: that certain states of the Union claimed the right to secede from the Union. Lincoln went to war on that issue, insisting that the states had no right to secede. And that long and bloody conflict was fought to settle that question, and it was resolved at last in favour of Lincoln's view,—hence, the United States of America still.

In other realms the question of authority often brings itself to the front. I remember hearing one tell of how he had ventured upon a criticism of Sam Jones, the great Southern preacher. This particular preacher was travelling with Mr. Jones, and Mr. Jones had used an illustration one evening to which this friend objected. So when they got back to the hotel he discussed the case with the great preacher, and urged him, for many reasons, not to use that illustration again. And he said that Sam smiled, and looked at him somewhat quizzically, and said, "Well, George, if I were dead sure that you were an authority, I would not." Now that is the question, as to who is the authority.

In many other realms of human thought and activity that question arises. I have sometimes wondered who is the supreme authority in the realm of fashions—I should like to meet him or her, and I would have something to say to them sometimes. (Laughter.) I read somewhere last night about a new kind of beauty contest—this was a long-haired beauty contest. That is one contest of which I entirely approve. If anyone will get one up I will be glad to contribute one of the prizes. But by whose authority are our lives regulated? Sometimes that question is raised in the domestic sphere—and wise people will stay outside of the house until the parties to the conflict have settled it themselves.

But in religion, where does authority reside? Evangelical Christianity has insisted always that the supreme authority resides in this Book; that the Bible is the inspired and infallible Word of God; it is the touchstone to which all religious matters must be brought. It is, indeed, the very voice of God to men, and our fathers were wont to quote a "Thus saith the Lord"—and that, in former days, was believed to be an end of all argument. Over against that you have the Roman Catholic conception, not denying the divine character of the Scripture, but insisting that only the church is competent to interpret it, thus standing between the individual and the Bible, interpreting the Bible for its people, and saying to them, You have no right to private interpretation. The

Bible is God's Word; but the traditions of the fathers have equal authority, and you are to be bound by the infallible interpretation of the church. But Evangelical Christianity, I repeat, has ever held the Bible to be *the* authority, an infallible Book, the objective standard to which all matters in dispute must be brought.

But what is the modern view respecting authority in religion? Modernism utterly rejects the idea of an infallible Bible, of an authoritative Scripture—Modernism admits that there is in the Bible much that is good, but mixed with it there is much error! And it is the function of human reason to separate the precious from the vile, to take what is good and leave the rest—but, according to that view, authority does not reside in the Book: it resides in a man's religious consciousness; therefore, whatever I believe to be right, must be right to me. Logically, of course, that spells anarchy, for every man becomes a law unto himself, he recognizes no authority outside of himself. And Modernism, when it is finished—I say that at the outset—*Modernism, when it is finished, is sheer lawlessness*; it rejects all authority except the authority that resides in the individual himself, in his unaided human reason; and therefore every man becomes a law unto himself. Modernism is of the "old man", and the old man, even though he wear the gown and hood of a professor of philosophy, is always an anarchist, he "is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Modernism is a naturalistic religion; it grows out of the pride of the human mind that magnifies men and minimizes God: it holds that authority in religion is in a man's own consciousness, rather than objectively in the Book as the revelation of God Himself.

Here is what Prof. L. H. Marshall, of McMaster University, says on this subject:

"I believe the Scriptures to be inspired, but is not this great book inspired? (reference being made to Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*) is not Tennyson and the other poets inspired? Are not your sermons inspired? and could not my mother's letters be inspired?" Further in this connection Prof. Marshall said, "We do not find God in books, but in the heart. Where is the seat of authority for religion? Would you be religious if the church and the Bible were gone? Experience is independent of these two factors. What we want to get home to the people is that real authority for religion is in men's souls. The foundation of my religion is in my soul."

II.

Out of that position there grow Two CONTRARY VIEWS OF GOD AND THE WORLD. Fundamentalism conceives of the created order as having come into being by the Word of God: "He spake, and it was done"; He said, "Let there be light: and there was light"; "And God said, and it was so." That is what the Bible says, and that is what Fundamentalists accept as authoritative; hence they see in Jesus Christ what the Bible says He is—a revelation of God, God manifest in the flesh; that "all things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." He is the Creator, and He is God manifest in the flesh. Hence in the Fundamentalist view He is personal and transcendent; that is to say, He made the world, He made the starry heavens, He is the Author of all things that are, by Him the heavens were created and all the hosts of them.

The Bible teaches that though God made the world, He has not withdrawn from it. Our Lord Jesus Himself says of the flowers of the field, as I was telling some of you in class this morning, "If God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall He not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?" Jesus Christ conceived of God as the Great Gardener clothing the grass of the field, painting the lilies, giving the rose its glorious hues, filling the earth with beauty by His own will and purpose—and then, controlling it. He said of the birds, "Your heavenly Father feedeth them." He did not talk of some unknown First Cause, about the operation of some inexorable law, nor of the infallibility of animal instincts: He personalized God, and He said,—Above the earth, and above the stars, filling all space, and yet exercising His sovereign will, your heavenly Father is looking after the birds; and if you trust Him He will look after you too. That is the revelation of God in the Bible,—all this marvellous universe of ordered beauty and

utility springing into being at the command of His almighty Word, and then upheld "by the word of his power"; transcendent above it all, answering the prayer of little children, stopping, if need be, the machinery of the universe that one of His little ones may not be crushed—that is Fundamentalism.

What is Modernism? Modernism denies that we have a reliable cosmology in this Book. The record of creation in Genesis is not to be relied upon! A certain now celebrated professor said that where Science conflicts with the Bible he will accept Science before the Bible. That statement was afterwards corrected, and he said, in effect, "I did not say that: I said when the facts of science conflict with the Bible I will accept science." But what are the "facts" of science? Who knows what is a fact? That which men of science call a fact to-day the scientific mind of to-morrow will hold up to ridicule, and say it is not a fact at all. I am not an astronomer, I have not given careful study to that important science, I do not profess to be an expert in that department; but if you consult your Encyclopaedia Britannica you will find that even in such an authoritative work as that, one scholar declares that even the Copernican system is nothing more than a hypothesis, and has never yet been established to be a fact. What do you know about "facts"? But Modernism substitutes reason for revelation; and by the operation of unaided human reason the Modernist imagines—alleges, let me rather say, I do not want to class him altogether among the novelists or the writers of fiction—but the Modernist alleges that he has discovered a principle that is universally operative, by whose operation the cosmic order can be explained; and he says that by the operation of that principle in all realms the universe has come to be what it is.

I am not going to discuss Evolution. I do not think I am any more competent to discuss it than most professors who attempt it. I am not going to discuss the right or wrong of it, but I merely state the fact that that lies at the basis of modernistic philosophy: somewhere, somehow, an incalculable number of years ago, unnumbered millions, God, or some Thing, or Somebody, the Unknown, the Great First Cause, released a certain vital energy, and ever since then that energy has been resident in the cosmos—such as it is—and by endless transmutations this present universe of order has come to be. But you see, by that philosophy our evolutionary friends have effected what is held to be the purpose both of science and philosophy, to push the Great First Cause back as far as possible—and they have pushed Him so far back that it is very difficult to find Him. But the universe, in that view, is only a perfectly-ordered machine, inexorably governed by the operation of law.

Here let me pause a moment to show the inconsistency of that whole view of life. It is amazing that in the material realm these men magnify law; they say that law is inexorable and infallible, that you cannot change it; it is always grinding out its results—and it is useless to pray against it. This is a world of law and order until they get into the moral and religious realm, and then they deny that there is any law at all, they are a law unto themselves! But here is a created order, a machine that bears, perhaps, if you have glasses to look for it, the name of the Engineer Who built it, and if He is there at all, He is there as a Spirit, but His hand is not upon the throttle; there is no use to pray to Him; there is no use to ask for any variation in His movements at all. Now what does that do? It removes God, for all practical purposes, from His universe, pushes Him out of sight, there is no use to pray, no use to talk to God: the great thing is that we are IT, and we are to run the machine.

III.

Now I say that the modernistic view of God and of the world is fundamentally antagonistic to the Bible view. Further: Out of that grow TWO CONTRASTING AND OPPOSING VIEWS OF HUMAN ORIGIN AND DESTINY. Where did you come from? What does the Bible say? The Bible says that God made man in His own image and likeness; that He came from the hand of God a perfect being, bearing the stamp of God upon him; and the Bible declares that the moral evil which we now see in the world came as a result of man's transgression, the sins of the fathers being visited upon the children: "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners"; "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin"—that is the Bible view of how man originated, and how sin entered into human life. But what is the modernistic view? The modernistic view is that man began in the dim and distant past; and that he has been evolved from

some lower order of animal ancestry. In other words, the Bible says man has fallen down, is a degenerate; the modernist says that he is on the ascending scale, he is going up, he has not fallen at all. Fundamentalism accounts for moral evil on the ground of human sin: Modernism says it is the residue of our lower animal ancestry; and if you live long enough you will slough it off. Why, do you not see, dear friends, that these views of human origin are diametrically opposed, that you cannot mix them? If one is right the other is wrong, and there is no possibility of their walking together in agreement.

Another thing: Fundamentalism, which is but another name for the Gospel, says that human sin is remedial; it says that God divinely interposed, that He suspended His law, and came into human life by a virgin birth, by a miracle, and that there appeared on earth a Man Who was a man and yet Who was God beside: "The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." And so Fundamentalism says that Jesus Christ came to be the Head of a new race, which should become "partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust"; that God did stoop unto human life and lifted human life up to Himself, repeating the miracle of the virgin birth in the experience of every believer by his "being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever."

But Modernism, in the very nature of the case, denies the possibility of any such divine interposition—Modernism says God cannot get into His machine. Dr. Fosdick says—and he is only one—that the doctrine of the virgin birth "involves a biological miracle that is incredible to the modern mind"; he says that God did not come into human life in the Person of Jesus Christ by a divine miracle. Of course, Modernism denies the state of sin, or the necessity for any redemption. Very naturally, if we are on the ascending scale we only have to wait! Go down to the office to-morrow, and if the elevator is not there, stay for a while, it will come—just wait, it will come, and you can get on. You may be as old as Methuselah before you get to the top, but that does not matter—we are all waiting, and we are going up sometime! That is what Modernism says, we do not need the grace and power of God, and the redemptive purpose of God thus to redeem. My dear friends, do you see what grows out of that? There is no need of redemption according to Modernism, no need of the touch of God. What is salvation? Well, Fundamentalism says it is a birth from above, Fundamentalism says it is being gripped by the power of God, Fundamentalism says that salvation is of grace because it is of God: that it is of God, and of God only, therefore it is all of grace. ("Amen", "Praise the Lord"). Fundamentalism teaches that there is no way of getting out of the pit, and out of the miry clay, unless God stoops and lays hold upon us; and it says that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself"; "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." By His substitutionary death He restored the moral balances and made it possible for God to "be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

But Modernism has something to say about salvation. Modernism admits that we are not as good as we might be, that we ought to be better. Modernism preaches a gospel of idealism, which is a proposal that you are lifting yourself up by your shoe straps, that is all. Where do you get your ideals? Out of your own consciousness? How do you realize them? By the power of your own will. Salvation is only an acceleration by human effort of evolutionary processes, just speeding things up a little bit so that we may arrive a little more quickly!

These ideas of salvation are poles apart: Fundamentalism, based on the Bible, says salvation is of God; that He is the Alpha and Omega; and that every man is utterly lost and bankrupt until God touches him. Modernism says that he is a mighty fine fellow, and a great deal better than he thinks he is; that he has it within him to save himself; there are "celestial fires"—a bit of a wreck, of course—but if you brush away the ashes you will find the divine element there, indestructible! There is no possibility of reconciling these two: one is of grace, the other of works: "And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work." You cannot mix grace and works up in that fashion. These things are, I say, poles apart.

IV.

And then How DIFFERENT THE VIEW OF LIFE! Fundamentalism says that when the Lord has thus made a man over again, he comes not only to live with him, but to live in him. The Spirit of Christ dwells in you, and "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." But He is here, God is not an absentee God to me; I have had a talk with Him to-day. No, He is not far away, because I have touched Him, and He has touched me to-day; I have heard His voice, and I know that He has heard mine. ("Amen!") He is not an absentee God; He is here. Nor is He a vague impersonal Something, a kind of Atmosphere, an intangible spirit merely, without personality. You cannot pray to the divine immanence if that is all God is. He is immanent, but He is personal and transcendent; and He comes, as our Brother Hearn sang to us this morning, to abide, "Our Lord abides".

Modernism does not know anything about that, about the abiding presence of Jesus Christ, it cannot know anything about that—I mean Modernism when it is finished, of course. So wherever you find a Modernist who thus magnifies man and minimizes God, you must not be surprised if prayer-meetings are neglected and forsaken. I challenge you—there may be some visitors here to-night—I ask you to think of this: find me a man anywhere on this continent who preaches salvation by works, by human effort, without the blood, without the sovereign grace of God, and I will find you a man who has to lecture on Wednesday night to get anyone to come to prayer meeting. Such a ministry is destructive of prayer. What is the use of praying? Why pray? But, oh, if salvation be in God, if it is all of grace, we ought to be praying all the time. There is a wide difference between these two views.

V.

Then just a word about THE FUTURE. Fundamentalism has a glorious future. ("Hallelujah", "Amen"!) Yes, you may say that out loud if you like. It really has, because Fundamentalism says that the Lord made this earth—and He can make it over again. Hence we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, and He is going to change heaven and earth; the whole creation is going to be delivered into the glorious liberty of the children of God. And some day there will be no briars and thorns and thistles. You evolutionists, you get the thistles out of your farms, will you? Show me a garden anywhere in the world that has no blight. But some day He (Who made this world is going to remake it: "Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." It may be a dark day now, but the Architect and Builder is coming back some day, He is coming on "the literal clouds of the skies" ("Amen"); and He says, "Behold, I make all things new". And I tell you we need a great many things made new!

Of course, Modernism has no such prospect as that. Modernism says things evolve—and by their own admission they move very slowly. Your evolutionist will tell you that he has to go back to prehistoric times to find any sort of support for his theory, for man has not evolved within human knowledge. It is purely a speculation: long, long ago—millions and millions and millions of years ago. Do you know when that was? I do not. But that is when it began, and it went on—and on—and on—and on, and sometime, it either stopped altogether or else it moves so slowly, that with all the range of human history before them no scientists of earth can find one solitary thing to support their foolish philosophy—not one. But it is going to be better by and by! Of course you will have to wait millions and millions and millions of years because things move so slowly! We may help to push it on a little bit by improving the conditions of life; but such a heaven as the Modernist has, must come by an evolutionary process. Did you ever hear a modernist talk much about heaven? Think it over. I do not know what sort of a heaven he has; no one knows anything about it except what this Book says, and the modernist repudiates that.

Then let me point out to you another thing: Fundamentalism deals with the individual. Fundamentalism goes back and says, "Once upon a time there was one man, and one man sinned—and God has been dealing with one man ever since. By one man, not by the multitude, but by one man sin entered into the world." Fundamentalism says that men have to be saved one by one, personally regenerated, born again one at a time; it is a matter of individual

salvation. But Modernism merges the individual in the mass. It is not the individual, but the race, that is evolved. How old are you? "Oh, I am forty or fifty years old". How long do you expect to live? "Well, my father lived to be eighty." Perhaps you will live to be as old as that, but what of it? What evolutionary progress can you trace in that span? "Oh, well, it does not apply to me, it does not apply to the individual; it applies to the race." The individual is lost, and the hope is held out to us that in the dim and distant future, by these natural processes, we shall have a better world. But the trouble is we shall not be there, that is what is bothering me! It may be very altruistic to tell me I have to fall into the ground and die, and stay there, and that somehow or another the world will be better for my having lived, and that a hundred million years from now there will rise up a race to call me blessed, but that will not help me very much! My dear friends, Fundamentalism deals with the individual; it says that if you are wrecked and ruined, God's grace can make a new man of you here ("Praise the Lord"); and He can make you grow up into Christ in all things, until by and by you will stand as an individual in all the glory of Jesus Christ Himself, sharing His glory, without fault before the throne of God. That applies to me—and I am selfish enough to want it to apply to me. I want to know that something can be done for this poor sinner—that God's grace can carry me through; and that some day He will come and receive me unto Himself.

Have you wondered how it is that the church to-day is running off into "social service", and all sorts of mass movements? Have you wondered why preachers, instead of dealing with the individual, deal with the mass? And instead of preaching to the individual, they spend their energy in endeavours to legislate for the advantage of society? It is the inevitable result of the evolutionary idea; for it is folly to concern yourself with the individual in the view of that philosophy. I say that these two positions are directly opposed to each other, and if we are going to have men saved, made new creatures here and now, we want a religion that applies to-day—not by and by only, but to-day.

Now our text tells us that the time is coming when many will "be offended, and shall betray one another, and they shall hate one another. And many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many." But many people look out on the white fields, and say, "What is the use—evil is in the ascendancy." "Because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold." And so some preacher says, "Well, I believe the gospel for myself, but I am not going to fight for it—I am not going to fight for it; I don't think it is worth while. You know, it just stirs things up." Listen: "He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." There is a time of testing coming, and the test of the genuineness of your religion will be found in your enduring even to the end. A dear friend of mine once said to me,—he was an American, so if there are any Americans here, do not be offended, I mean no offence at all—we were very intimate friends, and he said this across my table at the time of the war: "You Britishers never shout for your flag," to which I replied, "No, we don't; we just die for it." What is the use of shouting for it if you cannot die for it? My brother, what is your religion worth, if it is not worth dying for? What has the faith of Christ done for you, if it has not made Jesus Christ, His honour, and His glory, and the glory of His gospel, of greater importance to you than every other consideration besides?

Shame on you, preacher, for sitting on the fence! I know a preacher not a hundred miles from here—not very many blocks from here—who always carries a cushion with him to conventions, so that he can sit on any kind of a fence with comfort! He is always there. Someone wrote me that he delivered an address in Ottawa some time ago when he said, "I do not know of a single modernist preacher in the Convention of Ontario and Quebec." I can introduce him to one of the rankest modernists in Canada without taking him more than three blocks from where he preaches—but he does not know it, that is the pity of it. A certain official the other day said the Denomination was to be congratulated that there was only one professor in McMaster that was under suspicion! What if that were true? I go to a man and I say, "I congratulate you, sir, because I understand that you have lost only one lung! (Laughter); or to another, "You are to be congratulated because you have lost only one eye." What nonsense!

Smallpox is in the neighborhood. Look from the window and there is the hearse; there are two or three people carried out from the house across the way. A day or so after the hearse stops at the door on the right, and the same week it stops at the door on the left. The father of the family smiles and says, "I am so glad we have no smallpox in our home." What of it? Are you safe? What if it were so? What if it were so that there were not a single modernist preacher in the Baptist denomination? What if there be only one unorthodox professor in McMaster—that is not true—but what if there were only one? Just wait five years, and see how many modernist ministers you will have! Go to that mother whose child has just been taken to the isolation hospital with scarlet fever, and say, "I have come to congratulate you that only one of your children has scarlet fever!" Of all the inanities I have ever heard of I think that is the worst,—only one! I heard Dr. Porter, of Kentucky, say once in Buffalo, meeting that argument, "I go into a restaurant and the waiter brings me a piece of pie, and I say, 'Waiter, take that pie away'. 'What is the matter?' 'Why I just lifted the crust, and there is a fly in it.' 'But, sir, there is only one!' 'Well, that is one too many for me, take it away.'" Back in the Old Testament a man comes to the priest and the priest says, "What is that in your forehead?" He examines it with his expert knowledge, and he says to that man, "You are a leper." "No, I am not, sir, my hands are all right. Feel me, there is no leprosy there—I can walk, I can do a day's work; just look, my hair is all right, it is not coming out by the roots." "Oh," but the priest says, "there is the spot of leprosy in your forehead." "Well, but it is only one spot." Do you know what the law said? The moment the evidence of that disease appeared that man must be separated. What is the meaning of our quarantine laws? Back round about Christmas time I went to see a mother who was broken-hearted because her little girl had been taken away to the isolation hospital, for over Christmas, she was not to be home for Christmas. But if she had not been taken away, perhaps a lot of other people never would have come home! She had a contagious, an infectious, disease, and had to be isolated.

Why, in the name of common sense, will preachers defend that principle, as Dean Farmer does, when he says there are two schools of thought, and that if we had two colleges we could afford to have one that was out and out an orthodox institution, but as we have only one, then we must have both under one roof. Shame on him!

What follows? You know what will follow. What shall we do? Well, I will tell you what we will do in this place. We will hold fast the faith ("Amen"), and we will warn people, and we will dare to call names, we will dare to say, "Thou art the man!" I want you Baptists—how many Baptists are here to-night, hold up your hands? I mean Baptists who are not ashamed to be called Baptists. (A large response) All right. How many are here from out of the city? I won't ask your names or where you come from, but let us see your hands? Yes, a great host. Now, do you not see that there is no possibility of agreement between these two opposing systems I have set before you this evening, and that one or the other will have to go down and out? Which shall it be? I pray you to abide by God's own Word, and stand fast for the faith once for all delivered to the saints.

Are there any here to-night who are unconverted. You say, "Why do you talk like that?" Because I would lead you to Christ, my dear friends, that is why; because I know that in you there is something that is enough to kindle the fires of hell if all the fires were put out; because I know that apart from the touch of the divine Spirit you never can be saved. That is why I preach like that; it is because the Bible says there is one gospel, and there is not another. If a man preaches another gospel which is not another, which denies the blood, and the supreme authority of the Word of God, while there is breath in this body, I will fight that thing as God helps me. ("Hallelujah!") Will you help me do it? Say it by putting up your hands. I don't want you to join any picnic around here; this is an army. And you who are unconverted, this precious gospel is worth fighting for. What wonders it has done for some of us.

By the way, you Jarvis Street people, our dear sister, Mrs. Coghill, some time this afternoon fell asleep in Jesus. I was with them last night and into the early hours this morning, and I saw that whole family rejoicing in the

Lord—I told it this morning, but I will tell it again—the younger boy said, “You know, Pastor, mother went away from us into unconsciousness, and did not know any of us; and then she seemed to come back for a week, and seemed to know us all. She was much better, and I believe that I know why the Lord let her come back. During that time Albert was converted, and my wife was converted, and blessing came to this home such as we had never had before.” There were the father and three boys and the daughters and daughters-in-law, every one of them rejoicing in Christ. And those splendid boys at nearly one o’clock this morning, as I stood with them about their mother’s bedside, with smiles on their faces, said, “You know, it is not death now that we have Him. It is wonderful to know where she is going.” And the husband said, “I could not stand it if I did not know that she was safe in the arms of Jesus.”

Oh, it is a great gospel, it is a great salvation. I wish you all had it, I wish I could know that everyone, every man and woman, every boy and girl, here this evening was saved, washed in the blood, made new creatures in Christ, having eternal life, made heirs of glory. Would that not be a bit of heaven here to-night if that were so of every one? It is true of many; may it be true of many others.

Editorial.

THE COMING CONVENTION.

It is human to err. Even the wisest men may be mistaken, but it is not easy for any of us, when we find ourselves in error, to acknowledge it. Albeit, such acknowledgment is the only safe course. In all matters of dispute between mortals there is one Arbiter who makes no mistake. It is safe therefore always for those who desire the truth to be known, and righteousness to be done, to commit their case to Him. “Commit thy way unto the Lord; trust also in him; and he shall bring it to pass. And he shall bring forth thy righteousness as the light, and thy judgment as the noonday.” We therefore urge our readers to cry mightily to God that His gracious Spirit may bring His purposes to pass.

We shall never forget the great Ottawa Convention in 1919. We had no organization. We had solicited the help of only one man, and he had promised to second our resolution. The night before the Convention, we received a telegram from him saying that he would be unable to be present. There was only one other man to whom we had shown our resolution. We therefore telephoned him intending to ask him if he would take the place of the one who could not come, and second our proposal. We were unable to reach him until the next morning, and then he deferred his decision and said he would meet us at the church. On arrival there he assured us that he was with us, but could serve us better by not seconding the resolution. He later came forward with a carefully prepared amendment. He had taken advantage of the confidence we had given him to prepare an amendment to defeat our proposal. A great company of people were earnestly praying that God would have His way, and from the very beginning of the debate, it was evident that the Holy Spirit had come to take charge of the meeting. Who can ever forget the mighty shout of dissent which greeted the proposal of a certain Toronto pastor that our resolution should be withdrawn. Throughout the afternoon the mighty power of God was evident. The Spirit of God swept through that assembly like a prairie fire, burning up all opposition before it, with the result that after five hours’ debate, the resolution carried with a mere handful voting against it. That was really the beginning of the present stage of the controversy

in which we are now engaged, and from that moment the Lord has never forsaken us. We are absolutely certain God will have His way at the next Convention. Whatever that way may be, we do not know, except for this that we are certain He will not vindicate Modernism. Even though the supporters of McMaster should obtain a majority, a contingency which we regard as exceedingly improbable, if not impossible, we should still be sure that God was having His way, but not in the sense of justifying such departure from the faith. Haaman was given a long and large measure of prosperity, but the flowered path in which he so rejoiced, led him only to the gallows. Sometimes things have to get worse before they can get better. Sometimes Truth is brought to the scaffold, while Wrong sits upon the throne, but the truth is bound to win. We are absolutely certain that the Bible is true: that it is God's Word and that God's Word is truth. We can do nothing against the truth but for the truth. Therefore no possible combination of powers can effect the defeat of the truth. We may therefore, with confidence, commit our cause to God. Let us especially pray that He may preside at all business meetings of the churches throughout the Convention when delegates are appointed, that the delegates who come to the Convention may be men of His choice who will do His will. We would suggest that the issues of the Convention should be made a subject of earnest prayer in all our churches, and in our homes.

HOW LONG WILL McMASTER REMAIN A BAPTIST INSTITUTION?

We publish below an interesting letter just received from the West. Some of our readers may find some difficulty in understanding it, but when they have read the letter we will endeavour to explain.

"Winnipeg, Man.

Dr. T. T. Shields,
Toronto, Ont.

Dear Doctor Shields,

I would like to enquire as to the teachings of the 'Church of Christ Disciples' department of McMaster University, of which I understand a man named _____ or some such name is leader or teacher. Is its teaching Modernistic or otherwise?

I have a young neighbour in his teens a member of the above sect, who is being persuaded to attend McMaster to study Theology in the near future.

Will you kindly send me this information and oblige me?

Yours sincerely,

(A subscriber to *The Gospel Witness*)

(Signed) _____

September 9th, '26."

What is the "Church of Christ Disciples department of McMaster University"? At the meeting of the Senate of last September, when we raised the question of the wisdom of Professor Marshall's appointment, another matter engaged the attention of the Senate. When the minutes of that meeting were read at the Hamilton Convention, those who were present may remember that we asked the Chancellor if it was a complete report, to which he replied that only minutes governing the Marshall matter were on hand. We now take the denomination into our confidence as a further illustration of the fidelity with which the present governing bodies abide by the provisions of the charter. At the meeting referred to, the Chancellor stated that the body known as the "Disciples of Christ", having no college of their own in Canada, and desiring

to retain their students in this country, had asked if an arrangement could be made whereby they could make use of McMaster University, and he said that the Dean in Theology would explain the proposals they had in mind. Thereupon Dr. Farmer said that the matter had been discussed with certain representatives of the Disciples body and that he and the Chancellor had suggested that a course of study might be arranged which could be taken by students in the fourth year of arts, and for which they could be given credit in their arts course. (We are now, of course, quoting from memory. Our friends on Bloor Street may be ready to charge us with verbal inaccuracies. If such inaccuracies should be found in this report, we shall be glad to correct them, but the only way to get a stenographic report published, apparently, is to state the case to the best of our ability, from memory.) We then asked if McMaster University, a Baptist institution, founded for the propagation of Baptist principles, was now prepared to undertake the propagation of the tenets of Alexander Campbell. To this, objection was taken and we were told that we ought not to put the case so strongly. We then inquired whether the lectures in the new course would be given by a member of the Disciples body and whether the distinctive doctrines of the Disciples would be taught, both of which questions were answered in the affirmative. We then asked if the teaching of the doctrines of the Disciples be not the propagation of their principles, what is it? We further remarked something to the effect that we admired the ingenuity of the Chancellor and the Dean in finding a way to evade the provisions of the charter. We called attention to the fact that the charter of the University provides that every instructor in theology must be a member of a regular Baptist church, but that in the Arts department, professors are required only to be members of some evangelical church, and we called attention to the fact that because the charter implicitly prohibited the teaching of other views of theology by requiring that all such teachers should be members of Baptist churches, the Chancellor and Dean ingeniously proposed to put this course in Campbellite theology in the fourth years of the arts course.

We presume the plan there proposed has been carried out, for at that meeting a committee was appointed to carry on negotiations with the Disciples body with this in view. We have known many members of that body who were members chiefly because they practised immersion, but we are very sure that Baptists generally have little sympathy with the principles of Alexander Campbell. As we have understood his teaching, baptism by immersion was considered a condition of salvation, and no one had any right to call himself a Christian who had not been immersed. We know that our great Baptist brotherhood in the South feels that there is scarcely any evangelical body with whom they have less in common than the people whom they call the Campbellites. We intend here no discussion whatever of their views. We daresay it may be found that the people known as Disciples have somewhat modified the teachings of Alexander Campbell, but that is not the point. At the meeting of the Senate in question, we asked what would happen if a continuing Presbyterian church should find, under the new order of things, that they are under-supplied with colleges, and we are asked permission to add a Presbyterian instructor to the arts faculty of McMaster, could this Baptist university accept such a proposal, and if not, why not? We pointed out, as we remember, that there might be many other religious bodies who might desire to put a university stamp upon their college work and teach their doctrines under the aegis of McMaster. We further remarked that many of the

supporters of McMaster had been anti-federationists, and had insisted upon the advantages of a separate Baptist university and had therefore strenuously opposed any proposal to federate the theological department of McMaster with Toronto University. But the new arrangement to which we have hereinbefore referred, proposes another source of federation, namely, making McMaster itself the heart, and gathering about it, if not colleges to begin with, at least, special courses, teaching the doctrines of other denominations. We wonder why this matter has not been given to the public. It is but another symptom of the present condition of McMaster University.

PROFESSOR J. G. BROWN AND "THE WESTERN RECORDER."

As yet we have not seen Dr. Brown's reply to the challenge of *The Western Recorder* to provide proof of his statement that Dr. John A. Broadus leaned toward Liberalism. Dr. Brown not only named Dr. Broadus, but also Doctors H. C. Wesson, Alvah Hovey, G. W. Northrup, A. H. Strong and Calvin Goodspeed, in the same class as Conservatives, and then said, "It is remarkable, however, that many of them later in life and after a careful study of all the facts, greatly modified their whole attitude toward the problems raised by criticism and science." We are awaiting with great interest Dr. Brown's disclosure. The habit of invoking the spirits of dead men to support one's contention cannot be regarded as a very honourable procedure. They are no longer with us to speak for themselves. Another glaring instance of this practice occurred in *The Canadian Baptist* of recent date, where a letter strongly supporting Professor Marshall and McMaster University was headed "Another of Spurgeon's Men". It is perfectly true that the one who wrote that letter graduated from Spurgeon's College, but to say that any one holding such views or supporting Professor Marshall was one of Spurgeon's men, is libel on the name of that great stalwart of the faith. We have no language too strong to characterize such a wicked forgery. Spurgeon spoke in terms of strongest condemnation of views which might be called almost ultra conservative in comparison with the theological position taken by Professor Marshall. Dr. Brown belongs to an institution that in season and out of season, without the shadow of proof for its assertions, have charged *The Gospel Witness* with inaccuracies. We suggest to these brethren that if they have forgotten how to be strictly accurate in their statements, they should at least endeavour to keep probability within telescopic range. We promise our readers that we will publish Dr. Brown's explanation of his implied charge that scholars, if they live long enough, outgrow their faith in the Bible as being wholly inspired of God, as soon as that explanation appears. We hope it will not be unnecessarily delayed.

THREE FAREWELL ADDRESSES.

On Thursday, September twenty-third, we shall vary our usual prayer-meeting programme. The first half hour will be occupied by a season of prayer. At eight-thirty, three young men, Mr. J. D. Harrison, Mr. J. B. Kuhn and Mr. H. E. Fisher, will give three short farewell addresses. These young men are sailing under the auspices of the China Inland Mission from Vancouver on September the thirtieth. It is always a pleasure and an inspiration to listen to the testimony of the outgoing missionaries of the China Inland Mission.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. 1.

T. T. SHIELDS, Editor.

No. 4.

Lesson 2.

FOURTH QUARTER.

October 10th, 1926

THE GOOD SHEPHERD.

Lesson Text: John, chapter 10.

I. THE PARABLE OF THE SHEPHERD AND THE SHEEP.

In this parable there is an overlapping of metaphors, but Christ is the Antitype of all types: He is the Tabernacle, the Holy of Holies, the Veil between, the Mercy Seat, with all that it contains; the unbroken tables of stone, the golden pot of manna, the budding rod; He is the Altar, and the Sacrifice, and the Priest—He is, indeed, All and in all. So also in this parable He is the Sheep-fold, the Door, the Shepherd, the Pasture—He is everything.

1. He is the Sheepfold. The only place of safety and satisfaction for Christ's sheep is in Him—not in the church, but in Christ does salvation consist. 2. He is the Door of the sheep. The figure is suggestive of marking a separation between differing conditions: He is to His people what the door of the ark was to Noah, the way to safety and protection from the storm. Only through Christ can anyone be saved. 3. He is the Shepherd. Not in an institution, or in a state or condition is salvation found; but in a living Person. Many things may be noted about the Shepherd: (a) His voice is distinctive, it is different from all other voices; the sheep therefore are able to recognize it. Here is a suggestion as to the uniqueness of God's Word: it stands apart from all other books; it has a character all its own; it is by the use of the Word sinners are saved: in response to the call of the Good Shepherd, the sheep come. Preachers and teachers would do well to magnify the Word of God. (b) The shepherd's knowledge of the sheep is here suggested. Among men it is considered a great gift for one to be able to call multitudes of people by name; but although this Shepherd has so many sheep He has a name for everyone of them, and He never forgets their name: "The Lord knoweth them that are His." An interesting example of this principle is the conversion of Saul of Tarsus,—how the Lord called him by his name from heaven; and then gave both his name and address to Ananias. We should pray that when the gospel is preached, whether in the pulpit or the class, that the Good Shepherd may call His sheep by name. (c) He leads His sheep by going before them. It is the custom in England when the King travels for a pilot engine to precede His train, so that if there were danger on the track the pilot would discover it before His Majesty arrived. But here the King of kings, Who condescends to a shepherd's task, goes before His sheep and stands between them and all harm. He is our Guide, our Leader, our Example. (d) He comes, not to destroy, but to give abundant life. It is never necessary for His sheep to graze in bare and dry pasture: He always has an abundance for His own; and whenever Jesus Christ comes to anyone of us He comes to lift us to greater heights, to enlarge the correspondence of life, to fill us with His Spirit, Who is Himself the earnest of our heavenly inheritance. (e) This shepherd is especially distinguished by the fact that He gives His life for His sheep. There have been many other shepherds: some of them have come wearing the shepherd's robe only as a disguise with intent to fatten on the sheep; others have come merely as hirelings, to use the sheep for their own profit. But "the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep". What more could He do than this? (f) Moreover, His life itself is unique, for it is ever at His own command: no one could take it from Him; He laid it down of Himself. (g) He especially enjoyed His Father's favour on account of His death for His sheep. Always the Beloved of the Infinite, paradoxical as it may seem, He still further endeared Himself to His Father by His sacrifice for the sheep. It is through His death in behalf of sinners that Jesus Christ is to be supremely glorified: "Therefore God also hath highly exalted him," etc. (Phil. 2:9).

4. The sheep: (a) The sheep are distinguished by the fact that they hear the Shepherd's voice and follow Him. They will not follow strangers: they are able to distinguish between the voice of the Shepherd and all other voices. And so a truly gracious

soul cannot be turned from the things of God, for they are distinguished also by their refusal to follow strangers. (b) Our Lord declared that He had other sheep which did not belong to that which was then recognized as His fold. He speaks of His interest in and redemption accomplished for the Gentile world. Still He is thinking of His other sheep. 5. Christ is here represented as a divider again. He always divides, and so does His Word.

II. THE PARABLE APPLIED.

1. How men prove that they are not of Christ's sheep (vs. 26, 27). 2. His sheep are given eternal life. It should be made clear here that eternal life means more than endlessness of duration: it is descriptive of the quality rather than quantity; it is a life that comes from God which is, in its very nature, eternal (vs. 27-29). 3. The opposition to Christ in this connection was based upon His claim to be God. It is the Deity and authority of Christ against which men kick still. 4. He challenged them to deny the divine character of His works (v. 32). 5. He proves what He has before stated, that men cannot take His life from Him until He lays it down of Himself (v. 39). 6. His true sheep always follow Him and believe (vs. 41, 42).

GOOD NEWS OF CONVERSIONS.

No better news can come to a true believer than tidings of salvation. Recently there have been some remarkable conversions through the efforts of some of the Jarvis Street workers. During the summer, some of our workers have been busy preaching the gospel in the open air, and visiting from house to house. In one neighbourhood there was a little girl of nine or ten years of age, converted some time ago and baptized and now a member of Jarvis Street Church. She was the only witness for Christ in that family. At her suggestion one of the brethren called in a home where there was a young woman who, three years ago, had gone to the Catholic Church. He got into conversation with her and ultimately, not on the occasion of the first visit, she was converted. On account of her becoming a Roman Catholic, she had been estranged from her father and mother. Her conversion resulted in a re-union with her parents after three years of separation. When she was baptized, her mother came to witness her baptism. Since that time much work has been done with the family by these earnest workers, with the result that the father and mother, and the younger sister, and an uncle and aunt have all professed faith in Christ. These, among others, came forward boldly on Sunday evening, openly confessing their faith.

Some time ago there was an announcement in a Toronto paper of a meeting of an Agnostic Society, at which the speaker was to attack the teachings of the pastor of Jarvis Street Church. Some of the brethren of Jarvis Street, on their own initiative, attended the meeting and when opportunity was given in that strange atmosphere, gave their testimony for Christ. These agnostic friends were very fair in their attitude, and said they did not know but would be glad to be shown. Among those who professed conversion last week was one of these agnostic leaders.

Thus the blessed work of salvation goes on. When we are told in the second chapter of Acts that "the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved", we believe we are not to understand that all the work was done at public services, but by their ministry from house to house, those early Christians preached the gospel and doubtless it was by that daily ministry, as well as by the public preaching, people were daily added to the church. So all our churches ought to be busy seven days a week, everywhere and always witnessing for Christ.

LAST SUNDAY'S SERVICES.

Sunday was a day in the heavenly places for those who attended Jarvis Street Church. The preacher was the Rev. J. W. Kemp of Auckland, New Zealand. In the morning he delivered a mighty sermon on Hebrews 12: 1, 2,

and in the evening "The Christ of the First and Final Centuries of the Christian Era". A number responded to the invitation at both services. Mr. Kemp left on the night train for Vancouver, where he will hold services for several days in the Mount Pleasant Baptist Church. Under the ministry of the Rev. A. Baker the Mount Pleasant Church has taken an uncompromising stand for the faith once for all delivered. We have the happiest memories of a ten days' visit to Brother Baker and his people, and we are sure Mr. Kemp will greatly enjoy his ministry in Mount Pleasant Church.

THIS WEEK'S BIBLE UNION MEETINGS.

This note is written Tuesday, the fourteenth. We shall hold three meetings this week. In Windsor the evening of the fifteenth, at this writing we do not know the name of the hall. In Chatham, Thursday, the sixteenth, in the Oddfellows Hall, and in London on Friday, the seventeenth, in Hyman Hall. The speakers for the three evenings will be Revs. C. J. Loney, W. E. Atkinson, W. S. Whitcombe and the Editor. Probably, at the meeting in London on Friday, Mr. Thomas Urquhart has promised to speak if it is possible for him to be present.

NEXT WEEK'S BIBLE UNION MEETINGS.

Next week we shall have six in our party,—Revs. C. J. Loney, W. E. Atkinson, G. W. Allen, W. Gordon Brown, James McGinlay and the Editor. We shall leave Toronto Monday, the twentieth, by motor; our first meeting being at Coaticoke, Quebec, Tuesday, the twenty-first. Wednesday the meeting will be held in the old First Church building, Montreal; Thursday, the twenty-third, in Ottawa, and Friday, the twenty-fourth, in the G.J.W.V.A. Hall, Murray Street, Peterboro. At all these centres the subject will be "Shall Modernism capture the Baptist denomination". We ask all pastors and others who read these announcements, who are within reach of any of these centres, to do their utmost to be present themselves, and to persuade as many of their people as possible to be present also. We ask all who cannot attend, earnestly to pray that God's blessing may be upon the services.

LAST WEEK'S BIBLE UNION MEETINGS.

Last week we held two Bible Union meetings, at which the present denominational situation was discussed. The first was in Collingwood, Ontario, on Thursday, the ninth. The meeting was held in the Opera House, and was attended by a very large congregation. The gathering was quite representative, numbers being present from several outside places. We were greatly cheered by the number of non-Baptists who were present, who love the Word, and who recognize that the fight for the faith is a fight in which all true believers should be engaged. The speakers at the Collingwood meeting were Revs. C. J. Loney, W. E. Atkinson, W. Gordon Brown, and the Editor.

From Collingwood we motored to London to complete arrangements for the meeting this week, and thence to Woodstock. In Woodstock the meeting was held in the City Hall. It was completely filled except for the gallery, which held but a few persons. It was a large gathering and representative of many places outside of Woodstock. There was a good representation from both of the Woodstock churches. Rev. R. Jones, pastor of Oxford Street church, presided, and the programme of the night before in Collingwood was repeated. At the close of the service, one lady came to Mr. Atkinson and said, "I have just one criticism to pass upon your speech to-night. You told of someone who had 'lost' his faith in McMaster University. That was not strictly correct. The other day I left my car and left my purse inside the car. When I returned the purse was gone, but I did not lose it,—someone stole it, and it would be more correct to say that such a one had had his faith stolen than to say that he had lost it." We think this good sister's point was well taken.

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION.

Rev. W. M. Robertson delivered his final address Thursday evening, September 2nd. The area of the auditorium was practically filled, and that in the midst of Exhibition week. Mr. Robertson preached a great sermon on "The duty of contending for the faith". The following resolution was enthusiastically passed by a standing vote. The resolution speaks for itself.

"September 2nd, 1926.

Rev. W. M. Robertson,
of Toxteth Tabernacle,
Liverpool, England.

Dear Mr. Robertson:

The Pastor, Deacons, and members of Jarvis Street Church, desire on this occasion to express their very hearty appreciation of your ministry in the Jarvis Street pulpit during part of July and part of August. You came to us as a stranger whom we knew by reputation only: you leave us as a brother beloved.

Jarvis Street Church is widely known as standing and contending for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints. Its membership has an appetite for expository preaching. Your able, earnest, biblical, and intensely spiritual ministry has been a benediction to the whole church. We shall follow you in your return journey with our earnest prayer, and you and your people will be frequently mentioned before the Throne of Grace.

We desire to express also our hearty fellowship with the church over which you preside; for we are sure that a church which is privileged to enjoy such a ministry must be a church that stands uncompromisingly for the gospel.

We want you to know that you have a place in our affections, and that we desire the fellowship we have enjoyed during these weeks of your sojourn among us to be renewed in the not distant future.

With affectionate regards, we are,

Yours in the fellowship of the gospel,

(Signed) Thomas T. Shields, Pastor.
George Greenway, Chas. Brownlow,
J. G. Hyde, E. A. Brownlee, L. F.
Shields, Fred. Turney, H. G. Hum-
phries, Deacons.

Violet Stoakley, Church Secretary.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS

One Dollar per year to all new subscribers during 1926. (Regular subscription, \$2.00 per year). This paper contains weekly a sermon by the Editor, an exposition of the Whole Bible Sunday School Course, and Editorial matter dealing especially with the battle between Fundamentalism and Modernism. (\$1.50 in Toronto).

SPECIAL OFFER.

A Volume of Sermons by Dr. Shields entitled "The Adventures of a Modern Young Man," being a series of eight sermons on Luke 15, The Prodigal and his Brother, will be sent with *The Gospel Witness* for one year for One Dollar and a Half.

Send your subscription to:

THE GOSPEL WITNESS - 130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto 2, Canada.