

20c. Per Copy for this Issue

# 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, *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. 26. TORONTO, NOVEMBER 4, 1926. Whole No. 236

# ICHABOD!

## McMASTER'S NEW NAME

### CONTENTS

**The Editor's Views of Convention.**  
**Mr. T. Urquhart on the Situation.**  
**The Public Press and the Convention.**  
**Prof. L. S. Keyser.**  
**Dr. W. B. Riley Replies to Dr. J. C. Masee.**  
**Ambassador of God, by Dr. W. B. Hinson.**  
**The S. S. Lesson.**  
**Verbatim Report Education.**  
**Debate**  
**Indexes.**

### HELP GRATEFULLY ACKNOWLEDGED.

In addition to the invaluable help of the regular Gospel Witness staff, the Editor gratefully acknowledges his indebtedness to Mr. W. Gordon Brown, B.A., for his able and generous assistance in the preparation of this issue of the paper.

## Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.

**G**OD, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.

For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son? And again, when he bringeth in the firstbegotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him. And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire.

But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the scepter of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands: they shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.

But to which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool? Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?

Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was stedfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will?

---

# How the Ark of God Was Surrendered to the Philistines

---

## An Inglorious Capitulation

---

Probably the greatest battle for "the faith once for all delivered to the saints" ever fought in Canada was that which took place at the recent Baptist Convention held in First Avenue Baptist Church, Toronto. It was only a battle—and the war is still on. It will be our endeavour in these pages to give an interpretation of that great conflict. We must begin with the first session of the Convention.

### THE CONVENTION BUILDING.

The First Avenue building has a very limited capacity. The outside seating capacity of its pews, by actual measurement, is seven hundred and fifty. We understand one hundred and fifty chairs were used in addition, which would make the maximum seating capacity of the church, with aisles crowded, nine hundred. It was most unfair to hold such an important Convention in so small a church; but there was evidently a reason for so doing. When the question was raised at the opening session, the pastor of the church said they were under no obligation to provide accommodation for other than delegates. He first of all said they were under no obligation to provide accommodation for "curiosity seekers", but this he withdrew. We do not believe Dr. Graham's position in this matter is a sound one. The entire membership of a Baptist church may be assumed to be as much interested in the affairs of the Convention as the few who happen to be selected as delegates. There were many Baptists in Toronto from remote parts of the Convention territory who, although they were not delegates, came at their own expense in the hope that they might receive some enlightenment from the Convention discussion. They, of course, were all crowded out of the building. The whole spirit of what Dr. Graham described as the "machinery" in the Convention was anything but Christian. We can think of no phrase that so accurately describes the temper of the McMaster company as that which is used respecting Saul of Tarsus: "Saul, yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord".

### APPOINTMENT OF SCRUTINEERS.

When the committees were appointed at the Friday evening session, it was moved that the scrutineers be appointed by the Chair. The Secretary immediately put a sheet before the Chairman, and without a loss of a moment's time the Chairman read off the list of the scrutineers. They were all of one colour, all the type of men who were "agreed already" in respect to the matters

under discussion. Objection was raised to their appointment, but was overruled. The Editor of this paper suggested that even in a political election, the law provided that scrutineers from all parties to the contest should be privileged to serve at the polling booths; whereupon we were informed that the Chair recognized no sides, which, of course, it may at the outset be said, was sheer nonsense. If the officers of the Convention had resolved upon a programme which required only fair and just dealing, one would have supposed they would have offered no objection to the appointment of scrutineers from both sides of the question at issue; but they had their programme to carry out, and were determined to effect it by fair means or foul.

### THE SECRECY OF THE BALLOT VIOLATED.

As an illustration of the importance of the office of a scrutineer, we here relate an instance told by the Rev. John Linton at a meeting held recently in his own church. As reported to us the story was to the following effect: At the Hamilton Convention in Nineteen hundred and twenty-five, Mr. Linton was seated somewhere near Professor E. M. Keirstead when a vote by ballot was being taken. A scrutineer came down the aisle collecting the ballots. Mr. Linton observed that when the scrutineer in question took the ballot from the hand of Dr. Keirstead, he did not put it with the other ballots, but kept it apart by itself. A few moments later Mr. Linton went back to the room where the scrutineers were to count the ballots, and when the scrutineer came in, whom Mr. Linton had seen take the ballot from the hand of Dr. Keirstead, that scrutineer said, "Keirstead voted against us". Thus the secrecy of the ballot was violated. If such an offence were proved to have taken place in connection with any political election in this country, any court in the land, we believe, would declare such an election void, and the scrutineer would be punished. Yet this scrutineer, so destitute of any sense of honour, is reported to be a Baptist minister. This is an example of the true spirit of McMaster. And there can be no doubt that when scrutineers were appointed at the Nineteen hundred and twenty-six Convention only such men as could be relied upon to serve McMaster were selected.

### THE DISCIPLES AS THEIR LORD.

Before we go further, we would call attention to the fact that wherever the Word of the living God is the issue the same principles operate in the conflict, and behind these principles are the "principalities and powers," and "the rulers of the darkness of this world." Our Lord admonished us to expect just such treatment. He said "It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord." He declared that those who witness to the truth of the gospel would receive at the hands of the world the same treatment which was meted out to the divine Author of the gospel Himself. It matters not who the particular witnesses may be who stand for the integrity and authority of the Word of God, they will in their measure receive the same treatment which was meted out to the Incarnate



Word Himself. Therefore, the best report of the Ontario and Quebec Convention will be found in the inspired Word itself:

And while he yet spake, lo, Judas, one of the twelve, came and with him a great multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and elders of the people. Now he that betrayed him gave them a sign, saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he: hold him fast. And forthwith he came to Jesus, and said, Hall, master, and kissed him. And Jesus said unto him, Friend, wherefore art thou come? Then came they, and laid hands on Jesus, and took him. And, behold, one of them which were with Jesus, stretched out his hand, and drew his sword, and struck a servant of the high priest's, and smote off his ear. Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword. Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels! But how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be! In that same hour sa'd Jesus to the multitudes, Are ye come out as against a thief with swords and staves for to take me? I sat daily with you teaching in the temple, and ye laid no hold on me. But all this was done, that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled. Then all the disciples forsook him, and fled.

And they that had laid hold on Jesus led him away to Caiaphas the high priest, where the scribes and elders were assembled. But Peter followed him afar off unto the high priest's palace, and went in, and sat with the servants, to see the end. Now the chief priests, and elders, and all the council, sought false witnesses against Jesus, to put him to death; but found none: yea, though many false witnesses came, yet found they none. At the last came two false witnesses, and said, This fellow said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days. And the high priest arose, and sa'd unto him, Answerest thou nothing? what is it which these witness against thee? But Jesus held his peace. And the high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye? They answered and said, He is guilty of death. Then did they spit in his face, and buffeted him; and others smote him with the palms of their hands, saying, Prophecy unto us, thou Christ, Who is he that smote thee?

Now Peter sat without in the palace: and a damsel came unto him, saying, Thou also wast with Jesus of Galilee. But he denied before them all, saying, I know not what thou sayest. And when he was gone out into the porch, another maid saw him, and said unto them that were there, This fellow was also with Jesus of Nazareth. And again he denied with an oath, I do not know the man. And after a while came unto him they that stood by, and said to Peter, Surely thou also art one of them; for thy speech bewrayeth thee. Then began he to curse and to swear, saying, I know not the man. And immediately the cock crew. And Peter remembered the word of Jesus, which said unto him, Before the cock crew, thou shalt deny me thrice. And he went out, and wept bitterly. When the morning was come, all the chief priests and elders of the people took council against Jesus to put him to death: and when they had bound him, they led him away, and delivered him to Pontius Pilate, the governor.

Then Judas, which had betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented himself, and brought again the thirty

pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, saying, I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood. And they said, What is that to us? see thou to that. And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed, and went and hanged himself. And the chief priests took the silver pieces, and said, It is not lawful for to put them into the treasury, because it is the price of blood. And they took counsel, and bought with them the potter's field, to bury strangers in. Wherefore that field was called, The field of blood, unto this day. Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value; and gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me. And Jesus stood before the governor: and the governor asked him, saying, Art thou the king of the Jews? And Jesus said unto him, Thou sayest. And when he was accused of the chief priests and elders, he answered nothing. Then said Pilate unto him, Hearest thou not how many things they witness against thee? And he answered him to never a word; insomuch that the governor marvelled greatly. Now at that feast the governor was wont to release unto the people a prisoner, whom they would. And they had then a notable prisoner, called Barabbas. Therefore when they were gathered together, Pilate said unto them, Whom will ye that I release unto you? Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ? For he knew that for envy they had delivered him.

When he was set down on the judgment seat, his wife sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with that just man: for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him. But the chief priest and elders persuaded the multitude that they should ask Barabbas, and destroy Jesus. The governors answered and said unto them, Whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you? They said, Barabbas. Pilate saith unto them, What shall I do then with Jesus which is called Christ? They all say unto him, Let him be crucified. And the governor said, Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried out the more, saying, Let him be crucified.

When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made, he took water, and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it. Then answered all the people, and said, His blood be on us, and on our children.

Then released he Barabbas unto them: and when he had scourged Jesus, he delivered him to be crucified. Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the common hall, and gathered unto him the whole band of soldiers. And they stripped him, and put on him a scarlet robe.

And when they had platted a crown of thorns, they put it upon his head, and a reed in his hand: and they bowed the knee before him, and mocked him, saying, Hail, King of the Jews! And they spit upon him, and took the reed, and smote him on the head. And after that they had mocked him, they took the robe off from him, and put his own raiment on him, and led him away to crucify him. And as they came out, they found a man of Cyrene, Simon by name: him they compelled to bear his cross. And when they were come unto a place called Golgotha, that is to say, a place of a skull, they gave him vinegar to drink mingled with gall: and when he had tasted thereof, he would not drink.

And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots. And sitting down they watched him there; and set up over his head his accusation written, THIS IS JESUS THE KING OF THE JEWS. Then were there two thieves crucified with him, one on the right hand, and another on the left.

And they that passed by reviled him, wagging their heads, and saying, Thou that destroyest the temple, and buldest it in three days, save thyself. If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross. Likewise also the chief priests mocking him, with the scribes and elders, said, He saved others; himself he cannot save. If he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him. He trusted in God: let him deliver him now, if he will have him: for he said, I am the Son of God. The thieves also, which were crucified with him, cast the same in his teeth. Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land unto the ninth hour. And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? that is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? Some of them that stood there, when they heard that, said, This man calleth for Elias. And straightway one of them ran, and took a sponge, and filled it with vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave him to drink. The rest said, Let be, let us see whether Elias will come to save him.

Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost. And, behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent; and the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many. Now when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was the Son of God. And many women were there beholding afar off, which followed Jesus from Galilee, ministering unto him: among which was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses, and the mother of Zebedee's children. When the even was come, there came a rich man of Arimathaea, named Joseph, who also himself was Jesus' disciple: he went to Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded the body to be delivered. And when Joseph had taken the body, he wrapped it in a clean linen cloth, and laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock; and he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre, and departed. And there was Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, sitting over against the sepulchre.

### THE CONVENTION DELEGATION.

As yet we have had no opportunity of examining the list of the names of delegates. We presume they will be published in the Year Book as in other years. It will be very interesting to know what proportion of these delegates came from Toronto churches. Between the Hamilton and Toronto Conventions, the Executive Committee took it upon themselves to establish certain rules which never before had operated in the Convention. We believe the Convention should have rules by which the Enrolment Committee should be governed, but we do not believe the Executive Committee had any right to depart from the practice of years and make rules for themselves, at least without first of all advising the churches of their intention so to do. A large part of the Convention, however, is entirely subject to an ecclesiastical body, and the independence of many of the Baptist churches of the Convention has become a thing of the past.

### PROXY DELEGATES.

A large use was made of proxy delegates. So far as we know, there were not more than a dozen proxies in opposition to McMaster. For ourselves, we made no effort to obtain them beyond announcing

in *The Gospel Witness* that there were many willing to give their time, if necessary. But on the McMaster side the Convention was diligently canvassed for proxies. Dr. Vining paid a visit to the eastern part of the Province and, we have been informed, personally visited several churches in an endeavour to obtain their authority to appoint proxies. In the midst of his speech he was reproved by the Rev. A. Penman of Buckingham for this practice, who declared that Dr. Vining had endeavoured to come into his church for that purpose. We have proof that the Revs. J. M. Warner and C. R. Duncan played some part in securing authority from churches to appoint proxies. Professor J. G. Brown, throughout the campaign, was a very diligent letter writer; some of his letters we have seen with our own eyes. How many others were occupied in this personal canvass we do not know. We were informed by Mr. Holland Pettit that he estimated there would not be more than fifty proxy delegates altogether. We think it would be a very healthy thing if the Enrolment Committee would publish their report on this matter in *The Canadian Baptist* at an early date, informing us for what churches the proxies were appointed, and to what churches they belonged. We happen to know a good many members of some of the Toronto churches and we know that in at least one instance a much larger number of members of one church were present at the Convention than the full complement to which that church was entitled. We presume they were there as proxies. But the packing of the Convention was not limited to the appointment of proxies. Wherever there was a McMaster defender in the pastorate, he endeavoured, as far as possible, to have McMaster sympathizers appointed as delegates. We have learned that in not a few instances, the burden-bearers and vital members of the church were passed over in order to secure the appointment of McMaster sympathizers. When all the facts are known to the churches, a great reaction must set in, and we shall be greatly mistaken if it does not very injuriously affect all the funds of the Convention.

### EDUCATION DAY.

Education day, Tuesday, October nineteenth, opened with an address on Denominational Faith and Practice, by Professor A. L. McCrimmon, ex-Chancellor of McMaster University. About one-third of Dr. McCrimmon's time was occupied with denunciations of the critics of McMaster. We had said to some friends before the session opened that Dr. McCrimmon was put up for that purpose. The professor of Christian ethics at McMaster used his privileged position in an endeavour to prejudice the entire Convention in advance of the opening of the debate. We submit this matter to men of honour everywhere, and ask whether men who have any sense of fair play would condescend to such practices.

### THE LENGTH OF THE DEBATE.

The debate lasted from 11.25 in the morning until six minutes past twelve midnight, with two brief adjournments for meals. We

print below a table of the speakers and the time their speeches occupied. The names of the McMaster supporters are printed in black type; the names of those opposed to McMaster's present course in Roman. To this should be added the lengthy addresses of Dr. Vining and Dr. Green, which carried the discussion on until, we believe, nearly two in the morning. It will be observed that McMaster was represented by eleven speakers, and the fundamentalist side of the question by only seven, up to the taking of the first vote. The time occupied by the McMaster speakers was five hours and forty-four minutes, and the time occupied by the fundamentalists, two hours and fifty-three minutes. Thus it will be seen that McMaster University was only two minutes short of having twice the time of their opponents. To this should be added at least fifteen or twenty minutes of Professor McCrimmon's speech which was delivered before the debate began, and the addresses of, we suppose about forty-five minutes each, of Drs. Vining and Green. If this latter is a fair estimate, we must add an hour and fifty minutes and two speakers to the McMaster side. With this in view, our readers will judge of the fairness of the McMaster defenders in their treatment of Rev. John Linton. It will be observed that one hour and thirty-three minutes occupied by the fundamentalists was taken after ten o'clock at night, showing that until this editor rose to speak, the debate had continued for six hours and fifty-one minutes, of which only one hour and twenty minutes had been taken by the fundamentalists. And when we resumed our seat, our side of the question had had two hours and forty-three minutes out of eight hours and fourteen minutes. Notwithstanding, the Convention which believes in "reasonable liberty" voted to refuse to let Rev. John Linton speak, and Dr. Farmer generously allowed him to speak for ten minutes. This time-table was carefully kept by Mr. Clark McCredie. The figures speak for themselves.

Dr. Whidden, presenting report .....	11.25	12.10	45 minutes
Adjournment for lunch.			
Dr. Whidden, (continuing) .....	2.00	2.15	15 "
Dr. MacNeill, moving adoption .....	2.15	3.02	47 "
Mr. Albert Matthews .....	3.02	3.45	43 "
Rev. W. J. H. Brown .....	3.46	4.12	26 "
Rev. G. W. Allen .....	4.12	4.28	16 "
Rev. J. M. Warner .....	4.29	4.48	19 "
Rev. R. R. McKay .....	4.48	4.55	7 "
Rev. W. S. Whitcombe .....	4.55	5.06	11 "
Rev. W. S. Edgar .....	5.06	5.24	18 "
Rev. James McGinlay .....	5.25	5.28	3 "
Discussion re point of order .....	5.28	5.34	6 "
Rev. James McGinlay, (continuing) .....	5.34	5.49	15 "
Rev. Robert Price .....	5.49	5.54	5 "
Rev. W. S. Whitcombe .....	5.54	5.55	1 "
Rev. Robert Price, (continuing) .....	5.55	6.13	18 "
Rev. John Galt .....	6.13	6.29	16 "
Adjournment for tea.			
Prof. L. H. Marshall .....	8.22	9.42	1 hr. 20 min.
Rev. W. Gordon Brown .....	9.50	9.58	8 minutes
Rev. W. C. Smalley .....	9.59	10.11	12 "
Dr. T. T. Shields .....	10.15	11.38	1 hr. 23 min.
Rev. John Linton .....	11.42	11.52	10 minutes
Dr. J. H. Farmer .....	11.53	12.06	13 "

### "THE CANADIAN BAPTIST".

As usual, the denominational organ is guilty of utter misrepresentation at many points. We have no doubt at all that the most accurate count of the vote would have shown a large majority on the side of McMaster University. It must, however, be borne in mind that the entire Convention territory had been covered by representatives of McMaster, and that a large part of our constituency represented by the Home Mission churches had been deliberately kept in ignorance of the issues involved: the Home Mission pastors had implicitly been forbidden to discuss the question. In apostolic time the Sanhedrin said, "Let us straightway threaten them." The "threatening" business has been a favourite instrument of the opponents of the truth from then until now. The terror of the "machine" was put into the hearts of a great company of splendid men on our Home Mission fields; many others were bribed or bought by the Summer Session; *The Canadian Baptist*, for a whole year, poured forth its streams of poison—and in spite of it all, two hundred and fifty-eight voted against McMaster. But the churches represented by many of the delegates that supported McMaster have not yet been heard from! *The Canadian Baptist* says, "Every charge against McMaster University, Chancellor Whidden, Dean Farmer and Prof. Marshall was shattered and repudiated." Let our readers peruse these pages and read the speeches of these men for themselves, and we believe they will reach the conclusion that practically every charge has been proved up to the hilt.

### IGNORES DISCUSSION OF ATONEMENT.

We would call attention to the fact that *The Canadian Baptist* almost entirely ignores the discussion of the atonement. Of Professor Marshall it says: "As for the atonement he stood with Spurgeon." As for our own speech, it merely remarks that we "could not see in what respect it was possible for Prof. Marshall to say he stood with Spurgeon." Thus the great matter at issue, *The Canadian Baptist* entirely covers up with its usual dishonesty. We call special attention to that matter as represented in the speeches of Rev. W. J. H. Brown, Mr. W. Gordon Brown, Professor Marshall, and the Editor of this paper. Passages will readily be found by reference to the index.

### DR. VINING'S RESOLUTION.

Let us now examine the resolution moved by Dr. Vining and seconded by Dr. Green, published in connection with their speeches in the report of the Educational Session of the Convention in this issue of *The Gospel Witness*. After the passing of this resolution no opportunity was given to the Editor of this paper to apologize—even had he been disposed to do so. Of course, the Convention knew such an apology was an impossibility. Our charges had been abundantly proved, as this issue of *The Gospel Witness* shows.

### MEMBERSHIP ON THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS.

As to our membership on the Board of Governors: we have no concern about it. We asked the Convention to vote on that issue at Hamilton, and it refused to do so. If they desire to dismiss us from membership by vote of the Convention, they are welcome so to do. But so far as this resolution is concerned, passed at nearly two o'clock in the morning when a very large number of the delegates had left, we attach no importance to it whatever. We have no idea how the vote stood, but we are informed that one on the other side of this question, and a denomination official, expressed the opinion that the vote was so close that had a count been made, it might easily have been declared lost.

As to our being unacceptable as a delegate to future meetings of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, we do not know what the future has in store; but so far as we see at present, we expect, if we are still living, to be a delegate to the next Convention. No one who stands for the Word of God has ever been acceptable to those who either reject it, or support its rejection by others.

### AN INNOCUOUS RESOLUTION.

A further resolution was passed by the Resolution Committee to this effect:

"No person may act as a delegate to such Convention whose conduct has been declared by a resolution of the Convention to be inconsistent with or injurious to the purposes and enterprises of the Convention as set out in Section 3 of the Act."

It has legally been established repeatedly that nobody constituted as our Convention is, has power to bind its successor; and the resolution above referred to is not worth the paper it is written on. We have little doubt that we shall be present at the Convention next year, and hundreds of others, and we shall stand solidly together—and we shall see what we shall see.

### THE BOOTLEGGERS CENSURE THE DETECTIVE.

In this connection we feel like reporting a part of the speech of Pastor James McGinlay at a great meeting held in Jarvis Street Church Wednesday evening, October 20th. Mr. McGinlay said that the vote of censure passed by the Convention on the Editor of *The Gospel Witness* would be paralleled by a vote of censure passed by the bootleggers of Ontario on the Provincial police, for the reason that the Provincial police had found in certain cellars illicit whiskey stills. He declared that the denominational police had found an illicit still in the denominational cellar, known as McMaster University, which was busy manufacturing heterodox theology.

### THE "NUTS" IN THE MACHINE.

He then referred to what Dr. W. T. Graham had said at the first session of the Convention, that it would not be possible to move the Convention to a larger building, because it would be difficult to move "the machinery". Brother McGinlay said that the "machinery" was

so well oiled that a little child could move it, and then added: "And I stand on this platform to-night, Mr. Chairman, because I refuse to be one of the 'nuts' in the machine." If Brother McGinlay had taken a year off to prepare his speech of five minutes he could not have done better—he described the situation exactly. His bootlegging metaphor was more apt than he himself, at the moment, probably, felt it to be, for the present teaching of McMaster, as represented by Professor Marshall, is as illicit as the making of bootleg whiskey—and is a great deal more deadly.

The reader who carefully studies the report of the Educational Day printed in these pages will have no difficulty in recognizing the "nuts" in the "machine"!

### McMASTER'S METHODS.

"Ye shall know them by their fruits." McMaster University expelled Mr. Gordon Brown from residence because he dared to report the truth. Under the disguise of "superannuating" him, Professor Campbell was dismissed for exercising his liberty as a Baptist, and protesting against McMaster's Modernism. A member of the Home Mission Board addressed a letter to the Board, proposing that the Home Mission Board should refuse to appoint to summer fields the students who had signed a protest against Professor Marshall's teaching. The Home Mission Board passed a resolution muzzling the Home Mission pastors by expressing the Board's desire that there should be no mention of the controversy in the Home Mission churches. The extent of McMaster's efforts in securing proxy votes will appear when the list of delegates is printed. At the Convention itself McMaster supporters occupied two-thirds of the time in discussion, and heckled every speaker on the Fundamentalist side, consuming no small part of his time. The Convention was held in a small church, which could not comfortably accommodate even the delegates, thus excluding the Baptist public. But for the full reports given by the newspapers, the general public would have been ignorant of the facts of the case.

### McMASTER'S SPIRIT.

The spirit of the McMaster element on Education day was the spirit of the high priest's palace and Pilate's hall. Cold type cannot possibly convey to the mind the virulence of most of the speeches delivered in support of McMaster. The speeches of Reverends R. R. McKay, W. C. Smalley, and John Galt, were practically the only exceptions.

### THE CONVENTION'S DECISION IN A NUTSHELL.

Two things stand out prominently in the report of the Education discussion in respect to Professor Marshall's position: The first is that it is proved to a demonstration that he does not accept the divine inspiration and authority of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. And the second is that he expressly repudiates the great



central doctrine of the gospel, namely, the principle of penal substitution in the death of Christ. We therefore hold that our case is absolutely proved. Jarvis St. Church will be asked to vote on the same resolution which was passed by the Stanley Avenue Church, at its next Communion Service, and we have not the slightest doubt that it will be unanimously approved. The Committee appointed to consider the organization of an Association of Regular Baptist Churches within the Convention is already busily engaged at its task, and we believe will be in a position in a short time to call for a great meeting in Toronto. Meanwhile we suggest that those who have the cause of evangelical truth in the Baptist Denomination at heart, should from this moment withhold all contributions from our denominational Boards. We know that there are many splendid missionaries absolutely true to the faith, whom it is a joy to support, but it is surely impossible to hold fellowship with any Board, and by that we mean to trust any Board, which has openly endorsed Professor Marshall's repudiation of the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ.

### THE CONVENTION'S CENSURE.

An examination of the amendment to the amendment will show that it passed censure not only upon the Editor of this paper, but upon certain students, and upon all, indeed, who have dared to call their souls their own within the Convention of Ontario and Quebec. McMaster University will discover that its victory, measured in terms of funds, has been the most expensive proceeding to which it has ever set its hand. "We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth."

We rejoice to hear that God is signally blessing all the churches which are standing out for the truth. The Sunday following the Convention in Jarvis Street sixteen came forward at the morning service, and seven in the evening. Last Sunday enormous congregations were in attendance, it being necessary in the evening for persons to sit on the gallery steps, and all the deacons to sit on the platform. We have heard of blessing from every quarter where men are standing for the truth. A bitter spirit never pervades the churches that are out and out for the gospel, and we believe that through this great conflict a mighty revival will come to Canada; that it is in fact already on the way.

### THE PLACE OF PRAYER.

We urge our readers mightily to intercede with God for the outpouring of His Spirit, and the making bare of His arm. God will vindicate the trust of His people, for He still shows Himself strong in behalf of those who fear Him. We have received piles of letters, and not a few telegrams of congratulation, and the Editor of this paper, and the church he has the honour to serve, have never been happier in their history, and never more confident of the righteousness of their cause.

### "THE GOSPEL WITNESS" NOMINATES A PROFESSOR.

We would especially recommend our readers to study the performance of the Rev. J. M. Warner as given in this issue. His utter disregard for facts entitle him to special consideration! Professor Curr once made a remark to the effect that a man must wreck one or two churches in order to qualify for a professor's chair; and it has seemed to us that when a man has shown ability to reduce his congregations to the proportions of a comparatively small class, and has shown himself unable to lead a church to any large degree of spiritual success, he frequently retires to a professor's chair, from which comfortable corner he spends the rest of his life teaching young men to do what he was never able to do himself! With all these things in mind, *The Gospel Witness* nominates the Rev. J. M. Warner, B.A., B.D., for a Chair of some sort—we are not particular what—in McMaster University.

### COPIES OF THIS ISSUE.

It is intended to publish the largest single edition of this issue we have ever printed. It will be seen that it is eleven times the size of the regular issue of sixteen pages. Last week we announced that we would send copy postpaid for ten cents to anyone sending their name, and we repeat the offer; but while doing so, we would inform our readers that the edition is very much larger and very much more expensive than we had anticipated, and that the cost of the issue will be far in excess of ten cents per copy. If our readers, therefore, can send us more than ten cents, even twenty-five cents or a dollar for a single copy, it would greatly help our funds. There are many pastors who cannot do that, and we are more anxious that they should have *The Gospel Witness* than that we should have their money. We hope, therefore, that no one will feel the slightest embarrassment in sending for free copies of *The Gospel Witness*, and we suggest to all pastors interested that they order enough *Witnesses* to put a copy in every family in their church, having a few copies in reserve at the parsonage for other people who may want them, and that they then put the whole matter before their church, explain the function of *The Gospel Witness*, the battle it has fought, and is fighting, and is determined to continue to fight; and ask for their generous help. Any offering, however small, will be acceptable, and in view of our very heavy expense, no offering, even though it should run to a thousand dollars or more, could be too large.

We suggest that lists of names be sent us of persons to whom this issue may be mailed. One brother has sent us nearly one hundred names from one church and ten dollars to cover the cost.

### "THE GOSPEL WITNESS" CIRCULATION.

*The Gospel Witness* mail has never been so heavy as since the Convention. Orders are pouring in by every mail. It may interest some of our readers to know that the Northern Convention issue of *The Gospel Witness* equalled the combined regular circulation of both

*The Watchman-Examiner*, of New York, and *The Baptist*, of Chicago. We shall hope to be able to double the circulation of *The Witness* by this time next year.

### WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

Hurriedly called emergency meetings were held in Jarvis Street Church Wednesday and Thursday evenings. The attendance on Wednesday far exceeded the seating capacity of the Convention church, and on Thursday evening Jarvis Street Church was practically filled, so far as we were able to observe, at least from the platform. From thirty to forty ministers occupied seats either on the platform or in the choir, and on Thursday evening the following resolution was passed:

In view of the present situation in the Convention, and the necessity of establishing a fellowship of brethren who hold and practise the doctrines, principles, and polity of the Regular Baptists, as individuals and churches, it is resolved that a committee hereinafter named be appointed to take steps toward the organization of an association of Regular Baptists within the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, to make possible the co-operation of such Regular Baptists in missionary and educational work; and with authority to call a meeting for the formation of such an association at such time and place as the committee shall determine; it being understood that it is intended that such organization is to be without prejudice to the churches' status as parts of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

Since that time the following resolution was passed by the Stanley Avenue Baptist Church, Hamilton:

WHEREAS the Stanley Avenue Baptist Church stands for the full inspiration and authority of the Bible as the Word of God; and for the absolute infallibility of Jesus Christ as the Incarnate God; and for the truth, that in His substitutionary death Christ endured the punishment of our sins in our room and stead, "the just for the unjust to bring us to God"; and

WHEREAS Professor L. H. Marshall, of McMaster University, by his teaching, implicitly denies the full inspiration and authority of the Bible as the Word of God, and explicitly rejects the truth that Christ endured, in our behalf, the punishment of our sins; and

WHEREAS the Convention of Ontario and Quebec at its annual meeting held in First Avenue Baptist Church, Toronto, Tuesday, October 19th, notwithstanding Professor Marshall's repudiation of the substitutionary and expiatory value of the death of Christ, expressed its confidence in him, and its approval of his teaching,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that this church's first duty, to be loyal to Jesus Christ and His gospel, renders it impossible for it longer to contribute to any fund administered by any Board elected by the said Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec; and it is hereby determined that unless and until the said Convention shall reverse its said endorsement of false teaching, all contributions from this church to Convention funds shall cease as from this date; and that this resolution shall apply to any and all monies which may be now in the church treasury:

AND FURTHER, since this church as a Regular Baptist Church within the Convention of Ontario and Quebec, may be deemed to have a vested interest in McMaster University, this action shall be without prejudice to our status as part of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

And to-day's paper reports that the Oakwood Avenue Baptist Church, Toronto, of which Rev. W. F. Mesley is Pastor, has declared its determination to maintain its own work in future without the help of the Home Mission Board; at the same time protesting against the Convention's action.

### MISSION CIRCLES RESOLUTION.

In addition to the foregoing resolution, we propose to submit the following to the Jarvis Street Church at its great Communion Service next Sunday:

**RESOLVED**, that since the Women's Home and Foreign Missionary Societies of Ontario West carry on certain work independently of the General Convention Boards, this church recommends that the Mission Circles forward their funds as usual up to the time of the closing of the Treasurer's books for this Convention Year; but that all funds received thereafter be held in the treasuries of the Jarvis Street Mission Circles, until a further pronouncement shall be made by this church touching the relation of the Women's Mission Circles to the General Boards, in the light of the decisions of the forthcoming Women's Convention.

We believe that this will solve the problem for the women of our churches, and we print this resolution here as a suggestion to other churches who may be perplexed to know what to do. The orthodox members of churches which are officially standing by McMaster we think would be well advised to hold their missionary contributions in their own possession until such time as the missionary department in connection with the Regular Baptist Association has been organized. We recognize that the course we here propose is a severe one, but the Boards of the Convention apparently can only be influenced by a cutting off of supplies.

### A LETTER FROM MR. THOMAS URQUHART.

Toronto, November 3rd, 1926.

The Editor of *The Gospel Witness*:—

I had intended at the recent Meeting of the Convention to take some part in the discussion of the report of McMaster University, dealing with certain legal and moral obligations and other issues involved in the report which I thought should be considered. As I would like to have my views before the denomination, I desire to present some of the matters which I had proposed to deal with.

1. There are certain legal and moral obligations binding upon the University by reason of the Charter as well as under resolutions passed at various Conventions from time to time since the incorporation of the University.

2. At the Convention in Walmer Road Church in 1922, when Dr. T. T. Shields suggested that if Woodstock College were cut off, there would be a saving of \$10,000 or more each year to the University for general University work. In reply to this, a member of the Board took the platform and pointed out that there were certain moral obligations which made it necessary that the school at Woodstock be maintained, and stated what these obligations were, one of which is set out in the resolution at the Convention held in Guelph, on March 28th, 1888, as follows:

"That this Convention affirms as its judgment that the efficiency of Woodstock College should be maintained as a Collegiate School, and the details of its organization so arranged as to increase its efficiency, and thus make it one of the best schools of its kind in Canada; and this Convention recognizes a moral obligation to such subscribers to the last appeal for \$56,000 as made their subscriptions on the understanding that

Woodstock College would, in course of time, be developed into a degree-conferring college, at Woodstock, and affirms that it is the duty of the Board of Governors to meet this and all bona fide obligations in an honourable and equitable manner; and this Convention pledges itself to sustain the Governors in so doing; and that this Convention also affirms that the best interests of the denomination will be secured, and the greatest success of McMaster University rendered possible by locating the Arts Department in Toronto."

3. Why was there not a question regarding this moral obligation in the questionnaire sent out by the Board to the pastors? If there was a moral obligation in 1888 and endorsed by a member of the Board in 1922 and admitted by the Board at other times during the intervening period, what has happened since 1922 to discharge this moral obligation? There is no reference in the report to show that this moral obligation has been satisfied. Is there a legal as well as moral obligation to Woodstock subscribers to return the money which they paid to the College?

4. There are legal obligations under the Charter of the University, one of which is as follows:

"And no person shall be eligible to the position of chancellor, principal, professor, tutor, or master, who is not a member in good standing of an Evangelical Christian Church; and no person shall be eligible for the position of principle, professor, tutor, or master, in the faculty of theology who is not a member in good standing of a Regular Baptist Church."

5. Was this legal obligation satisfied by the appointment of a Professor who was a member of an open communion church, a church in which there were members who were not baptized?

6. The legal obligation under the Charter regarding religious teaching, is as follows:

"For the education and training of students preparing for and intending to be engaged in Pastoral, Evangelical, missionary or other denominational work in connection with the Regular Baptist Denomination whereby is intended Regular Baptist Churches exclusively composed of persons who have been baptized on a personal profession of their Faith in Christ, holding and maintaining substantially the following doctrines, that is to say: "The Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and their absolute supremacy and sufficiency in matters of faith and practice, the existence of one living and true God, sustaining the personal relation of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the same in essence and equal in attributes, the total depravity of mankind, the election and effectual calling of all God's people, the atoning efficacy of the death of Christ, the free justification of believers in Him by his imputed righteousness, the preservation unto eternal life of the Saints, the necessity and efficacy of the influence of the Spirit in regeneration and sanctification, the resurrection of the dead, both just and unjust, the general judgment, the everlasting happiness of the righteous and the everlasting misery of the wicked, immersion in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the only gospel baptism, that parties so baptized are alone entitled to Communion at the Lord's Table, and that a Gospel Church is a body of baptized believers voluntarily associated together for the service of God."

7. Was this legal obligation violated during the years when Professor Matthews was a professor in the College in view of admissions which have been made regarding his teachings? Has this legal obligation been again violated by endorsing the teachings of Professor Marshall which do not harmonize with the principles set out in the Trust Deed upon which the endowment held?

8. I expected to see a reference in the report of the Board to a course of lectures which, I understand, has been arranged with the body known as Disciples of Christ, and to carry on which a Professor or lecturer belonging

to that body has been appointed and who deals with the distinctive doctrines of that body. It surely would involve a violation of the Charter if such a course were carried on in the Theological department, but this course, I understand, has been arranged in the Arts department, where now the distinctive principles of another body are being taught. We have had impressed upon us again and again the great advantages of a distinctive Baptist University, and this leads us to enquire if moral and legal obligations have also been violated in doing through, or in, the Arts department what could not be legally carried out in the department of Theology. Might we not contemplate the Continuing Presbyterian Church, or the Christian Scientists, or the Adventists, or the Lutherans, or any other body, asking for and securing a special course, and might not the University soon become the centre of a new federation of religious colleges and thus lose its distinctive character as a Baptist University?

9. Particular reference was made by the Chairman of the Board of Governors to the increase in income of \$5,000 from the general endowment fund, but no reference was made or information supplied giving any indication of the amount of the endowment or how it was invested. At the Convention in Walmer Road Baptist Church four years ago I called attention to this omission and contended that statements should be set out in the annual reports showing the amount of the endowment and how it was invested. The Chairman then offered that he would show a statement of this for my personal information. I did not take advantage of his offer, as every member of a Regular Baptist Church is entitled to know, through the published reports, the amount of the endowment, the securities in which it is invested, and the rate of interest earned, together with a statement of profits and losses.

10. I would add in addition to what I intended to say at the Convention that, in view of the evident growth of modernism and giving consideration to the vote of the Convention, those members of Baptist Churches who have, by their wills, made bequests to missionary and educational funds, should reconsider their wills and make it clear that these bequests are made upon the distinct understanding that they are to be used to promote the distinctive principles of the body known as Regular Baptists and make it absolutely certain that these bequests shall be used for no other purpose. I was personally consulted some months ago by a testator regarding safeguarding his bequests to denominational funds in view of the drift to modernism, and I advised him that he had better let the matter stand until after the coming Convention. My advice now is that any person who desires to be absolutely sure that his wishes shall be carried out, should, instead of making bequests direct to Boards of the Convention, make the same to special trustees in whom he has confidence, giving directions to them as to his desires and granting to the Trustees the power to select the missionary or educational purpose in connection with Baptist work to which the bequests should go. I might add that, since the Convention, to my personal knowledge, one will has been changed along this line, the testator revoking bequests of several thousand dollars to our Baptist Missionary Boards, and placing the amount in the hands of three trustees, one of the trustees being an executor of the will and a member of a Baptist Church, and two pastors of our denomination in whom the testator had absolute confidence that they will see that his expressed wishes are properly carried out.

THOMAS URQUHART.

P.S.—I am sending a copy also to *The Canadian Baptist*.—T. U.

## "THERE IS NOTHING NEW UNDER THE SUN".

*Note: The following excerpts were sent us by Rev. J. W. Thompson, of Long Branch. They speak for themselves.—Ed. Gospel Witness.*

### "CHRONICLES OF THE SCHONBERG—COTTA FAMILY".

By Mrs. Charles Rundle,

Author of "The Voice of Christian Life in Song"; "The Three Wakings"; "The Diary of Mrs. Kitty Trevelyn", etc.

(Published by S. W. Partridge & Co. Ltd., London, England).

#### Prefatory Note:

The portions of these chronicles which refer to Luther, Melancthon, Frederic of Saxony, and other historical persons, can be verified from Luther's "Tischreden"; Luther's "Briefe, Sendschreiben Und Bedenken", edited by De-Wette; the four volumes called "Geist aus Luther's Schriften", edited by F. W. Comler, C. F. Lucisu, Dr. T. Rust, L. Sackreuter and Dr. Ernest Zimmerman; Tutschmann's "Frederick der Weise"; "The History of the Reformation", by Ranke; and that by D'Aubigne; with the ordinary English historical works relating to the period.

Page 223, Oct., 1520.

"We do indeed many of us wonder that Dr. Luther should use such fierce and harsh words against the Pope's servants. Yet St. Paul even 'even could have wished that those were cut off' that troubled his flock; and the very lips of Divine love launched woes against hypocrites and false shepherds severer than any that the Baptist or Elijah ever uttered in their denunciations from the wilderness. It seems to me that the hearts which are tenderest towards the wandering sheep will ever be severest against the seducing shepherds who lead them astray. Only we need always to remember that these very false shepherds themselves are, after all, but wretched lost sheep driven hither and thither by the great robber of the fold."

Page 120, May 14, 1512.

"Our most merciful Father seeing us overwhelmed and oppressed with the curse of the law, and so to be holden under the same that we could never be delivered from it by our own power, sent His only Son into the world, and laid upon Him the sins of all men, saying, 'Be Thou Peter, that denier; Paul, that persecutor, blasphemer and cruel oppressor; David, that adulterer; that sinner that did eat the apple in Paradise; that thief that hanged upon the cross, and briefly, be Thou the person that hath committed the sins of all men, and pay and satisfy for them. For God trieth not with us, but speaketh earnestly and of great love, that Christ is the Lamb of God Who beareth the sins of us all. He is just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.'"

Page 182, April, 1517.

"Lord Jesus, Thou art my righteousness, but I am Thy sin, Thou hast taken me upon Thyself, and given to me what was Thine; Thou hast taken on Thee what Thou wast not, and hast given to me what I was not."

Page 173, Sept., 1513.

"It seems that Dr. Luther attacks the old methods of teaching in the universities, which makes the old professors look on him as a dangerous innovator, while the young delight in him as a hero fighting their battles. And yet the authorities Dr. Luther wishes to re-instate are older than those he attacks. He demands that nothing shall be received as the standard of theological truth except the Scriptures. I cannot understand why there should be so much conflict about this, because I thought all we believed was founded upon the Holy Scriptures. I suppose it is not; but if not; on whose authority?"

Page 213, June 23, 1520.

"See how her burgher life has destroyed the heroic spirit of her crusading ancestors. She thinks that the holy places are to be won back from the infidels without a blow, only by begging their pardon and kissing the hem of their garments."

Page 234, April 2, 1926.

"But now to confess Luther seemed to me to have become identical with confessing Christ. It is the truth which is assailed in any age which tests our fidelity. It is to confess we are called, not merely to profess. If I profess with the loudest voice and the clearest exposition every portion of the truth of God except precisely that little point which the world, and the devil are at that moment attacking, I am not confessing Christ, however boldly I may be professing Christianity. Where the battle rages the loyalty of the soldier is proved; and to be steady on all the battlefield besides is mere flight and disgrace to him if he flinches at that one point.

"It seems to me also that, practically, the contest in every age of conflict ranges usually round the person of one faithful God-sent man whom to follow loyally is fidelity to God. In the days of the first Judaizing assault on the early church that man was Paul. In the great Arian battle this man was Athanasius—'Athanasius Contra Mundum'. In our days, in our land, I believe it is Luther; and to deny Luther would be for me, who learned the truth from his lips, to deny Christ. Luther, I believe, is the man whom God has given to His Church in Germany in this age. Luther, therefore, I will follow—not as a perfect example, but as a God-appointed leader. Men can never be neutral in great religious contests; and if, because of the little wrong in the right cause, of the little evil in the good man, we refuse to take the side of right, we are, by that very act, taking the side of wrong."

### "EVENING TELEGRAM" EDITORIAL.

The impression created in the public mind by the discussions in this Convention may be judged by the following editorial which is taken from *The Evening Telegram*, Toronto, October 23rd:

#### LET PRESS STUDY THEOLOGY AND ACQUIRE COMMAND OF FREE SPEECH.

These columns cannot turn back the hands of the clock and begin life anew.

Else this journal would join a divinity class in its freshman year and seek to graduate in theology.

Thus, and thus only, could the carnal columns of THE PRESS on its secular side, be free to print the truth about sinners on the wrong side of public questions. THE PRESS is not permitted to claim the liberty, not to say license, exercised by THE PULPIT in its denunciation of malefactors on the other side of theological questions.

Public journals are not admitted to the study of theology. Consequently, a degree of divinity will never arm The Telegram, D.D., with THE PULPIT privilege of dealing faithfully with the actual inexactitudes of the Toronto Star in the words of Rev. Professor Marshall's faithful dealings with the alleged inaccuracies of Rev. Dr. Shields:—

"I THRUST SLANDERS BACK DOWN DR. SHIELDS' THROAT AND SAY 'THOU LIEST.'"

#### THE PULPIT HAS FIRST CHANCE AT STOCK OF STRONG WORDS.

Rev. Dr. John MacNeill and his allies may think they have a hard time. The pack and set of publications that have opposed THE PRESS, and especially the peerless and patriotic columns of this journal, are a thousand times worse than the worst of Rev. John MacNeill's adversaries. A public journal must needs bear all things, hope all things, suffer long and be kind, and never have a chance to "hand a few" to the Toronto Globe & Co., or quote such words as the language that barbed the chaste and scholarly jolt Rev. Dr. John MacNeill thus imparted to Rev. Dr. Shields.



"He has attacked all the boards as part of the continent-wide propaganda carried on by the Baptist Bible Union, whose leader and champion in the South is Dr. J. Frank Norris; Dr. Riley, of Minneapolis, in the West; and Dr. Shields, the president, in Canada. Their methods are the same everywhere. Of Dr. Mullins it had been said that he would sell a spavined horse as a sound animal, a broken-down motor as a perfect machine, and as a lawyer would go into court and defend a lie. Not much that could be added to that, but Dr. Shields might have slipped a six-shooter into Dr. Mullins' pocket. That would have made him a real, up-to-date orthodox character."

#### OH, THAT THESE COLUMNS WERE A D.D.

THE PRESS never really began to envy the freedom of speech claimed and exercised by THE PULPIT until Rev. A. J. Vining also spoke. A high sense of public duty has opened these columns to a moderate representation of the true character of:—

"That arch false witness against T. L. Church, M.P., that millstone round the neck of the Conservative party, the Toronto Mail and Empire." (Groans).

Oh, that the Mail and Empire could be handled with the freedom permitted to THE PULPIT, instead of in the refined language of the restraints accepted by THE PRESS. These columns could then speak the honest thought of an outraged patriotism to the Mail and Empire in the style of Rev. A. J. Vining, and in the words that told Dr. Vining's opponents "where they got off at" as follows:—

"I have more respect for a toad catching flies in the vapor of a dunghill than for some of you."

Same to the Mail and Empire, Toronto Star & Co., and many of them.

#### THE SKY IS THE LIMIT.

THE SKY IS THE LIMIT in controversies fought out by ornaments of THE PULPIT.

The oracles of THE PRESS are doomed to speak in words as warm and glowing as the contents of an ice wagon of gentle and restrained prose.

But the ornaments of THE PULPIT are free to let a holy anger blaze and burn in language as red hot as the fire of a flaming gasoline tank of "conflagratory words."

#### LETTER FROM REV. W. B. RILEY, D.D.

Moody Bible Institute Monthly,  
Chicago, Ill.

Minneapolis, Minn.  
August 12, 1926.

"My dear Moody Monthly: I am in the Bible Institute of Los Angeles for a day or two on my Western vacation trip. My attention has just been called to a letter from my loved friend and brother, Rev. J. C. Masee, appearing in your magazine for August. In view of the extremely cordial relations that have long existed between myself and the Moody Institute, as well as the very fraternal relations I have long maintained for Dr. J. C. Masee, I am sure you will give equal place in your excellent columns to what I have to say.

"I accept without reservation Dr. Masee's declaration that he still preaches the same Gospel which he has declared from the beginning of his ministry. I affirm it as my conviction that Dr. Masee will never become an exponent of Modernism, but to his last day remain a friend of the truth. My purpose in

writing is to voice at one and the same time my joy in that fact, and my regret at the rather acrimonious criticism passed by this, my beloved brother, against the Baptist Bible Union of North America.

"I happen to be the Vice-President of that Union, chosen particularly to represent the Northern Baptist Convention territory, and inasmuch as I labored for many many weeks over the form of the organization, and particularly on its confession of faith, I may be expected to understand both its spirit and method.

"They are not in my judgment the spirit or method 'of denunciation, mis-interpretation, impugning of motives and the widespread directing of suspicion toward men who declare their conservatism and their faithful adherence to the Word and to the Christ of God.' It is difficult to understand how language like this could be employed by a man in describing his best beloved brethren, and all the more difficult when he affirms that he does not believe in the wisdom or righteousness of such a critical course.

"The Baptist Bible Union ought not to have been born and would never have been born had the fundamentalist organization, within the bounds of the Northern Baptist Convention, functioned; but when certain Bible-loving brethren saw convention after convention come and go, and was told by their chosen leader that he had 'no program' to present, they felt that they were in the position of men who must count themselves already conquered, or organize for the defense of the faith once delivered. I was in the company of those who so felt and that ground and that only found myself compelled to shift from the so-called fundamentalist organization to the Baptist Bible Union of North America.

"This Bible Union is not a company of men who 'entertain bitterness towards their brethren.'

"The Bible Union is not a company of men who 'seek contention for contention's sake.'

"The Bible Union is not a union that 'imputes motives unjustly or seeks to spread suspicion without a cause.'

"On the contrary, it is a company of men who hold absolutely to the old-time Baptist position.

"There is not an article in its extensive declaration that would have been doubted or ever debated for one second by the Baptist fathers of fifty years ago. There is not an action it has sought to have taken that is not in confirmation of the faith and conduct of these same fathers.

"The action taken at Washington was in contravention of all for which the denomination has stood for centuries. It declared that immersion is the only Scriptural Baptism, and in the next paragraph further declared that the teaching of the Bible could be set aside in the cases of all members of the church, save those who went to the convention, and yet the church remain in good standing.

"It is well-known to the readers of this article that I am not a Diana-Denominationalist. I have fraternized with my Paedo-Baptist brethren for many years with pleasure and with profit; but when a man declares that the Bible teaches a thing and teaches nothing else and then turns around and says we need not do what the Scriptures say, it is a far more offensive position than the ordinary Paedo-Baptist ever took, and that's the meaning of the Washington action.

"However, while the fundamental forces were split at Washington by the desertion of three of our company who played into the hands of Modernism, it still remains a fact that so far as organizations were concerned, the Fundamentalist body, of which Dr. Masee was at one time President, with the exception of less than one dozen, and the Baptist Union body, to the last man, were united in their vote.

"Controversy, therefore, was in no sense between these two bodies. It was between two or three individuals belonging to the first and the hundreds of both organizations who opposed them.

"Permit a further word also on the question of a six months' armistice in the interest of soul winning.

"I joined Dr. Masee in advocating by speech and voting a soul winning campaign. That was in perfect line with my continuous policy. I believe

evangelism to be the vital breath of the church, but I am not ignorant of history. The greatest periods of evangelism known to the past have been those characterized by controversy concerning the faith, and have come in consequence and as a direct result of the work of those who contended earnestly for it. The cry of 'Peace, peace, when there is no peace,' is not the speech of the true prophet.

"I have preached against Unitarianism and seen scores of people converted.

"I have denounced Evolution as a science, falsely so-called, and at the close of my address drawn the net to see scores seek and find the Christ.

"I could not conceive of a reason for ceasing from the defense of the faith for a period of six months any more than for a period of six years or sixty years. If Jude meant to suggest an armistice he certainly forgot to put it into his injunction, 'Contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered.'

"The time to contend for the faith is when it is being attacked, and certainly that time is now. Whether the Gospel so preached is a power can be put to the test if any man desires to visit Minneapolis and study the institutions that have grown up at the centre where such contention for the faith has been continuous for thirty consecutive years. I invite investigation.

"In conclusion I want to say that I have no ill-feelings of a personal sort towards Modernists. I meet them with the utmost cordiality as they will consent, but I have no sympathy with their destructive doctrines. It is my conviction that they are weakening the church and have already well-nigh sold us out to Unitarianism, and that the true warrior can do nothing else than declare and defend the 'faith once for all delivered'. I am not unmindful of the fact that those churches in America, where both of these things are being done, are among the most progressive, effective and successful. It seems to me the part of unwisdom to yield the very points upon which God has put His most signal approval, and on that account I shall continue to be a Baptist of the old-time order and a fundamentalist first, last and all the while.

"Fraternally yours,

"W. B. RILEY."

## 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 (\$2.00 in Toronto).

Send your subscription to:

**The Gospel Witness**

130 Gerrard Street East

Toronto 2, Canada

## WILL A MAN DEFEND HIMSELF AND NOT DEFEND CHRIST AND THE BIBLE?

By Professor Leander S. Keyser, D.D.

I want to give a concrete case (without mentioning any names), and draw the relevant lesson from it. There is a certain prominent man in one of the leading denominations who does not approve of the present controversy in the Protestant church. He does not want the evangelical portion of the church to defend the Bible and Christ against the criticisms of the Modernists, but wants all of us just to keep quiet for the sake of peace. At the same time he professes to be thoroughly evangelical himself, and to be loyal to the standards of his own denomination, which bind all its members to the evangelical position.

Again and again the Modernists have torn out large parts of the Bible and called them "outworn categories." Again and again they have denied the Virgin Birth of our Lord, His essential deity, His resurrection and His visible second coming. But the man to whom I refer, and who professes to be evangelical in his theology, has never used his pen or lifted his voice through all these years in defense of these holy Christian doctrines.

But here is a still more inconsistent feature of his case. Some time ago one of his church's periodicals contained a few lines that seemed to reflect upon him. Did he keep quiet then? Did he go on the principle of saying nothing for the sake of peace and good will? No; he fairly flew to his own defense; and not in a mild spirit, either, but with real anger and with many harsh expressions. Oh, yes! he was ready to defend Number One—that is, himself, but never a word in defense of the Bible and evangelical Christianity! Not very consistent, is it? This leads one to wonder whether he really wants people to keep quiet for the sake of peace or whether it might not be because he half sympathizes with the liberalistic party.

The thing that seems to be so inapt is that a man can profess to be earnestly, wholeheartedly evangelical, and yet can sit quietly by and permit the precious doctrines of our faith to be attacked without coming to their defense, and even go so far as to rebuke those who do oppose heresy and try to vindicate the fundamental doctrines. If a man's wife or mother were in any way disparaged, surely he would not fold his hands and keep silent. But Christ's virgin birth can be denied and held up to scorn as a "biological miracle" which is intolerable to the "modern mind," and yet some professedly evangelical men will maintain a mouse-like silence.

Consider another precious doctrine that is regarded as "outmoded" by many propagandists of Modernism—the doctrine of the atonement as substitutionary and sacrificial. It surely is a doctrine which is plainly taught in the Bible; and the shedding of Christ's blood on Calvary is connected with it. Note how large a part of the four gospels is devoted to the narrative of the sufferings and death of our Lord. Yet there are people who assert that we are saved, not by the death of Christ, but by His life; by which they mean that He was only our teacher and example. Then He did not "give His life a ransom for the many," as He Himself declared. Then He did not shed His blood "for the remission of sins." Then He was not "wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities." Then souls are not "washed in the blood of the Lamb." Why, expiation, substitution, propitiation, atonement—these are terms that run through the whole Bible and are basic in the system of Christianity; they are the foundation of God's plan of redeeming grace.

Yet, strangely enough, there are people who will allow this great foundational doctrine to be discredited and rejected, and will keep their lips sealed. How can they do so? Did Christ act in this ironical way when the Pharisees accused Him of casting out devils in the name of Beelzebub? Did Paul sit at ease when the Judaizing teachers perverted the true gospel of salvation by grace, and when the antinomians took advantage of the doctrine to serve their own lusts? Did not Jude earnestly bid us to "contend earnestly for faith"?

In this crucial hour when, not Christianity alone is in danger, but when souls are in peril through dangerous teaching, let us not perch on the top rail of the fence like sleeping fowls, but let us get down in the arena, stand firm for the truth, defend it, proclaim it, explain it, fight for it, show its beauty and rationality, and expose the bareness and baldness of the opposing errors.

## Chancellor Whidden's Speech

In Presenting the University Report to the Convention

### EXPLANATORY NOTE.

We are sure our readers will justify our attempt to economize space in this issue. We have deleted from the Chancellor's speech a large portion of the report for two reasons: firstly, it has already been quoted, and secondly, it will be included in the official verbatim report of education day. This report begins with the Chancellor's reference in his speech to the Woodstock College section of the report. Explanatory notes will be found throughout the report set in the larger type.

The eight point type in which these words are set, represents the stenographic report of the educational session.

The ten point type in which these words are set, represents, when no signature is attached, the comments of the Editor of this paper. Where comments are made by others, the name is attached.

**WILL OUR READERS RE-READ THIS PARAGRAPH THAT THEY MAY HAVE THE DIFFERENT TYPES IN MIND AND THUS BE ABLE READILY TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN THE**

eight point type of the main text

of the Report, and

the ten point type in which our comments are printed.

\* \* \* \*

### The Closing of Woodstock College.

The Woodstock College section of the report deserves our very earnest and sympathetic and prayerful consideration. Let us remember all the facts before we record our decision on this question,—the glorious history of Woodstock, the beginnings of which, centred in and under God, were the result of one great man, Dr. Robert Alexander Fyfe; let us not forget the contributions made by other men, and by women, too; let us, however, keep in mind what our Baptist pastors and our Baptist parents have been doing and have not felt able to do. However, I am not going to speak further. I am sure we will discuss this section of the report this afternoon with a great deal of fine spirit and recognizing, not only the rights of all concerned at the present time, but all the claims upon us as a people.

Our readers will bear in mind that Woodstock College is closed. At the Walmer Road Convention, 1922, we were taken to task for what we had said about Woodstock and Moulton Colleges. We were roundly censured by Dr. Frank Sanderson for having criticized the work, but this is what we said:

#### Woodstock and Moulton Colleges.

We all pay taxes for the up-keep of our public and high schools. As Baptists, in Ontario and Quebec, we voluntarily tax ourselves to keep up two Baptist secondary schools, Woodstock and Moulton Colleges. These two institutions are virtually residential high schools, they each do some

work below the high-school standard, but both provide courses leading to matriculation.

The question arises, why do we, by the maintenance of these two schools, duplicate our high schools; and tax ourselves for their support over and above what we are compelled as citizens to pay for the public system?

#### Do They Do Baptist Work?

In what respects are these schools superior to our high schools? Something may be said for the advantages of a residential school, especially for students of certain dispositions. But is that all? It may be assumed that in both these colleges a Christian view of life is presented. But is it the Baptist interpretation of New Testament Christianity which obtains? We believe that in Woodstock there is an understanding that students are to be treated as though it were an undenominational college. It is, of course, known that it is a Baptist institution; but we are not aware that the religious principles for which Baptists distinctively stand are taught the students as a body. Certainly the students are given to understand that the school will not interfere with their denominational predilections. We presume the same principle is observed at Moulton.

#### Why Educate Pedobaptists Under Cost?

At Woodstock we understand the Pedobaptist students are never less than sixty per cent. of the total, and sometimes the percentage is higher. The percentage of Baptists at Moulton may be higher, but to be perfectly safe, it is almost certain that at least fifty per cent. of the students at both colleges are of Pedobaptist parentage. Thus we are educating the children of Pedobaptists, with the tacit understanding that they shall leave our institutions as strongly Pedobaptist as they entered.

Some will tell us that from year to year conversions take place in Woodstock and Moulton. But probably quite as high a proportion of our young people who never go to either of these colleges are converted through the ordinary ministry of the home, the church, and the Sunday school. \* \* \*

There can be only one possible justification of this expenditure of money given by our Baptist Churches, and that is, that these institutions are doing such a spiritual work as cannot be done by the public and high schools; and that that spiritual work is consistent with the witness of Baptist Churches. It may be a generous act to educate the children of Pedobaptists while giving them an undertaking that we will not influence them toward our views; but we submit that Pedobaptists and not Baptists should be asked to pay the deficits thus incurred,—especially as thousands of Baptist parents in our churches who contribute to the Budget and thus to these colleges, cannot afford to send their own children to either institution.

#### Excuse us for Saying, "I Told You So".

Since then an educational "expert" was employed to make a survey of the whole situation, and we understand he recommended the closing of Woodstock College. We refer to this matter now only to show the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec that we modestly offered, for nothing, the Board of Governors advice, which they later obtained at a price from someone else; and upon which they have now acted. We were told in 1922 that the Governors were under a moral obligation to keep Woodstock College open, and to spend upon it some ten thousand dollars a year. If that were true in 1922, what has become of the "moral obligation" in 1926? We were denounced as a trouble-maker in 1922 for pointing to an economic necessity which, in 1926, the Governors have been compelled to recognize. We heartily

approve of the closing of Woodstock College, providing it involves no breach of trust. According to the Governors' report for the years 1922 to 1925 the aggregate deficit in Woodstock College was \$41,579.69. We offered a suggestion in 1922 which aimed to save the Denomination from this waste. The animus of the Board of Governors toward the Editor of *The Gospel Witness* in the interim has cost the Denomination on account of Woodstock College deficit alone \$41,579.69.

While dealing with this matter we may quote from the speech of the Chairman of the Board of Governors respecting Moulton College as follows:

"Now the misfortune from the standpoint of the Board of Governors is that we are not educating a larger percentage of Baptist girls. Out of 186 young women on the roll of Moulton College, much less than half are Baptist girls from Baptist homes. If it were to get very much worse we would be faced with the problem of how far we should go in educating the public. We have not faced that yet as we did in Woodstock, but I wish Baptists would provide for their girls at Moulton College. The Baptist girls get precedence over the non-Baptist girls. We would like to see the residence full of Baptist girls, if that could be accomplished in any way. I can tell the delegates that the charges for attendance, tuition and board at Moulton College are nearly one-third less than they are at any other Toronto girls' school. Or if you look at the other side of the picture, the other girls' colleges charge about fifty per cent. more than Moulton charges." (Emphasis ours.)

Thus it would appear that even in respect to Moulton, our criticism that we were educating paedo-Baptists under cost, at the cost of the Denomination, without making any attempt to convert them to the Baptist position, was justified. The Woodstock-Moulton matter of 1922 and 1926 should show the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec that the Denomination is paying dearly in dollars and cents for the "spirit" of certain of the Governors.

#### The Chancellor Continues.

##### THE CHANCELLOR continues:

I am going to take the liberty to say a simple word or two with regard to the section which presents briefly, and, I fear, without the elaboration and glow that it should have possessed—there are some of us who cannot say by the use of piled-up adjectives all that we think and feel about those with whom we are associated and have been associated, as we cannot, some of us, in regard to those who are in our own home. But if you good people will remember that you have already read, or should have read—I take it this is a Canadian Baptist reading delegation that is here—the sincere resolutions that have been spread upon our minutes concerning the long years' of service of Professor P. S. Campbell and Professor E. M. Keirstead, you will understand how we who have been colleagues of theirs, have felt about them and about their retirement.

The Chancellor implies that he and his colleagues were so affectionately disposed towards Professors Campbell and Keirstead that their retirement from the Faculty was a real grief. To be absolutely frank it is necessary to "pile up adjectives" to describe this statement

of the Chancellor, but we find a phrase in the speech of the Chairman of the Board of Governors ready-made for our purpose—it is sheer “humbug”! The Chancellor knew perfectly well that the departure of these two orthodox members of the Faculty was certainly not lamented by either himself or by the Deans.

#### The Summer Session.

I should like to add this other word. This statement that is given in our printed report, while brief, is an absolutely honourable, accurate, fair-to-the-facts statement to you, our brethren in Convention assembled.

May I refer in an explanatory way to the great satisfaction some of us have had who are new members of the McMaster Faculty in the recent Summer Session? It had been hoped to put on a summer session two years ago. The absence of Dr. Farmer on his sabbatical year made it impracticable; then later on the sudden passing of our good Dr. Gilmour and Dr. Bates, who did so much to help us in creating interest and in making possible the Summer Session. So that no Summer Session had been put on for five years until we met about the 23rd of June.

Brethren, I want to say with all kindness that I came to appreciate so much in my few days of contact with the men who were there, their spirit, their earnestness, their Christian brotherliness for one another, and for those of us who were helping a little, and their deep appreciation of the unnamed donors that made the School possible, that I was pained when I read words like these on page 188, Volume 5, of *The Gospel Witness*, under “The Glory and Shame of the Ministry”:

What was the recent summer Conference at McMaster University but an attempt to bribe men into submission? (Cries of “Shame”). If a man finds himself one of many guests in another’s house and a fellow guest should propose a vote of thanks to the host, what can he do but vote for it? We do not suggest that the ministers who attended this conference had any consciousness of accepting bribes, but that that was the intention of the session no one—

“no one”—note the rhetoric of it,

—can doubt. Someone will object that there have been other sessions at times—

and so on.

—that is quite true; but we have heard these conferences discussed officially on more than one occasion, and their object was always stated to be to enlist the co-operation of pastors in the work of the University.

I may say I had heard proposed summer sessions discussed at several meetings of the Senate and I had never heard that mentioned.

To this we reply, that when preparation was made for a former conference, we distinctly remember that the main argument was, the advantage to the University rather than to the men.

Such benefit as pastors might derive was only incidental to the main purpose. This sort of thing drags the ministry down to the level of the priesthood of EM’s day. (Laughter and cries of “Shame”).

In the name of a generous and loving Christ who knows the frailty of those who arranged that programme, what kind of words are these to be printed in a paper that calls itself Christian?

We reply to this that it would be difficult to conceive of any institution where a greater premium is put upon insincerity than at McMaster University. We are not alone in believing that the Sum-



mer Conference was a bribe: laymen who do not live in Toronto have expressed their belief that it was designed to serve such a purpose. The above record shows that some cried, "Shame", when the quotation from *The Gospel Witness* was read. While perhaps they did not intend it, they could not have used a more appropriate word: it is the shame of the ministry that men can be so cheaply bought.

#### The Noon Adjournment.

I think our time is almost up, and I will have to move the adjournment in a moment, Mr. Chairman. I should like very much that the Chairman of our Board should be listened to with regard to the claims of the forward movement. He will be heard, I am sure, with deep appreciation this afternoon.

Brethren of the Ontario and Quebec Convention, the time has certainly arrived for us to take more adequate care of our educational work as it centres in McMaster. Think of the labours of my former pastor of college days, Dr. O. C. S. Wallace, in those earlier days, the chapel he erected; think of the strenuous and successful efforts of Dr. A. C. McKay during his brief Chancellorship, the erection of the Science building; think of the long, splendid, hard service, the long service splendidly rendered, during that hard and trying period in which Dr. A. L. McCrimmon was the Chancellor—(applause)—the opening of Wallingford Hall, the holding of things that we possess, the conserving of all of our interests, and yet the simple fact remains that the endowment that was sufficient nineteen years ago, and the plant that was sufficient nineteen years ago, are simply painfully inadequate at the present time. We had accommodation nineteen years ago for from thirty-five to forty young women—no residence of course, but I am referring to the daylight hours—to-day we have a hundred and thirty in the same quarters.

I believe a great many of our people are waiting for the privilege of sharing in a real worth-while Forward Movement for McMaster University, in which the great majority of us believe up to the hilt. (Applause).

Now, Mr. Chairman, unless you rule otherwise, I am going to move that we do now adjourn, to meet, if it is with the approval of the Committee of Arrangements, at say 1.45. There will be the time for singing and prayer, and then we can go on with the moving and seconding of the report. I so move.

The motion, duly seconded, was agreed to.

MR. KENNEDY: Mr. Chairman, I want to bring up a matter that I brought up Monday night.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are out of order now. I will call on Dr. O. C. S. Wallace to ask the benediction.

After the benediction, the Convention adjourned.

## Afternoon Session

### The Chancellor Resumes His Speech.

The Convention having been resumed:

THE CHANCELLOR (continuing): Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of this great Convention for but a very few minutes more. I want to urge the importance of the last section of our report: "McMaster University Foursquare with Baptist Principles." I am not going to re-read it.

We have not reprinted, as you will observe, what has appeared several times in our annual reports. See the Year Books and the reports separately, if you have them, for the years especially mentioned in this paragraph.

It really seems strange for those who have perspective to think of McMaster University as doing other than standing foursquare with Baptist principles; and I want to appeal this afternoon, in the few words that I shall speak as amplifying that section, to those especially who have come a considerable distance to be present in this great assembly. I want to appeal to you as Baptist people to have the open mind, to show the spirit of British fair play, to show the depth of your conviction by the height and the loftiness of your conception of your brethren.

The latter part of the foregoing sentence is illuminating! We supposed that the depth of Baptist conviction would be displayed in one's loyalty to Christ and His truth as revealed in the Scriptures; but the Chancellor requests that it be shown "by the height and the loftiness of your conception of your brethren". It is sober truth in the light of these discussions, as many of our readers will agree, to say that the stature of some of the brethren make any sort of lofty conception impossible!

#### The Chancellor's Chivalry.

To think of McMaster University as not an orthodox Baptist institution is as inconsistent, so it seems to me, as to speak of a whole family or a whole church or an entire Convention or an entire movement within a Convention, as being utterly untrue to Jesus Christ, because it may be that the son of one of the outstanding leaders in such Convention or movement is unfortunately serving sentence in a penitentiary, or that another great leader's real estate transactions are such that one after another his most devoted men feel that they must fall away from him, but not away from Christ; or even that the click of a pistol should lead us to designate the great Baptist host as utterly given over to impossible practices according to our understanding of the principles of Jesus Christ and the principles of our beloved denomination.

We are able to discern the direction of only one of the Chancellor's allusions made above, but the malice disclosed in this remark is unworthy of any fair-minded man, to say nothing of a gentleman and a Christian.

Some of our children may not agree with the fathers—children who have gone out from McMaster University—in their intellectual solution of great problems; but I think the time has come, in all fair play let me say and let me urge, the time has come when to accuse the mother for producing the differences and the varieties of thought—I say it is just as unfair as to ascribe in the other cases to Conventions or churches or movements the deeds of the few.

I am going to take the risk—I really won't risk telling you a story to-day—(laughter)—but I am going to take the risk of reading a copy of a letter to show—now, I do not know this father, he lives in the Province of Quebec, I think, I do not know whether he is a hundred per cent. serious or not, you will have to determine, but here it is:

R.R. No. 2, Granby.

Dear Dr. MacWhidden:

I am going to send my boy to some university when he is through high school. I da'st not do it, but I sold that piece to the railroad and I did good with my crop this year. I da'st ask you one question. I don't want Jim to be always a fool. (Laughter.) One man told me that your school is so Orthadox—(laughter)—

—capital O-r-t-h-a capital D-o-x—(laughter)—

that you teach that the world is flat. This I da'st say is not true, because if so, why does water run down. (Laughter).

Please answer by return mail. We are all well and hope you are the same. (Laughter).

(Received Jan. 5, 1926.)

Do you think that this properly sets forth the foursquareness of your University?

We are unable to see what purpose the Chancellor supposed the use of the letter quoted above would serve. Perhaps this is the foundation for Professor Marshall's remark in his speech in England

last summer that he had found fundamentalists in Canada hated science.

**Very Close to the Truth.**

I received to-day a photograph from a Canadian paper. The inscription on the front of it reads as follows:

"No service will be held in this church to-day. By order of the trustees."

What was it? The young pastor had dared to preach the whole Gospel against the rank infidelity of the University near there, and the ecclesiastical powers of the University controlled the trustees of the church and they closed the church up. They not only did that, but, I received it from first-hand, they went to work to break his heart, damn his soul—

that is the ecclesiastical authorities—

—and blacken his name. I will say to you, my friends, the persecution that will burn a man at the stake is merciful as compared with the persecution that will damn a good man's name.

From *The Searchlight* of April 2. I do not often quote from it.

**The Persecution Whlp.**

Why does Dr. Whidden quote this paragraph? Apparently he would hold the Editor of this paper responsible for supplying the information. As a matter of fact we had absolutely no communication with the Editor of *The Searchlight* on this subject; but the only words in this strong statement to which we object are, "damn his soul". Happily, it is not in human power to do that. But to show that this statement was substantially true we quote a letter by Mr. E. P. Stewart, one of the prominent Ossington Avenue members who led in that church's opposition to its pastor. In *The Canadian Baptist* of February 11th, 1926, Mr. Stewart said, in part:

"The Ossington Ave. Baptist Church, Toronto, held its annual business meeting on Jan. 13th and 20th. The first evening is usually devoted to the receiving of reports, and the second to the election of officers. This programme was set aside on account of Rev. Geo. W. Allen refusing to accept the denominational budget as outlined by the Convention. Mr. Allen openly opposed giving any support to Social Service, Religious Education and Christian Education, which includes McMaster University. On account of this attitude the deacons, at a meeting held prior to Jan. 13th, voted that the first item of business should be the discussion and vote on the following motion: 'It is moved and seconded that we, the Ossington Avenue Baptist Church, accept the Denominational Budget, including all the Denominational Boards and that by this motion we express approval of the work being done by all these Boards, and our belief in the Christian integrity of the men and women carrying out the programme of our Convention.' After a two-hours' lively discussion the above motion was carried by a vote of 115 to 68. Immediately following this a resolution was brought in declaring the pulpit of Ossington Avenue Baptist Church vacant, as from Jan. 13th, 1926, and that a retiring allowance of \$400

be paid to Mr. Allen. The reasons given by the mover and seconder of this resolution were as follows: Unwillingness of Mr. Allen to co-operate with his official board; attacks upon individual members of the church; unwarranted use of the pulpit in the denunciation of official representatives of denominational boards; unauthorized attacks upon Prof. Marshall and other McMaster professors; unauthorized co-operation with Dr. T. T. Shields, and especially Mr. Allen's acceptance of an invitation as Pastor of Ossington Avenue Baptist Church, to appear on a public platform for the avowed purpose of denouncing Prof. Marshall and McMaster University."

There is not the shadow of a doubt that Mr. Allen was ground under the heels of Canadian Baptist "ecclesiastical authority". It is difficult to account for the sudden enthusiasm for denominational interests of men like Mr. Stewart and others, apart from the hypothesis of a denominational inspiration.

Or again, an extract from one of our evening papers under date of June 7, 1926. The last phrase is in inverted commas.

Dr. T. T. Shields in his pulpit at Jarvis Street Baptist Church yesterday renewed his fight against what he characterized as "the infidel-making teachings at McMaster University."

Or again, from Volume 4, page 529 of *The Gospel Witness*:

The spirit of McMaster University is the spirit of the Spanish Inquisition.

Or again:

Altogether then, apart from the theological aspect of the question, the institution itself has long manifested a spirit that is as alien to the Spirit of Christ as anything could possibly be.

I am not going to make any comments. I could continue the quotations.

### The "Spirit" of McMaster in Convention.

If any justification were wanting for the foregoing paragraphs quoted from *The Gospel Witness*, the "spirit" and action of the First Avenue Church Convention has supplied it. Let any unprejudiced reader peruse these pages and observe the "spirit" of the speeches of Drs. MacNeill, Vining, Green, Farmer, Professor Marshall, and others on that side of the controversy, and consider whether they can find anything, anywhere, in keeping with the Spirit of Christ.

Brethren of the Baptist churches of Ontario and Quebec, is this your way of advancing the interests of your Christian University? (Cries of "No"). I simply leave with you the need of the hour, I leave with you the honest and sincere assurance that the governing bodies of McMaster University are, to the best of their knowledge and ability, endeavouring to conduct the affairs of your University in harmony with the provisions of our Charter, a copy of which I have near at hand, and within the scope and meaning and application of that great body of Baptist principles for which our fathers stood and for which we dare to say we are prepared to stand still,—not to stand still in our tracks, but still to stand in these days of great opportunity and high challenge, to go forward in the building of the Kingdom of God through the enterprises, especially now, that we as a body of people are responsible for.

And I want to say as I take my seat that my greatest reason for believing that we can with all confidence hand over to you our report, knowing that you

will interpret it and accept it as it is given, is because I know as an old student of McMaster something of the power of the spirit and the grace of God that has operated in those plain, those substantial halls of ours.

I was a room-mate of the first man in the Arts Department of the University who ever professed to give his heart to Jesus Christ, and I know that no other Canadian Baptist preacher has ever had the joy of winning more men and women and boys and girls into the kingdom of light than that same number one, and I know that the good work quietly but surely has been going on. I know that not only have our evangelistic bands and student supplies and student pastors during session time and summer time, but that our men and women who have gone to mission fields abroad and at home, and our men who are engaged in the work of the Christian ministry, missionary endeavour, Christian teaching, and the many callings in which they are to be found as devoted Christian people, I know that they again are the evidence of the fact that the great-bulk of the work that has been done at McMaster has been done solely with the thought of pleasing Him Whose name is written into our legend, and that the results in large measure have been pleasing unto Him and according to His mind and will.

Even if the Chancellor's proud boast of McMaster's record could be taken at its face value, even if it were true that its influence hitherto had been wholly on the side of Evangelical Faith, that could afford no justification for the present deliberate appointment to its teaching staff of one whose views are manifestly out of accord, not only with Baptist standards, but with Evangelical Christianity.

### Dr. John MacNeill's Speech

It gives me great pleasure, Mr. President, to say that Dr. John MacNeill will move the adoption of the report and that it will be seconded by Mr. Albert Matthews, the Chairman of the Board of Governors. (Applause).

REV. JOHN MACNEILL: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Convention of Ontario and Quebec: I rise to move the adoption of the report of the Senate and the Board of Governors of McMaster University which has just been presented by Chancellor Whidden and which report also contains the Treasurer's statement.

May I say that as I do so I rejoice in the opportunity that is given to me to-day to attempt to expound to you the position in which our University stands at the present time. On account of the very limited time at our disposal I shall be compelled to address myself almost exclusively to the immediate issues of the hour.

Nothing would have given me greater pleasure to-day than to employ the time accorded to me, this brief period, in discussing the commanding tasks of our Baptist people, especially in relation to their great educational enterprise.

The time is surely past when any true citizen of any democracy needs to be convinced of the necessity of education. We are a democratic people, we live in a democratic land, we live in the midst of a democratic country, and our whole form of government is based upon democratic principles. History attests the fact over and over again that no democracy can flourish and long endure that is not constantly enlightened and informed. Consequently education has become a part of the very vital breath of every true democracy. Liberty and learning go hand in hand; ignorance is everywhere a menace; even freedom becomes a possible curse unless it is constantly informed and enlightened—a great democracy informed and enlightened in the things relating to their own welfare.

But even enlightenment will not make a democracy safe for the world or the world safe for democracy, for the simple reason that the moral and spiritual nature of man calls for renewal and for the power of the divine dynamic within it; hence the great need not only of education, but of Christian education. Certainly the day has long since passed when any true Baptist should need to be convinced of the necessity of Christian education. It is after all, my

brethren, the only complete education, for the simple reason that it addresses itself to the needs of the whole man.

Consequently it is very plainly evident that education by the State can never be complete education. True education must take recognition of the whole nature of mankind, physical, intellectual, moral and spiritual, and by the very genius of the State, broad-based as it is upon individual liberty and upon the safeguarding of the individual conscience,—for that reason the State can never become a teacher of religion. And so to meet that great need which Baptist people have always recognized, and to overcome the necessary limitations laid upon the State, they have at great cost to themselves undertaken to establish here and there their systems of education under distinctly Christian auspices.

Thus far we agree entirely with Dr. MacNeill; and it is because we believe so profoundly in "Christian" education we have engaged in this controversy; it is because we believe there has been introduced into McMasetr University, not merely on-Christian, but anti-Christian, teaching that we are engaged in this conflict.

I would remind you that over this vast continent to-day there has grown up a great Baptist brotherhood of colleges and universities and institutions, and at great cost our people have produced a commanding intellectual and moral leadership not only for the needs of our denomination but for the great demands of our continental realm in every phase. (Applause).

### A Baptist Brotherhood of Colleges.

Dr. MacNeill refers to "a great Baptist brotherhood of colleges and universities and institutions" on this continent. Would Dr. MacNeill have us believe that all the colleges and universities which wear the Baptist name on this continent are part of a "Baptist brotherhood"? Does Dr. MacNeill credential Crozer, or the "Baptist" Unitarian institution known as Newton Theological Seminary? Or would he include in the "Baptist brotherhood of colleges" Rochester?—of which Dr. Augustus H. Strong said:

"The result of the election of Dr. Cross has been the resignation of some members of the committee and the withdrawal of others from active service. I regard that election as the greatest calamity that has come to the seminary. It was the entrance of an agnostic, skeptical, and anti-Christian element into its teaching, the results of which will be only evil. The election of Dr. Cross was followed by that of Professors Robins, Parsons, and Nixon, who sympathized with these views. These men, with Prof. Moehlmann, soon gave evidence in their utterances that a veritable revolution had taken place in the attitude of the seminary toward the fundamentals of the Christian faith."

It is at least significant that two of the professors named by Dr. Strong as responsible for introducing "an agnostic, skeptical, and anti-Christian element into its (Rochester's) teaching" came from McMaster University.

Now, within our own Convention the history of that educational enterprise is a glorious history. We look back over the half century or more in which we have been concerned in this task of educating and training our people. Those who are closer to its beginnings than I could possibly be, will bear their witness that from its very inception it was conceived in prayer and in soul-travail, it has been nourished in great sacrifice, it has been fortified by unflin-

courage. Yes, and let me say also that from the beginning to this day it has been guided by the same and godly and Baptist leadership of the great and noble succession of men from the days of Dr. Fyfe and his friends to the days of the present Chancellor and his colleagues. (Applause).

Never, my friends, was the opportunity so challenging as it is to-day in connection with our educational enterprise. Ah, we have found ourselves face to face with a great task, and if ever the trumpet call of duty sounded in the ears of our people to take a great forward step in connection with our educational work, that trumpet call is sounding to-day, and, thank God, this Convention is the proof that there are multitudes of our friends that will rally to the support of that great enterprise. (Applause).

Mention has been made in the report and has also been referred to at some length by Chancellor Whidden of the proposed Forward Movement—that forward movement that we all recognize has been long overdue. Yes, the need is very great, and it is very, very pressing.

It is long overdue. And why? Because we have found ourselves unable, at least up to the present hour, to undertake it. What has been the history of the last few years? It is this, my brethren, that for the past five or six years we have been torn by strife—we have been torn by strife. The last five or six years to all the lovers of peace and righteousness and co-operation have been heart-sickening years. (Hear, hear). There may be some of our number who have enjoyed them; I can bear my testimony to-day that the vast multitude of our people are thoroughly heart-sick of them. (Hear, hear). The hour has come when our people are saying: Contention must die within our ranks. (Hear, hear). We must attend to the task that God has given us to do.

### Who is the Divider?

We answer Dr. MacNeill at this point in the words of Scripture: "Art thou he that troubleth Israel? I have not troubled Israel: but thou, any thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim"; "There be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ."

What has been the history of the last five or six years? Churches have been rent asunder; lifelong friendships in some instances have been destroyed; the dragon's teeth have been sown in our denominational life; suspicions have been engendered which will not perish within a generation; the energies of our people have been diverted and dissipated from the great claims of the Kingdom, and we have been compelled to find ourselves harried and helpless with the work of God half done.

### Who Sowed the Dragons' Teeth?

Who have been the sowers of "dragons' teeth" in our denominational life? Some of the representatives of McMaster University, notably also the Secretary of Foreign Missions, have gone up and down the Convention endeavouring to create prejudice against the Editor of *The Gospel Witness*, in an attempt to invalidate his testimony. In some instances pastors, in their zeal for McMaster, have failed in their loyalty to truth, with the result that true believers in their congregation have revolted against their attitude. There is no doubt that one party in this controversy has specialized in "dragons' teeth", and if anyone desires to know which party that is, let him read these pages and study the speeches of men like Dr. MacNeill himself. We bear Dr. MacNeill no ill will. Were it not so serious, we should be amused by his tirades; every time Dr. MacNeill has spoken in public on this issue he has made friends for Jarvis Street. Twice directly, and a third time indirectly, Dr. MacNeill has charged the

Editor of this paper with having committed the unpardonable sin. Dr. MacNeill should be the last man to charge anyone with engendering suspicions.

### Dr. MacNeill Leads the Charge!

But, my friends, we will survive; don't you fear for a moment, we will survive it. (Applause). The long history of our educational enterprise may teach us that. We have not come by an easy road in our educational task, but, believe me, we have come by a road of steady triumph. The long years that have gone by will teach us that.

If I needed any distinct and definite proof that the good hand of God has been upon this institution ever since its birth I could find it over and over again in the steady progress and the abundant blessing that has rested upon McMaster University all through her history in the face of, and in spite of, at times, the destructive criticism and unwarranted opposition with which she has been confronted.

Fifty years of our history has revealed this fact—and I think we might as well face it—that from the very beginning our educational enterprise was met in some quarters by an utter lack of sympathy, and it has been met in other quarters by open and avowed antagonism; and that has been true, not particularly of the days of controversy,—but that has been true when there was no denominational controversy upon the horizon of our life.

But McMaster University will live and rise above it and will triumph over it. God has this institution in His keeping. Make no mistake whatever, my friends, about that. God had this institution in His keeping. We know that we can trust our churches, and we know too that all the misrepresentation and innuendoes and the whispering campaign of suspicion that is levelled against the University will perish as every other brood of misrepresentation has perished. It will perish in the strong tops of the consecrated sanity and the spiritual vigour that have never been wanting in the heart of this great Convention of Ontario and Quebec. (Applause).

Now, when we turn to the discussion of the immediate issues of the hour, let me just make these two preliminary comments. It may be necessary before we go through to deal in personal terms, distasteful as that may be to some of us, and yet the very nature of the case has made it a great necessity.

### This is Absolutely Untrue!

The second thing I want to say is this, and to say it very frankly and very firmly and kindly; I should like to say this, that I shall utter no word to-day, as I have uttered no word in the past—I shall utter no word to-day except in reply to the charges that Dr. Shields has made against the great interests of our educational work.

He has been pleased to represent himself as the target of a great deal of scorn and abuse in the denomination. Brethren, let it be known and let it never be forgotten, that so far as I know there has not been one voice in the Convention that has been lifted against Dr. Shields except in the stern necessity of self-defence or the defence of those noble men and those sacred institutions that he has so constantly attacked. (Applause).

The last two paragraphs we brand as absolutely untrue. In 1919 we presented a resolution to the Convention at Ottawa. We mentioned no names, we attacked no person; but from that day the Pastor of Jarvis Street Church has been the target for the darts of those responsible for later developments in McMaster University. Before the Convention in St. Thomas, of 1921, a member of Walmer Road Church telephoned us and said that he had just heard from Dr. MacNeill a report that Dr. Shields intended to run for the Presidency of the Convention, and split the Convention. Of course, we replied that a more absurd suggestion could not be made—such an idea had



never entered our mind. But those who were present at the St. Thomas Convention will remember the electric atmosphere, and the manifest and bitter attitude toward the Jarvis Street Pastor assumed by many denominational "leaders". One pastor on that occasion came to us and said words to this effect: Before coming to this Convention I was warned that it would not be to my interests to be seen in your company. There are hundreds of witnesses to the fact in this Convention, that the representatives of McMaster University, and of *The Canadian Baptist*, and of the Foreign Mission Board, conducted a veritable campaign of personal abuse and denunciation against the Pastor of Jarvis Street Church. And when Dr. MacNeill states that no one in the Denomination has attacked Dr. Shields except in the stern necessity of self-defence or the defence of "noble men and sacred institutions", he states what is utterly untrue; and inasmuch as he was himself guilty of such attacks, he must know that his statement is not in accord with fact.

#### Who is the Slanderer?

In the last issue, I think, but one of *The Gospel Witness*, at least in a very recent issue, he has charged Dr. Farmer with conducting during the past year a campaign of slander. Brethren, every true and honest heart in this Convention knows very well that Dr. Farmer, if he has spoken, has spoken only after great provocation and indeed after it seemed that silence had ceased to be a virtue. If Dr. Farmer has spoken he has spoken in defence of that which is dearest to every man—his own reputation and his own character. If he has spoken, he has spoken in defence of the great work of the denomination to which he has given fifty crowning years of his life. (Applause).

At least three witnesses testify that Dr. Farmer said that the progress of the work in Jarvis Street Church might be accounted for by the withdrawal of Satan's opposition, in order that greater injury should be done to the cause of Christ at a later day. Let the many hundreds of friends outside of Toronto, and the thousands of others in Toronto, who occasionally visit Jarvis Street Church, be the judges as to whether the work in Jarvis Street justifies such slander.

#### Dr. MacNeill Re-enlists: So Do We.

No, my friends, we are not here because we love a fight, and this battle is not of our bidding. But let me give Dr. Shields the assurance this afternoon that now that the issue has been joined we are prepared to fight to the last drop of blood in our veins. (Applause). I say we are prepared to fight to the last drop of blood in defence of the men and the institutions that are marked by the sacrifice of our people in the last fifty years, and we will carry, if need be, the battle right to the very gates.

Dr. MacNeill need not fear that he will lose any blood from his veins at our hands; we would not harm a hair of his head; but we accept the gauge of battle, and reaffirm our determination to spend ourselves to the utmost to tear off the mask of utter hypocrisy so piously worn by McMaster defenders.

Now, what is the situation, my friends? The situation is this. A year ago at the Convention in Hamilton the Senate and the Board of Governors sought—I want you to get this—the Senate and the Board of Governors sought and received the vindication of the Convention, a vindication that was given by an overwhelming majority. Chancellor Whidden was vindicated as the educational leader of our work; Professor Marshall and his appointment

approved; Dr. Farmer vindicated—he who had been so completely the centre of attack throughout the past year in so many ways, Dr. Farmer, vindicated and gloriously vindicated, not only in the adoption of the educational report but in his election to the highest office in the gift of the Convention. (Applause).

### **Decisions May Be Reversed.**

In a democratic country even a legal verdict may be reconsidered, and if it can be shown that the verdict was arrived at through false evidence, the decision of the court may be reversed. To suggest that the decision of the Hamilton Convention was final was sheer nonsense. No Convention decision can be final, and especially as the verdict was obtained by an utter misrepresentation of the facts of the case; and we dare to tell Dr. MacNeill now that the decision of the Convention held at the First Avenue Baptist Church is no more final than that at Hamilton. As we have elsewhere shown, the decision was obtained by the foulest political means, means that were unworthy of a company of honest men, to say nothing of Christian people. We refuse to accept the decision, and pay our Baptist people the compliment of still believing that, could they know the facts, they would reverse that judgment; and we hereby dedicate ourselves afresh to the task of giving them the necessary information.

That was the verdict of our democratic people a year ago, and according to all Baptist usage we abide by the verdict of our people gathered in conference as they do. Some of our people seemed hopeful enough to believe that following the Convention at Hamilton all our troubles were settled; but the ink was hardly dry that recorded that decision when Dr. Shields took the field again, opening up his attacks and renewing his charges that had been exploded and rejected by the Convention assembled in Hamilton.

He has returned again and again and he has set aside the verdict of that Convention. He announces also that he is determined to set aside and defy all future verdicts of the Convention until, to use his own language in reference to McMaster, "the entire business is cleaned out from top to bottom." (Hear, hear). Brethren, we come again to-day, after a year's stewardship, in the fullest confidence of your vindication once more. We have nothing to hide, we have nothing to fear, for we have simply and implicitly followed the mandate that was given by our people to us a year ago in the Convention at Hamilton.

### **Needs Cleaning Out From Top to Bottom.**

We do not know when and where the language here attributed to us was used. We have no doubt we said it, but if we never said it before, we say it now: The entire institution needs clearing out from top to bottom. This the First Avenue Convention proved to a demonstration!

Now then, in dealing with these charges which are renewed against the University—I say renewed because there is not anything new in them, the same old straw we are threshing over, the same old problems we are trying to face. We settle them from year to year, and yet they remain unsettled.

### **The Old Straw of Modernism.**

Dr. MacNeill complains that it is the same old straw we are threshing over. He is right!—Modernism is nothing but straw; there is no wheat in it—and this we propose to demonstrate.

There are three main lines along which Dr. Shields has renewed his attacks against our educational interests;

### Was Prof. Campbell Retired or Dismissed?

First of all, he has centred his attack once more upon the governing bodies of the University. Reference, for instance, has been made in the report to the retirement of our two aged professors, Professor Campbell and Professor Keirstead, one in his 78th year and the other in his 77th year, and for that action the governing bodies have been very severely censured. We are told through the pages of *The Gospel Witness* that these brethren have been dismissed—not retired—these brethren have been dismissed. The phrase is used that “the axe has fallen” and their heads have gone off, of course, as the result of it. We are made or asked to believe that their dismissal was the price they paid for their loyalty to truth and to our great Baptist principles.

Such an apostle of accuracy as Dr. John MacNeill ought to be careful of his statements! Dr. Keirstead’s health was so unsatisfactory that he voluntarily retired. His well-known attitude toward this question as illustrated by the incident related by the Rev. John Linton elsewhere referred to, certainly would not make it easy for him to remain longer. But in the case of Professor Campbell: he is still hale and hearty; his mind is still active; and he is still three or four years younger than was the great Clemenceau, the “Tiger” of France, when he stepped into the breach and saved France from destruction. When Dr. MacNeill attempts to defend the dismissal of Professor Campbell on the ground of his age, and declares that his retirement had nothing to do with his protest against McMaster’s Modernism, he simply says, “Amen”, to the insincere pronouncement of the Chancellor on the same subject.

My brethren, there is not the shred of a shadow of evidence to prove that charge. (Applause). Anyone who is acquainted with the doings of the Board and the governing bodies within the last few years knows that for the last two or three years or more the retirement of these brethren has been contemplated, and the Board in its great anxiety for the future has looked about to find how they might provide for their future. I may just incidentally relate to you or pass on to you a bit of information that has come to the Chancellor, that Professor Campbell—you know his was the case for which we were most severely censured—that Professor Campbell’s family have sent deep expressions of their great gratitude that he was relieved of the burden of his work, and they are profoundly grateful for the generous provision made by the governing bodies for his future. (Applause).

### Thankful for Small Mercies.

We have no knowledge of the communication from Professor Campbell’s family to which Dr. MacNeill alludes. No doubt Professor Campbell—and his family—would appreciate some provision being made for his need. We have heard of a prisoner in the dock saying, “Thank you”, to the judge when sentence has been passed upon him! But why did not Dr. MacNeill tell the Convention that before Professor Campbell was retired a committee of the Senate summoned him before them and lectured him for an extended period, in an effort to persuade him to recant!—and it was only after they had received his written reply in which, referring to his letter of protest, he said, “What I have written, I have written”, that the axe fell. Dr. MacNeill and his associates have spent themselves in denouncing *The Gospel Witness* as printing that which is untrue to fact; and we have challenged them again and again to prove their con-

tention. After reading Dr. MacNeill's address we are compelled to admit that even the most powerful microscope would fail to discover an atom of truth in some of its paragraphs.

Yes, Dr. Shields has returned again and again to this attack upon the governing bodies. Just let me read two or three phrases. I will not weary you with them, but here is what he says:

There is a little group that dominates the Senate. We are told—I am quoting again—that they are “utterly destitute of Baptist principles.” We are told that they “seek to poison the springs of denominational life.” We are told that they are “the deadly elements in the life of the denomination.” We are told that they are “the machine.” We are told that they are “the devil's instrument for the destruction of the denomination.”

Oh, we are a bad lot I am afraid. (Laughter).

Now, listen. We have tried over and over again to get Dr. Shields to name that little group. Who are they? Who are they? I challenged him on the floor of the Convention at London to name that little group. Mr. Duncan, through the pages of *The Canadian Baptist*, has called upon him to name that little group, every one of them. And he ought to do it, and he ought to state the charges and put them down in black and white. He ought to state the charges and put them down in black and white and put his name to them—if he dare. (Applause).

### We Name the Men!

We remind our readers that we have been attacked repeatedly for mentioning names. We have mentioned them only because we have been compelled to do so. But here Dr. MacNeill asks us to name the men, and reminds us of Mr. Duncan's letter to *The Canadian Baptist* to the same effect. We very gladly here and now respond to his request. On the Board of Governors, the evil genius of the University is Dr. Frank Sanderson. Another who is in full sympathy with Modernism is Rev. W. A. Cameron, as his own published utterances attest. I should not call him a modernist exactly; but he is certainly not an evangelical in the ordinary acceptance of that term; but his sympathies are unquestionably with the modernistic school. We name Mr. E. C. Fox as a man to whom the University is a business institution; and who is not specially concerned about religious principles. And now we shall have to include Dr. MacNeill himself. Dr. MacNeill is too careful of his own interests to speak very positively on any disputed question until he feels he is fairly sure on which side the majority lies. But with all the evidence in the present case before him, and in view of his unqualified endorsement of Professor Marshall and his position, we should expect Dr. MacNeill himself, were such a thing proposed, to approve of the appointment of a professor holding the views of a Harry Emerson Fosdick.

On the Senate there are such men as Mr. J. H. Cranston who, ever since Professor Matthews' day, has been bitterly antagonistic to everyone who stands for the old faith. We would not call Mr. Cranston a modernist: we doubt whether he knows enough about the subject to be classed accurately as belonging to either side; but since the days of Dr. Elmore Harris he has been a bitter opponent of everyone who stands for evangelical truth.

On the Faculty we may name Professor Chester H. New, an

out-and-out evolutionist. Professor Wilson Smith is another who is an undoubted evolutionist. We had always thought of Professor J. G. Brown as a professional cipher, but recently he, too, has committed himself to an endeavour to justify Modernism. The attitude of Dean Farmer ever since the appointment of Professor I. G. Matthews has been one of encouragement toward Modernism. At the Hamilton Convention he defended the "looser" view of Scripture; and later argued for an inclusive policy in educational matters. We have named the "little group"; what will Dr. MacNeill do about it?

Brethren, it cannot be done, for the simple reason that there is no such group, there is no such coterie. I bear you witness that I have been for nearly twenty years a member of the Board and the Senate, and I have never known nor seen nor heard of any such coterie or group with the Senate of McMaster University that sought to do that. But I will tell you what I have known. I have known this, that the only attempt that I have ever found to browbeat that body and to club it into submission was made by Dr. Shields himself since he came to the Senate. (Applause).

We challenge Dr. MacNeill to produce a scintilla of evidence in support of his silly charge that this writer ever attempted to "browbeat" the Senate. Once I listened to the vituperative denunciations of Dr. MacNeill and his associates over the Faunce degree matter for more than four hours; and on another occasion, when registering my protest against Professor Marshall's appointment, I presented a written statement. Every word that I uttered on that occasion was stenographically reported, and, with the minutes of that meeting, printed in *The Canadian Baptist*. Let Canadian Baptists judge whether there was any attempt to "browbeat" and "club" the Senate into submission. Brother MacNeill reminds us of some parliamentarian's remark to the effect that a certain honourable member was intoxicated with the exuberance of his own verbosity.

#### Concerning Some Members of the Faculty.

Now there is a second line of attack that Dr. Shields has renewed and followed, and it has been directed against the members of the Faculty; but during the last year he has widened that attack until at last it has included practically every member of the Theological Faculty.

Dr. Brown recently has come in for a good deal of attention. (Laughter). The attempt, the further attempt I ought to say, has been made to discredit Dr. McCrimmon; and you will remember that following that resolution of confidence passed at the Convention in Hamilton last year relating to Dr. McCrimmon, we have been informed through the pages of *The Gospel Witness* that of course such a certificate of character is a useful thing for those that need it—(laughter)—and a certificate of sanity is a good thing for one who has occupied a place in any asylum. (Cries of "Shame"). Brethren, surely a cause is hard pressed for some support when it must resort to such shameful language as that. (Applause).

There is here a reference to the fact that I had protested against the shameless partisan conduct of the Educational Session of the Convention in 1922 by Dr. A. L. McCrimmon when he was President of the Convention. For what we said respecting that matter we have absolutely no apology to make. What we wrote, we wrote not long after the Walmer Road Convention of 1922; and it was not until three years later, at the Convention of 1925, that a resolution in reference

to what we had written was presented, and that in the dying moments of the long-drawn-out Educational Session of the Convention in Hamilton. It must have been not far from midnight. Why was a resolution of confidence passed in Dr. McCrimmon three years after? Why was it not passed that year, or the year following, or at London? We have no doubt the resolution was carried in somebody's pocket to every Convention, but nobody dared present it. We did say, following the Hamilton Convention, that a certificate of character is a good thing for those who need it,—and we say so still. We do not ask for one for ourselves; we care nothing about resolutions of confidence.

But I want to deal especially with the two members of the Faculty that have been perhaps the centre of fire during the last year. I refer to Professor Marshall and Professor Farmer.

Now, about Professor Marshall, let me say that I believe he has given abundant evidence of his absolute loyalty to our Baptist position. (Applause). Just listen to me while I put the facts before you, and they are these. Before ever Professor Marshall left England a year ago last July to come over and look over the situation and meet a committee of the Senate appointed to meet him, the whole declaration of our trust deed was put into his hands, and he accepted that without reservation. Had he not been able to accept it he should never have taken his voyage across the Atlantic to meet us. He gave himself without qualification to the declaration that is within the Trust Deed of the University.

Dr. Shields attacked his appointment, as you know, upon the flimsy rumours of an unknown man at that time in the Old Land. Dr. Shields' charges were based altogether upon the Robertson letters. And let me say just by the way in passing, that there is another Robertson letter—(laughter)—Professor Marshall holds a Robertson letter that endorses him and his teaching fully. (Applause). I leave it to Robertson to square his conscience with the two; I could not do it.

### **The Controversy Does Not Rest on the Robertson Letters.**

Here Dr. MacNeill says, "Dr. Shields' charges were based altogether upon the Robertson letters". This is an utter mis-statement. I made no charges. At the Senate meeting I communicated the Robertson letters to the Senate. It was true he was an unknown man to me, but I am not interested in the personality of the one who rings the fire alarm: the question is, Is the house on fire? I merely acquainted the Senate with the information that had come to my hand; and suggested that an effort should be made to ascertain whether the implications of Mr. Robertson's letters were well founded. For this I was denounced as a trouble-maker. My attitude and action in the whole matter were determined not upon the Robertson letters, but upon Dr. Farmer's own statement respecting Professor Marshall's position and later, of course, upon the Professor's own utterances.

### **Are All the Charges Exploded?**

Well, those have all been exploded and rejected, those rumours from the Old Land. But listen. Just to make assurance doubly sure Professor Marshall did what he was not called upon to do at all. Last year at our Convention he stood before our people and in a frank and open way he made the confession of his faith and gave himself unreservedly to the declaration of it. I am going to repeat it to you again, because some of you have short memories and I want you to have it in your minds. Listen to this:

### When Were They Exploded?

Dr. MacNeill glibly declares that the rumors from the Old Land have all been exploded and rejected. When were they exploded? This is the true manner of McMaster, mere assertion without proof. Thus they have dealt with every criticism that anyone has ever passed upon McMaster. For all such they have but one answer, "lies". But here are some of Professor Marshall's own statements. We have printed them before, but we must print them again:

"Some of our people are theologically the narrowest of the narrow, while others are the broadest of the broad, but all are one in personal loyalty and devotion to Christ. We hold, for instance, that the Christian disciple is free to adopt the Hebrew tradition about the creation if it satisfies him, or the teaching on that subject of modern science. He is free to interpret the Scriptures by any method which commends itself to his judgment as true—he can follow the so-called orthodox method or the method pursued by modern scholarship. We are not in any way bound by the traditions of the past, but are perfectly free to welcome all light and truth from whatsoever quarter they come, in the sure confidence that all light is God's light and all truth is God's truth. Living in personal loyalty to Christ, we have at the same time open minds for all new truth which God vouchsafes to reveal to mankind through any channel."

Professor Marshall's confession of faith as read by Dr. MacNeill:

I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth; I believe in the deity of Jesus Christ His Son Our Lord; I believe that on all the great questions of morality and religion the absolute and the final word is with Jesus Christ our God and Saviour; I believe in the virgin birth; I believe in the vicarious suffering of Jesus Christ as effecting the atonement between man and God; I believe in the glorious resurrection of Jesus Christ, in the empty grave—remember that—in the empty grave on the first Easter morn. I have already testified on that point. I believe that Jesus ever liveth to be the inspiration of all his followers. I am a fundamentalist in the New Testament sense of the term. "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." And nobody in the wide, wide world shall ask any other fundamentalism of me. I believe that the Bible is the inspired word of God from Genesis to Revelations; I believe in the life hereafter, as the trust deeds say, both for the just and the unjust; I believe in the necessity of conversion, in the need of people being born again.

What is his confession of faith? In the light of his many other utterances, it cannot be accepted by evangelical believers. Let us examine it.

### An Analysis of Prof. Marshall's Confession of Faith.

The following is a reprint from *The Gospel Witness*:

Before analyzing this confession of faith, it is necessary to remember that Modernism has appropriated the language of orthodoxy. Such words as "inspiration", "divinity", "deity", "vicarious", "atonement", "redemption", "resurrection", and many others, are often heard from modernist lips, but a careful analysis of their speech will show that they empty these words of all their evangelical content, and use them to express ideas which sometimes are exactly opposite to those which they originally contain. Like the Jews of Nehemiah's day, who had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon and of Moab, and whose

children could not speak in the Jewish language without using speech which was half of Ashdod, so modernists put a Philistine content into the speech of a spiritual Israel. Once there was a day when at least a part of Professor Marshall's confession of faith would have been accepted without further enquiry, but it cannot be so accepted now.

The next clause in the Professor's confession is as follows:

"I believe that on all the great questions of morality and religion the absolute and the final word is with Jesus Christ our God and Saviour."

That, at first blush, to the undiscerning, would seem to be satisfactory, but it is carefully phrased. It is only on matters of morals and religion the final word is with Christ. What about the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and the whole plan of redemption there set forth? An examination of Dr. Driver's view, as above set forth, will show that Christ must not be appealed to in matters relating to what is called "historical criticism". Christ is not the authority, for example, on the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, or on the historicity of Jonah, or on the Messianic character of the 110th Psalm. An infallible Christ is the Rock upon which the whole philosophy of higher criticism splits. The position of Driver and his school is absolutely untenable if the infallibility of Christ be admitted. Reference to our quotation under the head of Dr. Driver's view from Dr. Driver's own works will show that he removes Christ out of his way as an authority in critical matters. And as every one informed on the subject must know, that is the favourite resort of the modernists; therefore Professor Marshall's statement respecting the authority of Christ is anything but satisfactory. Our own view is that Jesus Christ is Lord of all realms; "In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." "For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." And on every subject of which He speaks, to the genuine believer, the Word of God is final. But Professor Marshall's statement leaves the door wide open to all the principles of Modernism.

The Professor continues,

"I believe in the vicarious suffering of Jesus Christ as effecting the atonement between man and God."

What does Professor Marshall mean by "vicarious suffering"? Several sermons and addresses were delivered in which there was no reference to the death of Christ at all. Students W. Gordon Brown and W. S. Whitcombe report the teaching of Professor Marshall in the classroom as follows:

"The blood of Christ" in the New Testament is due to the influence of pagan religions.

"My point was that you have to remember that the world in the apostolic age was reeking with sacrificial blood. You have that in Mythraism, not only Jews but pagans were relying on blood. The Apostles naturally laid stress on the blood of Christ in opposition to this, but the Apostles never did think of the physical blood of Christ as being the cleansing agent. The idea that God has the physical blood is absurd. I hope my point is clear now. When the Apostles referred to sacrifice, they referred to His sacrifice. They could have referred to it without the blood had it not been that the world was full of it at the time. All the way through Paul's teaching his great thought is that the saving thing in his life, his fellowship, with a risen and glorified Saviour. Away with this crass physical notion! . . . Who wants to wallow in blood? It is spiritual, of course. I do not mind who knows what I say on that point."



### Calls Substitutionary Atonement "Bold" and "Crude".

In one of his classes Professor Marshall mentioned Luther, and spoke to the following effect:

Luther's theory is possibly the boldest, and I think (if I may say it without offence), the crudest statement of the substitutionary atonement; that sin could not be forgiven until it had been punished and Christ endured the punishment of sin in man's stead.—The Prophet, June, 1926.

#### The Walmer Road Sermon.

For the Professor's views of the atonement as expressed publicly, so far as we know, we have only the Walmer Road sermon and his pamphlet. From the sermon we quote as follows:

"What the world needs is redemption and salvation. What is that? In simple terminology, salvation is emancipation from the dominion of evil and power to do the will of God. There is no real life for us apart from the fellowship of God, and complete harmony between our wills and the will of God. As Augustine said so beautifully and so truly, "The vision of God is the life of man." What hinders this fellowship and harmony? There is a sin barrier between ourselves and God, and it is this sin barrier that Christ destroys. He destroys it in two ways.

"In the first place by His Cross and Passion He procures forgiveness for us. The Cross is the witness of God's redeeming love and forgiving grace. It is the pledge that no sin of ours can ever destroy God's love for us. However deeply we have sinned, however heavy the burden of guilt upon our consciences if we turn in repentance and faith to the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ we may be forgiven. The very worst—harlots, profligates, prodigals, murderers and criminals—when conscience wakens within them and they realize the enormity of their offences and are tortured by remorse, can through repentance and faith find forgiveness.

'He died that we might be forgiven.'

"The guilt-bond that was against us, that was contrary to us, he hath taken out of the way and nailed to His Cross.

'E'er since by faith I saw the stream  
Thy flowing wounds supply;  
Redeeming love has been my theme  
And shall be till I die.'

"There is no pit of sin or guilt, or degradation from which the redeeming love of God in Christ cannot rescue us."

We ask our readers to read the quotation we have given, over again. What is there in these words to suggest that Christ bore the penalty of man's sin? The atonement is wholly subjective: "The cross is the witness of God's redeeming love and forgiving grace." There is absolutely nothing to suggest that the righteousness and truth and justice of God were involved; that by the death of Christ a penalty was paid which was exacted by God's holy law. But by a vision of the love of God, as revealed in the cross of Christ, the sinner is moved to repentance and faith, on the ground of which he is forgiven! This is little more than the Example theory of the atonement. The Cross is vastly more than "the witness of God's redeeming love and forgiving grace." It is a revelation of His truth and righteousness, and justice, in a word, of His infinite holiness. A mother's love may win a wayward boy to penitence, but it cannot atone for his sin, or expiate his guilt.

We are still therefore waiting to find a single word of Professor Marshall's

which indicates that he believes that Jesus Christ did actually bear our sins in His own body on the tree in the sense of being our Substitute.

Once more the Professor says:

"I believe in the glorious resurrection of Jesus Christ, in the empty grave—remember that—in the empty grave on the first Easter morn."

Is this sufficient? Mary and Peter and John believed in the empty grave when they did not believe in the resurrection. Read John 20: 1-16. Indeed, a careful examination of the record of the resurrection stories will disclose the fact that no one was ever convinced of the reality of the resurrection by the empty grave. The Pharisees believed in the empty grave and paid the soldiers money to declare the message of the empty grave with their own explanation. But we must not be unfair to Professor Marshall. What has he said elsewhere about the resurrection? Let us quote from students who have listened to his teaching in his classes.

#### Does He Believe in the True Resurrection of the Body?

The Risen Christ said, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have". (Luke 24: 39).

What change was it that took place in the body of Christ? It was some kind of metamorphosis as Paul himself stated (speaks of) in I Corinthians 15, on the spiritual body.

\* \* \* \* \*

Personality must have some vehicle of expression. As we have a psychic body in the present life, so we will have a spiritual body in the next. The electrons of which the atoms are made up are always in motion, floating in ether. If we could very highly magnify the hand, we would find that it is made up of minute particles which are not even touching, but floating in ether. So we have now an ethereal body or spiritual, and a physical body, and death will be merely the parting of the two. If this is so, Paul went right to the heart of the matter. Paul's conception is that the resurrection body is a spiritual body, not the fleshly resurrection of the Pharisaical teachings. It is hard to think of a discarnate personality when thinking of the afterlife. How is this personality to exist? Paul says there is an ethereal or spiritual body, which is the bearer of the personality.—Testimony of students in Prof. Marshall's Third Year Class in Arts Bible.

Once again we venture to disagree, and that most strongly, with *Professor Marshall's theory of the resurrection body*, tentative though that may be. We do not doubt that what the professor says concerning the nature of what we commonly know as "matter" is based on the scientific hypotheses of the day; but when he suggests that the *resurrection body may be composed of ether*, we are very much inclined to wonder, question, and ask, whether such a composition would be a body at all.

*Professor Marshall teaches that Paul rejected the pharisaical teaching of the fleshly resurrection.* We recall that Paul once greatly disturbed a meeting of the Sanhedrin by drawing those of its members who were Pharisees, as he himself had been, into sympathy with himself, when he said, "For the resurrection of the dead I am called in question." In that instance Paul showed that his doctrine of the resurrection was closely akin to that in which the Pharisees believed. We also recall the words of our Lord Jesus, Whom, after His resurrection, the disciples took for a spirit, but Who said to them, "A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have." Evidently there is some disagreement between Professor Marshall's teaching and the New Testament.

And just here we note another point of the Professor's remarks. *He places the resurrection at death.* Therefore, it follows, according to

his theory, that if I die to-day, Tuesday, and am buried in some quiet cemetery on Friday, I will be resurrected three days before I'm buried!! We doubt whether we should call this a resurrection at all.—*The Prophet*, June, 1926.

Once more Professor Marshall says:

"I believe that Jesus ever liveth to be the inspiration of all his followers".

When he said that, perhaps ninety-five out of one hundred, catching the sound rather than the sense of his words, believed he had quoted scripture. Of course it is true that Christ is the inspiration of His followers. In running the race set before us, we are to look unto Jesus, we are to consider Him that endured such contradiction of sinners against Himself, lest we be wearied and faint in our minds. But this statement of the Professor's inevitably follows upon his view of the atonement, for, apparently to him, the atonement is inspirational, rather than expiatory, but the scripture says: "They truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death: But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." We should be glad to have anyone point out to us in anything that Professor Marshall has written, anything that indicates his belief in the eternal priesthood of Jesus Christ. We have already observed that the Driver view destroys such priesthood.

The Professor also says,

"I believe that the Bible is the inspired word of God from Genesis to Revelation."

Let us examine the evidence.

#### Prof. Marshall Holds the Loose View.

At the Hamilton Convention it was frankly admitted that Prof. Marshall does not hold "the strong view" of the inspiration of Scripture, which is that it is infallibly inspired from cover to cover; but his is "what some would call the freer, looser view", which is that it is merely "the religious content of Scripture" which is "infallibly sure". This second view carries more implications with it than meet the eye. Yet Dr. Farmer plead for toleration toward it. Those who have followed events in the Convention for a number of years past will recall that in 1919 the Convention passed a resolution discountenancing "some new vague view of the Scriptures".—*The Prophet*, January, 1926.

#### Says Paul Did Not Know He Was Writing Scripture.

In his class in Arts Bible for third year students, Professor Marshall said in speaking of "how Paul's letters became Scripture", that Paul had no idea he was writing Scripture. Concerning the seventh chapter of I. Corinthians the professor also said that many of Paul's remarks are made only from his own judgment: on some matters he claims inspiration, but not on (marriage), except in some points.

In connection with the first quotation that Paul did not think that he was writing scripture, we can hear by faith that great Apostle answer, "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, putting spiritual words with spiritual ideas." (I Cor. 2: 13, free translation of lateral part.)

Concerning the second quotation from Professor Marshall we remember hearing Dean Farmer, in discussing the same chapter, say: Paul "does not disclaim inspiration, but rather claim it." Certainly Professor Marshall's view on this subject is not that of truly believing and conservative scholarship.—*The Prophet*, June, 1926.

### On the Book of Jonah.

The Master said (Math. Ch. 12, v. 40, 41; Rev. Ver. with marginal note reading.) "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the sea monster: so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold a greater than Jonah is here."

Mr. W. Gordon Brown says Prof. Marshall believes that the book of Jonah is only allegory, and not history.

### "Your Attitude to the Bible and Mine are Poles Apart."

*The Canadian Baptist* for March 4th, contains a statement by Professor Marshall. Speaking of his view of the Book of Jonah, the professor says: "I have been told that I ought to be prepared to believe that Jonah swallowed an eighty-ton whale if necessary."

The incident to which the professor doubtless refers was a conversation we had with him. The professor had been referring to the difficulties connected with the miracle of Jonah and the sea-monster. Mr. Whitcombe then said: "My view of the book is this: if the Bible said that Jonah swallowed the whale, I would be prepared to believe it." The professor laughed and replied, "I cannot imagine you swallowing a ninety-ton whale." Mr. Whitcombe rejoined, "Well, neither can I, professor, but my God is the God of the impossible." Then the professor said, "Well, Mr. Whitcombe, your attitude to the Bible and mine are poles apart." He later explained that he referred to his attitude on such points as few have mentioned.—*The Prophet*, June, 1926.

Professor Marshall continues,

"I believe in the life hereafter, as the trust deed says, both for the just and the unjust; I believe in the necessity of conversion, in the need of people being born again."

What does Professor Marshall mean by "conversion"? What does he mean by being "born again"?

No man believes in the necessity of "conversion" in the evangelical sense who does not believe that we are all by nature children of wrath. We give below quotations from Professor Marshall's addresses. He is of age, he must therefore speak for himself:

### On "Juvenile Human Nature".

In the past, the church, often enough, instead of concentrating on the spiritual care and culture of the young in the hope and prayer that, shall we say, quite naturally some day their spiritual awakening should come, and they should appreciate the beauty and the glory of Christ, and give themselves to Him in the act of personal surrender—instead of doing that kind of thing the church has too often let the young people drift, and then by spasmodic effort—by expensive missions held once a year—it has tried to bring them back again by forcing them through all the throes of a psychic revolution. Now, that is a wrong method. There is no need for a lad to go to the devil before he comes to Christ. I don't believe that. And this error in policy, I think, has been due almost entirely to a false view of juvenile human nature.

### Religion Really and Truly Natural.

I believe that just as it is natural for a plant to turn toward the light, or the mariner's compass to point to the north, or a new-born babe to suck nourishment from its mother's breast—so I believe it is, in the best sense of the term, natural for the spirit of man to seek illumination and strength and inspiration from the Spirit of God. I believe it is very important nowadays to emphasize the fact that religion is really and truly perfectly natural; and that Jesus Christ Himself said that when a man really comes to himself and realizes all he needs, and the powers

and possibilities of his nature—what does he do? He says with the prodigal son, "I will arise and go to my father."

Well now, that is important where the religious education of the child is concerned. When you and I give children religious training and education, when we take the baby hands and put them together and teach the child to pray, we are not endeavouring to graft some alien growth into the nature, or force anything artificial upon child life: we are simply and solely helping the child to recognize the best and highest and noblest possibilities of its own nature; and we are seeking to initiate the child into the mystery of God.—Hamilton Convention Address, Oct. 19, 1925.

#### Man's Natural State.

"He (Christ) never despaired of anyone—not even of the prodigals and wastrels, and harlots. He had hope for all, simply because He knew what was in man. He knew that at the heart and centre of man's being, planted there by the hand of God, was something divine, beautiful, radiant, deathless, indestructible. It may be buried, hidden from view, ignored, forgotten, suppressed, but it is there in everybody, even in the worst, and there it remains incorruptible in all its corruptness, undefiled in all its defilement, awaiting the day of its manifestation, its expression, its diamond radiance, its power. . . . Beneath the ashes of collapsed human nature He knew that there were yet sparks of celestial fire.

" . . . Some time ago a French professor tried a series of remarkable experiments on some seeds. His aim was to see if the germ of life could be destroyed without destroying the seed itself. He kept naked seeds of lucerne, mustard and wheat for three weeks at a temperature of liquid air and then for 77 hours at a temperature of liquid hydrogen, viz., 250 degrees below zero. He then put them in a vacuum for a whole year. He deprived them of their internal gases by subjection to an air pump; he kept them for a long time under mercury, in nitrogen and in carbon dioxide. After all these hardships most of the seeds still sprouted when sown in the usual way! The germ of life in a seed seems, therefore, to be tough. So it is with the divine element in the human soul. Whatever the rough and tumble of life it abides indestructible. . . . How wonderful and how beautiful it is to think that in all of us, in you and me and in every human being, there are moral and spiritual potentialities, divine powers, which, under proper stimulus and encouragement from on high can develop into the excellencies of Christ."—Sermon on "The Insight of Christ" in First Ave. Church, Toronto.

#### ON THE SUPERNATURAL.

What Do We Mean By a Miracle? A great change has come into the attitude of religious people to miracles. The old conception of a miracle was a juggling with the laws of nature. God when working a miracle suspended natural law in order to do some supernatural act. But no miracle is contrary to all the laws of nature. A savage would regard modern civilization with its radials and street cars as a miracle simply because he did not know the laws that controlled them. But to us such things are not miraculous because we understand them. So a miracle is an event due to the operation of a law unknown to ourselves. As no one knows what is possible, for continually new possibilities are opening up, we cannot draw the boundary line between the possible and the impossible. The greatest of the modern scientists only know very little of the laws of nature. As one of them said: "We believe all things not impossible, we hope all things not improbable." For knowledge is only a tiny islet in a vast sea of ignorance.—Testimony of students in Prof. Marshall's Third Year Class in Arts' Bible, published in *The Prophet*, June, 1926.

#### Offers "Clues" to the Miracles of Christ.

1. Miracle of evil spirits entering into swine, Matthew 8: 28-34. This cannot be fully explained by any known law; but is there anything

in modern science which can give us a clue? The following story is told, not as an explanation, but as a possible clue to the situation.

In an asylum in England there was a patient who was perfectly normal except for the delusion that his arm was glass. His doctor tried many means of persuading him to the contrary, but could not convince him. Eventually, once when the monomaniac was walking alone, the doctor crept up behind him, and hitting the glass arm, he dropped a glass bottle at the same moment. From that time the man was normal in every way, for he believed his glass arm was broken, and so the delusion was lost. In this way Christ possibly scattered the delusion of the madman in the country of the Gergesenes by saying the demons had entered into the swine, for they saw them rush into the sea, and so the demoniac may have been cured by thus being made to believe that the evil spirits had left him.

#### 2. Christ walking on the sea.

There has recently been psychic research carried on by Sir William Barrett, dealing with the problem of levitation, meaning by levitation that in a certain psychic state the body loses weight. This is offered as a clue, not necessarily as an explanation, when speaking of this miracle.—Testimony of students in Prof. Marshall's Third Year Class in Arts' Bible, from *The Prophet*, June, 1926.

#### Says It Is Not Necessary To Be Converted To Teach In Sunday School.

On one occasion the professor advised: "Persuade as many of your elder scholars (in the Sunday School) as possible to work in the lower departments of your school." He was asked whether he thought they ought to be converted before they were thus given work in the Sunday School, or a question to that effect. He replied that he did not know that you could not have them teaching unless they were converted; to get them into the primary department, you may get them interested and get them for baptism.—*The Prophet*, June, 1926.

Ah, my friends, as I think of the last year in relation to Professor Marshall, it seems to me that nothing has been more palpably unjust and more pitifully pathetic than the way in which Professor Marshall's opponents have been driven from pillar to post and from one position to another in a vain attempt to find out some count against him. Listen! The charge was made first of all that he did not believe in the new birth, in regeneration. That was exploded, and something else had to be found. The charge was made that he preached a bloodless gospel. That has been exploded, and something else had to be found. The charge was made that he denied the physical resurrection of Jesus. That has been exploded, and something else had to be found. The charge has been made that he did not accept the authority of the Word of God as the inspired truth of God. That has been exploded, and something else had to be found. The charge has been made that he denied the supernatural from end to end. That has been exploded, and something else had to be found. He was charged also with denying the necessity of baptism as a prerequisite for church membership. That has been exploded too. He did deny the necessity of baptism as a prerequisite for salvation, as every true Baptist will do; but he holds to baptism as a prerequisite for membership in the church.

#### Says Baptism Not Essential to Church Membership.

After what we have written above, will anybody believe that every charge of false teaching made against Professor Marshall has been "exploded"? Dr. MacNeill says that the charge of denying the necessity of baptism as a pre-requisite to church membership has been "exploded"; but in an article on "Baptists and Church Membership" this is what Professor Marshall wrote in England six months or thereabout before he came to Canada:

"To regard baptism as essential to salvation or even to membership in the Christian Church is to ascribe to the baptismal rite

a crucial importance for which there is no warrant in the New Testament, or in any truly spiritual interpretation of the Gospel, or in common sense."—From article on Baptism and Church Membership, in *Baptist Times and Freeman*.

He speaks of baptism as not being essential to salvation, or even to membership in the Christian church. Of course it is not necessary to salvation; but why set these two things one against the other, if by them he meant one and the same thing? Later Professor Marshall has the audacity to ask us to believe that by membership in the Christian church he did not mean the local church, but the church universal! To this we answer: Are there then some people who are saved who are not members of the body of Christ? or are there some who are members of the mystical body of Christ who are not saved? Surely the antithesis involved in Professor Marshall's statement is not without significance. When he said "salvation" he meant one thing; when he said "membership in the Christian church", he meant another; and he said baptism was not necessary to either. Furthermore, he has himself been pastor of two churches, both of which were open membership, and open communion churches. Again we say Dr. MacNeill resorts to the favourite McMaster method of merely denying the charge and abusing the witness, but producing no proof. Dr. Porter, former Editor of *The Western Recorder*, said:

"Please permit me to say, that if any given proposition can be proved, beyond the scintilla of a doubt, it has been proven that Prof. Marshall is a destructive critic of the rankest variety. Whatever comes of the fight, you have rendered a valuable service in 'smoking out' this unbeliever."

### Dr. MacNeill Continues:

I was careful on that day when we met him in July a year ago to reassure myself on that point, knowing he came from England where there were open churches, and Professor Marshall said, not only was that his own private conviction about membership for Baptist churches, but he was prepared to stand by it and preach and practice it so far as he was called upon to practice it, when he came into the circle of our Canadian Baptist life. (Applause).

Well, brethren, why should I need to defend Professor Marshall? He can defend himself—don't you worry: (Applause.) I hope he will be heard from. You will want him to be heard from—(applause)—you will want him to be heard from before this session closes.

### Prof. Marshall Four-square on the Essentials of the Gospel!!

But here is the point I make. Here is a man who stands absolutely four-square on, say, the five great central essential facts of the gospel: The deity of our Lord Jesus; the virgin birth of Christ; the vicarious suffering of Christ as effecting the atonement and the reconciliation between God and man; the miracle, the physical miracle of the resurrection of the living Christ; and the Bible as the inspired word of God, as the last and final authority for all faith and practice.

That man stands foursquare upon those essentials of the Gospel of Christ, and what I want to ask you to-day, you who have the final decision, is this: Do you want this gospel driven out of McMaster University? (Cries of "No!") Dr. Shields has declared that it is his avowed determination that he will drive this man with his gospel out of McMaster University and he will not cease his agitation until it is done.

The obvious answer is that Professor Marshall does not stand "four-square" on these essentials, as we shall later see. If he did,

we should be the last to desire to drive him out of McMaster. We did not say that we were determined to "drive this man with his gospel out of McMaster University", for the simple reason that Professor Marshall has no gospel in the New Testament sense. But we did say, and we here repeat, that we will never cease from this agitation until all our Baptist people have been given full information.

No! We will stand by that gospel because it is the gospel with which we began, and the only gospel of our hope, and we should never have invited any man to the Faculty of McMaster University who had not first of all given his allegiance to the heart, the throbbing heart of the gospel of Christ as you and I know it as true Baptist people. (Applause.)

Now, then, I come to Professor Farmer. Brethren, let me say this. I cannot think of the last year in Dr. Farmer's life without a great sense of shame that this great and good man, this servant of the churches, should have been compelled to suffer what he has, even at the hands of a few of his brethren. ("Hear, hear.") I venture to say that in the long annals of our Convention's history there has never been a parallel to the shameful, and the vindictive, and the persistent attack on the part of Dr. Shields to destroy the influence and the reputation and the character and the work of the Dean in Theology.

What is result of it? Dr. Farmer stands higher to-day in the confidence and the affections of our people than ever before. (Applause.) I will say nothing to-day, my friends, about those men who have known that all that is true about Dr. Farmer's belief and about his character and yet have sat in silence, have even sat on Dr. Shields' platforms and have heard him say it and have lifted no voice of protest against it. But I will say nothing about that.

### **The Person of Christ and Other Personalities.**

We leave to the judgment of our readers the remarks of Dr. MacNeill on this subject. Having heard Dr. Farmer propose the surrender of the principles on which the University is founded, and having heard him plead for toleration of the looser view of Scripture, and having heard him defend one whose gospel has no atonement in it; having heard all this, and remembering, too, that from the beginning to the end of his stay in McMaster, Dr. Farmer defended, and still defends, Professor I. G. Matthews, we protested against his compromising attitude, very mildly at first, but were forced at last publicly, as a watchman, to warn the people of the advancing foe of Modernism. But for having done this, we are guilty of a "shameful" and "vindictive" attack on this champion of the principle of compromise! We are unmoved by Dr. MacNeill's strictures; we believe our conduct would have been "shameful" to the last degree had we consented to this in silence. Dr. MacNeill very mercifully passes by "those men who have known that all that is true about Dr. Farmer's belief and about his character and yet have sat in silence, have even sat on Dr. Shields' platform and have heard him say it and have lifted no voice of protest against him". But what shall be said of the men who have seen the very foundation principles of our Holy religion put in jeopardy, and the honour of God's Word and of His Son dragged in the mire, and have been silent? We put the Person of Christ above all other personalities; and when men support movements which would destroy men's faith in Him, while we have breath to speak, they shall hear from us whether it be Dr. Farmer or Dr. MacNeill.



### Standing in "the Wilderness."

But this is what I want to say, that if such a thing should be conceivable—it is utterly inconceivable—but if such a thing should be conceivable that this denomination to-day at the bidding of Dr. Shields should set aside that little man with all his nobility of life, his transparent honesty, his unimpeachable integrity of character, his Christ-like simplicity and selflessness of heart, and above all, after his fifty years of sacrificial service on the denominational altars,—I tell you if this denomination should find it within its heart at the bidding of Dr. Shields to set that little man aside, we should make our name a by-word in this land from end to end—(applause)—and I for one, let me tell you, would be proud to go out and stand beside him in the wilderness and shake the dust from off my feet against the denomination that should do so. (Applause.)

Dr. MacNeill would follow the impeccable Dean into the wilderness and shake the dust off his feet against the denomination that should turn its back upon Dr. Farmer. But he has no word of protest against the denomination that would turn its back upon the Great Sacrifice, and deny the authority of the Word of God. We say frankly to Dr. MacNeill and those who are with him that, taking the position they do in respect to these indispensable principles of Christian faith, he is likely to have every opportunity of standing beside Dr. Farmer in "the wilderness", for no spiritual blessing can come in any large way upon the denomination who denies the faith, as was done at the First Avenue Convention.

Just once more. The charge is made also against the University that the University authorities, the Board and the Senate, are dominating all the other boards of the Convention, and have a strangle-hold on the life and the work of the denomination. Again, let me say that there is no foundation for such a statement as that.

But, brethren, that introduces a wider aspect of the whole question that I want you to see just before I sit down. Section 3 of the Act of Incorporation reads thus:

The objects of the Convention shall be the promotion and prosecution of such work and enterprise as are deemed in the interest of the denomination, and particularly those specified in Section 5.

That refers to the various boards, Foreign and Home, and so forth. One would have thought that if those boards were so oppressed by the tyranny of McMaster Dr. Shields would instantly have come to their rescue and their defence. But what has proved to be the case? Dr. Shields has not only attacked the Educational Board, but he has attacked almost every board within the Convention. There is scarcely one that has not passed under his severe censure—the Educational Board, the Foreign Board, the Home Board, the Publication Board, the Western Board, the Sunday School Board—not one that has not passed under the censure of Dr. Shields.

### Only One Board in Our Convention.

We have arrived at a day when there is one board in the Convention, and that board is McMaster University. The Chairman of the Home, Foreign, Publication, and Sunday school Boards is each a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster University. The Chairman of the Western Board is a member of the Senate; the Chairman of the Superannuated Ministers' Board is a professor. McMaster University has obtained a strangle-hold upon every one of the Boards. It is the finest illustration of an interlocking directorate in the religious world we know anywhere.

Our people ought to know, and if you are not informed, it is our business to-day to inform you, that this is just a part of a continent-wide propaganda

that is carried on by the Baptist Bible Union, of which Dr. Shields is the head. Its champion and leader in the South is Dr. J. Frank Norris—(laughter)—its champion and leader in the North is Dr. Riley, of Minneapolis; Dr. Shields is its leader in Canada, and the President of the whole organization.

In this paragraph Dr. MacNeill talked sheer nonsense. Our part in this controversy dates back to 1919 which was four years before the Baptist Bible Union was born. When the Walmer Road Convention was held in 1922 there was no Baptist Bible Union, for that organization did not come into being until 1923, and until after Professor Marshall's appointment the president of that organization took no steps to effect an organization of a branch of the Bible Union in Ontario.

### *The Gospel Witness* and Prominent Baptists.

Its methods are the same everywhere—trusted orthodox Baptists leaders in the South and North and in Canada are attacked, not on account of their unorthodoxy or their heresy, but because, I suppose, they refuse to fall into line and to adopt the spirit and the methods that lie at the heart of the Baptist Bible Union. When I think of the great men of the South, of Truett, of Scarborough, of Gambrell, of Robertson, of Mullins—all these men have been attacked.

So far as we know, *The Gospel Witness* has never contained any word of criticism of Drs. Scarborough, Gambrell or Robertson, unless it may have been a remark about Professor Robertson's endorsement of Dr. Glover in *The British Weekly*. Our only contact with the great Dr. Gambrell was to receive a letter from him after he had read an address of ours entitled "The Baptist Message", saying that he rejoiced in every word of it.

We had Dr. Truett up in Walmer Road celebrating a little anniversary we had in connection with my ministry, and it was stated by the leader of the Baptist Bible Union in the South: "We know now where Dr. Truett stands, we have got his number, we have got his mark; he is going over to the modernists, he has gone over to Canada, he is going to the side of the leading modernist in Canada. That is me. (Laughter.) I am getting on. (Renewed laughter.)"

As to Dr. Truett, we have always had for him a very high regard and have had opportunity of knowing him, we believe, much more intimately than Dr. MacNeill, and we regard him with deep affection still. We have criticized Dr. Truett for having such an arch-modernist as Dr. Shailer Mathews in his pulpit and for publicly recommending his congregation to buy Dr. Mathews' books. Dr. Truett is a glorious preacher and we believe preaches nothing but "the glorious gospel of the blessed God." He is as great a puzzle to us as Dr. Farmer, in that he can hold fellowship with those who deny nearly everything which Dr. Truett preaches.

There is one name mentioned there that bears a familiar relationship to us, and that is Dr. Mullins, President of the Baptist World Alliance, of which this Convention is a unit. You know what has been said by Dr. Shields about Dr. Mullins. He has been characterized as being utterly dishonest, or words to this effect: That if he were a horse trader, he would sell a spavined horse knowingly as a sound one; if a motor salesman, he would sell a broken down car as a sound one; if a lawyer, he would go into court to defend a lie. I hardly know of anything that could have been added. I suppose there was one—he might have slipped a six-shooter into Dr. Mullins' pocket. Then that would

have made him a real up-to-date orthodox Christian. (Laughter). In that case Dr. Shields would have come to his defence, I suppose.

As to Dr. Mullins, it might have been wiser had we refrained from writing what we did about him, but we are more than ever convinced that every word we wrote was absolutely true. What we said of Dr. Mullins related to his Memphis speech which we heard for ourselves. Dr. Mullins based his argument upon an absolutely false statement. Had we time to verify the quotations, we could quote from many Southern papers to support the criticisms of Dr. Mullins' position, one professor from Kansas City writing, "Dr. Mullins deceived me".

### Dr. MacNeill's Chivalry (?)

We suppose with the chivalry of a true gentleman Dr. MacNeill refers, in his mention of the "six shooter" to the terrible Texas tragedy. If one were justified in painting the minister concerned in blackest colours, if indeed we were to accept the estimate of him formed by his worst enemy, even then we might have supposed the incident would have produced tears rather than laughter in a Christian assembly; and we dare to say that any true man, if indeed he was not mad with rage, would have refrained from referring to it. In any event, of this we are sure, there was no malice in the heart of Dr. Norris toward his assailant. Attacked in his own study by a stranger, rightly or wrongly, but indisputably, he acted in self-defence. If Dr. MacNeill could but hear the tones of his own voice and observe the animus displayed in look and gesture, in his Convention speech, we think he would hang his head in shame for the rest of his natural life.

### Dr. Dixon and the Baptist Bible Union.

Now, listen! Take the North. Thoroughgoing fundamentalists like Dr. Brouger, President of the Northern Baptist Convention; Dr. Francis and Dr. J. G. Masee, of the Tremont Temple,—not one of them is willing to identify himself with the Baptist Bible Union. And is it any wonder that Dr. A. C. Dixon before he died repudiated publicly his membership in it and all connection with it, for the spirit and the methods of the movement could not be tolerated by any man who wanted to retain his self-respect.

We have no apology for what we said of Drs. Brouger, Francis, and Masee. These have all done exactly as Dr. MacNeill has done: "The children of Ephraim being armed and carrying bows, turned back in the day of battle". Dr. MacNeill dares to cite the case of Dr. A. C. Dixon, and says he repudiated his membership in the Baptist Bible Union and all connection with it, "for the spirit and methods of the movement could not be tolerated by any man who wanted to retain his self-respect." This, to be perfectly plain, WE BRAND AS AN ABSOLUTE FALSEHOOD. Dr. Dixon was our warm friend to the day of his death. We were the guest of himself and Mrs. Dixon in Baltimore by his own personal and special and urgent invitation, not long before his death. He never complained of the spirit and methods of the movement. He felt that all that was required was that a protest should be made, and that when it had been made, the responsibility would rest upon those who had been warned of their danger. But what is the gist of Dr. MacNeill's speech thus far? A discussion of

the point at issue? Has he produced a jot of evidence in disproof of Professor Marshall's Modernism? Thus far he has been engaged, as he has been engaged for several years, in denouncing the Editor of *The Gospel Witness*.

Then take our own Convention in our own Dominion, the same thing has been true. It is utterly impossible for men to go on with their work; they are not free to do it. Attempts have been made over and over again to discredit our leaders in the eyes of the people. Mr. Albert Matthews has been called stupid, Mr. S. J. Moore was never known to do anything heroic in his life. (Cries of "Shame".) Dr. Frank Sanderson has been said to be worse than Ananias—he has unseated Ananias. Then take the case of Dr. Bowley Green. His belief in the deity of Christ has been cast under suspicion, and his logic characterized as kangaroo logic. Dr. Dayfoot has been held up to ridicule and scorn, trusted as he is. E. O. Forde, who did one of the greatest pieces of work in this city in the face of great difficulties—(applause)—he of glorious memory, he goes to Lethbridge. But he must be discredited before he goes, not because he is unorthodox, but because he refused to come to heel.

### An Incident Dragged In.

I have this telegram in my hand. I must give you this. This shows what is going on all the time. Last week I received this night letter of inquiry concerning Dr. H. H. Bingham, of Calgary. An outstanding church on the other side was thinking of calling him, they wanted to be assured about him, and they say this—I will not read it all. I can give the name, and it will be given if it is needed.

We must have a thoroughgoing fundamentalist and have always believed him to be such. However, Shields, Toronto, advises us he is modernistic.

(Cries of "Oh! Oh!")

Well, brethren, I took a great deal of delight in answering that telegram. (Applause.)

DR. SHIELDS: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

DR. MACNEILL: Dr. Shields will have ample opportunity, I am sure, to, sir.

(Cries of "Sit down.")

DR. SHIELDS: All right. I just wanted to ask a question.

DR. MACNEILL: Dr. Shields will have ample opportunity, I am sure, to defend any charge against him. I shall claim the privilege of rebuttal at the close of this debate as the mover of the motion, and I shall attend to all that may be given. (Applause.)

A DELEGATE: I rise to a point of order.

(Cries of "Sit down." "Fair play there.")

THE CHAIRMAN (W. C. Senior): Let us hear what this man has to say.

THE DELEGATE: Mr. Chairman, the speaker is proposing the adoption of the report of McMaster University—(cries of "Amen")—and I claim he is not proposing it at all or speaking to the question. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. MacNeill has the floor.

DR. MACNEILL: I am dealing with those things that have the very closest relationship—

THE DELEGATE: Mr. Chairman, may I ask for your ruling? I have the right. I have nothing to do with any side.

DR. MACNEILL: The Chair has given its ruling.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have given my ruling.

THE DELEGATE: What was it? (Cries of "Sit down".)

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. MacNeill has the floor.

DR. MACNEILL: Speaking to the question, well, I did want to tell you what I said in that telegram. After saying that Dr. Bingham was absolutely

orthodox, intensely evangelistic, a fine leader, sane and lovable, I felt I should add this:

Bingham only one of the trusted orthodox Baptist leaders on the continent attacked by Shields. Please regard it as good guarantee of his orthodoxy. (Applause.)

We have referred to this incident in our speech, which will be found later in these pages. Other points raised by Dr. MacNeill need not be referred to. We have mentioned other men, and if men will deny the truth and take sides with the enemies of the Gospel, we shall do as we have done, call them by name and say, "Thou art the man".

#### A False Conclusion.

Well now, brethren, what is the conclusion of the whole matter? It is this. The simple fact is that Dr. Shields has failed to make out his case. In spite of all the efforts of the past year with reams of paper and quarts of ink and tours through the Convention, he has failed to make out his case, he has failed to prove it. The simple fact of the matter is that Dr. Shields and his followers have taken the wrong road. It is not the road toward peace for this denomination, for the simple reason that it is not the road of righteousness: it will never lead to peace, it will never lead to unity, it will never lead to co-operation. It has led, and it is bound to lead in the future, towards strife and division and the dissipation of our energies and the consequent wrecking of all those great denominational enterprises which we have set up.

Two great principles, my brethren—and I close with this sentence—two great principles have always governed Baptist people. In the essentials, loyalty and unity; in all the non-essentials, complete liberty of the individual conscience. In all the essentials, unity; in all the non-essentials, liberty. On that ground our fathers stood in the past, on that ground we have stood through all our history, and, please God, we will hold that ground and cling to it to the very end. (Applause.)

### Mr. Albert Matthews Seconds the Report.

MR. ALBERT MATTHEWS: Mr. Moderator and fellow-delegates to the Convention: I should like to sketch briefly the financial situation as you will find it in the Annual Report now in your hands.

(Following this Mr. Matthews discussed the financial report referring to Woodstock and Moulton Colleges and to McMaster University. As the Convention instructed the Executive Committee to publish a verbatim report of the discussion on Education Day, those who desire to follow the speakers' discussion of financial matters, can do so in the Convention's official report.) Mr. Matthews continued in part, as follows:

#### Mr. Matthews Attempts Explanation of the Sanderson Incident.

At page 16, *The Gospel Witness* (Oct. 7th) says as follows:

We venture now to publish two other conversations. They were, it is true, "private" in the sense that they were not held in any public place. They were not, at the time, labelled "confidential" and inasmuch as they referred to public matters, under the present exigencies we believe we are abundantly justified in giving the facts to the Baptist public.

That is one point I want to speak of, this private conversation, but I am heading on to another one and will come back.

Before his appointment as Chairman, the present Chairman of the Board of Governors informed us that he had been approached by the then Chancellor urging him to accept the Chairmanship.

of the Board. He said that the Chancellor complained of the moribund condition of the Board of Governors.

I never used that word until this day.

The gentleman who was then Chairman was very ill and unable to exercise the duties of his office, while other members of the Board seldom, if ever, attended. We recall that the gentleman in question informed us that the Chancellor said he envied the Home Mission Board its efficiency, it was so well organized, and its work was so thoroughly done. He had named certain men as not giving attention to the work of the Board of Governors; and then we distinctly recall that our friend reported the Chancellor as saying: "As for Dr. Sanderson, I don't know whether he has any God left or not."

That is one of the conversations. Following that is one with Mr. Moore. I won't read that. He can take care of himself.

A DELEGATE: Go on.

MR. MATTHEWS: (reading)

It was because of these two conversations we took action before the Walmer Road Convention of 1922.—

Because of these two conversations.—

At the close of the Educational Session of that Convention we went to the Chairman of the Board of Governors who had himself nominated Dr. Sanderson for the position of Governor and reminded him of our conversation. He said that he distinctly recalled someone's having said to him that he did not know whether the gentleman in question had any God left or not, but he did not remember who had said it. I then asked him,—

says the Editor—

—"What is an honest man to do in view of your action this afternoon in supporting the candidature of the gentleman in question?"

Now, Mr. Moderator, if you will give me a minute or two I should like to speak first of all of this private conversation. I refuse to believe that there is any exigency, which means any crisis or emergency, in our denomination apart from the heart and mind of Dr. Shields, and yet I do not blame him for bringing forward anything he considers at liberty to bring forward in respect to me, but I want to give you my conversation as I gave it to him.

He was my pastor. At that time Dr. McCrimmon was Chancellor, and he sent for me and intimated that he would like me to undertake the Chairmanship of the Board of Governors. It came as a bolt from the blue to me. I said, "My dear Chancellor, no one has less ability for the Board than I have. It is utterly unthinkable that I should undertake so great a thing and follow in such distinguished footsteps as those of Dr. Thompson." He said, "You are the choice of the brethren and we want you to take it." I said, "It is impossible, I have not the ability or the temper or the platform training or anything of that kind that is so essential." Away I went, and next day I was sent for by Dr. Thompson—I had the next office to him in the building—and Dr. Thompson, of whom I think as much as I ever did of my own father, I think—one of the finest men I ever knew—(Applause)—with that gentle voice of his and that wistful eye—said, "Matthews, I want you to undertake this task. I want you to take from my failing hands the burdens of the Board of Governors." That is what faced my life at that time.

Now, what was the proper course for me to take? An impossible thing on one side, an appeal from a man on his death-bed on the other. I leave it to the ministerial brethren present whether I did the right thing or not in taking it to my pastor and asking him about it. That is what I did. I did not speak of it in a public place—this most sacred thing that had come into my hands for decision. I did not earmark it "confidential" in any sense. I appealed to my pastor, as we laymen have been taught to do.

I am not criticizing Dr. Shields for bringing this before the public, but I want to bring my side to your attention. I simply want to raise the question as to whether in your estimation this is the standard of Christian ethics that McMaster University is supposed to adopt in preference to the standards which are now adopted.

### Did Not Know Whether He Had Any God Left.

What does Mr. Matthews mean by the "standard of Christian ethics"? We confidently and unequivocally assert that Mr. Matthews did tell us that Chancellor McCrimmon said that he did not know whether Dr. Frank Sanderson had any God left or not. Whether Chancellor McCrimmon said it, or whether he was justified in saying it, is not the question: we are absolutely certain that Mr. Matthews told us he said it; and furthermore, that Mr. Matthews admitted that somebody had said it when we approached him in Walmer Road at the close of the Educational debate, at the 1922 Convention, when he said he remembered the phrase but did not remember who said it. There were some things it were a crime to regard as confidential; and my standard of "Christian ethics" forbids my remaining silent when it is proposed to elect as Governor of a Christian university a man of whom the head of that university said he did not know whether he had any God left or not.

Now to pass on to the next matter, that of Dr. Sanderson. I am sorry to take your time.

(Cries of "Go on".)

The question is, at the close of the Walmer Road Convention—a great many of the delegates here were absent from that Convention—Dr. Sanderson was under serious attack. He made a good confession before his brethren. Dr. Sanderson, who had been charged with all sorts of things by the Editor of *The Gospel Witness* and others up and down the country, made this confession: I am a poor sinner and nothing at all; but Jesus Christ is my all in all.

Following that came this question to me: What is an honest man to do in view of your action this afternoon in supporting the candidature of Dr. Sanderson? There is no reply there; the thing carries its own reply—any man that makes that moving confession,—the whole body of Walmer Road Church was alive with spirituality such as I have never seen.

As some of the honest men—I do not want to say all the honest men—I put it this way: The honest men of that Convention elected Dr. Sanderson on that good confession he made by a very large majority to the Board of Governors for the succeeding four years. I am only sorry to have to say this in addition, that the pastor of Jarvis Street Church on the following Sunday or a week or two afterwards gave that harsh and bitter word of reply to Dr. Sanderson following that heartfelt confession when he exposed the utmost depths of his heart and soul and mind to his brethren. That is what happened.

Now as to the slander itself. I do not know whether Dr. McCrimmon is here or not, but I want to clean this thing up. I thought it was nailed a year ago. I never heard Dr. McCrimmon or any other man say, to my knowledge, that Dr. Sanderson did not know whether there was a God left or not. I do not recall ever having heard anybody make that statement. This statement says that I did not remember whether Dr. McCrimmon or whether someone else made it. There were so many statements nobody could recall them all so far back, but I certainly absolve Dr. McCrimmon from anything of that kind.

As for Dr. Sanderson after his great confession—I did not know the man very well at that time, but in the succeeding four years on the Committee I got to know him and to love him and appreciate him—when he made that great confession my heart welled up and my soul magnified my Master. I have learned to love him much more and more highly as the years have gone by.—(Applause.)—And, Mr. Moderator, I will covet the opportunity this after-

noon, to-night, or to-morrow, or whenever it comes, to re-nominate Mr. Sanderson for the Board of Governors.

All that Mr. Matthews can say is that he does not remember such a statement having been made. I accept Mr. Matthews' statement without reservation: I do not believe Mr. Matthews would say he did not remember if the matter was still in his mind. But I have a most distinct recollection of all the circumstances, and four years ago, while the person who made the statement was forgotten, the statement itself was distinctly remembered. But Mr. Matthews would now cover it all up by referring to Dr. Sanderson's confession: "I'm a poor sinner and nothing at all; But Jesus Christ is my all in all." No one would be readier than I to accept such a confession if there were made with it an acknowledgment of what everybody who knows Dr. Sanderson knows thoroughly well, that his confession was contrary to his record for some years before. Dr. Sanderson followed Professor Matthews into the wilderness, and had been an aggressive propagator of the principles of Modernism up to that time, at least. A man cannot wipe out the record of years by a pious confession of faith when driven into a corner; and for one, I absolutely refuse to believe in his sincerity.

#### Another "Dodge."

Now, sir, I apologize for taking your time. I have only one more reference to make. These meetings which are held throughout the Convention criticizing members of the Board of Governors, criticizing the management of the Board of Governors, sowing the tares up and down the country, sniping at us in that way, preventing us, blockading us, and humbugging the people—I want to justify those terms with one more illustration before I sit down.

The stenographic report of Dr. Shields' speech at the meeting in Woodstock, September 10th, 1926, is as follows:

At the London Convention I was re-elected on the Board of Governors. The first meeting after the Board of Governors met at London I was about ten minutes late and they had appointed a committee consisting of nearly the whole Board except myself, and the next move was to do away with the monthly meeting. Ever since I have been a member of the Board we had a meeting every month, and it was decided to meet every quarter, and the quarterly meetings were held when I was out of town. If you know of any political dodge that can beat that, then I do not.

Now, I agree with Dr. Shields there, I do not know of any political dodge that can beat that. I do not believe there is a political party in Canada that would do that dirty thing, and if there is any Chairman of the Board of Governors, or of any other Board in this Convention, who will stoop to that thing, he ought to resign immediately and get off the Convention. There is not a ward politician in this great city of Toronto who would attempt a thing like that. And yet that is put before our people. It is referred to again in Chatham and in Peterborough and other places. That poison gas is going round about us in that way, and as Chairman of the Board I resent that kind of thing. It is not fair and it is not true.

I am going to tell you what is the fact. Dr. Shields can agree or not. I do not charge him with anything malicious; I think his memory misled him on that point. (Laughter.) After the Convention at London I was approached by out of town members of the Board from London, Brantford, Hamilton, and other places, to say that these Board meetings every month were not of sufficient importance to take all the time that they required. The members had not only to come to town in the afternoon and work late into the night, but they



had to stay in Toronto all the night and go back next day. It was a big task and there was no remuneration, but they did not mind that.

The day after that I met Mr. Moore. He said, "Now, Matthews, most of those meetings are routine things, there is not a lot to do at them, but I am exceedingly busy and not too strong, and I wish you could go back to the pre-war procedure of quarterly Board meetings." I said, "I have no hesitation about suggesting that if it is agreeable."

I then called Dr. Shields and explained the situation to him, and told him that we proposed, with his permission, to go back to the pre-war situation of quarterly meetings, with monthly meetings of the executive. He agreed with that. He said, "I am just as busy as I can be, and that will be satisfactory to me."

Now, Dr. Shields mentioned in Woodstock that he was ten minutes late and that the thing had been done. I grant he was ten minutes late, or more than that, but I did not bring on the matter before the Board of Governors until he arrived. Dr. Shields made the motion, or seconded it, that that be accomplished. (Cries of "Oh, oh", and applause.)

### No Proof to Me.

I do not question Mr. Matthews' sincerity in his explanation of this incident, but I have absolutely no recollection of ever having been called by Mr. Matthews on this matter. If Mr. Matthews says he called me, I can only accept his statement; but I am greatly surprised that it should have entirely escaped my memory,—the more so because if Mr. Matthews is not in error here, it is the only case, I believe, in which I was ever consulted on any matter in the six years of my membership on the Board of Governors; nor have I the slightest recollection of moving or seconding the proposal. I know that I shall call down the wrath of not a few when I say, that if it is so recorded in the minutes of the Board, it is no proof to me—and members of the Board will understand what I mean.

More than that, seven members out of the seventeen, such distinguished men as S. J. Moore, Joseph Shenstone, Dr. Shields himself and others were left off the Board because routine matters could be attended to by a smaller committee, and general matters of policy would come up every three months in the usual way before the whole Board. That is my position.

I want you to get my point of view. That is what I mean by the blockading tactics and confusing the minds of the people—drawing men out on sacred questions of theology, and then slipping these things into them like that.

Now, I ask again if you want to substitute in McMaster University for what we have there to-day? (Cries of "No".) McMaster University has had a long and honourable career. We are very imperfect, we know that, and yet we have attempted to do whatever we could do.

I only want to make one more confession before I sit down. It is my great sorrow that I have not been able to follow in the great footsteps of Dr. Thompson. As I told you when I was speaking of this personal matter, I consented to take this position only in deference to my great love for Dr. Thompson. I depended on my brethren to do what they could do, which is not very much. I have persevered three years—more than that—our new Chancellor has been here three years, and we have made no progress whatever in the way of the Forward Movement. I am ready to accept the responsibility for that lack of showing. I confess myself a pronounced failure as Chairman of the Board of Governors.

(Cries of "No".)

I do not ask for your sympathy. I shall be very happy to step aside when my term will be up next year, and I do hope that some other man will be able to accomplish the thing that I have not been able to accomplish, that is, to get on with the work of the Lord in McMaster University. The reason we cannot accomplish it is because of these barricading, blockading tactics, the bringing up of this kind of piffle, this humbug all over on the Convention floor.

I will do the best I can; I will stay with the University as long as you wish me to, if the present ideals are lived up to—ideals of reverent scholarship, supported by trust in God and guarded by sound learning; but if those other standards of Christian ethics are to be substituted for such sound learning and reverent scholarship in McMaster University, then I will be very glad to have my hat.

Mr. Moderator, I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the adoption of the report. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and Gentlemen, the question is before you. It has been moved by Dr. MacNeill, and seconded by Mr. Matthews, that we adopt the report which has been presented by Dr. Whidden. The question is now before you. (Cries of "Question", "Question".)

## Amendment to Board of Governors' Report.

REV. W. J. H. BROWN (Annette St. Baptist Church, Toronto): Mr. Chairman and friends, I rise to make an amendment that will be seconded by Mr. Allen, after which I desire the privilege of speaking to it.

The amendment is this:

That the motion to adopt the report be amended by the following being added to it:

That while gladly recognizing the qualities of Professor L. H. Marshall as a man, and his ability as a teacher, this Convention is convinced by his own utterances that the theological views of Professor Marshall are out of harmony with, and involve an infringement of the doctrinal standards embodied in the Charter of McMaster University, and the principles held by the Regular Baptists of Ontario and Quebec; and that therefore his continuance as a professor in that institution would not be in the best interests of this Convention.

(Cries of "Lost".)

Brother Allen will second the amendment

REV. G. W. ALLEN (Grace Baptist Church, Toronto): Mr. Chairman, I will just second the amendment, to save time, from my seat, but I should like the privilege to speak to it after Brother Brown speaks.

THE CHAIRMAN: Brother Brown has the floor.

## Rev. W. J. H. Brown's Speech.

MR. BROWN: I should like to say, dear friends, that the church I have the honour to serve, last year had eight of her young men in attendance at McMaster University, which meant one out of fifty-four of our membership, which means that Annette Street has given of her young men to McMaster in accordance with her membership three times what the other churches of Toronto have given for that year (Applause). And many, if not most of them, were urged by me personally to attend the University. So I am interested, and I think I have a right to speak to the question we have before us.

I have just been thinking that it was a great pity that some man whose theological soundness was absolutely unquestioned had not been appointed to the Chair of Pastoral Theology in McMaster University. (Cries of "Hear, hear" and "There are none.") I hear some voices saying "There are none." Surely there are some to be found, but modesty forbids me giving you the name of one man. (Laughter.) But he was not consulted in this matter, he did not get a chance. At the present time there occupies the Chair of Practical Theology in McMaster University my good friend here, whose theological soundness is questioned by a great many people throughout the bounds of our Convention. (Applause.) Now, I do not need to say, Mr. Chairman, that so long as that continues it is an absolute impossibility that McMaster University will receive the support that it should from our people.

### What Christ Does Prof. Marshall Teach?

I think I will get near to the heart of the amendment that I am proposing if I seek to answer the question: What kind of a Christ does the theology of

Professor Marshall give us? Is it the Christ given us in the doctrinal statement of our University? Is it the Christ that Dr. Farmer presented to us in his wonderful Presidential Address? (Cries of "Yes".) That Christ we all adore,—("Amen")—our souls worship, we gladly own ourselves to be His bond slaves! (Cries of "Amen" and "Hallelujah"). That Christ is the great infallible Christ. (Cries of "Amen" and "Hallelujah"). Is the Christ that Professor Marshall's theology gives us an infallible Christ? (Cries of "No". "Yes". "As good as yours".)

Let me remind you of Dr. Farmer's statement at our Convention last year, when he said that the incoming professor held the views of Dr. Driver so far as dates and authorship were concerned. What does Dr. Driver have to say—

A DELEGATE: What does Dr. Farmer have to say?

#### Dates and Authorship.

MR. BROWN: What does Dr. Driver have to say, for instance, about the authorship of the Pentateuch? On page 136 of Dr. Driver's book, "Introduction to Literature of the Old Testament", he tells us that a large portion of the Pentateuch, that part relating to the Passover, to the Priesthood, to the Tabernacle, to the sin-offering and to the day of atonement, was not written by Moses, but came from pagan sources and was written a thousand years after Moses was dead and in his grave.

What does Jesus Christ say about the authorship of the Pentateuch? In the fifth chapter of John, the 45th and 46th verses, these words are recorded that came from Him: "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me:—(cries of "Amen")—for he wrote of me."

In the twelfth chapter of Mark, the 26th verse, we have these words from the lips of Jesus: 'as concerning the dead', that they rise: have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him?"

And let me remind you of the recorded incident in the sixteenth chapter of Luke that was told by the Lord Jesus Christ, how Abraham answered the rich man: "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them."

And again: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

Jesus Christ claimed the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Applause, and cries of "Amen".)

The view that is held by our brother, the Professor, is that he did not write the Pentateuch. The theology of Professor Marshall on this point does not give us an infallible Christ. (Cries of "Hear, hear".) This view accepted by the Professor denies the Davidic authorship of the 110th Psalm, page 324, of the book to which I have referred. In Mark 12, Jesus Christ said that that Psalm was written by David. (Cries of "Amen".) I prefer to believe the statement of Jesus Christ. (Applause, and cries of "Amen".)

#### Was Jonah Real or Fiction?

Now let us look to the question of the historicity of Jonah. (Applause.) I expected many to smile, but I have never been able to be convinced that the matter was a joke. (Cries of "Oh, no"). Will you who smile the smile of scorn tell me who it was that said: "As Jonah was, so the Son of Man shall be"? (Applause.) I have read somewhere that Moody used to say that he could judge of the soundness of a man's theology by his rejection or acceptance of the historicity of the story of Jonah. (Cries of "Hear, hear".) I find myself in very hearty accord with the great evangelist on that point.

In the eleventh chapter of Luke, the 32nd verse, Jesus Christ said: "The men of Nineve shall rise up in the judgment, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here."

Allow me to quote the words of another:

It is impossible for Jesus, who was speaking words of the most solemn warning as to the future Judge and the future judgment, to have asserted that imaginary persons described in a fictitious book, who fictitiously repented at the preaching of an imaginary prophet should rise up in judgment and condemn the actual impenitents of

man has been misjudged,—(applause)—surely this very good man has been orthodox to the core. I want to tell you, I want to shake hands with him, because I have nothing in my heart but love for him. But a closer examination of that sermon has convinced me of the truth of the criticism,—(laughter)—that has been made regarding it, that the atonement it proclaims is wholly subjective, and that there is nothing in it that suggests that the righteousness and truth and justice of God were involved at Calvary.

Just here I recollect a sermon preached in this pulpit. I simply refer to it. I have in my pocket here a criticism by the great Professor Kanamouri, who was given that sermon to read, and who after reading it, in his own sweet, wonderful spirit, said words to this effect: That his long experience as an out and out modernist—for he had been converted in youth and trained for the Christian ministry and then became the apostle of modernism to Japan, and was marvellously brought back to faith in this infallible Book—gave his testimony after reading that sermon, that the man who wrote it was a modernist. I pass his words on to you.

#### Can "Regular" Baptists Tolerate "the Broadest of the Broad"?

The sermon that Professor Marshall printed concerning what Baptists believe clearly reveals his own attitude on the whole question. What did he say? He said this: That we have among us—speaking of Baptists—those who are the narrowest of the narrow, and also those who are the broadest of the broad, but both alike were loyal to Jesus Christ.

The broadest of the broad deny the virgin birth; deny the vicarious atonement, in the orthodox sense; deny the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ; deny the physical resurrection; deny the visible and audible and glorious second coming of Jesus Christ. How can they be loyal to Jesus Christ? (Cries of "They cannot".) They are not loyal to Jesus Christ,—(cries of "No".)—and the man who says they are very clearly reveals his own position.

Mr. Chairman, it is our profoundest conviction that this dear friend who now occupies the Chair of Pastoral Theology in McMaster University has theological views that are absolutely out of harmony with the views set forth in the doctrinal statement of the trust deed of our University.

I have pleasure in moving this amendment, and Mr. Allen is now to speak to it.

There are some hundreds of copies of this amendment here if anybody wants a copy.

#### Rev. G. W. Allen's Speech.

REV. G. W. ALLEN (Grace Baptist Church, Toronto): Mr. Chairman—**SOME DELEGATES:** Let us have the amendment again, please.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Allen, will you read the amendment before you second it?

**MR. ALLEN:** The amendment moved by Brother Brown is this:

That while gladly recognizing the qualities of Professor L. H. Marshall as a man, and his ability as a teacher, this Convention is convinced by his own utterances that the theological views of Professor Marshall are out of harmony with, and involve an infringement of, the doctrinal standards embodied in the Charter of McMaster University, and the principles held by the Regular Baptists of Ontario and Quebec; and that therefore his continuance in that Institution would not be in the best interests of this Convention.

Mr. Chairman, and Brethren and Sisters in Christ Jesus, Members of our churches in the Convention, Delegates from those churches coming here to do the Lord's work: I come before you this afternoon to second this amendment, not with enticing words of man's speech, and not depending upon the wisdom of this world, for it is written in the blessed Book that "the world by wisdom knew not God"; but I wish to bear this testimony to my blessed Redeemer that I come to second this amendment in the name and for the honour of my Saviour the Lord Jesus Christ. (Applause and cries of "Amen".) I come to second this amendment in the name of Him who was punished for my sin because my

sin could not be forgiven by an infinitely just God until it had been punished. I come in the name of that Saviour who conquered death and rose and ascended; He has gone to prepare a place for me and for all His church, and I believe He is coming soon to take His church to Himself. (Cries of "Amen".) It is in the name of that Master that I come before my brethren and sisters in Christ Jesus to second this amendment.

#### Was Prof. Marshall Sincere in Subscribing to McMaster's Doctrinal Statement?

I wish to refer just very briefly to *The Canadian Baptist* of November 5, 1925, in which the Dean in Theology of McMaster refers to the doctrinal statement in the Charter. There is only one part of the doctrinal statement that I want to ask you to notice to-day. And may I digress just sufficiently to say this to all you brethren and sisters? I sometimes wonder if we really know the doctrinal statements of our blessed Bible and the doctrinal statements, as we should, that our denomination stands for. In the doctrinal statements which Professor Farmer gave, he quotes this: "The total and universal depravity of mankind." Now, brethren and sisters, will you remember that as we stand to-day that doctrinal statement in the Charter includes that doctrine—the total and universal depravity of mankind. I would ask you to remember also that we are told in the same article that the Professor under question subscribed to that before ever he left England to come to Canada. This was sent, so the Dean says here, this was sent to the Old Country before Mr. Marshall came out to visit us. He had time to think it over carefully, and before setting sail for our shores at all he declared his sympathy with, and his acceptance of, these statements.

I beg of you to remember that Mr. Marshall, before he came out at all, and in coming to us, expressed his acceptance of that declaration.

—quoting from *The Canadian Baptist*.

Now, we have also been told by one of the speakers in the first part of the afternoon that the Professor under question accepts the doctrinal statement in that Charter without reservation. Those were the two words used a few minutes ago from this desk, "without reservation;" and here is this doctrine of total and universal depravity.

The first address that I heard the Professor give—I am not quoting now from what somebody else said they heard he said, or somebody said, but I heard him say it, and many of you heard him say it, and many of you read it because it was officially and stenographically reported and published by the Senate—I quote from the Senate's report, page 49, beginning with line 26 from the top:

I believe—  
says the professor,

—that just as it is natural for a plant to turn towards the light, or the mariner's compass to point to the North, or a new-born babe to suck nourishment from its mother's breast, so I believe it is in the best sense of the term natural for the spirit of man to seek illumination and strength and inspiration from the spirit of God. I believe that it is very important nowadays to emphasize the fact that religion is really and truly perfectly natural.

Now, friends, I ask you how are you going to harmonize the statement of total and universal depravity—(cries of "No, No," and "Oh, Oh")—and then this statement that it is perfectly natural for the spirit of man to seek the spirit of God?

Then, also, I would ask you to notice in the sermon which has been referred to—I will not quote the part that was quoted, I will quote another part of the sermon that was preached in First Avenue. I am asking you to compare what the Professor says and what he subscribed to in the Charter concerning total and universal depravity.

Incidentally, I want to ask you, brethren and sisters, to remember that a year ago the Chancellor at least twice, according to the Senate's report, affirmed very strongly that the Professor would preach what he believed. I want to

say to you all that that is exceedingly true of any person. You will preach what you believe—sometimes in spite of yourself. You will preach what you believe not only in the pulpit but in the class room. It does not make any difference what you have signed or subscribed to, you will preach what you believe, perhaps all unconsciously.

#### That First Avenue Sermon.

Here is what he said in the First Avenue sermon, quoting from *The Canadian Baptist* of November 26th:

He knew—  
referring to Christ,

—He knew that at the heart and centre of man's being, planted there by the hand of God, was something divine, beautiful, radiant, deathless, indestructible—there in everybody, even in the worst—and there it remains incorruptible in all its corruptness and undefiled in all its defilement awaiting the day of its manifestation. He saw in all an angel in fetters, the new man, waiting the opportunity to throw the old man off. Beneath the ashes of collapsed human nature he knew, that there were yet sparks of celestial fire. He saw a light brooding over the darkness in the blackest soul; he saw the radiant love of purity in the heart of the profligate; he saw the love of home and kindred and virtue latent in the prodigal wasting his substance in riotous living; he saw the soul of honour latent in the cheat; he saw the love of truth latent in the liar; he saw courage sleeping in the coward. He knew that there was a fund of unselfish energy somewhere, even in the man who seemed to be entirely self-centred and self-absorbed; he knew that in man there was something akin to the creative spirit of God, that man has an innate love of the good and the beautiful and the true. So it is a divine element in the human soul; whatever the rough and tumble of life it abides indestructible.

And four more lines. The Professor continues:

How wonderful and beautiful it is to think that in all of us, in you and me and in every human being, there are moral and spiritual potentialities, divine powers, which under proper stimulus and encouragement from on high can develop into the excellencies of Christ.

Now, I have quoted from these two addresses—(applause)—one before the Convention and one in this church, and I want to quote two lines from one other address. This has already been quoted. It is only two lines for emphasis:

When a young man chooses a vocation in which the powers God has given him are used to the utmost, then he can truly say that he has come to Christ. When we can give service to humanity and help any organization labouring in the cause of Christianity, then we can say we have come to Christ.

Now, brethren, this report from the Senate, and this sermon, stenographically reported, I understand, that appears here in *The Baptist*, and this other sermon quoted, which was preached in James Street, Hamilton, and which I have never heard contradicted,—I want to ask you, friends, how these can be harmonized with our doctrinal statement of the total and universal depravity of mankind.

#### The Scripture on Total Depravity.

And now, Mr. Chairman, and brethren and sisters, I want to give you just briefly what to me is the final word in all this matter. I want to read two or three verses from the Bible, and I will leave you under the guiding of the Holy Spirit to see for yourselves whether it is natural for man to look to God, whether it is possible to develop into the excellencies of Christ or not, according to the Word of God. Genesis 6: 5: "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination"—"every imagination,"—"of the thoughts of his heart was only evil constantly". Job 14: 4: "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one". Psalms 14: 23. "The Lord

looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are all become filthy; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." Jeremiah 13: 23: "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil." Jeremiah 17: 9: "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked: who can know it?" Ezekiel 36: 26-27: "A new heart also"—"a new heart,"—"will I give you, a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take-away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them." John 3: 3: "Jesus"—speaking to Nicodemus,—"answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again"—born from above,—"he cannot see the Kingdom of God." Romans 3: 10: "As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one," and 11: "There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God," and 12: "They are all gone out of the way, they are altogether become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one," and 23: "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." Romans 8: 7: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." 2 Corinthians 5: 17: "I have these two passages left which I want to give you from God's Word: "Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away: behold all things are become new." And the last one is Galatians 6: 15: "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature,"—or a new creation.

Now, friends, I have to ask you to think of our doctrinal statement—total and universal depravity. Think of the Professor's statement about developing into the excellencies of Christ, and, so on; think of the Word of God's own statement in this great matter.

I have to tell you frankly, friends, that if I were called to sit with other brethren in an ordination council, and if the Professor in question were a young man coming before that council to be ordained as a Baptist minister to serve some church in our Convention, and after he had given us his story of salvation and his call to the ministry, if the Professor should come forward with a statement of beliefs, and he should speak about his believing in developing into the excellencies of Christ and those things which I have read to you—I want to tell you frankly before God that I would consider it my duty to vote against the ordination of a man with those views. (Cries of "Hear, hear".)

And I say this, brethren: If I would have to vote against that man being ordained into our Baptist ministry, then I do not consider that he is fit to prepare other young men to be ordained into our Baptist ministry. (Applause.)

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am here to second this amendment to the report, and in seconding it I challenge every brother here, I challenge every sister here, who, as a delegate, has a right to vote—I challenge you in the name of God: Remember that eternity is just ahead—(Cries of "Hear, hear")—and as you vote will you please remember that you will have to give an account, not before any man or group of men, but before Him; you will have to give an account of every deed done in the body. Therefore I ask you to forget men, but by all means remember Christ.

## The Amendment to the Amendment Moved

REV. J. M. WARNER (St. Clair Avenue Baptist Church, Toronto): Mr. Moderator and fellow members of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec: I rise to move in amendment to the amendment:

That all the words after the word "that" in the amendment be struck out and that there be substituted therefor the words following:

In adopting the report of the Senate and Board of Governors this Convention re-affirms the previous declaration of the Bloor Street Convention of 1910 and the Hamilton Convention of 1925 touching the attitude of the University to the Bible, including the claim for reasonable liberty embraced within the terms of these Convention declarations and of the Charter and Trust Deed.

This Convention deplores and condemns the campaign of misrepresentation and slander carried on for months by the editor of *The Gospel Witness* and certain of his supporters, including some students; against members of the Faculty of McMaster University and its governing bodies and against other boards and individuals, and calls for the cessation thereof.

("Hear, hear".)

This Convention affirms its strong confidence in Chancellor Whidden, Dean Farmer and Professor Marshall, and assures them of its sympathetic support in the work of Christian education in McMaster University.

(Applause.)

Mr. Moderator, I beg to move this amendment to the amendment, and after it has been seconded by the Rev. R. R. McKay of Sarnia, I desire the privilege of speaking thereto.

REV. R. R. MCKAY (Sarnia): I have very much pleasure in seconding this amendment. I want to say a word or two when Mr. Warner gets through.

### Rev. J. M. Warner's Speech

REV. J. M. WARNER: Mr. Moderator and members of the Convention, I do not intend to take your time in making a profession of my personal faith in Jesus Christ, for I believe you accept that, nor in quoting many passages of Scripture which both you and I believe.

I desire, however, to do just two things: In the first place, to make a brief statement; and, in the second place, to establish at least one line of proof from the evidence that we have before us regarding that statement.

The proposition that I wish to make is this: That the reality and the soundness of any cause can be judged by the sincerity and the consistency of those who espouse and champion that cause. Or, putting the matter the other way: The hollowness of a cause, so far as the charges associated with that cause are concerned, can be shown by the insincerity and inconsistency of those who espouse and champion it. That, sir, is the proposition which I make and which I think could be established by many lines of evidence if we had time to do so.

#### Find "the Insincerity and Inconsistency".

Here Mr. Warner speaks of the "insincerity and inconsistency of those who espouse and champion" a certain cause. In the words which follow Mr. Warner continues the general plan of attack upon the Editor of *The Gospel Witness*. There is absolutely no attempt here to meet the charges of false teaching, which we have repeatedly brought against Professor Marshall; but a further attempt to discredit one of the witnesses. We shall not answer these matters here. A reply will be found in the account of our own speech on page — of this number. When it is examined, our readers will be able to judge on which side the "insincerity and inconsistency" lie.

#### Study These Paragraphs Carefully.

I just wish to take a moment of your time, however, along one line, but before I do that, I should like to make this explanatory statement that is already implied in the addresses made here this afternoon, and that is that the President of the Baptist Bible Union of North America, and the Editor of *The Gospel Witness*, and the leader in and the chief director of these charges are one and the same person. That gives you the historical background and sufficient understanding of what I have to say in support of this statement.

Two years ago the Baptist Bible Union in Convention, fearing the modernistic tendencies of the studies that our young men on this continent were following in certain colleges and seminaries, and stating that the books they studied were modernistic in their influence, suggested that instead of that they would have a series of books which they would recommend, and if the



young men pursuing the ministry would compass that reading course, they would undertake to guarantee to them ordination when they came before the ordination councils.

That was followed in *The Gospel Witness* of June 5, 1924, by this statement:

The third decision of importance was the adoption at the Northern Baptist Convention in Milwaukee, in 1924, of an alternative reading course for candidates for ordination. The reading course adopted a year or two ago by the Northern Baptist Convention was almost wholly modernist in complexion. It will now be possible—

says the Editor of *The Gospel Witness*.

—for candidates to comply with the Convention requirements and at the same time take a conservative course.

Now, what were some of these conservative scholars that they recommended to their students, say, on these very matters they are charging against Professor Marshall, Dean Farmer and the others? I should like to read a list of the names of those men if I had time. I shall just mention two or three:

Dr. Orr, on *The Problem of the Old Testament*.

Dr. Strachan, in his works on theology.

Professor Peabody, of Harvard, on *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*.

Professor Vedder, of Missouri, in his *Church History Handbook*.

Professor McIntosh, in *The Doctrine and Person of Christ*.

Professor Gregory, on *The Canon and Text of the New Testament*.

I will not read you all the statements I might quote this afternoon regarding what these men say on these questions and these charges which they bring against Professor Marshall and others; I would just like to read one or two.

Professor Strachan says in one place:

While we vindicate the proper authority of Scriptures, we want to show that its authority is not immediate and absolute, but mediate and relative through human and imperfect records, and needing a supplementary and divine teaching to interpret them.

On errancy or inerrancy of the Scriptures, Dr. Strachan says:

Inspiration is still consistent with much imperfection in historical detail, and its narratives do not seem to be exempt from possibilities of error.

This is what one of the teachers they recommend says regarding the errancy or inerrancy of the Scriptures.

Then I should like to take time to tell you something about these other men that they recommend. Professor Vedder has been anathematized by the very man who recommends his books to the students to be used as text-books of conservative theology. And in the study of history and comparative religion Professor Peabody, great scholar though he may be, and recommended by the President of the Baptist Bible Union, is one of the outstanding Unitarians of the continent of America. (Cries of "Oh, oh".)

### The Editor Not Responsible.

At a meeting of a Text-Book Committee in 1924 the question of whether it was wise to recommend the early books of men who in later years had departed from the faith, and we spoke strongly against such recommendation. But this was in Minneapolis, after the Milwaukee Convention and in connection with an organization which had no connection with the Baptist Bible Union.

Then if we turn to this Professor Gregory, who stands on the list vouched for by the Baptist Bible Union and supported by the Editor of *The Gospel Wit-*

ness, what do we find? And when I use some of these terms, you will understand that I want you to put into them the interpretation that perhaps the Editor of *The Gospel Witness* would want you to put into them if he were saying them himself.

Dr. Gregory is recognized, or was recognized during his lifetime, as the outstanding German modernist teacher of his day and generation. Regarding *The Canon and Text of the New Testament*, Gregory was for years the leading professor in Germany, and was killed in the late war fighting on the German side. He was what fundamentalists call modernist. Here is his book on *The Canon and Text of the New Testament*, recommended by the Baptist Bible Union. Listen to one or two things that this German modernist says in this book recommended to the students for the ministry by the Baptist Bible Union. He says:

In the early Christian church no one thought of calling the gospels or the epistles a part of Holy Writ. The Old Testament was that.

That is to say, according to Gregory, the gospels and epistles and revelations composing our New Testament were merely human writings and not inspired Holy Writ as was the Old Testament.

It was not until years after that the gospels and epistles began gradually to be regarded as authoritative. The New Testament thus went through a process of evolution—

—says Professor Gregory

—and finally came to be regarded as much Holy Writ as the Old Testament.

Let us further illustrate what the Baptist Bible Union urge in Gregory's book as to the genuine inspiration of one of the epistles of the New Testament, the second Epistle of Peter. These are Professor Gregory's exact words:

I do not regard Second Peter as genuine; I do not think that this epistle belongs to this age—

that is, to the close of the apostolic period. He goes on to say:

As I think about the year one hundred I must remind myself that Second Peter probably was not written.

What does it mean? It means that Gregory teaches that the Apostle Peter was dead and in his grave for years before the second epistle was written. In other words, Second Peter is a spurious epistle and not part of Holy Writ. And yet the Editor of *The Gospel Witness* sanctions the reading of such a book as that by the students of the Christian ministry on the continent of America. (Cries of "No".)

I do not need to give you further additions regarding those matters, but I should like just to call your attention to this fact, that Dr. Strachan in his book or books that they have recommended says this:

The higher criticism conducted in a humble and candid spirit can only show me the real meaning of Christ's words.

Do you notice what Dr. Strachan, their scholar, their teacher, recommended by them—noble teacher he was, too—says:

The higher criticism conducted in a humble and candid spirit can only show me the real meaning of Christ's words. I have no fear of the higher criticism, but rather welcome it as a new means to the understanding of Christ.

I am not saying that that is my position, dear friends, but that is what their teacher, recommended by them says in regard to this matter.

He says again:

I do not undervalue the historical method. This method has given us some information as to the authorship of the sacred books, and it has in some degree helped in their interpretation. I am free to acknowledge my own obligation thereto.

Mr. Moderator, I have taken this much time to read these brief extracts—I could read more—to show you, and I say it very kindly, the insincerity and inconsistency of those who bring charges against our own professors when they recommend books to be read by their students which are much more radical than anything we ever think of accepting or entertaining in our Convention.

I move the adoption of the amendment to the amendment.

### Rev. R. R. McKay's Speech

Mr. Warner's motion was seconded by Rev. R. R. McKay of Sarnia. We have examined Mr. McKay's speech; we should like to print it in full, but we cannot see that it made any real contribution to the debate, except in its spirit. There was not one unkind word in it. It expressed sympathy with and confidence in the University, and while we do not agree with Mr. McKay's position, we rejoice to testify that his speech was the speech of a Christian gentleman.

### Pastor W. S. Whitcombe's Speech

PASTOR W. S. WHITCOMBE (Markham Second and Baker Hill): Mr. Chairman, members of the Baptist churches of Ontario and Quebec: I stand before you this afternoon because I have something to tell you. (Cries of "Amen".)

A DELEGATE: That is what we want.

MR. WHITCOMBE: I do not wish to cast any reflection upon the men who have spoken before me—(laughter)—but I have something to tell you.

I want to speak this afternoon on two things very briefly. In the first place, I want to second very heartily anything that the previous speaker, the Rev. Mr. McKay, has said concerning Professor Marshall's personal character in the way of teaching ability and, if I might coin a word, "lovability." I, too, have had several conversations with Professor Marshall and have found the same qualities which Mr. McKay has named.

#### Professor Marshall's Personality is Not the Question.

Let me say this. We are not discussing this afternoon the personal character of Mr. Marshall. (Cries of "Hear, hear".) Let me say that if we were discussing how loving a person Professor Marshall is, there would be no one vote more heartily for it than myself. We are not discussing that. We are discussing the theology of Professor Marshall.

A DELEGATE: That is it.

MR. WHITCOMBE: While I gladly recognize the qualities of Professor L. H. Marshall as a man, and his abilities as a teacher, there is another side to the question, and it is that side of the question, or one phase of it, that I wish to bring before you this afternoon.

After having listened to so many speakers, a good many of them strong supporters of the University, I do not believe there is a single person here this afternoon but will admit that five years at McMaster University must have some cultural effect; and I have spent five years at McMaster University. There was very little to start with, but I have been there five years, and the last year I have sat four hours a week in the class-room of Professor Marshall.

#### Professor Would Take Science Before the Bible.

In addition to that, I have had several conversations with him, and the ones which I wish to speak about this afternoon were concerning the Professor's view of the relationship of science to the Bible. I remember the occasion quite distinctly. The Professor was sitting in my chum Brown's room in the University—let me quote the whole incident: Mr. Brown and I had asked the editor of *The McMaster Monthly* for space in his publication to put an article in there in regard to this controversy, and in that article we had occasion to quote an utterance which has already been quoted, of Professor Marshall's, that he gave in the Old Country, where he says something to this effect—I think you will all recognize the quotation:—That the Christian disciple is free to adopt the teaching of the Genesis account of creation, if that satisfies him; or the teaching on that subject of modern science. We had occasion to quote that in this article, and before we printed this article we took it to the Pro-

fessor. We said, "Now, Professor, we want you to know exactly where we stand. We are going to be in your classes four hours a week. This is where we stand, and if you want us to get out of your classes, say so. If you feel that our presence in your classes will in any way embarrass you,—(laughter)—having come out in this public way"—(laughter). Just a minute, ladies and gentlemen. Hear the Professor's reply, and then the joke may be on you. We said, "If you feel our presence in your classroom will in any way embarrass you, we will withdraw." And he said, "Gentlemen, as long as you are getting anything out of my classes I hope you will stay."—and so we stayed. (Applause.)

This quotation had to do with the relation of science to the Bible. I said something to this effect: "Now, Professor, I don't claim any profundity of thought"—(laughter)—I said something to this effect: "Now, Professor," I said, "here is my position on this,"—(laughter)—"Here is science"—(laughter.)

A DELEGATE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I think it is only fair that we listen to this brother. (Cries of "Hear, hear".) We have listened to these other men, and it is only fair that we listen to him. (Cries of "Hear, hear".)

THE CHAIRMAN: We are having a good time, brothers. This is all right. Just let us give Mr. Whitcombe every chance we can.

MR. WHITCOMBE: I should like to assure the Chairman, that if you are enjoying it, I am.

I gave the Professor my position. I said, "Now, Professor, here is my position. Here is science and here is the Bible." I said, "I realize that when God speaks through the Bible, He does not contradict what He says when He speaks through nature; but scientists when they theorize about the facts of science bring forward hypotheses, which everyone admits are in contradiction to the Bible." "Now," I said, "You realize"—or something to this effect—"You realize that there might arise, or there does arise, a conflict between the teaching of the Bible and science. Now, which would you take first?" And the Professor said that he would take science first before he would take the Bible. (Cries of "Oh, oh".)

#### Is the Bible "a Lie in My Mouth"?

Let me go further to tell you a little bit more of what he said. He said, "Mr. Whitcombe, I must accept truth from whatever source it comes";—(cries of "Hear, hear".)—which of course is perfectly true,—just exactly what I had already said. (Laughter.) But the Professor went on to say, "I cannot go to God with a lie in my mouth." By that he meant to say—(Cries of "Oh, oh".)

THE CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. WHITCOMBE: —that if he accepted the plain statement of the Bible, he would be going to God with a lie in his mouth. (Cries of "Oh, oh", and "No, No".)

THE CHAIRMAN: Give Mr. Whitcombe a chance.

#### "Your View of the Bible and Mine Are Poles Apart."

MR. WHITCOMBE: Now, just another incident, and then I am through. We were discussing the much-mooted question of Jonah, and the Professor was alluding to the difficulties connected with such a great miracle as Jonah being actually swallowed by the whale, and I said, "Professor, here is my position."—(laughter)—I have found out since, I understand since, that this is the position of Moody, so possibly you will listen to it with far greater respect. I said, "If the Bible said that Jonah swallowed the whale, then I would believe it." If the Bible said it, I would believe it. (Applause.)

REV. H. E. STILLWELL: I would not.

MR. WHITCOMBE: And the Professor said, "Mr. Whitcombe, I cannot imagine you swallowing a ninety-ton whale!" I said, "Professor, I cannot myself, but my God is a God of the impossible." (Applause.) And the Professor went on to say, "Well, then, Mr. Whitcombe, your view of the Bible and mine are poles apart."

With that, ladies and gentlemen, I leave you to consider; just this, just one other word.

A DELEGATE: Mr. Chairman—

MR. WHITCOMBE: Just one other word. You have been laughing considerably. Possibly some of you think this is a very small point, but let me

say this: If you were going along a country road—I am a country pastor—and your tire developed a flat place on the bottom, and some good individual came along and said, "Now, don't worry, that tire is only flat on the bottom," what would you say to him? If your tire is only flat on the bottom it is a mightily sure sign there is no air-pressure in it. And if Professor Marshall's theology is flat in one point, let me say it is flat in every point. (Applause.)

### Rev. W. S. Edgar's Speech

The next speaker was the Rev. W. S. Edgar, of Gilmour Memorial Church, Peterboro. We have examined Mr. Edgar's speech carefully, but can find nothing in it worth printing. The only contribution Mr. Edgar's address made was in the form of a further opportunity to his audience to "let patience have her perfect work" until he had finished. It did the opposition no good, and ourselves no harm, except that it consumed time which might otherwise have been occupied by someone who had something to say.

### Pastor James McGinlay's Speech

MR. JAMES MCGINLAY: Before I left my home this afternoon, or this morning, to come to this Convention, in my own bedroom on my knees I asked God to give me grace to stand up to-day and deliver that which is the conviction of my heart. While on my knees my personal reputation loomed up before me, and there and then I asked God to give me grace to become more like my Lord and Christ, Who became of no reputation.

It is evident to any fair-minded individual, let alone a body of orthodox Baptist people, that there is a question before this assembly to-day, the solution of which spells success or ruin to the future of our beloved Baptist denomination. (Cries of "Hear, hear".) And I also asked God to give me grace to speak to the question. In case I am misunderstood, I will read once again the amendment to the motion, for on previous occasions in this Convention I have discovered that when it came time for voting there were so many amendments to the motion, and amendments to the amendment to the motion that I did not know what I was voting for, but to-day I hope that you will see the issue clearly.

The amendment to the motion is this:

That while gladly recognizing—(cries of "Order".)

The reader will observe the fine "spirit" of McMaster's defenders. They thought they could upset the speaker by heckling, but he was equal to the occasion.

MR. MACDOUGALL: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. We are discussing the amendment to the amendment?

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. MacDougall, we are discussing the amendment to the amendment.

MR. MCGINLAY: It is all the same.

MR. URQUHART: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The whole matter of the report and the amendment and the amendment to the amendment are before the house; they are all before the house. Others have discussed them, and Mr. McGinlay has the same right that every other brother has in that discussion. (Cries of "Hear, hear".)

MR. MACDOUGALL: I rise to a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are discussing just now the amendment to the amendment.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, may I ask if there is not before this house a motion to adopt the report, and the amendment to the motion to adopt the report, and the amendment to the amendment to the motion to adopt the report? Is it not so? In reality, are we not discussing all three things?

THE CHAIRMAN: There is before us, first, the report; then there was

presented an amendment to the report; someone else has moved an amendment to the amendment, which is now under discussion.

**MR. WILSON:** Mr. Chairman, may I rise to a question of privilege? How in all the world can we discuss the Board of Governors' report, and move on it, if we are not discussing it and are only discussing the amendment to the amendment? I claim, sir, that we are discussing all three things, and that they all relate to the one thing. (Cries of "Hear, hear".)

**A DELEGATE:** Mr. Chairman, to be consistent with your own ruling, the mover of the proposition and of the amendment would not even be allowed to reply to these speeches which have been made.

**ANOTHER DELEGATE:** That can be made very clear. According to parliamentary practice, if I understand it, a motion having been made, and an amendment having been made and seconded, and an amendment to the amendment having been made and seconded, that is now what is before us, and when the amendment to the amendment is disposed of, then what is left may be discussed further. (Cries of "Hear, hear".)

**THE CHAIRMAN:** We are now discussing the amendment to the amendment.

#### More "Points of Order".

**A DELEGATE:** I rise to a point of order. The amendment to the amendment makes the whole thing before us—the original motion with the amendment and the amendment to the amendment, which is the corollary of it; it takes in both these. The amendment to the amendment becomes an addition, it does not take the place of the motion.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Mr. McGinlay was about to read the amendment. My ruling is that we are discussing the amendment to the amendment. Mr. McGinlay may discuss it. It comprises—

**MR. URQUHART:** Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order on that. The whole matter is before the house. There was a motion to adopt the report.

**A DELEGATE:** The Chairman has ruled.

**MR. URQUHART:** Then I appeal against the ruling of the Chair. I want to say I have a right to speak a word in reference to it. The motion to adopt the report is before the house and was moved and seconded. Then there was an amendment to that, and the speakers to that amendment spoke to the report, and those who followed them spoke to the report. Then there was submitted an amendment to the amendment to the motion to adopt the report, not the amendment—(cries of "No")—and the last speaker did not say a word about the amendment to the amendment, he dealt with the whole general question that is before the convention. I appeal against the ruling of the Chair.

**A DELEGATE:** Mr. Chairman, with the hope of clearing this matter up, if it is not unparliamentary, I would move that we discuss the whole three together.

**MR. WILSON:** I second that.

**MR. MCGINLAY:** To save further dispute I will discuss the amendment to the amendment, and I feel that I will stick to the point as closely as many of the speakers have who have preceded me. (Applause.)

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Gentlemen, let us get on with this business.

**A DELEGATE:** I do not want to give a wrong impression by what I said before. We are discussing the question now as to whether the amendment previously moved was to be put to the house, or whether it shall be changed in the manner suggested by the amendment to the amendment. Therefore it seems to me that we are discussing whether this change shall be made or not. Therefore it would be in order to hear—

**ANOTHER DELEGATE:** Mr. Chairman—

**AND ANOTHER DELEGATE:** Mr. Chairman—

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Mr. McGinlay will discuss the amendment to the amendment. (Cries of "Hear, hear".)

**MR. WILSON:** Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask a question—

MR. URQUHART: I appeal against your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I think we ought to have a vote of this meeting upon the ruling.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, may I ask this question: When we offer an amendment to the amendment, is not that something to be amended, and cannot we discuss the thing that is to be amended?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, you can. But if you read the amendment instead of the amendment to the amendment you will find you have gone away from the subject under immediate discussion.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, is it the desire—

A DELEGATE: Mr. Chairman, in the interests of brevity and saving time, may I say that personally I am inclined to agree with Mr. Urquhart's opinion? But apart from that altogether, I would suggest that if the amendment to the amendment is the matter under discussion, there is no harm in allowing Mr. McGinlay to read the amendment.

#### McGinlay the Resourceful.

MR. MCGINLAY: I had so little to say, dear brethren, I thought this would help me out a bit. (Laughter.)

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen: It is quite obvious to a casual observer, let alone a Baptist in this Convention, that there is a question to be settled to-day. The solution of that question, to my mind, spells success or ruin to our beloved denomination, and as a preacher of the Gospel and as a pastor of a Regular Baptist church within the bounds of this Convention, I feel that it is my duty to speak on that subject.

I should like at the outset to say that the trouble in our Convention is not the ethics of any party, nor the ethics of any party leader. (Applause.) I should like to also say that the trouble in our Convention is not whether or no the character and teaching ability of the staff of McMaster University is what it ought to be. That is not the question that this denomination is confronted with to-day. The question is the theological position of one who is now a professor in our denominational college. That is the question that will settle all this trouble—at least, to-day. (Applause and laughter.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Give Mr. McGinlay a chance.

#### McGinlay Puts to Sea.

MR. MCGINLAY: I am getting my sea legs as I go on, and I am going to stay here until I finish. (Applause.)

Now, I have convictions concerning Professor Marshall, and I want to say to you to-day that my convictions are not based upon anything which Dr. Shields has said. (Cries of "Hear, hear" and "Oh, oh".)

Now, let me prove it, please, gentlemen. My convictions this afternoon are not based upon anything that has been printed in *The Gospel Witness* nor in *The Prophet*. My convictions this afternoon are not primarily based upon anything that Professor Marshall has taught, because I have never taken any lectures from Professor Marshall. My convictions this afternoon concerning Professor Marshall are not based upon anything which I have heard from anyone outside of this denomination; and I wish to say to-day that the man who has sown suspicion in my mind concerning the teaching of Professor Marshall of McMaster University is a man to whom this denomination has looked for leadership and has received leadership for more than a decade, the President of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, the Dean in Theology of McMaster University, Dr. J. H. Farmer. Anything that I have to say this afternoon concerning Professor Marshall's teaching is based absolutely on the words of Dr. J. H. Farmer, our beloved Dean in Theology and President of this Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

At the Hamilton Convention last year you heard and I heard Dr. Farmer say that Professor Marshall was in sympathy with the Driver view, which was "the moderate critical view—that has to do with dates and authorship and so on."

Now, I have heard Dr. Farmer in his class room disagree with the attempts of modern scholarship to disclaim the date and authorship of some Old Testament books on the ground that their date and authorship was not in agreement with the literary styles of the alleged period in which it was written and

authorized, and I know that Dr. Farmer from his own words in class-room does not agree with the Driver moderate critical view. Therefore, on that ground, on the authority of Dr. Farmer, I question Professor Marshall's attitude towards the Old Testament.

Dr. Farmer in conversation stated that he knew that the coming of Professor Marshall from England to our Convention would cause trouble. Now, I honour the judgment of Dr. Farmer, and I say to-day that what was last year prophecy in the mind of our beloved President is to-day history—we have trouble in our denomination, and Dr. Farmer said that he knew that the coming of Professor L. H. Marshall would bring trouble. It is not for me to say, but for Dr. Farmer to say, what led him to believe that Professor Marshall's coming would bring with it trouble.

Again, the Dean in Theology said at Hamilton—you heard it and I heard it:

I have been trying honestly to work on the basis of the Charter. When this thing was in its crisis in July and I had to make up my mind as to my action, I faced the thing then before God and in my room.

Now, with whom did Dr. Farmer do battle? I can see the apparent answer. In the mind of Dr. Farmer there was going on a civil war, a battle between two passions, the one, to remain true to his own orthodox convictions and turn down Professor Marshall; the other, to appoint Professor Marshall and introduce teaching into our University that was not only inconsistent with the Charter Deeds, but inconsistent with Dr. Farmer's own theological views.

#### "A Thorough-going Evangelical" (?)—"A Liberal—Evangelical" (?)

Dr. Farmer also said that Professor Marshall was and is "a thorough-going evangelical." Now I think that Professor Marshall has refused to be thus labelled. Professor Marshall himself has said that he is what is known in England to be "a liberal evangelical."

And again, Dr. Farmer on the one hand defending Professor Marshall's orthodoxy has stated that, because in our Convention there are some people who are educated and who hold looser views than we do, for their sake it is imperative that we bring under the one roof the two schools of thought and teach such from the one university. Dr. Farmer—not Dr. Shields—said that.

And so, ladies and gentlemen, as a student who sat in Dr. Farmer's classes, as a student who has been drawn closer to Jesus Christ through the sound, orthodox teaching of Professor J. H. Farmer, I this afternoon honour his sound judgment and believe with all my heart that Professor L. H. Marshall's teaching is not only opposed to Dr. Farmer's, but is opposed to the Charter Deeds of McMaster University. (Applause.)

#### Will Dr. Farmer Keep His Promise?

In the Hamilton Convention Dr. Farmer said that, if at the end of one year it was discovered that Professor Marshall's teaching would not be in harmony with our beliefs, he would be the first to dismiss him. I have faith enough in Dr. Farmer—I honour Dr. Farmer; there are some people who honour a man by standing to their feet when he is introduced, but I honour him by believing what he says—and I will believe that if Dr. Farmer will see as we see who have heard Professor Marshall in his sermons—(Laughter)—that his views will, and have caused trouble in our denomination, then Dr. Farmer will stay by his word.

Now, I am through, and I will say this as an apology for daring to speak to-day against a learned scholar such as Professor Marshall is. I want to appeal to the laymen in our Convention. It is your vote that counts, and I want to say this: Must you be a scholar, must you have a university degree to understand that which is the pure, unadulterated teaching of the blessed Word of God? (Cries of "No".)

I am going, not to tell a story, but I am going to talk about a baby—not the one Chancellor Whidden talked about, but another baby. I want to ask you mothers here to-day—

A DELEGATE: Where?

MR. MCGINLAY: I assume there are some here. If you go home to-night,



and that little baby lying in the cradle is hungry, you take a bottle—the milk bottle—(Laughter)—and instead of filling it with pure milk from the City Dairy or elsewhere—(renewed laughter)—instead of filling that bottle with pure milk, you fill it with something that looks like milk, but is only whitewash, and hand it to that baby, will that baby drink it? (Cries of “No”.) Will it? (Cries of “No”.) Laughter and applause.) Why won't that baby drink that whitewash?

A DELEGATE: It is not educated to it.

MR. MCGINLAY: I will tell you why. Because God hath given to that baby something that tells it the difference between that which is nourishment and that which is not. (Applause and laughter). Let me finish this story, then I will sit down. That baby has never studied the ingredients contained in milk; that baby knows absolutely nothing concerning the contents of that milk; but one thing it does know—the difference between that which is real and that which is not.

### “An Unction from the Holy One.”

And I say this afternoon, men and women, that our God, Who has brought us into his family through faith in Jesus Christ, has given us something at our spiritual birth that enables us to discern that which is true and that which is not. (Applause.)

As far as I am concerned I care not how the vote is cast to-day, but I will remain true to the blessed Book that can speak to me through simple faith. (Cries of “Hear, hear”.)

THE CHAIRMAN: In the parlance of the baseball field, Mr. Price at bat, Mr. Galt on deck.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Six o'clock.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Price is a student pastor on the Reaboro field.

## Student Pastor Robert Price Speaks

MR. PRICE: Mr. Moderator and fellow-Christians, I feel this afternoon that I have something to say to this Convention. I am on the opposite side of the controversy to the students who have been speaking already, and it is not my purpose this afternoon to defend Professor Marshall, for really it is not necessary perhaps to defend Professor Marshall, as I do not feel that Professor Marshall needs any defense. I feel, like Dr. MacNeill, that Professor Marshall is well able to take care of himself, and I think that before Professor Marshall is through here this evening even Dr. Shields will have recognized that fact. (Cries of “Oh, oh”.) But there are a large number of students who have taken a part in this controversy, but the students who are on the McMaster University side of the controversy have had little or no opportunity of saying a word. (Cries of “Oh, oh”.)

Mr. Moderator, I have not had the privilege of touring the whole of Ontario and Quebec in the company of Dr. Shields to present to the people of Ontario and Quebec McMaster's side of the story,—(Applause)—and so I crave this afternoon the privilege of saying something at least.

### The Bible and “Science”.

Now, to apply the words of Mr. Whitcombe,—I wish that Mr. Whitcombe had quoted Professor Marshall a little more accurately. Professor Marshall did not say that he would agree with the hypotheses of science rather than with Scripture. Professor Marshall is here, and he will contradict me if I make a mistake. What Professor Marshall said was this: that if a scientific fact—not a scientific hypothesis—were to contradict the Scripture, he would have to accept the scientific fact. But remember this, that first of all Professor Marshall made this statement: “I do not believe that science and the Bible are out of harmony in any respect.” (Applause.) To put the matter plain and straight, friends, this is what the Professor means: If the Scripture said that two and two were five, Professor Marshall said that he would have to continue to believe that two and two were four. But Professor Marshall does not believe that the Bible says that two and two make five. So Mr. Whitcombe's question really amounts to nothing. It was just an attempt to catch the Professor. (Applause and cries of “No, no”.)

Mr. Price is very positive in his statements concerning what Professor Marshall actually said in the conversation to which he refers.

He neglected, however, to say that there were only three present during this conversation, namely, Professor Marshall, Mr. W. S. Whitcombe, and Mr. W. G. Brown. Just how Mr. Price can speak with so great assurance of a conversation at which he was not present himself, must remain somewhat of a mystery. Notice that Mr. Price said:

"So Mr. Whitcombe's question really amounts to nothing. It was just an attempt to catch the Professor."

This statement, we boldly say, is unfair, unjust and untrue. Mr. Whitcombe asked the question in an honest effort to find out the Professor's view. He talked with him face to face, and put the question in the plainest language at his command. The Professor replied, we believe, in equally frank and plain terms.

Again, Mr. Price quotes Professor Marshall as making this sweeping statement: "I do not believe that science and the Bible are out of harmony *in any respect*." When Professor Marshall said that, we do not know, but we are certain that it was not during the conversation to which Mr. Price refers.

Let us quote again an account, which we have previously given, of that part of the conversation which is under discussion:

**Prof. Marshall on the Bible and Science.**

In conversation we spoke to the professor as follows: "Here is the Bible and here is science. We do not believe that there is any contradiction between the Bible and true science. Contradictions to the Bible are not found in scientific facts but in scientific hypothesis. And in such cases we accept the statements of Scripture before all else. Now what is your attitude?" The Professor proceeded to say that was not his attitude. He stated that he would put science first.

—W. S. Whitcombe and W. Gordon Brown.

**Mr. Price's Challenge.**

In the next place, I should like to reply to Mr. Whitcombe further, but lack of time makes that impossible. (Cries of "Go on".) Very well. I should like to challenge Mr. Whitcombe to come upon this platform and make some of the statements concerning Professor Marshall's position that he did in his own church, Second Markham, when he said that Professor Marshall's position on the Old Testament made Jesus Christ into a liar and an ignoramus. (Cries of "Oh, oh".) Why is that statement not made here to-day? That would not sound well to a lot of you people. (Laughter.)

To continue, I feel quite capable, of course, of answering the logic of our friend, Mr. McGinlay. (Laughter.)

**Mr. Whitcombe Accepts the Challenge.**

MR. WHITCOMBE: Mr. Price, I will accept your challenge if you will give me the chance. (Applause.)

(Mr. Whitcombe joins Mr. Price on the platform.)

MR. WHITCOMBE: I am not afraid to repeat in any place statements I have made in any other place.

SOME DELEGATES: Go to it. Speak up.

MR. WHITCOMBE: Mr. Price has said that I have stated in my own church, the Second Markham Church, that the views of Professor Marshall would make Jesus Christ—you did not quote it quite correctly. What I did say was that the views of Professor Marshall would make Jesus Christ either an ignoramus or a deceiver.

A DELEGATE: It is the same thing.

MR. WHITCOMBE: Now, ladies and gentlemen, where I got the idea was from a lecture delivered in McMaster University by Dr. J. H. Farmer. (Cries of "Oh, oh".)

SOME DELEGATES: Go ahead.

MR. WHITCOMBE: Give me a chance. (Cries of "Oh, oh".) If that is all the chance you will give me, ladies and gentlemen, that is all I can say.

SOME DELEGATES: Give him a chance. Go on.

THE CHAIRMAN: You challenged him.

MR. WHITCOMBE (addressing Mr. Price): I sit down at your command, sir. I rose at your command. (Applause).

### Mr. Price: "Go and Sit Down".

It will be noticed that Mr. Price challenged Mr. Whitcombe to repeat certain statements which he had made on other occasions. Mr. Whitcombe gladly accepted his challenge, but apparently this frankness was to the consternation of Mr. Price, and he told Mr. Whitcombe, after the latter had come to the platform at the speaker's invitation, to go and sit down.

The statement which Mr. Whitcombe was about to make was to the following effect:

"Where I got the idea was from a lecture delivered in McMaster University by Dr. J. H. Farmer." It was just here that Mr. Whitcombe was interrupted and told by Mr. Price to go and sit down. The lecture referred to was one that Dr. Farmer gave on the demonology of the New Testament, in opposition to the discussion contained in the text-book for that class,—Stevens' *Theology of the New Testament*."

Professor Marshall also gave a lecture in which he touched on the same subject, and spoke to the following effect:

#### The Miracle of Gadara.

Miracle of evil spirits entering into swine, Matthew 8: 28-34. This cannot be fully explained by any known law; but is there anything in modern science which can give us a clue? The following story is told, not as an explanation, but as a possible clue to the situation.

In an asylum in England there was a patient who was perfectly normal except for the delusion that his arm was glass. His doctor tried many means of persuading him to the contrary, but could not convince him. Eventually, once when the monomaniac was walking alone, the doctor crept up behind him, and hitting the glass arm, he dropped a glass bottle at the same moment. From that time the man was normal in every way, for he believed his glass arm was broken, and so the delusion was lost. In this way Christ possibly scattered the delusion of the madman in the country of the Gergesenes by saying the demons had entered into the swine, for they saw them rush into the sea, and so the demoniac may have been cured by thus being made to believe that the evil spirits had left him.

#### Views of Dr. Farmer and Prof. Marshall Contrasted.

In thinking over the implication of these remarks the suggestions of Dr. Farmer came to mind. We remember that he pointed out that a view which denied the reality of demon possession committed Jesus to being *either* ignorant on a subject with which He spoke with assurance, *or* to accommodating himself to the supersti-

tions of His day. Dr. Farmer went on to say that the accommodation theory is unethical, which is a mild way of saying that Jesus was a liar if He accommodated His views to the superstitions of His countrymen; and to think that Jesus was ignorant is incredible: "Whatever mystery there may be about His self-emptying, He certainly did not speak out of His ignorance," said Dr. Farmer. He says He spoke the words the Father gave Him to speak. He spoke out of His knowledge; we are told in John 3:11: "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen." That is one of the watersheds in criticism. If a man says that He said some things that were not true, he is on the wrong side of the watershed."

Thus we believe we are perfectly justified according to Dr. Farmer's own reasoning in saying that such a view of Jesus as is set forth in Professor Marshall's lecture above referred to, makes Jesus either ignorant or a deceiver.

—W. S. Whitcombe.

MR. PRICE: I am not at all in doubt about Mr. Whitcombe's words because there was a gentleman by the name of Mr. Clark, who asked him if he had ever heard Professor Marshall say those words, and he said: No, Professor Marshall was too wise to say that. You can see the implication in that phrase.

SOME DELEGATES: Oh yes, we can see that.

MR. PRICE: Now, on page 7 of *The Prophet*, I read these words:

A DELEGATE: Which issue?

MR. PRICE: June 12th, page 7.

A DELEGATE: Which prophet is it, Isaiah?

#### "A Minimum of Doctrinal Preaching!"

MR. PRICE: This is *The Prophet*, edited by Mr. Gordon Brown, in which Mr. Whitcombe has quite a bit to say sometimes. Very well, in large letters you will read these words:

I suggest a minimum of doctrinal preaching.

Those are supposed to be the words of Professor Marshall in the class, and underneath it you will find this explanation:

What kind of Christians will a "minimum of doctrinal preaching" produce? Will they love their Bibles? Will they be conversant with its great teachings? Will they be able to tell false doctrines when they hear them? Will it be difficult to sweep them away by the isms of the day?

Now, Professor Marshall did say those words: "I suggest a minimum of doctrinal preaching." But let me give you the connection in which he said those words.

Professor Marshall said that in the Old Country a great deal more attention is paid to the church calendar than is done in this country, and that at certain seasons of the year it is the custom there to preach on the great doctrines of religion. "For example," he said, "at Christmas time you might well preach the doctrine of the incarnation; on Good Friday—and they always have services in the Old Country on Good Friday—it would be well to preach on the atonement; on Easter Sunday it would be a splendid opportunity to preach on the resurrection; on Whitsunday it would be a splendid opportunity to preach on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit". And then he said, "Gentlemen, I suggest that here the church calendar might well be taken as a minimum of doctrinal preaching". (Cries of "Oh, oh".) Now you see the way in which it appears in the paper:

I suggest a minimum of doctrinal preaching.

And Professor Marshall is here to tell you that those were his words exactly. Certainly the Professor agrees that that is the case. (Applause.)

Now, friends, you see things have not been reported just exactly straight, and I am somewhat surprised that the young men forget two rather striking, if homely, illustrations that Professor Marshall used. He said that doctrine ought to be in every sermon. He said that you need not put doctrine right under the people's noses. He said, to use an illustration this way, that eggs are good food, but that he does not like to have an egg cooked hard and put on the top of a pudding and put on the table for dinner; it is far better to cook the egg in the pudding, for then the person gets something toothsome and something meaty at the same time. (Laughter.) Professor Marshall suggested that doctrine ought to be in a sermon as an egg in a pudding.

Another illustration Professor Marshall used is this: Doctrine is to the sermon what the skeleton is to the body. In other words, it is that which gives it form and that which gives it strength. As far as I can see there would be no sermon without theology. That is Professor Marshall's illustration on that matter.

### A Representative Statement From the Professor.

In dealing with Professor Marshall's attitude toward doctrinal preaching, we notice first of all that Mr. Price admitted: "Now, Professor Marshall did say those words: 'I suggest a minimum of doctrinal preaching.'"

We believe that it is always well, whenever at all possible, to give the context in which a sentence was uttered. Hence in publishing the above-mentioned remark of the Professor, we attempted to give something of the connection in which it was said. It is to be noted, however, that Mr. Price failed to read the context given, which is as follows:

"Doctrinal preaching. There is a great reaction against this in Europe. It is said that it is dry. If it is dry, the fault is with the preacher and not with the doctrine. Dead theology is false theology. Doctrinal preaching is important because people need an intellectual grip of religious truth. *I suggest a minimum of doctrinal preaching.*"

The above is a representative statement from the Professor. Throughout his lectures he constantly exalted what he is pleased to call "religion" at the expense of what he terms "theology". He said several times in our hearing: "I do not preach theology but religion." When it was mentioned to him in class, Professor Marshall did not deny the fact that, since he did not preach theology but religion, his published utterances therefore did not prove him orthodox.

—W. S. Whitcombe and W. Gordon Brown.

I do not say for a minute that Mr. Brown has wilfully misinterpreted the Professor. I believe that Mr. Brown would be incapable of that. I respect Mr. Brown, although I disagree with what he has done. I disagree with the use he makes of things; still I admire Mr. Brown. But you will notice again, I believe, that Mr. Brown heard only the words, "I suggest a minimum of doctrinal preaching." The reason he heard only those words was because of the suspiciousness of his own mind. That fact is indicated again on this same page:

Professor Marshall said again: "I always say that Jude was worth writing if it were for nothing else than for his benediction."

This is the comment:

How does this reflect on the rest of that inspired book, which exhorts us to "earnestly contend for the faith"?

The answer to the question, friends, is simply this: It does not reflect upon the

rest of the inspired book at all. I might as well speak of John 3: 16 sometimes, and say that the whole of John's gospels were well worth writing if it were only for John 3: 16. There is no reflection meant there whatsoever. (Applause.)

#### **Professor Marshall Destroying the Faith of the Students.**

There is another quotation on page 3 that I should like to make reference to. This is an example of how a young man whose faith is supposed to have been taken away from him through the teaching of Professor Marshall—weakened, at least. This is what is said by Mr. Brown:

“Many of the students have not the same confidence in Scripture as they had when he started. To us at first a Scripture text ends argument! He has shown that would not be accepted in England, and most of the men in the class (that is, this student's own class) have taken that attitude, too.”

Now, what Professor Marshall said was to this effect: In the Old Country there are simply millions of people who do not go to church, there are millions of people who do not believe in God, there are millions of people who do not believe that the Bible is the inspired Word of God, and it is positively useless to go to those people quoting texts because they simply do not believe in your God, and they do not believe in your Scripture. Professor Marshall said: What you have to do is to show them the reasonableness, first of all, of the Scriptural position, and then bring along your Scriptural references and drive the matter home.

Now, friends, that is exactly what the preachers are doing all across the country. Dr. John MacNeill has one sermon in which he deals with immortality, and first of all he says: Science cannot contradict immortality; in the second place, the everyday life of man demands immortality and religion assures immortality. No one surely is going to say that Dr. MacNeill is a heretic for that sermon?

What is he doing in the first two positions but trying to advance a reasonable situation? Our friend, Dr. Shields, is very fond of two terms—psychology and psychological. I have read a very large number of Dr. Shields' sermons. I have heard Dr. Shields preach more often than any other preacher in Toronto, and I never heard a man make use of those terms more frequently; and Dr. Shields makes no apology whatsoever for appealing to the reasonableness of his doctrine and his teaching.

And there is a far higher authority than Dr. Shields, even, that is the Lord Jesus Himself, for you will remember on some occasion our Lord said in effect: If you, being evil, know enough to give your children good gifts, is it not to be expected, is it not reasonable to think, that God will care for you, His children, since He is much better than you are?

And does Jesus Himself not refer to reasonableness in attempting to put His teaching before men?

#### **Must We Come Down to the Level of Infidelity?**

When a speaker comes to “refute” the statements of his opponents, he should be careful to be absolutely accurate. We did not say that the personal faith of the student to which Mr. Price refers was “taken away from him through the teaching of Professor Marshall—weakened at least.” We did say that this particular student informed us of the influence that the teaching of Professor Marshall was having on most of the men in the class in Theology to which this student belonged.

One may seek to explain as best he can the sad attitude that we are told that many people in the Old Country assume, but whatever may be said about that, it does not alter the fact, according to the information this student gave us,—and we wrote down the quotation

given above as he talked with us,—that most of the men in the class in Theology which graduated last year have come to believe that the quotation of a text of Scripture does not end all argument—that is, they have had the idea of implicit faith in the Bible as the final court of appeal taken away from them.

We recall hearing Professor Marshall say that Wesley in his day could assume belief in God and the Church, in Heaven and hell, but that C. H. Spurgeon was the last of the great preachers who could do that, and therefore, that if Spurgeon were alive to-day, he would employ a different method from that which he used to use.

Somewhere we have read that the great Spurgeon once said of the defence of the Bible and its doctrines, that the best way to defend a lion was to let it out; and we have no doubt that if he were alive to-day, he would go on, just as he did in his lifetime, preaching the pure Word of God and assuming it, and its great teachings, to be true. Surely it is unthinkable that we shall ever gain belief in the theology of the Bible by going half way with infidelity, and seeking to bring our proclamation of the Gospel down to its low level.

Yet we also recall Professor Marshall advising the preachers-in-the-making in his classes to be able to preach without their Bible, that is, without appealing to the Bible, basing their message largely or entirely upon experience. Someone rather wisely remarked that preaching without the Bible was just what was wrong with the Professor.

—W. Gordon Brown.

### Professor Marshall and the Atonement.

Now, there are many more things I should like to say, but you will have to pardon me while I take the time to put before you Professor Marshall's doctrine of the atonement. I consider this to be essential, so I think I shall have to ask the Convention just to take time to listen.

You see, friends, I was not suspicious of Professor Marshall, nor of his position. I was not one bit afraid to ask questions in the class, and if you read this paper you will see I did ask questions in the class, and you will also see that for some of my questions I have been handled with ungloved hands by the Professor. But I do not find fault with the Professor for that at all.

To understand the discussion published in this paper you will have to know the background of things, of the lectures in Systematic Theology under Professor Keirstead. We had discussions concerning Romans 3: 26, about which so much has been said, and we had come to certain conclusions about that text. Then we went into Professor Marshall's class, and without him first ever having been warned of the discussion we had had, or the conclusions we had come to, the questions were put to him, and because he did not answer us exactly in the same words we had been speaking in, some people got suspicious.

### Can We Ask What a Professor Believes?

Mr. Price intimated that Professor Marshall should have been warned that we were going to ask him some questions concerning his view of the atonement. We do not consider that a man is fit to teach theological students who has not himself a clear grasp of the true meaning of the death of Christ, which is, indeed, the heart of the Gospel, that those students are presumably being trained to preach.

All fair-minded people will agree with us that it is not laying a trap for any man, and least of all for a theological professor, simply to attempt to find out what he believes on so vital a subject as the atonement.

—W. S. Whitcombe and W. Gordon Brown.

But Professor Marshall took time later on to set before us his own position on the atonement, and if I misquote, Professor Marshall or state him wrongly this afternoon, I feel quite sure that Professor Marshall, as an honest Christian gentleman, will set the thing right and satisfy this assembly as to his position on this great matter. Professor Marshall says, in the first place, that it is not easy to set forth a complete doctrine of the atonement, but that any doctrine of the atonement that would be satisfactory to him must contain the following elements: In the first place, it must have its origin in the love of God, "God commendeth His love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us," and then he would quote John 3: 16, and many other texts from the New Testament.

In the second place, the holiness and justice of God are recorded in the atonement. Professor Marshall made that statement in the class while I was present.

In support of that position a text like that of Romans 3: 26, would be in order: "To declare, I say, at this time His righteousness: that He might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

In the third place, it must contain the substitutionary element, and in respect to that Professor Marshall in the class quoted the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah: "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned everyone to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all."

In the fourth place, the statement must have a moral value. The law of self-sacrifice is the law of the universe. Life comes from death. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit."

And in the fifth place, it must have a certain moral influence. "Because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow His steps."

Mr. Brown has laboured to some degree in this paper to show that Dr. Farmer and Professor Marshall disagree on the matter of the atonement. We have tried to make out—I do not feel like taking the time to unfold the paper again—in effect, this is what they say: They think they heard Dr. Farmer says that Romans 3: 26 is the New Testament doctrine of the atonement, and that when Professor Marshall claims there is no doctrine of the atonement there, Professor Marshall is disagreeing with Dr. Farmer. Dr. Farmer did not make the statement that Romans 3: 26 declares the theory of the atonement. He does say that he thinks it gives an indication of the doctrine of the atonement as held by the Apostle Paul;—

MR. W. G. BROWN: Prove it.

MR. PRICE: —but there is no more a complete statement of the atonement in Romans 3: 26, than there is in Romans 5: 8, which teaches that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself."

I heard Dr. Farmer preach myself at Mr. Marshall's church, Castlefield Avenue, Good Friday morning. Dr. Farmer took as his subject, Why Christ Died. First of all, he advanced some reasons that would not answer the question fully. Then he came to the positive part, and I can give you his sermon in outline.

In the first place, Jesus had to die because God loved the world, and he quoted John 3: 16. In the second place, Christ died in order that God's holiness and justice might be vindicated, and he made use of Romans 3: 26. In the third place, the atonement has a substitutionary value, and he quoted Isaiah 53, which just previously I had quoted myself in prayer.

I say this without the possibility of contradiction, that if Professor Mar-



shall and Dr. Farmer were brought face to face and were to set before one another their respective doctrines of the atonement, there would be no disagreement whatsoever, and no lack of harmony whatsoever.

Concerning Professor Marshall's view of the atonement, much has already been said and, no doubt, much remains to be said. Two or three remarks are in order here.

As for Romans 6:26, we quote the following from the August number of *The Prophet*:

**Professor Marshall and Romans 3: 26.**

Talking recently with a prominent minister of our Convention concerning the teachings of Professor Marshall, we remarked especially his refusal to "come out" on Romans 3:26: "That He might be just, and the Justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

This brother had had a personal conversation with Professor Marshall concerning his own particular views. He told us that the same thing as happened when Mr. W. S. Whitcombe brought this verse three different times to the professor, also happened when he himself spoke to him of it: he refused to "come out" on it.

**Denies the Heart of the Gospel.**

Mr. Price says:

"In the third place, it must contain the substitutionary element, and in respect to that Professor Marshall in the class quoted the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah: 'All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned everyone to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all.'"

When it comes to the matter of the substitutionary death of Christ, it would be well to consult Professor Marshall's own answer to a question of Dr. Shields' as given below. Besides that it will be noticed that Professor Marshall admitted "criticising" Luther's view. His criticism was quoted in the speech of Rev. W. J. H. Brown.

We believe that what Professor Marshall said Luther held is the very heart of the Gospel; and any man who, implicitly or explicitly, denies this meaning of the death of Christ, is neither true to the Word of God nor a fit instructor of those who are to preach in the Baptist Churches throughout the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.—W. Gordon Brown.

Now, Christian friends, Professor Marshall is present this afternoon, and for that fact, in a way, I am sorry, because I feel it is my duty to bear testimony to him, and with your permission and his forgiveness I am going to do that.

I am going to do it because it is said in *The Prophet* that certain young men have been injured by his teaching. I believe that when Professor Marshall came to this country, my religion was very largely of the head; I did my best to get all the arguments I possibly could to support my position theologically. Professor Marshall came, and Professor Marshall certainly has a clear intellect, clear as crystal, and there is no doubt in the world but that he has the power to express himself, and express himself accurately. But the gift of Professor Marshall to me was in a different way—it was in the appeal that he made to the heart. It is not what Professor Marshall has taught me, it is in what I have caught from Professor Marshall, what I have caught of his beautiful Christian spirit. It has been wonderful to me.

May I add this word? I am afraid that before Professor Marshall came private prayer with me was almost neglected; but since he has come, and since

I have listened to his contributions on the class, and have learned to appreciate some thing of his spirit, private prayer has become to me the source of spiritual power.

Mr. Moderator, I thank you. (Applause).

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The hour for adjournment is almost at hand; we have fifteen minutes. We will hear Mr. Galt, and unless he is very brief, we will necessarily adjourn before the close of his address.

Rev. John Galt Spoke.

The Rev. John Galt, of Oshawa, here addressed the Convention. We have before us the stenographic report of Mr. Galt's speech, and after a careful examination we have concluded it has nothing in it that would give our readers any light one way or the other. At the beginning of the report of his speech we find these words:

"I am here to-night supporting the amendment to the amendment because—(Commotion caused by delegates leaving the Convention)—

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Order. Let us be quiet, brethren. It is only a few minutes to the adjournment. Give Mr. Galt an opportunity.

**MR. GALT:** I am used to this, Mr. President—I once was a missionary to cab-drivers. It won't disturb me at all."

It would be unfair to charge the exit of the delegates from the church to Mr. Galt, for he spoke at the end of a very long, tiresome session; but we confess to having felt a little amusement when Mr. Galt declared that he was used to preaching to a retiring congregation, and honesty compels us to say, after examining his address, we are not surprised.

The record of the afternoon session following Mr. Galt's address continues as follows:

**A DELEGATE:** Mr. Chairman, may I have a word? Do you give it as your ruling that every person must leave the building?

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Well, the announcement was made that we must all leave this building.

**THE DELEGATE:** That does not refer to this other building?

**THE CHAIRMAN:** We will reopen again the business session beginning at eight o'clock. We will sing for ten or fifteen minutes before, and the doors will be open at forty minutes to eight.

### Rev. J. B. Kennedy Again Ruled Out.

**REV. J. B. KENNEDY:** Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word. I was ruled out of order this morning, and I do not want to be ruled out of order again. No man is out of order if he is trying to relieve the suffering of humanity—no man is out of order.

Well now, I brought this matter up on Monday night, and I knew this Convention was going to be crowded. Now I have this proposition to make: There is a Presbyterian Church within three blocks of this church which will easily seat fifteen hundred people, and we can have it for the asking. Now, would it not be better for us to go to that church?

(Cries of "No, no" and "Yes, yes".)

**THE CHAIRMAN:** I think that has been settled by the Convention earlier in the session. We cannot open it again.

(At 6.35 p.m., the Convention adjourned until 8 p.m.)

## Evening Session

**THE CHAIRMAN:** When this afternoon the session adjourned, we were discussing the report of the Board of Governors in an amendment to the amendment. It had been amended, and then an amendment to the amendment had been moved, and we were in the midst of that discussion when we adjourned. We were taking our speakers in the order they were given to the Chairman, and the next in order is Professor Marshall of the University. (Applause.)

### Professor Marshall's Speech.

**PROFESSOR L. H. MARSHALL:** Mr. Moderator and fellow delegates of this Convention: It is very kind of you to give me so hearty a welcome and to show me beforehand that I have not forfeited the confidence which you reposed in me last year.

I am sure you will all agree that I have had a most extraordinary welcome into Canada. (Laughter.) In fact, I have thought again and again of an instance referred to and illustrated in the English comic journal, Punch, some time ago. A man was paying a visit to his friend and, no sooner had he got to the garden gate, than his friend's dog advanced to greet him in a rather aggressive manner, and the visitor hesitated to go forward until his friend came to the front door and said, "Now, come along, never mind, he won't hurt you." And the visitor noticed that although the dog was barking very furiously, he was wagging his tail just as vigorously, so he called out to his friend and said, "I don't know which end of the beast to believe." (Laughter and applause.)

I have never in my life received a heartier welcome than I have had here in Canada, but at the same time there have been those who have been barking against me and trying to frighten me away. But at any rate, if I am not a Christian, I am an Englishman, and it is very hard to frighten an Englishman away.

### Thanks to Dr. Shields.

But we must give honor where honor is due, and I think I ought here to express my thanks to Dr. Shields for many great services which he has done me, unwittingly. In the first place, he has been my publicity agent; I have had wonderful congregations wherever I have gone. (Laughter and applause.) Then I have been the recipient of scores and scores, I think I might say hundreds, of acts of courtesy and kindness which would never have been mine but for the fact that I have been his victim.

I remember just about a year ago, I went to the railway station to try and get my furniture released. The clerk told me that it could not be released unless I produced the bill of lading. For some reason or other the bill of lading had gone astray. "But", I said, "I have got my house and I want my furniture, I want my books; I want to start work." He said, "It cannot be done without the bill of lading." "Well," I said, "surely something can be done." He said, "Nothing can be done. I will take your name and address." I gave him my name and address, when the clerk looked up to me and said, "Are you Professor Marshall?" (Laughter.) I said, "Yes." "Oh," he said, "I will see about it," and I got the furniture out the same day. (Laughter.)

I have said comparatively little about this controversy. I have preferred to allow the stream of misrepresentation and abuse to flow by me. I know that my silence has been interpreted in some places as a sign of weakness, but I am sure you will agree with me when I say it, that had I time to reply to all that has been written and said against me, I should have had nothing else to do.

Then I may say that I am not naturally a controversialist. I am afraid of controversy, in this sense, that it seems to me that controversy is apt to destroy one's Christian spirit and to produce in one a very unchristian temper, and to my mind that is the most deadly heresy of all. (Cries of "Hear, hear".) I remember that Mr. Spurgeon used to quote a saying of Matthew Henry: If

religion has done nothing for your tempers it has done nothing for your souls. So we must try and keep a thoroughly good temper.

We can well believe Professor Marshall's experience in Canada has been a very trying one. We believe a great unkindness was done him by Dr. Farmer and others responsible for his coming; and we have felt deeply sorry for him throughout the controversy. We have no special complaint to make,—our readers must judge by reading whether Professor Marshall excelled his colleagues in the matter of good temper.

At the same time, though, as I say, I am not naturally a controversialist, but when the challenge has been flung down I am not in the least bit afraid to take it up. Then, too, may I point out that I have no weekly journal like the Gospel Witness in which I can disseminate my views—and I am rather thankful that I have not got such a thing as that upon my conscience.

I could, of course, have replied through the pulpit, but while I have no desire at all to make my conscience on the matter the standard for other people, I want to say most emphatically that in my judgment the pulpit is not the place for controversial matters at all, and to use the pulpit for controversial matters is to prostitute it. When a man enters a Christian pulpit it is his business to preach the Christian Gospel. And, furthermore, it seems to me—I may be quite wrong, but this is how I view it—it seems to me that to attack absent brethren from the pulpit is to turn it into a coward's castle.

This may sound very plausible, but when a public man publicly teaches that which is contrary to the Word of God, he must not complain if he is publicly rebuked.

Let me say also that the only reason why I take the trouble to reply to anything that has been said to-night is not on personal grounds at all, it is simply in the interests of the University and the denomination. To tell you the honest truth, on merely personal grounds, I do not mind what certain people say about me at all. They can say I am a modernist, an atheist, an infidel, a Mohammedan, a Buddhist and the devil himself all rolled into one, it does not concern me personally. I am simply replying to-night because I occupy a position on the staff of McMaster University, and now that my accusers and traducers are here face to face, surely now is the time to reply.

#### **"As Bold as Two Lions."**

Last year, I said I came to you in all humility and charity, but that I felt as bold as a lion. Well, I come to you to-night, I trust, in the same humility and charity, but I feel as bold as two lions. I cannot possibly reply to all that has been said against me and about me, for I should have to speak for at least twenty-four hours, but I will at any rate try to deal with all the main questions, and as there have been so many offences against Christian charity and Christian courtesy, I pray for grace that I may not add to the number. I wish to speak plainly, but I assure you, I give you my word of honor as an Englishman that I speak without any malice at all.

May I just say a word or two more by way of introducing myself? I do plead for a fair hearing if possible from everybody. I am afraid that some people have been told that they must not take much notice of me, that I am not a truthful man, that I will lead them astray, that I am a deceiver. I do not think it is fair to try and prejudice the mind of the Convention against one of the speakers in that way. After all, I think the case for the prosecution has been pretty well pressed, and it has been pressed for twelve months, and surely I am entitled to a fair hearing when in a few minutes I state, in part, at any rate, the case for the defence.

#### **Concerning Mr. Robertson of Liverpool.**

I will pass over matters as quickly as I possibly can; you must all be tired. May I just remind you of how the trouble began? I feel more and

more that I am not the cause of it, but simply the occasion. You remember how that Dr. Shields published two letters from Mr. Robertson of Liverpool. I said last year that he had no title at all to speak for English Baptists, and I found that me statement was truer than I knew of, for I found he took himself and his church out of the Liverpool Baptist Union, out of the Lancashire and Cheshire Baptist Association, out of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, and persuaded the church, which in my days in Liverpool was the strongest supporter of the Baptist Missionary Society, to withdraw its support from the society, which I regard as one of the greatest missionary societies on earth—a society founded by William Carey.

He was evidently pressed for evidence for the charges he made, and as you may not all have seen it, I just want to say one brief word about his action in this particular regard. In addition to those two letters he sent to Canada about me, he sent this letter to me:

Dear Sir,

I read with great enjoyment an article written by you in a recent number of *The Baptist Times* on Baptist principles, and would be glad to know if you have anything in print, as I would greatly like to read the same. It was refreshing to read such a timely, straightforward statement.

You know the rest. Now, remember, that the article he asked me to send and the article he praises in this letter was the very article he wanted to send over here to Canada as evidence against me.

Now, Mr. Robertson has a perfect right to attack me whenever he likes, but I do say this, and I must say it as emphatically as I can, that this letter was a trick, and a very base trick, and I know of nobody, rightly or wrongly tarred and feathered as a modernist, who would stoop to trickery and knavery of this particular order. (Applause.)

I wrote to Mr. Robertson and asked him to account for the glaring difference between the two letters he sent to Canada about me and this letter he sent to me. He never replied. I asked him also to state the grounds on which he made these charges which were mentioned in his letter, but again I have had no reply.

Now, it seems to me that a man who will resort to low-down trickery of that order is not entitled to speak on questions of this sort at all. No man can fairly stand for sound doctrine when his ethics are rotten. (Applause.) I have the highest authority in the universe for that, for Jesus himself says: "By their fruits ye shall know them." "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit." It is a saying well known to students of English literature: "He cannot be wrong whose life is in the right." I should like to turn that round to-night and say this: He cannot be right whose life is in the wrong.

Now, I contend, friends, that this letter from Mr. Robertson is a fair sample of the ethics of the whole campaign. (Hear, hear.)

### Prof. Marshall and Prof. Campbell.

The next subject I want to touch, and I will touch it very lightly, is the letter that was published by Professor Campbell. I may be quite wrong, I cannot prove what I am going to say, but I feel I know Professor Campbell so well that somehow or other I do not think he wrote that letter entirely on his own initiative; he may have done so. (Cries of "Shame, shame".) All right, I withdraw the statement. But at any rate when I read the letter, these words occurred straightway to my mind: "The hand is the hand of Esau, but the voice is the voice of Jacob." (Applause.)

I have just one or two observations to make about it. Professor Campbell and I met daily in the faculty room. He was always exceedingly kindly and courteous to me, and I trust I was always as kindly and courteous to him. We always seemed to be on terms of the warmest friendship, we worshipped together in college chapel daily, and I want to say that Professor Campbell never discussed any theological or biblical problem whatsoever with me face

to face. You can imagine, therefore, my surprise when I found that I was attacked in the public press.

After the publication of the letter, of course, I felt obliged to face Professor Campbell on the subject. You remember how he labelled me as a modernist and then described what modernism is and what modernism does? He says:

**When Modernism is Finished.**

It paralyzes the pulpit, it paralyzes the pew, it paralyzes home missions, it paralyzes foreign missions. The modernist is an enemy to himself, an enemy to his home, an enemy to his church, an enemy to his denomination, an enemy to his university, and an enemy to his Lord.

Well, now, if the suggestion means anything at all, I suppose I can apply all this to myself, that I am paralyzing the pulpit, that I am paralyzing the pew, that I am paralyzing home missions, that I am paralyzing foreign missions. You may go and ask what Queen's Road Church, Coventry, did for foreign missions and see if I paralyzed them, if I was an enemy to myself, an enemy to my home, an enemy to my church, an enemy to my denomination, an enemy to my University, and an enemy to my Lord. I say those suggestions, so far as they apply to me, are not only false to the core; they are ludicrous and they are grotesque.

Then I felt obliged to face Professor Campbell on another matter which is found in paragraph four. He said:

A prominent member of the Central Baptist Church—  
after hearing me preach—

—made a remark to this effect: The attacks made on Professor Marshall's position are justifiable.

I said to Professor Campbell: "You published that paragraph about me. It is a defamatory paragraph. It is very clearly and explicitly a charge of heresy. I just want to know what the heresy was." What do you think his reply was? He said, "I don't know." In other words, he had published a paragraph accusing me of heresy and he had not the ghost of a notion what the heresy was. All I say is: That is not fair play. (Applause.)

If I was guilty of heresy in my sermons in the Central Baptist Church on that particular Sunday, I am quite prepared to be condemned, but I am not prepared to be condemned as a heretic when the people cannot tell me what the heresy is. That is not fair.

I have been doing my best to find out and I cannot with any degree of certainty. One suggestion did come to me, and that was that the reference was to the fact that in preaching on Christmas Sunday I had not referred to the Virgin Birth. Well, as it happened, my texts that day were taken from the Apostle Paul. The Apostle Paul, even when he refers to the birth of Jesus Christ, never, as it happens, refers to the Virgin Birth, and I do not mind at all being proved a heretic by any method which involves the Apostle Paul as well. (Laughter.)

How pathetic this laughter was! The sermons referred to were taken by stenographers and published in *The Gospel Witness*, and that on Sunday morning was on the text, "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." But Professor Marshall selected the phrase, "God sent forth his Son". If the virgin birth is not explicitly taught in that text, it is undoubtedly implied.

Let me point out that there is not one definite and specific charge against me in the whole letter. It is simply as flimsy as a cobweb, and I brush it aside as entirely worthless for the purposes of this debate.

### Prof. Marshall and Dr. Driver.

Well, now I am going to tackle a subject about which a great deal has been said, and wrongly said. I want to say just a word or two on this Driver question. You must remember that I come from England, and it may surprise many people here to know that in English theological colleges Driver's *Introduction to the Old Testament* is almost without exception the text-book prescribed. May I just point out the meaning of that? That does not mean for a moment that English theological colleges accept all Driver's conclusions. The idea is this, to give a theological student an introduction to the real problems of the Old Testament.

Now, I am afraid there are many people who do not really understand the Old Testament problem at all. They still think of the critical study of the Old Testament as though it were purely destructive, and they seem to be entirely oblivious of the fact that the destructive phase of critical study has almost entirely passed and that to-day critical study is largely constructive and the whole aim of it is simply to set the spiritual message of the Bible in a clearer light.

#### Can He Stand With Dr. Orr?

The reason, then, I referred to Driver is just this. As I say, it is the text-book everywhere in Britain; I do not suppose Driver is taboo anywhere. Driver gives the student the right method—the right method of study—it is for the student to see to it that he does not come to wrong conclusions. The method, remember, is simply the method referred to in that text-book prescribed by the Baptist Bible Union. I refer to Orr on *The Problem of the Old Testament*. Now, listen to what Orr says:

This attitude of unreasoning denunciation of what is called "Higher Criticism" is also manifestly an extreme; the problem we have to deal with requires a clearer discrimination of issues. It is only to confuse the issue, and is a gratuitous weakening of the believing case, not to recognize that the real cleft goes much deeper. There are few outstanding scholars at the present day on the Continent or in Britain who do not in greater or less degree accept conclusions regarding the Old Testament of the kind ordinarily denominated critical; yet among the foremost are many whom no one who understands their work would dream of classing as other than believing, and defenders of revealed religion. The attitude to criticism of so large a body of believing scholars may at least suggest to those disposed to form hasty judgments that there is here a very real problem to be solved; that the case is more complex than perhaps they had imagined; that there are real phenomena in the literary structure of the Old Testament, for the explanation of which, in the judgment of many able minds, the traditional view is not adequate, and for which they seem to themselves to find a more satisfactory solution in some form or other of the critical hypothesis.

The truth is, and the fact has to be faced, that no one who studies the Old Testament in the light of modern knowledge can help being, to some extent, a "Higher Critic", nor is it desirable he should. "Higher Criticism," rightly understood, is simply the careful scrutiny, on the principles which it is customary to apply to all literature, of the actual phenomena of the Bible, with a view to deduce from these such conclusions as may be warranted regarding the age, authorship, mode of composition, sources, etc., of the different books; and everyone who engaged in such enquiries, with whatever aim, is a "Higher Critic," and cannot help himself.

Professor Marshall, by the use of this quotation, would create the impression that he is in agreement with Dr. Orr; but Dr. Orr was by no means in agreement with Dr. Driver, but again and again labours to controvert Driver's position.

### The Chancellor's Misleading Quotation of Dr. Orr.

But Professor Marshall is not the only one to quote Dr. Orr. Chancellor Whidden quoted from Dr. Orr in his speech before the Convention at Hamilton. We print below in one column what appears in the official report of the Educational Session of the Hamilton Convention "issued by authority of the Senate of McMaster University", and in a parallel column what Dr. Orr really says in his book. The words omitted by the Chancellor are printed in bold-faced type:

#### As quoted by the Chancellor:

"To what result, we may ask, does our whole investigation conduct us on the age and composition of the Pentateuch generally?"—a matter of composition and date, not of document.—"For one thing, not to the conclusion that Moses himself wrote the Pentateuch in the precise shape or extent in which we now possess it; for the work, we think, shows very evident signs of different pens and styles, of editorial redaction (i.e., editing) of stages of compilation—in the collation and preparation of the materials of this work—and many hands and minds may have co-operated and have continued to co-operate, after the master-mind was removed."

#### As it appears in Dr. Orr's book:

To what result—we must now ask—does our whole investigation conduct us on the origin of the Priestly Writing, and the age and composition of the Pentateuch generally. We began by leaving it an open question whether, or how many, separate documents were employed in the compilation of that work, and if so, what were the ages and mutual relations of these documents. To what conclusions have we now been led?

For one thing, it is first to be said, not to the conclusion that Moses himself wrote the Pentateuch in the precise shape or extent in which we now possess it; for the work, we think, shows very evident signs of different pens and styles, of editorial redaction, of stages of compilation. As before observed, its compilation has a history, whether we are able ever to track satisfactorily that history or not. On the other hand, next, very strongly to the view of the unity, essential Mosaicity, and relative antiquity of the Pentateuch. The unity which characterises the work has its basis mainly in the history, knit together as that is by the presence of a developing divine purpose; but arises also from the plan of the book, which must have been laid down early, by one mind, or different minds working together, while the memory of the great patriarchal traditions was yet fresh, and the impressions of the stupendous deliverance from Egypt, and of the wonderful events connected with, and following it, were yet recent and vivid. In the collation and preparation of the materials for this work—some of them, perhaps, reaching back into pre-Mosaic times—and the laying of the foundations of the existing narratives, to which Moses by his own compositions, according to constant tradition, lent the initial impulse, many hands and minds may have co-operated, and may



have continued to co-operate, after the master-mind was removed; but unity of purpose and will gave a corresponding unity to the product of their labours. So far from such a view being obsolete, or disproved by modern criticism, we hold that internal indications, external evidence, and the circumstances of the Mosaic age itself, unite in lending their support to its probability."

Any candid reader will observe that this was an absolutely dishonest statement of the passage, used apparently with deliberate intent to deceive. But when the Word of God is handled deceitfully, it is no wonder that human authors should be similarly treated. We defy anyone to find in Dr. Driver's writings a passage that would agree with Dr. Orr's conclusions as above recorded.

That apparently is Dr. Orr's attitude, and that is commended by the Baptist Bible Union.

In regard to the Old Testament, remember, all I stand for—and I stand for nothing else—is this: I stand for the historical method. That is all. Sound biblical interpretation demands that. In dealing with any passage of Scripture we answer first of all two questions: What did the sacred writer actually say? and for that purpose some of us insist that a careful examination of the Hebrew text and the Greek text of the Septuagint whenever available is a perfectly legitimate thing. And the second question is: What did the sacred writer really mean? and for that purpose we have to try to reconstruct the historical setting, and for that purpose real historical knowledge is required. If that method is wrong, I must confess I despair of finding a right one. There is no other method that is really sound. And the right method rightly used is bound to lead in the end sooner or later to right conclusions.

### **Dr. Driver's Method Brings His Conclusions.**

Above, Professor Marshall refers to the historical method as the only one that "is really sound" and then adds, "And the right method rightly used is bound to lead in the end sooner or later to right conclusions." Elsewhere he says, "Driver gives the student the right method—the right method of study—it is for the student to see to it that he does not come to wrong conclusions." In the one case he insists that the method used does not necessarily bear any relation to the conclusions reached; but here he tells us that the right method is bound to lead to right conclusions!—the logic being that the Driver method is bound to lead to the Driver conclusion. In this latter passage he is right.

I believe that right methods have often been wrongly used; but right methods rightly used are bound to lead to right conclusions. And, remember, that what is often called Modernism in the realm of biblical interpretation is in scores of instances nothing more nor less than a return to the original meaning of the Holy Scripture. I do maintain this, and maintain it strongly, that the man who is loyal to the Old Book is the man who first of all seeks to be accurate in his interpretation of the Old Book. (Applause.)

### **The Editor of "The Prophet" Censured.**

Now, I want to say just a word or two before I get on to my main topic. I want just to say a word or two—I will deal very kindly and very gently with him, but I want to say a word or two about the editor of *The Prophet*. I deal with him simply because of the use that Dr. Shields has made of him. I will deal with one or two of his statements later, but I just want to say one or two

things about him. Mark you, I think he is a fellow of considerable ability, and I think if he were put under good leadership he would make a very splendid fellow. (Laughter). He is somewhat misguided at present, and I am very sorry that he regards as his models in the realm of religious journalism such papers as *The Gospel Witness* and *The Searchlight*.

But the two things I want to say about him are these. He has been setting himself up as an authority on religion and science. May I point out—and I have learned this from his schoolmaster who volunteered the information—that when he was a boy at the high school he was not allowed to study science at all, or at any rate he didn't do it, and I learned also from McMaster that he was not allowed to take biology although he did take a little human physiology.

The above paragraph is a fine example of the professor's "spirit" which Dr. Farmer so greatly admires. The "schoolmaster" referred to is a graduate of McMaster University, a very bitter partisan whom we ourselves proved to be utterly ignorant of the subject he was discussing. The implications of the Professor's remarks are that Mr. Brown's parents would not "allow" him to study science for fear it would destroy his faith!—he was not "allowed" to take biology! We have enquired about this matter, and the fact is that during his high school days Mr. Brown was not very rugged physically, but certain options were given students, and he selected Greek instead of science. While at McMaster he made his own choice absolutely, and there was no "allowing" about it. In other words, that which this paragraph implies is an absolute untruth.

Now, the point we want to lay hold of is this, it seems to me; a man cannot pose as an authority on religion and science unless he knows something about science as well as religion. I do not like that attitude of mind. We must not fear science. (Cries of "Hear, hear"). Let us lay hold of that, too. We must not fear scientific fact. Is this Christian religion of ours such a flimsy thing that it cannot bear examination? I think it can bear the most relentless scrutiny the whole wide world can bring to bear upon it. (Applause). If I were afraid of astronomy, of geology, or biology, and of the rest of the ologies, I should not dare stand up in a Christian pulpit. (Cries of "Hear, hear"). I am not afraid of science at all.

### Professorial Nobodies.

Here again the Professor affects a superior air. Who has any fear of scientific fact! What fundamentalist, if we may dare to use the term so cordially hated in some quarters, has any fear of astronomy, or geology, or biology, or any other science! What is the implication of the Professor's remarks that the only way to hold fast to the Bible as the Word of God is to shut one's eyes to science? But what does the Professor know about "scientific fact"? Will he be good enough to name us one exact science? Is it not true that what was called "scientific fact" yesterday, is, even by so-called men of science themselves, laughed out of court to-day? Let this spirit dominate in the University, let this attitude be manifest in a professor's teaching, and what follows? It is even more destructive of faith among young people than false teaching itself. We are utterly wearied by the superior airs of some of these professorial nobodies.

Now, the other thing I want to say about him is this, and I hope he will take my words very kindly. He has waxed very bold behind my back; he has issued enough very garbled statements of my teaching, as Mr. Frice, I am afraid, so conclusively proved this afternoon, and often enough he has put his

own interpretation upon my words; but so far as Mr. Gordon Brown has reported what he himself actually heard me say, do you know that never on one solitary occasion did he ever challenge a statement of mine in my presence and in the presence of his fellow students? Now I have not the slightest objection whatever to a student blazing all over the world all that I teach. I would love to have Dr. Shields in my class room all the time, if he likes to come. I am not afraid. All I would say is this, and this, I think, is simply British fair play, it is the principle we always work on in the theological colleges in England—first of all attack a man inside the classroom before you attack him outside. (Hear, hear). And I am afraid that, though Mr. Gordon Brown professes to be a great authority on all these subjects, he is just as immature and ill-informed in theological science as he is in natural science.

### How We Faced the Professor.

The suggestion of the remarks of the Professor is that some of us were afraid to face him with the questions which were up for discussion in the present controversy over his theology. Let us remind our readers that before we ever made any public statement, either by pen or speech, concerning the theology of Professor L. H. Marshall, we went personally to the gentleman about the issues we were about to raise. The occasion, as has been already stated, was the writing of an article, permission for the publication of which had been given by the then editor of *The McMaster Monthly*. After having completed the article Mr. W. S. Whitcombe and Mr. W. Gordon Brown took the manuscript, before ever attempting to give it publicity, to the Professor himself, and asked him if we had in any way misrepresented his views, saying that if we had done so, we would rectify such mis-statements. When this article, after having been taken to the Professor himself, was refused the promised publication, we ventured to write another article for our own paper, *The Prophet*, in which a sentiment similar to that which had been expressed in the previous article was stated. At the Professor's own request, we had another conversation with him about this article, a conversation which revealed to us more of the Professor's attitude on theological questions than we had before known.

Another incident we recall. A student of another class in the University from those we attended gave us an account of part of a lecture which had been given by Professor Marshall. This student desired that the account should be confirmed as accurate by the Professor himself before being given to the public. Hence it was that, at this student's wish, we took the article to the Professor. We met him in the Faculty Room of the University. As soon as he knew that the article was for *The Prophet*, he absolutely refused to even look at it, and severely reprimanded us for having already published notes from his classes in that paper.—W. Gordon Brown.

#### PROF. MARSHALL continues:

Remember that it takes a long time to be a theologian. I am not one yet, and I have been on the job for twenty years. Remember, theology is an exceedingly difficult science—theology is a science. I wish we could make everybody quite clear on the distinction between religion and theology. Remember that just as there are stars in astronomy—and astronomy is the science of the stars, so to speak, to interpret the stars,—so remember theology is the science of religion; it is the attempt of the human intellect to interpret and to justify religious experience. There is a very vital distinction between the two things.

and a man is not a theologian simply because he is religious. You can be religious without being a theologian at all. We have had a good many examples of that kind of thing. (Laughter).

Now, on one occasion—Mr. Price explained the circumstances this afternoon and I will not go through them; what Mr. Price said was quite news to me, I may say, I didn't know I had been in any way led into a trap—on one occasion I gave just a brief sketch of the history of the doctrine of the atonement. My aim was just to remind these young theological students of this fact—this cannot be heresy, for it is simply an historical fact, so don't be frightened of it—that there have been many theories of the atonement put forward by the Christian church. Many theories. You have only to get hold of any history of Christian doctrine—there is Origen and Anselm, and Luther's, and other works—and though it may not be generally known, there are even many types of the substitutionary theory of the atonement; and my feeling of the whole matter is that the whole truth does not lie with any one theory or any one type of theory. I think all these theories of the great churchmen have been trying to impress some great truth of the atonement; but I did venture to criticize Luther's theory of penal substitution.

### Mr. W. Gordon Brown's Comments on the Above.

The Professor says concerning the remarks he made in class on the doctrine of the atonement:

"What Mr. Price said was quite news to me, I may say, I didn't know I had been in any way led into a trap."

Well, if Professor Marshall was led into a trap, that trap was not of our setting. The way the discussion of the doctrine of the atonement came up was as follows: In his lectures on Practical Theology Professor Marshall was discussing the administration of the Lord's Supper. It was in that connection that (as reported in *The Prophet*),

Discussing the history of "The Lord's Supper" as an institution, Professor Marshall asked how it was that development took place which led to the Roman Catholic Sacramentarianism. He said that many of the early converts to Christianity were people who were thoroughly familiar with the magic of the mysteries with which the pagan world was infected. . . . Then, the Professor added, "You can understand the early Christian emphasis on the blood of Christ when the Roman world was full of ideas of that kind, trusting actual blood for cleansing from sin.

In that same class shortly after, one of the students suggested that what the professor had just said might, in part, be taken out of its context and used against him. So, of course the professor explained. . . . (He finished his explanation with the remark:) "Before you come to conclusions regarding my view of the atonement and the blood of Christ, wait till I have finished."

Now when Professor Marshall asked us to wait until we had heard all that he had to say before we came to conclusions concerning his view of the atonement and the blood of Christ, we inferred that he was going to say more on the subject, and we waited for him to do so. When the class came to the subject of "The Communion Service and the Spiritual Life," some of us were ready to raise the issue, and would have done so, had not a student who was not directly opposed to the professor on theological grounds raised the issue himself.

If this is a trap, then, in the words of Professor Marshall himself, "I throw up my hands straightway."—W. G. Brown.

### Further Comments by the Editor of "Gospel Witness."

Here we have the Professor's own admission that he did criticize Luther's theory of penal substitution. Surely implicitly he admits his

rejection of the idea of penal substitution. If penal substitution be not the very heart of the gospel of grace, we do not know what the gospel is,—but more of this later.

PROF. MARSHALL continues:

Well now, whether I was right or wrong, I find that one of the greatest teachers of this century, and I only came across this the other day, says just the same thing. The theologian to whom I refer is Denney. If Denney is a modernist and heretic, I will throw up my hands and surrender straightway and say I am one. This is what he says in his great work on *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*:

#### Dr. Denney on Reconciliation.

Punishment is something which can only exist in and for a bad conscience, and the sufferings into which Christ's love led Him, and in and through which His reconciling work was achieved, do not come through a bad conscience and therefore are in no sense penal. That the innocent, moved by love, should suffer with the guilty and for them is in line with all we know of the moral order under which we live. It is the triumph of goodness in its highest form. But that the innocent should be punished for the guilty is not moral at all. It is in every sense of the term impossible. As an incident in the divine administration of the world it is simply inconceivable.

It may not be out of place—

he says,

—to quote one or two of the most signal instances of this perversion. Luther, for example, carried away by the passion with which he exulted in Christ's identification of Himself with men, could write that "in His tender, innocent heart He had to feel God's wrath and judgment against sin, and to taste for us eternal death and damnation, and, in a word, to suffer everything which a condemned sinner has merited and must suffer eternally."

All I was meaning was just this, that whatever theory of the atonement we eventually put forward, it must be in line not only with the text of the Scripture here and there, but it must be in line with the purport of Scripture as a whole. I will not surrender John 3, 16. (Applause.) I will not surrender those glorious words, to me the greatest music of the New Testament: "God commendeth His love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us."

Now, an adequate theory I say must be in harmony with all Scripture, and no man has the right to say to his brother: You do not believe in the atonement because you do not accept my particular type of theory of the atonement. That is not justified. There are many theories of the atonement. The theological truth of the atonement is like a jewel of many facets, and we have to stress not merely one aspect, but we have to try and stress all aspects, and one aspect of the truth must not be pressed to the exclusion of all the rest.

Whether I am a heretic or not on this question of the atonement, I simply take my stand by the side of Charles Haddon Spurgeon. (Applause.) You will find the passage if you want it in Fullerton's *Life*. It is Spurgeon who is the speaker, and I never came across any statement which has so appealed to my heart:—

This darkness tells us all that the passion is a great mystery. I try to explain it as a substitution and I feel that where the language of Scripture is explicit I may, and must, be explicit too. But yet I feel that the idea of substitution does not cover the whole of the dread mystery, and that no human conception can grasp the whole. Tell me the death of the Lord Jesus was a grand example of self sacrifice—I can see that, and much more. Tell me it was a wondrous obedience to the will of God—I can see that, and much more. Tell me it was the bearing of what ought to have been borne by myriads of sinners of the human race, is the chastisement of

their sin—I can see that and found my best hope upon it. But do not tell me that this is all that is in the Cross. No, great as this would be, there is much more in the Redeemer's death. God veiled the Cross in darkness, and in darkness much of the deep meaning lies, not because God would not reveal it, but because we have not capacity to discern it all.

Well, that is just what I feel about the matter—and you can call Spurgeon a modernist if you like.

We wonder why Professor Marshall omitted the lines occurring between the two paragraphs he quoted from Dr. Denney? Here let us supply them:

"All this may be admitted without reserve, and we may reflect with pleasure that it excludes a great deal by which the Christian conscience has often been shocked in discussions of the atonement. It excludes the idea that the Son of God, with whom the Father was well pleased, should be regarded at the same time as the object of the Father's displeasure, and the victim of His wrath, on whom the punishment of all the world's sin was inflicted. It excludes all those ideas of equivalence between what Christ suffered and what men as sinners were under an obligation to suffer, which revolt both intelligence and conscience in much of what is called orthodox theology. It excludes all those assimilations of the sufferings of our Lord in the garden and on the cross to the pains of the damned, which cast a hideous shadow on many interpretations of His Passion."

#### **Professor Marshall and Dr. Denney.**

Professor Marshall at least goes as far as Dr. Denney, he says so himself. And if this quotation from Dr. Denney be not a rejection of the substitutionary work of Christ, we do not know what it is. Dr. Denney says, "That the innocent should be punished for the guilty, is not moral at all. It is, in every sense of the term, impossible. As an incident in the divine administration of the world, it is simply inconceivable." To this, Professor Marshall subscribes. Obviously, then, the imputation of the sinner's guilt to the divine Substitute is impossible and inconceivable; and if that be true, the imputation of Another's righteousness is equally impossible and equally inconceivable. Thus the whole doctrine of justification by faith, upon which the Reformation was founded, falls to the ground. Personally, we utterly reject Dr. Denney's view, and think that such teaching is pernicious in the extreme.

#### **Professor Marshall Misrepresents Spurgeon.**

Again: Professor Marshall says, "I simply take my stand by the side of Charles Haddon Spurgeon." We have dealt with this matter at some length in our speech. *If Professor Marshall has any true knowledge of Spurgeon's teaching respecting the atonement, the statement just quoted from the Professor is an absolute untruth. I hold, and will proceed to prove, that no greater untruth was ever told than when Professor Marshall said, "I simply take my stand by the side of Charles Haddon Spurgeon."* If he does not know what Spurgeon taught, it is but a further proof of the narrowness of his spirit: *if he does not know what Spurgeon taught, he was guilty of absolute misrepresentation and deliberate deception.* For example: he quotes

Denney as repudiating Luther's view. Let our readers go back and read the last paragraph from Denney quoted by Professor Marshall, of which he approves, and, at the same time, read the paragraph taken from Spurgeon with which Professor Marshall claims to be in full accord; and then let them read the following which is taken from the very sermon which Professor Marshall quotes:

"His strong crying and tears denoted the deep sorrow of his soul. He bore all it was possible for his capacious mind to bear, though enlarged and invigorated by union with the Godhead. He bore the equivalent of hell; nay, not that only, but he bore that which stood instead of ten thousand hells so far as the vindication of the law is concerned. Our Lord rendered in his death agony a homage to justice far greater than if a world had been doomed to destruction."

### The Word "Equivalent" in the Atonement.

It will be observed that Spurgeon uses the very word "equivalent" which Dr. Denney repudiates in the passage which Professor Marshall *did not* quote. We repeat, if the imputation of guilt is not moral, the imputation of righteousness must also be repudiated. But let our readers judge whether we have been right in saying that Professor Marshall's statements are not to be taken at their face value. The name of Spurgeon for more than half a century has stood before evangelical Christendom as almost a synonym for the gospel of grace,—and Professor Marshall would traffic with that name, and deceive his hearers.

### About "Papal Authorities."

Now, I will come to another question—and I am going on as quickly as I can. I come to the question of the anathema that was pronounced upon me by the papal authorities in Jarvis Street on January 14th last. I just notice the main points. The question of Genesis I, I dealt with so fully here, satisfactorily to most people who know the charges—"Professor Marshall Refutes Serious Charges"—you know it. I dealt with Genesis I there. I cannot say anything clearer than that. It was satisfactory to Dr. John MacNeill, it was satisfactory to Dr. Farmer, and I do not think I need worry about it being satisfactory to anybody else. (Applause.) I say that the message of Genesis I is primarily a religious message; behind the whole panorama of creation there lies the creative power and purpose of the living God.

Professor Marshall has referred to the "papal authorities" in Jarvis Street, and then he says of his statement, "It was satisfactory to Dr. John MacNeill, it was satisfactory to Dr. Farmer, and I do not think I need worry about it being satisfactory to anybody else". Since when did Dr. Farmer and Dr. MacNeill become the "papal authorities" of the Baptist denomination? Whatever may be said of Dr. Farmer, no one in his senses would ever charge Dr. MacNeill with being an authority on matters of theology. He is an interesting and effective preacher, but a very loose thinker. But, for the sake of argument, let it be granted that these gentlemen represent the highest standard of Biblical intelligence in the denomination, when did it come to pass that Baptists thus surrendered their liberties?

### Professor Marshall on Jonah.

Now, there is this question of Jonah. (Laughter). May I say that in Britain the normal view—you must remember that I came to you from Britain;

perhaps it is a pity I ever did, some of you think—in Britain the normal view is the allegorical or parabolic view. Do you know, I was taught that as a boy? Do you know that on the night of the Jarvis Street meeting, or rather on the following day, a man, an Englishman, aged fifty years, rang me up on the telephone. "Why," he said, "do you know I was taught what you told us back along in the village school when I was a child." I have never been to a school or college or university where that view was not upheld. I never had a single textbook recommended to me during my whole student and ministerial career that did not talk it. I do not know a single eminent British biblical scholar who does not take that particular attitude—and, remember, they are all taking it as rare as I have.

The mention of the Book of Jonah, an integral part of the canon of the Old Testament Scriptures, a book quoted by our Lord Himself,—we remind our readers that the very mention of it produced laughter in a Baptist Convention. This of itself is an indication of the spirit and attitude of McMaster supporters. We venture to tell Professor Marshall also that some people are getting a little weary of his constant references to Britain. There are tens of thousands of other people in Canada who come from Britain, and many of us are proud of the fact. We have been back and forward across the ocean a good many times, and are fairly conversant with religious conditions on both sides of the sea. Professor Marshall takes himself altogether too seriously when he assumes that he is representative of the religious life of Britain. We would remind Professor Marshall of the famous Tailors of Tooley Street. The question for Canadian Baptists to decide is not what people in England think of the Book of Jonah, but what is the teaching of Scripture, and particularly what is the teaching of our Lord? Professor Marshall shows in what academic circles he has moved when he tells us that he had never had recommended to him a single text-book that did not teach the allegorical and parabolical view of the book of Jonah. Modernists are the most one-sided mortals on earth. They know only one side of any question. Professor Marshall here discloses his whole theological point of view, but it proves nothing to say everybody believes it. According to the Word of God, the majority have always been wrong. We have heard of the "wide" gate and the "broad" road. Professor Marshall makes no appeal to Scripture. He does not know "of a single eminent British Biblical scholar", etc. We have dealt at some length with the question of Jonah in our speech replying to Professor Marshall.

#### English and Canadian Views.

Now, I found—remember, I was here some months before I found it—I find here the normal view is the historical view. But remember I am not trying to force on anybody the allegorical view or parabolic view. If you want the historical view you may take the historical view; all I insist is—I will go back to England any time I surrender—all I am insisting on is this: If a man finds it contrary to his conscience and his own sense of truth to take that or any particular view, he has the right to interpret the book as an allegory or a parable. (Applause and cries of "No").

I notice that amongst the people whose works are suggested by the Baptist Bible Union is Dr. A. H. Strong. In his little book on *The Tour of the Missions*, Dr. Strong says this:

Any honest Christian I would say has a right to interpret Jonah as allegory rather than history.



Well now, there is Dr. Strong. The question as you will remember is purely a question of interpretation. We believe with all the rest of you that the book of Jonah is part of the Word of God; in fact, my own view of the book of Jonah is that it is one of the sublimest bits of literature in the world. Why, it is a protest, a rebuke against that intolerance which is the curse of this denomination in Canada.

#### One of Professor Marshall's Caricatures.

Some time ago Dr. Shields referred in very glowing terms to that great Christian preacher, Dr. Dale. Dr. Dale thought about the Book of Jonah as I do—or rather I should put it more humbly: I think about it as he did; Dr. Clifford thought of the Book of Jonah as I do; Dr. Jowett thought of the Book of Jonah just as I do; and do you think all those three men have gone to hell? (Cries of "No"). There is something wrong with the theory that would put all those men into hell. (Applause).

Could anything be more ridiculous than this remark of Professor Marshall? Who ever suggested that a man would go to hell because he entertained an erroneous view of the Book of Jonah, or any other book? We are dealing with Professor Marshall as a professor in a so-called "Christian" university. His business is to teach young men and women the Bible, among other things. If absolute correctness of opinion were a sine qua non of saving faith, we know of nobody who would be saved. A man may go far wrong and teach much error and by God's abounding grace escape from hell. Notwithstanding, it is important that we should prove all things and hold fast that which is good.

And may I point out this? Christ's references to the Book of Jonah do not necessarily imply the historical view—not necessarily; you and I are always talking in our preaching about the Good Samaritan and the Prodigal Son, and we speak of them as if they were actual historical figures. We speak to our congregations about what the Good Samaritan did and what the Prodigal Son did, and we often go into a great deal of amplification of those old stories. As a great scholar has said, Christ has no intention of affirming or denying its historicity; He is simply appealing to it as an illustration. But if it could be really proved to me that Jesus Christ regarded the Book of Jonah as an historical document, the matter would be settled for me straightway—I would say it is an historical document. (Applause).

We have something to say of this position in our speech in reply to Professor Marshall.

#### The "Uneducated Fool" Story.

Now, I won't shirk anything. Just one brief word on this "uneducated fool" story. I confess quite frankly that I am sorry I said it, very sorry. I did not want to hurt anybody's feelings. But just let me put it in its right setting. Mr. Whitcombe really revealed the right setting this afternoon. I had an interview in which he told me that if the Bible said Jonah swallowed the whale he would believe that. Well now, it made me feel just a little bit sick, I was a bit ruffled to think that I should be expected to take an attitude of that kind; and you must remember, too, that it took me some time to realize that there are some people here who do not observe the world of distinction which men of honour do observe between private conversation and public speech. I should never once have said in public what I have said in private; not because it is inaccurate—oh, no, not necessarily inaccurate—but I should never have used such words as those in public. I confess I should not. I was irritated and ruffled at the time. I have had a lot to ruffle and irritate me, remember, but on the whole I have kept my temper fairly well. (Applause).

Although Professor Marshall doubtless did not intend to make the implication, it might appear to the reader that the remark about the "uneducated fool" was made to Mr. Whitcombe. The interview

which the Professor mentions was, however, one granted to Mr. Fieldus; and we believe that he betrayed no trust and violated no honour in reporting it.

#### Is the English Baptist Union or the Bible Our Standard?

But, after all, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. Now, if you feel that my statement that in England—I did not say that a man who believed in the historicity of Jonah was an uneducated fool; I never suggested such a thing, I said that in England a man is commonly so regarded—as I said in *The Canadian Baptist*, if any of you doubt that, go and stand on the floor of the Baptist Assembly in London next spring and start agitating for the dismissal of all our Baptist theological professors, because they believe in the allegorical interpretation of the Book of Jonah, and see what would happen.

Again Professor Marshall treats us to an account of what they would do in England. The Baptist Union of Great Britain passed a vote of censure on the world's greatest preacher more than thirty years ago. If they did that thing in the green tree, what would they do in the dry? The preaching of the Cross has ever been to those that perish, foolishness, and it is quite possible that with certain people those who still hold to what the Bible teaches are looked upon as "uneducated fools".

#### Human Depravity.

Now I am coming to this question of—Mr. Price relieved me of any necessity to refer to this question of the Bible and Science—I am going straight on to this question about human nature. May I say straightway that this question of total depravity was fully discussed when I came over on that special flying visit in July, 1925. There can be no doubt on that score. Now, if by the doctrine of total depravity—and remember, there are more interpretations than one—you mean that man is wholly incapable of anything good and wholly inclined to everything that is evil, well then, I say simply straight out: That doctrine is not true. (Cries of "Hear, hear").

A DELEGATE: It is.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: It is not true to experience in the first place. I ask you fathers and mothers to think of your little children. Do you mean to tell me that a sweet little child is simply a mass of moral corruption, wholly incapable of anything good and wholly inclined to everything evil? I say it is a lie. (Applause). That is not true of my child, though I can see all her faults. For instance, I can see all the evil tendencies she has got from me. (Laughter.) But no! My little child is not to be described as incapable of anything good and wholly inclined to everything evil. It is not true.

It is not only not true to experience, it is not true to Scripture. I have been twitted a great deal for referring to juvenile human nature. Why should not I refer to juvenile human nature when Jesus Christ does? Jesus said once to a party of people, look you, of grown men and women: "Except ye turn and become like little children, ye shall in nowise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." Jesus Christ apparently saw something good in a little child—and so do I.

Professor Marshall, like most men of his school, before attempting to refute a doctrine, grossly caricatures it. What theologian using the term "total depravity" ever intended by its use to say "that a sweet little child is simply a mass of moral corruption, wholly incapable of anything good, and wholly inclined to everything evil"? We have never heard of anyone who ever said so. The ruler's little daughter, the son of the widow of Nain, and Lazarus were all stone dead. The death that reigned within was not outwardly manifested in the first instance; nor greatly so in the second; but in the third;

death had reduced the body to a reeking corpse. But the little child, while not as corrupt, was just as dead as Lazarus and utterly incapable of responding to any voice save the call of Him Who is the resurrection and the life.

The same applies to Paul. Anyone who makes a study of that passage in Romans VII, will find that the Apostle Paul regarded the soul of man, even the unregenerate man, as a battlefield where good and evil were striving together for the mastery; and the tragedy of the whole thing for the Apostle Paul was—and he was a Pharisee—that it was the evil that was carrying off the victory.

#### Professor Marshall on Romans Seven.

It is extraordinary that our learned professor should attempt to prove his point from Romans VII, by regarding that chapter as representative of a battle in the life of the unregenerated man: "For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." Can the twenty-second verse be truthfully used by an unregenerate man, "For I delight in the law of God after the inward man"?

But remember, good and evil are striving for the mastery—and it was from that sorry state that he looked for deliverance to the Lord Jesus Christ, simply because he felt in himself that there was good being held in captivity, and he felt that Christ could set it free.

I simply hold on this matter what that great churchman, Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, held—and you can call me a heretic if you like; I will be a heretic any day with Augustine—in those beautiful words, those deathless words:

Thou has created us unto Thyself and our hearts are restless  
until they rest in Thee.

That is true of my nature, it is true of the nature of a great many Christian people.

But I have another witness, further evidence to call, and I am going to call from a strange place. I am going to call it from *The Gospel Witness*. In a sermon by Dr. Shields—you will find it in Volume 1, page 53—is this remark about conscience, which is my sermon from this pulpit in November last year, my sermon in a nutshell.

Defiled and seared as it is, conscience is a little bit of God; His law is inherent in the very constitution. (Applause).

On this matter Dr. Shields and I are in hearty agreement. (Applause).

MR. MCCREDIE: Would you let us have the reference of that again?

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: Yes. *The Gospel Witness*, Volume 1, page 53.

MR. MCCREDIE: The first volume is not numbered; it is only numbered separately.

MR. DUNCAN: I can give you the serial number all right.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: Mr. Duncan, I think, has it. I give it again:

Defiled and seared as it is, conscience is a little bit of God; His law is inherent in the very constitution.

And yet Dr. Shields has been repeating my famous illustration of the French professor trying to destroy the germ of life in the seeds.

MR. DUNCAN: It is *The Gospel Witness* of Saturday, July 1st, 1922; that will mean page 5.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: If you want further evidence of Dr. Shields see *The Gospel Witness* of March 11, 1926, page 6. Am I to read it? (Cries of "Yes").

All right. Anybody would think I preached this sermon. (Laughter.) Listen, listen. This is this heretic Professor Marshall, I think it must be, really:

But if somebody discovers a tribe in the interior of Africa, or somewhere in Tibet, and among them a man who has never heard a missionary, but, having seen the light of God in nature, so far as he was able to do so, has yielded himself to the great Spirit—"benighted" yes; you say—"a very imperfect knowledge of God;" yes; but if he has followed the only light he has had—mark, I say, "if"—if he has followed and believed in that light, may he not have believed in Christ? For the only light that ever shone from God into this darkened world came through our Lord Jesus Christ. The light of nature, though it shines less brightly, is the same light that shines in the face of Jesus Christ.

I believe that with all my soul.

If there is only a spark in nature that the soul of man sees, he will surely be judged by the measure in which he yields himself to God's light. Hence the epistle to the Romans, second chapter, teaches that God has His witness in the human conscience, and that men "show the work of the law written in their hearts." (Applause).

#### The Professor and "The Gospel Witness."

It is most interesting to discover how diligently the pages of *The Gospel Witness* are studied, even the sermons and lectures apparently are carefully examined at McMaster University. And here Professor Marshall deals, all must frankly admit, with one of the most difficult problems: the place of conscience in the human soul. It must, we think, however, be acknowledged that the quality of one's moral nature is determined not by conscience, but by the will. It points the way, but supplies no power to take it. Conscience is the compass, not the captain, of the ship of man-soul. And even though a compass be absolutely correct in its indications, with no captain on the bridge or at the wheel, the ship will go to pieces on the rocks. Conscience accuses or excuses, but never impels, nor compels.

In the second quotation from *The Gospel Witness*, which is from a lecture on "The Gospel in Genesis", there are these words:

"If he has followed the only light he has had"—mark,

I say, "if"—"if he has followed and believed in that light, may he not have believed in Christ?"

Conscience may recognize and witness to the light, but it has no power to move man to obedience.

#### Preaching to Fish and to Bones.

Did you ever hear of St. Bernard preaching to the fish? I saw a picture of that in the National Gallery in Berlin. You have all heard the story of St. Francis preaching to the birds. Well now, friends, we know this, that their preaching was vain so far as spiritual results were concerned because the spiritual faculty was not in the audience and therefore the audience could not respond. All I teach is this: It were as useless to preach Christ to men as to preach Christ to birds and to fish and to wolves, unless in human beings there were human needs and aspirations and faculties and capacities and potentialities to which Christ is able to appeal.

Professor Marshall reveals his true attitude toward the doctrine under discussion in this paragraph. Evangelical believers, we have

understood, have held that it is as useless to preach Christ to men as to preach Him to birds, and to fish, and to wolves, apart from the power of the recreating Spirit of God. Sin has destroyed our spiritual capacities. "You hath he quickened, who were dead in trespass and sins." Professor Marshall says he believes the spiritual faculty is latent in man. Baptist orthodoxy has believed nothing of the kind. We freely admit that the inevitable corollary of the doctrine of total depravity is the doctrine of the election of grace. It were no more useless to preach Christ to birds than to declare the Word of the Lord to dry bones. There was no spiritual faculty suggested in that prophetic vision except such faculty as the breath of God created.

I believe the spiritual faculty is latent in man, and that it was put there by the hand of God. There is the grace of God behind that. And I believe that it is the Holy Spirit that quickens this spiritual instinct in man, and that is the cause of what we call regeneration, conversion, or the new birth. If I am a heretic for believing that, I am content to be a heretic. But I just warn you: You must make Christ a heretic too for teaching good in little children; you must make the Apostle Paul a heretic for teaching that man had somehow the law of God written on their hearts. And I do not mind one straw being declared a heretic by the side of Jesus Christ and the Apostle Paul—not a straw. (Applause).

Listen, now, I just want to clear this question of human nature up. I am going to quote Denney again. This is theology, real theology!

There may be a doctrine of human depravity . . . so exaggerated and uncompromising as to exclude the very possibility of redemption.

That is a deep saying.

The Westminster divines came perilously near to this when they spoke of Adam's posterity as "utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good and wholly inclined to all evil. . . . We must hold such a doctrine of sin as makes it evident that we cannot save ourselves, we must not hold such a doctrine as implies that not even God can save us.

And if there is no spiritual instinct in man, God Himself cannot save man because there is nothing in man for the Holy Spirit to quicken. Then he refers to the Declaratory Act, passed by the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland in 1892, which states, *inter alia*:

"That in holding and teaching according to the Confession of Faith, the corruption of man's whole nature as fallen, this Church also maintains that there remain tokens of his greatness as created in the image of God; that he possesses a knowledge of God and of duty; that he is responsible for compliance with the moral law and with the gospel; and that although unable without the aid of the Holy Spirit to return to God, he is yet capable of affections and actions which in themselves are virtuous and praiseworthy."

Well, that is where I am.

But, you say, you accepted this doctrine of total depravity, universal and so on. Well, if I had this glass full of water and put a teaspoon of ink in, would it become ink? No, it would not. It would all be tainted, though. I hold—and I discussed this matter very frankly, we had a frank discussion on it and we eventually agreed—I simply hold that this doctrine does not mean and cannot mean that man is totally depraved. It means that man's whole nature is affected by the virus of sin, and I believe that with all the energy of my whole being because I find it is true to my own experience. I believe there is not any instinct in this human nature of ours which does not and cannot easily become a sin; our whole nature is affected by sin, and it is from that

fatal bias to evil, that fatal dominion of evil, that I believe the law of Jesus Christ sets us free. Now I am finished with that.

On those charges, remember, I was publicly proclaimed one of the most terrible heretics that had ever been in Canada, I think—and I still believe with all my soul in that little bit of gospel you have in the hymn:

Down in the human heart, crushed by the tempter,  
Feelings lie buried that grace can restore;  
Touched by a human hand, wakened by kindness,  
Chords that were broken may vibrate once more.

This sounds very plausible, but we reject the suggestion utterly. The God Who made man in the beginning can remake him, however he may be unmade by his own sin.

#### Professor Marshall and "The Gospel Witness".

Now, I want to come to one or two other matters. I am going to deal now with some statements in *The Gospel Witness*. You know what happens when you look into a convex or a concave mirror. No matter how handsome you are, you are made to look appallingly ugly. *The Gospel Witness* is my convex or concave mirror, because my most innocent statements are made to look perfectly appalling there.

I need not go into it all; you will remember that I went into it in that pamphlet, "The Open Membership Question." I will not touch on it at all, as I say, I explained it all in that pamphlet. All the statements are not by Dr. Shields, but still they are in *The Gospel Witness*.

Volume IV, page 671—this is from the *Toronto Star*. In that article Mr. Brown is quoted as saying to his class of young theologues:

Professor Marshall said not long since, "Do not preach sin; it will tend to drive some of your congregation away. Speak of it as evil."

I want to say that is an absolute and utter travesty of what I said. I said: When you are dealing with sin, do not simply deal with it in the term general concept of sin, for the people won't see what you are driving at. I said: Get down to particularities; deal with the concrete evils that actually appear in human hearts and lives. And, I said: Speak of sin as Jesus did:

For out of the heart of man proceedeth evil thoughts, fornications, murders—

You know the passage. That is enough of that.

In Volume IV of *The Gospel Witness*, page 679, we have this statement from Dr. Shields:

I name the gentleman, Professor L. H. Marshall—a man who has nothing in common with the things for which this Denomination stands.

Well that, remember, is simply an utter falsehood—I mean it. If I have nothing in common with you, in the first place you are not Baptists, and in the second place, you are all heretics and I am going to prefer that charge of heresy against you. (Laughter.)

In Volume IV, page 859, again is a statement of Mr. Brown:

Only the other day, Professor Marshall took his senior class in theology into his confidence in a certain matter, and said to them, "This is between you and me". He did not want the parents of the young men to know what he was saying; he did not want the Convention to know it; he did not want *The Gospel Witness* to know it. What his secret was we do not know; but we do know a Scripture that declares of false teachers that they "privily shall bring in damnable heresies"—heresies of destruction.

Now, remember that statement carries its refutation on its face for any intelligent person. If language means anything at all it means that I passed on to a class of theological students some secret heretical doctrine that I didn't want anybody else to know. If that is the case, I say: What was the secret heretical doctrine? Let us get it. Mr. Brown didn't know—he said he didn't know; Dr. Shields didn't know—if he did there would have been a special issue of *The Gospel Witness* no student knows, and I don't know, for the simple reason that there is nothing to know. I never passed on any secret doctrine. (Applause.)

Now, to besmirch a man's character and reputation in that fashion is so grave an offence against Christian law, Christian morality and common decency that a man guilty of it is morally disqualified from entering a Christian pulpit. (Applause.)

I will not worry you with much more. It is very tiresome. September 16, 1926:

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

This is a double-barreled thing. I will give you the first part first:

"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?"

Ladies and gentlemen, that is a complete fabrication; never on any occasion, either in England or in Canada, has any living soul heard me place Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* and Tennyson and the poets on the same level as Holy Scripture. (Applause.) Never. (Applause.) I simply nail that statement to the counter as an absolute and utter lie. (Applause and cries of "Hear, hear".)

#### The Professor True and Every Man a Liar.

The quotation Professor Marshall denies is not ours. It appeared in a letter from the Rev. John Dodds in *The Canadian Baptist*, and was furnished Mr. Dodds by a student at McMaster—and in this case, neither Mr. Brown nor Mr. Whitcombe must be held responsible. But Professor Marshall seems to have hit upon a plan of parodying the Scripture—Let Professor Marshall be true and every man a liar! We remind our readers that many of the things charged against Professor Marshall have been substantiated by at least two witnesses; and we know of no reason why Professor Marshall's denial should be regarded as more credible than statements which are thus attested.

Well, now, the second part. This is a mis-statement. It is largely right, but you know you can just give a thing a little twist that gives a wrong impression.

Further, in this connection, Professor 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.

—a thing I have never suggested.

"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."

Now, that is a somewhat garbled account of what I said, and yet there is a certain amount of truth in it. Let us be quite clear on that point. What I said was this, and what I teach is this, and if it is heresy, I will resign to:

night: The only vindication for vital religion is to be found in personal experience. Let me explain what I mean. The man who has a real, vital faith in God does not simply believe in God because the Bible tells him about God or the Church tells him about God. He can say: I felt God in my heart. That is what I mean. I hope that is not wrong. Meyer expressed my meaning perfectly when he said:

Whoso hath felt the spirit of the Highest cannot confound Him  
or deny.

That is just my meaning. The thing that makes for personal religion, the only vital religion, is an experience of that kind.

#### No Objective Standard.

There is nothing in Professor Marshall's statement here to suggest the necessity of any objective standard,—“I felt God in my heart”. That, of course, should be true of the genuine believer, but surely feeling is the fruit and not the root of faith. Beyond all question, it seems to us, we have here the modernistic doctrine of the supremacy of the subjective, and the authority of the Christian consciousness.

But my best witness is Dr. Shields himself. On April 8, 1926, there is this statement in which I heartily concur.

Somewhere I heard of that great preacher, Dr. Dale, coming into a new experience of the truth of the resurrection. Notice, “a new experience of the truth of the resurrection.”

He believed for years in the resurrection of Christ, but one Saturday night in his study as he was pondering this great truth, the Holy Spirit took that truth and laid it upon his heart afresh, and he got up from his chair and walked up and down, saying, “He is alive! Oh, He is alive! My Lord is alive! He is my Saviour, He is alive!”

I could not express my meaning better. The real thing is not simply a belief in the historical record of the resurrection of Jesus Christ; the most important thing is to have that vital experience that enables you to say: I feel and know that Jesus is alive. (Applause.)

Here is the same thing. The “vital experience” can never be independent of the historical fact. Without the fact the experience is impossible. Hence, apart from the objective historical record, subjective experience is impossible.

Now I come to a statement that has been made again and again—that I believe in the deity of Christ and the deity of all men. I must ask Dr. Shields to wait until I myself make such a statement before he puts it into my mouth. I have never made it; such a statement is entirely foreign to my own thinking.

We shall be obliged to Professor Marshall if he will show us the place where we have said any such thing.

I come to the most serious of all now, the only thing that really cut me. I gave a lecture some time ago—you have heard a lot about it—on miracles. I was going to give you some idea of what the lecture was, but I will just tell you what my argument was. I just pointed out how people, years ago, the intellectual people, years ago were cutting nearly all the miracles out of the gospels. They said miracles could not happen. I emphasized the fact that now that attitude seemed to be entirely wrong, that the most advanced critics had come to adopt the former conservative attitude. One of the greatest New Testament critics said a few years ago: It is just as certain that Jesus wrought miracles of healing as that He taught and died. This is simply my argument; I am putting the whole of the lecture in a sentence. If on the plane of ordinary normal experience spiritual healing is an acknowledged scientific fact—and I



quoted some of the evidence—how much more shall we believe that the transcendent personality of the Son of God was capable of setting at work for the healing of disease spiritual forces of which man has never even dreamed? That was my teaching. If that is heresy, well, I am a heretic.

Dr. Shields, because I referred to some evidence of spiritual healing as a scientific fact, has circulated the report that I teach in classroom that Jesus Christ is a trickster, an ignoramus and a deceiver. I say when he said that, that Dr. Shields was guilty, not only of the wickedest lying and slander, but he descended to the most vulgar abuse. (Cries of "Oh, oh".)

What Professor Marshall says here is largely contrary to fact. All that we have ever said on this point was to quote the following:

#### Professor Marshall on the Gadarene.

Miracle of evil spirits entering into swine, Matthew 8:28-34. This cannot be fully explained by any known law; but is there anything in modern science which can give us a clue? The following story is told, not as an explanation, but as a possible clue to the situation.

In an asylum in England there was a patient who was perfectly normal except for the delusion that his arm was glass. His doctor tried many means of persuading him to the contrary, but could not convince him. Eventually, once when the monomaniac was walking alone, the doctor crept up behind him, and, hitting the supposedly glass arm, he dropped a glass bottle at the same moment. From that time the man was normal in every way, for he believed his glass arm was broken, and so the delusion was lost. In this way Christ possibly scattered the delusion of the madman in the country of the Gergesenes by saying the demons had entered into the swine, for they saw them rush into the sea, and so the demoniac may have been cured by thus being made to believe that the evil spirits had left him.

Modernism, we are told, cares nothing about the will of the people. It is out to win, and if it cannot win by fair means, it will win by foul. You may say that I am a modernist, but that does not seem to fit me a bit—it fits someone else, though. (Applause.)

Modernism destroys conscience and leaves its devotees without a vestige of honor, and so on. You know, there is a whole lot of them; they don't apply to me a bit. He has defined modernism again and again, but he has never got me into the net. He says modernists do not believe that Christ with, and through, the Holy Ghost has power to make souls alive again.

I have given you just a few examples, and speaking quite calmly and deliberately, and without any malice, I take all those suggestions which have been taken from *The Gospel Witness*, and I thrust them back again down Dr. Shields' throat, and I say to him: Thou liest! (Applause and cries of "Oh, oh".)

#### Only a Case of Mistaken Identity.

When our readers have taken account of Professor Marshall's attempt to credential his view of the atonement by the great name of Spurgeon, and have read the testimony of students who have heard Professor Marshall teach, and have read the excerpts from his own writings, we are inclined to think they will substitute the name of Professor Marshall for that of Dr. Shields above, and accept this paragraph as the verdict in this controversy!

The vial of poison of which you have heard so much is not in my hands, it is in his, and I commend Dr. Shields carefully to consider this text—it deals, I know, with the most elementary morality: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." (Cries of "Oh, oh" and applause.) I stated at Hamilton as you know so well, for you have read it hundreds of times, a statement of

my own personal faith. I want you to remember this: I have been described as a smooth deceiver, dealing in weasel-word chicanery. Remember, that was an attack on my personal character. I might, if I liked, I suppose, have sued Dr. Shields for libel for making such a statement as that, but I should not think of doing such a thing. But one thing I must say before this whole Convention: That the slur that man has cast upon my honor as a man and an Englishman, I repudiate with unutterable scorn. (Applause.)

We invite Professor Marshall to issue a writ for libel at once. At the First Avenue Convention he answered one or two questions, and sat down saying he refused to be catechized. While we should deeply regret the necessity of discussing these matters in a court of law, we think it would help to clear up many things were we permitted to cross-examine Professor Marshall in the witness box.

The question at issue is this when I speak about my personal faith: Have I a right to be believed or not? Dr. Rushbrook, who recommended me here, believed in me and in my personal faith; so did Mr. Aubrey, so did Dr. Carlisle—and those three gentlemen know me, and they know my work. Dr. Shields does not know me, yet he claims the right to declare me a deceiver. The one whose honor and truthfulness is under suspicion is not myself, it is Dr. Shields. (Applause and cries of "Oh, oh".) It is surely not unreasonable to suppose that the man who has slandered Dr. Mullins has in all probability slandered me.

All that we ever said in respect to Dr. Mullins was to tell the truth of the ignoble part he played in a certain debate at Memphis. All that we have done to Professor Marshall has been to turn the light on his own sayings.

I could say a lot more, but I won't, for I don't like this job at all. I stand by every syllable of my confession of faith at Hamilton still.

I am just going to close with one more reference—I am leaving ever so many points I wanted to deal with. There is still the argument that where there is smoke there is fire. I think that is a perfectly legitimate argument: Where there is smoke there is fire. There is all this smoke of controversy; well then, there is fire. True! I believe there is fire; and I am going to be frank, I am going to uncover the fire and let you see what it is. If I go back to England for it, I will go. This is the fire: There are many people in the Baptist churches of Ontario and Quebec who are not Baptists at all, they are Plymouth Brethren. (Applause and cries of "Oh, oh".)

A DELEGATE: Give us the proof.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: Wait a minute. Thomas Phillips used to say that sometimes a Plymouth Brother joined his church at Bloomsbury, and after a very short time the Plym was entirely gone and there was nothing but the Brother left. (Laughter.) Our experience in Canada, it seems to me, is just the contrary. A Plymouth Brother joins the Church in Canada, and in a short time the Brother is all gone and there is nothing but the Plymouth left. (Cries of "Oh, oh".) A more unbrotherly lot of people than these I have never met in my life. In Mr. Brown's Annette Street Church, a church within a stone's throw of my house, he has been fulminating against me night after night, and yet he has never once come to me and used the language that he has used in public of me this afternoon, "Now, dear brother", and all the rest of it. (Laughter.)

I tell you this, friends: Even if I am not an orthodox Christian, I am not a knave and I am not a pest and I am not a deceiver. (Cries of "Hear, hear"). They might doubt my orthodoxy, but they have no right whatsoever to doubt my honour as a man. I object to that. Well now, remember this: I do not wish to speak disrespectfully of any Christian sect, but I must say this: If you want me to become a Plymouth Brother, you might just as well ask an elephant to get into a cockle shell. (Laughter.)

Now, the attitude of Dr. Shields and his followers. It seems to me it is the antithesis of the Christian spirit, it is the negation of Christian morality, and it strikes at the heart of that democratic principle for which all true Baptists stand. I have not been trying to set the people at defiance. The Convention agreed last year to my staying. If the Convention had not agreed to my staying, I should have gone; but I am not going. I have no desire to set this Convention at defiance; I will be governed by the Convention absolutely; but I will not be dismissed by a minority of the Convention (Applause) and I say this in the presence of the Convention: As long as the Senate stands by me I will stand by the Senate.

This fight, I understand, is to go on for another seventeen years in all probability. Well, remember, if God spares my life, I will be here too. (Applause). I say the bigoted intolerance that has been displayed is at complete variance with the Baptist tradition simply because it seeks to strangle that reasonable liberty which is the birthright of every true disciple of Christ. There is a divisive and disruptive force in our denominational life, and it seems to me it is essential that drastic action should be taken by this Convention so that this miserable campaign should cease. (Applause).

#### Convention in an Uproar.

(Cries of "Shields!", "Shields!", "Brown has the floor!", "Order!", "Order", "Shields!" "Question!", "Question!", "Shields!", "Brown has the floor!", etc).

#### Dr. Shields Speaks.

DR. T. T. SHIELDS: Mr. President,—(applause)—other brethren have spoken at their own will and at their own time. You yourself came to me a few moments ago before Professor Marshall spoke.

(Cries of "Order!", "Take the floor", "Platform", "Speak up").

DR. SHIELDS: I think the brethren can hear. The Chairman—(Cries of "Take the floor").

THE CHAIRMAN: Just come up here; come and make your statement where they can all hear it.

DR. SHIELDS: I will make my statement, but not my speech, for the moment. The President approached me before Professor Marshall spoke and said the way would be cleared for me to follow afterwards—(Cries of "Order") but—(Cries of "Order".)

THE CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen.

DR. SHIELDS: But Mr. Brown had sent up his card and had been recognized by the Chairman. (Cries of "Amen") When Mr. Brown has been discussed this evening it is his right. When Mr. Brown has finished his speech I shall exercise my discretion as to when I shall rise. (Applause and cries of "Oh, oh," and "Question, question").

DR. C. H. NEW: I rise to a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order! What is your point?

DR. NEW: Dr. Shields cannot defy this Convention. The mind of this Convention at the present time is that in view of the words that have just been spoken, Dr. Shields must explain or apologize, and he must do it right now. (Cries of "Hear, hear").

Few were more unruly than Professor New. This oracular pronouncement was most amusing.

DR. SHIELDS: I understood the Chair was at this end of the building. (Cries of "Hear, hear"). The Chairman informed me that there was a long list of gentlemen who desired to speak. I do not know that anyone else has been required to speak at a particular time. Make no mistake, I shall speak. (Cries of "Amen".) Mr. Brown—(Applause and cries of "Question".)

#### Another Attempt to Stop Discussion.

A DELEGATE: I move that the previous question be now put.

THE CHAIRMAN: You cannot put the previous question. Until you have got rid of the amendment to the amendment you cannot put the previous question.

(Cries of "Brown, Brown, Brown," and "Question, question, question").

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Brown—(Cries of "Question, question.")

**A DELEGATE:** I move that the question be put now.

**MR. WILSON:** Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? Were we not all informed in our churches and associations that full opportunity would be given us to discuss the question in this Convention? and wherefore should we limit the time now? (Cries of "Shields, Shields" and "Brown, Brown").

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Now, gentlemen, we are losing time and we had better just give Mr. Brown an opportunity. (Cries of "Hear, hear"). What Dr. Shields said to you a moment ago about the Chairman approaching him is just true. This is the fact, that one of the supporters of Dr. Shields came to me and spoke of Dr. Shields speaking, and I said there was a long list before him. Some of them were on his side; Mr. Brown is one of them. I said: If you will remove Mr. Brown and Mr. Fieldus and other names that are here then Dr. Shields may step in and speak.

**A DELEGATE:** I move, in order that—(Cries of "Sit down".)

**THE CHAIRMAN:** They have not withdrawn, and according to the rule Mr. Brown has the floor.

**THE DELEGATE:** Mr. Chairman—(Cries of "Sit down" and "Hear, hear".)

### W. G. Brown's Speech.

**MR. BROWN:** Mr. Chairman and Christian friends—

**A DELEGATE:** Make it snappy.

**MR. BROWN:** All right, give me the chance. Mr. Chairman and Christian friends, I shall not be long. (Cries of "Hear, hear"). I can assure you it gives me little pleasure if I were not conscious that I am trying to do the will of God to stand here. (Cries of "Oh, oh" and "Question").

**A DELEGATE:** I do not believe you.

**MR. BROWN:** It is the first time I have appeared on this platform. I would much rather tell of the marvels of God's Word as we have seen them through its proclamation in the work at Alton, and this summer at Orangeville, but I cannot tell that, I must come directly to the point.

### Does Revival Count?

When we made reference to the wondrous works of grace which we have been privileged to witness in Alton last summer and in Orangeville this summer, someone just beside us on the crowded platform said gruffly: "We have read all that". This remark gave us the impression that they have very little concern for the work of revival and soul-winning; and we will confess that this one remark hurt us more than all the rest of the taunt and ridicule which we experienced during the Educational Session. The greatest concern of every believing heart should be the salvation of lost souls, and the greatest joy to such a heart should be the news of the reviving grace of God in mighty conversions in this day of spiritual dearth.—  
W. G. Brown.

Professor Marshall has—and I am glad, I may say, of the opportunity of talking with Professor Marshall here—accused some of us of merely going behind his back. Now, ladies and gentlemen, I want to say that the first thing Mr. Whitcombe and myself, who have worked together, did—

**PROFESSOR MARSHALL:** Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. What I said was, and I was very careful in what I said, I said the statements that Mr. Brown had heard me make in class, he had never criticized in the classroom but had challenged outside. That is a very different thing.

### Another Attempt to Stop Discussion.

**A DELEGATE:** He is dealing with that.

**MR. BROWN:** I remember on one occasion asking a question in class when the subject of the atonement was under discussion, and when that particular subject was up, Professor—if I may address him—Mr. Whitcombe and

I would have raised a question had not Brother Bob Price raised it first. (Laughter). And that is absolutely true.

Now, I do not profess, though I may be said to profess, to be any authority on science, nor am I a great theologian; but I do believe this Book. (Cries of "Amen"). I agree with Professor Marshall when he says that we should not be afraid of science, that all truth is of God. I heartily agree with that. But, ladies and gentlemen, as Brother Whitcombe explained to-day, he put a very simple, plain, straightforward question to Professor Marshall. This question was put, as I remember it, in a discussion between the Professor, Mr. Whitcombe and myself, which he himself requested and at which Mr. Price was not present, and the Professor gave a straightforward answer.

### God's Word Our Authority.

Professor Marshall said above of us: "He has been setting himself up as an authority on religion and science". We were not aware of any such intent. What we did do, as far as our own thinking was concerned, was to make a mental comparison of the teaching of the Word of God and of some students of that Word, with the teaching of Professor Marshall, and in so doing we came to certain conclusions about his teaching, which we made bold to utter.—W. G. Brown.

A DELEGATE: Good.

MR. BROWN: Yes, I am glad he did. That is the kind of answer I trust we shall always have.

### Professor Marshall Would Put "Science" Above Scripture.

Mr. Whitcombe asked, if a contradiction should be real between the Bible and science as we know it, which would the Professor accept, and said he himself personally would accept the Bible no matter what it said, and the Professor plainly answered that that was not his attitude. (Applause).

A DELEGATE: That is right.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Price, in his discussion, which I did not have a chance to answer until this moment, said, as I recall it, that Professor Marshall told his students that they should put theology in every sermon. As I remember the conversation with the Professor, which took place on Bloor Street just outside the University, he said to us personally—and naturally the Professor is our example as a preacher—"I do not preach theology, but religion." How, then, could Mr. Price say that he told us to put theology in every sermon? I don't know of any such statement.

A DELEGATE: He didn't.

MR. PRICE: I object to that. (Cries of "Order" and "Sit down".) I have been misquoted there. I said from the illustrations that Professor Marshall gave us—the one of the skeleton and the body, and the one of the egg and the pudding—it would indicate that he thought theology would have to be in every sermon. The fact of the matter is that Dr. Marshall believes that the backbone of every sermon is theology. (Applause.)

MR. BROWN: However that may be, he said—and Mr. Whitcombe was there—that he does not preach theology, but religion. (Applause.)

One thing more, ladies and gentlemen, and I will sit down. (Applause.) This central question of the atonement, I believe that the whole gospel is wrapped up there. Now, I noticed that when Mr. Price desired a fair and full report of that lecture upon the atonement, he read from *The Prophet*. I noticed that, did you? (Applause.) Mr. Whitcombe and I can take notes, I believe, faster than any other students in class for the simple reason—(Cries of "Oh, oh" and laughter)—for the simple reason that we have acquired the ability of using a few shorthand symbols, and I took in forty-three lectures in one class, 243 pages of notes, and I defy Brother Price to produce a notebook like that.

### Prof. Marshall Calls Substitutionary Atonement "Crude".

Now, concerning Luther's view which Professor Marshall brought up. Let me give you his own words as recorded by Mr. Whitcombe, by myself, and the

combination of the two. (Laughter.) I may say these notes were taken in class and were typewritten just after the class, either the same day or the next day, by Mr. Whitcombe and by myself—this page—and both independently. Mr. Whitcombe's version of what Professor Marshall said in review of the various theories of the atonement to which he has made allusion to-night is this: Listen!

Luther—

I am reading the exact words—

—possibly the boldest, and, if I may say it without offence, the crudest—

Remember, he is talking about the atonement. (Cries of "No, no".) He is talking about theories of the atonement according to the—(Cries of "No, no.")

—sin could not be forgiven until it was punished and Christ bore the punishment.

That is what Professor Marshall said was Luther's view there. Now let me give you my version of it. (Laughter.)

Luther's view is possibly the boldest, and I think the crudest statement of the substitutionary atonement,

that is, the substitutionary theory;

that sin could not be forgiven until it had been punished and Christ endured the punishment of sin in man's stead.

I will read the whole thing once more. (Cries of "Oh, no".) Listen! (Cries of "Fair play".) Our minds are so confused at this hour that it is hard to remember a long statement.

Luther's theory—

Listen, you people who love the Bible; listen, you Christians who profess to be saved by the blood of Christ. Listen!

Luther's theory is possibly the boldest, and I think, if I may say it without offence, the crudest statement of the substitutionary atonement, or theory; that sin could not be forgiven until it had been punished and Christ endured the punishment of sin in man's stead.

Professor Marshall said that! Thank you.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman,—(Cries of "Shields, Shields".)

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us fight this thing out. (Cries of "Hear, hear.") Our brethren are here, they have a right to give expression. Mr. Wilson, you cannot come on for half a dozen yet. The next speaker on the programme is Mr. Smalley, of Ottawa.

Rev. W. C. Smalley Speaks.

Rev. W. C. Smalley, Fourth Avenue Church, Ottawa, was the next speaker. From an examination of Mr. Smalley's speech, we conclude no injustice will be done to either side by its omission. It answers nothing, and there is nothing in it to answer.

(Cries of "Shields, Shields, Shields".)

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen!

Another Suggestion to Stifle Discussion.

A DELEGATE: Could we not limit the length of the speeches?

(Cries of "No, no" and "Shields, Shields".)

Readers will observe that after the debate had continued until perhaps nearly ten o'clock at night, and the Editor of this paper is called upon to speak, the first suggestion for the limitation of the length of the speeches is made. What follows is printed in order to show the temper of the McMaster defenders. It is impossible for the printed page fairly to represent the spirit which manifested itself in these cries.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** We have been saying that when this occasion came we would give everybody a chance. (Cries of "Hear, hear".) I have in my hand the best part of a dozen men who want to speak; they have the right to speak. (Cries of "No, no".) If you say "No" that they cannot speak, I can do nothing else but cut off the debate.

(Cries of "Shields, Shields" and "Previous question".)

Men are calling "previous question". You cannot have the previous question; it is contrary to Canadian law. (Cries of "No, no" and "It is".)

**A DELEGATE:** I want to ask this, Mr. Chairman: Have we got to listen to a lot of addresses pro and con just to fill in the time until we are so sick and tired of this thing that people will straggle out? It is getting near ten o'clock.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** My brother, it is up to you.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** If Dr. Shields comes to the platform, then you other brethren who have sent in your names must waive your road for him. (Cries of "All right" and "Shields, Shields".)

**MR. LINTON:** If I understand by that that there is no other voice heard after Dr. Shields speaks, if I understand that is what you mean—

**THE CHAIRMAN:** That is not implied, sir, at all.

(Cries of "Linton", "Linton", "Linton".)

**MR. LINTON:** I demand the right to be heard.

**DR. SHIELDS:** I will follow you, Mr. Linton.

(Cries of "Linton, Linton, Linton".)

**A DELEGATE:** I move that Dr. Shields be now heard.

(Cries of "Linton, Linton".)

**ANOTHER DELEGATE:** I second that.

**MR. RATCLIFF:** Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? Would the Chair entertain a motion to put the question at the present moment?

(Cries of "No, no", and "Linton, Linton".)

#### The Chairman Calls for Fair Play.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** I do not think we would be dealing with our brethren fairly. (Cries of "Hear, hear".) There are men here who want to express themselves.

**A DELEGATE:** I made a motion, Mr. Chairman, and have a seconder.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** I know you did, sir. Do you understand what that motion means? (Cries of "No, no".) It means, there are still a dozen speakers here and it simply means you are putting Dr. Shields first and—

**MR. WILSON:** Call the order of the names.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Then it is moved and seconded that Dr. Shields be now heard. What is the will of the Convention? Stand up.

**A DELEGATE:** Contrary?

**THE CHAIRMAN:** There is no need to call for the "contraries", Dr. Shields has the floor, and there is no limit to his time. (Cries of "Hear, hear".)

#### Dr. Shields' Speech.

**DR. T. T. SHIELDS:** Mr. Chairman, brothers and sisters, I count myself most happy to speak for myself. I have tried, I think, personally, to listen with respect to every speaker during the progress of the day, and if there has been anything out of order on either side it has had no sympathy from me. I think it is desirable that we should learn, however we may differ from each other, to listen with respect when men state their views.

Now, I have a good deal of ground to cover and it is difficult I know to keep within reasonable limits, but I shall endeavour so to do, for you will bear in mind that there have been several speeches this afternoon, and most of them, or several of them at least, have been pointed in one direction.

### Explanation Concerning Dr. Bingham.

Now I should like to be permitted just to offer an explanation or so, and first of all respecting the telegram to which Dr. MacNeill referred. I accounted it a great honour to enjoy the personal friendship of the late Dr. W. B. Hinson, Pastor of the East Side Church in Portland. I came to love him very much. And when he was suddenly called home, the Pulpit Committee wrote to me and asked me if I could recommend anyone, and furthermore they sent me of their own volition—men whom I didn't know, but who knew me through my intimacy with Dr. Hinson—they sent me a list of names.

I did not know any of the gentlemen, and I told them so. I said: You will have to go elsewhere for information. Now, I do not know where Dr. MacNeill obtained his information. I have only to say that I never described Mr. Bingham—Dr. Bingham—as a modernist in the world. (Cries of "Hear, hear".) I have not; nor did I send any word at all.

I received a long telegram asking me if this gentleman might be depended upon to carry on Dr. Hinson's work. I knew Dr. Hinson; I knew the position he had taken; I knew his fear lest the thriving institution he had built up should be torn away after his passing; and what I said I say now frankly, that so far as this brother's personal views were concerned, I believed he was entirely orthodox and evangelical, but my acquaintance with Dr. Bingham led me to believe that he would not take the stand which their late lamented pastor had taken. And they told me that they wanted no man who would not carry on Dr. Hinson's work.

Now, I have no doubt—at least I presume that the recipient of that letter must have misunderstood my caution. But I think that telegram can be produced. And my fear expressed there is the fear I have expressed in so many places—I know so many men who are in their personal views thoroughly orthodox but who seem always to countenance those who depart from the faith,—(Cries of "Hear, hear")—and that was my word of caution.

I do not know what that telegram had to do with the present discussion, nor why it was introduced unless it were—it concerned a matter on the Pacific coast concerning which I had been asked by wire, and without any initiative on my part—and why that should be introduced to this Convention unless it were to create a prejudice, I do not know. (Applause.) I absolutely deny its accuracy, and I challenge Dr. MacNeill to prove it. (Applause.)

DR. MACNEILL: The quarrel is not with me at all, it is with the Pulpit Committee of that church.

DR. SHIELDS: Exactly.

DR. MACNEILL: With whom you can communicate. You go and settle the problem with them.

DR. SHIELDS: Did they instruct you to bring that telegram to this Convention? (Applause.)

### One Position in Private and Another in Public.

Another question—I merely mention it and pass—I regret the necessity of referring to a matter to which I did refer in *The Gospel Witness* as a private conversation; and, brethren, you may call me what you like, but it is one of the problems of the present day how to account for the fact that men take one position in private and another in public. (Cries of "Hear, hear".)

A DELEGATE: Who does?

DR. SHIELDS: I do not say—as I said in that paper—that one is justified always in discussing a private conversation; but when a man on a public issue takes one position in private and an entirely different one in public, and especially when that private conversation has largely influenced him in his own attitude, I think he is abundantly justified in making that known. (Cries of "Hear, hear" and "No, no".) On that we differ.

I am sorry that my friend Mr. Matthews does not remember, I think he will not go to the length of denying it, for I positively affirm that what I wrote in *The Gospel Witness* is absolutely true to fact. (Cries of "Hear, hear".) I



did not hear it said by the gentleman; it was reported to me; and it had to do with a man who was occupying a position in this Denomination.

### The Baptist Bible Union Did Not Endorse Text-books.

Now, one other question. I beg, Mr. Chairman, permission to ask, through you, if Mr. Warner would be good enough to give his authority for saying that the Baptist Bible Union passed on a certain list of textbooks.

MR. WARNER: I have not the volume, Mr. President, with me.

DR. SHIELDS: Every volume, every issue of *The Gospel Witness* is here.

MR. WARNER: You mean *The Gospel Witness*?

A DELEGATE: Why don't you call it the Scandal Witness? (Cries of "Order, order".)

DR. SHIELDS: While Mr. Warner is looking for that, may I say that what Mr. Smalley has now said is unfair, has been the practice. I am not responsible for what men associated with me may say or do unless I endorse their action or their statement, and I simply ask if Mr. Warner has any proof of the official endorsement by an organization with which I am connected of the list to which he referred.

MR. WARNER: In *The Gospel Witness* of June 5, 1924—(Cries of "Louder".) In *The Gospel Witness* of June 5, 1924, on page 9, the paragraph I read this afternoon appears endorsing the action of the Baptist Bible Union at the Convention in Milwaukee in 1924.

DR. SHIELDS: Would you read it, please?

MR. WARNER: (Reading):

The third decision of importance was the adoption at the Northern Baptist Convention in Milwaukee in 1924 of an alternative reading course for candidates for ordination. The reading course adopted a year or two ago by the Northern Baptist Convention was almost wholly modernist in complexion. It will now be possible for candidates to comply with the Convention requirements and at the same time take a conservative course.

I may say I did not make this excerpt myself, but the date is given, June 5, 1924, page 9 of *The Gospel Witness*.

DR. SHIELDS: Exactly. Now, may I explain that the Baptist Bible Union never pronounced upon any such thing. An individual member, who is a member of the World's Christian Fundamentalist Convention, so-called, and who is also a member, or was at that time, of the Fundamentalist Committee headed by Dr. J. C. Masee—that organization prepared a list of textbooks, and basing their recommendation on that list of textbooks some recommendation was made to the Northern Baptist Convention by an individual member. The Baptist Bible Union as an organization had absolutely nothing to do with it, nor was it, so far as I recall, officially considered in its meeting, so far as I remember.

MR. WARNER: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, if I may. It appears in the records of the Northern Baptist Convention as having been presented by the Baptist Bible Union, and was incorporated in the minutes of the Northern Baptist Convention of that year.

DR. SHIELDS: That is accepted as a recommendation in the minutes of the Northern Baptist Convention as coming from the Baptist Bible Union, but as a matter of fact the Baptist Bible Union, as such, never made any such recommendation. (Cries of "Oh, oh" and applause.)

REV. D. ALEXANDER: As State President of the Fundamentalist Association of Iowa, I agree with what Dr. Shields has said. It was one of the members of the World's Fundamentalist group that brought up that issue, not the Baptist Bible Union at all. (Applause.)

MR. WARNER: Here is *The Gospel Witness* printed in the record of the Northern Baptist Convention, with the page, in that way.

DR. SHIELDS: It has nothing to do with the Baptist Bible Union, and

you will not find it in *The Gospel Witness*. (Cries of "Amen.") Will Mr. Warner admit he made a mistake in that case? (Cries of "Come on".)

MR. WARNER: I am not a judge of records. If I have made a mistake in the judgment of records I should admit I made a mistake. I am accepting the recorded minutes of the Northern Baptist Convention, and the statement in *The Gospel Witness* endorsing such reading course.

DR. SHIELDS: The statement of *The Gospel Witness* approves the adoption of that course. (Cries of "Hear, hear" and applause.) Wait a moment now! —as recommended as a conservative course. So far as I am concerned I have absolutely no acquaintance with the list, nor have I ever seen it.

### A Deliberate Inaccuracy.

It will be observed by the foregoing that Mr. Warner, on the floor of the Convention, declared that the recommendation of the Alternate Reading Course appeared in the records of the Northern Baptist Convention as having been presented by the Baptist Bible Union. He also declared that *The Gospel Witness* reported this course as having been recommended by the Baptist Bible Union; and, refusing to admit that he made a mistake, he said, "I am accepting the recorded minutes of the Northern Baptist Convention, and the statement in *The Gospel Witness* endorsing such reading course."

*It is now our painful duty to charge Mr. Warner with a deliberate falsehood.* He is able to read plain English, and we defy him to show that such things as he declared on the floor of the Convention to be stated either in *The Gospel Witness* or in the minutes of the Northern Baptist Convention, can be found. Omitting only the long list of books, we print all that the minutes of the Northern Baptist Convention and *The Gospel Witness* have to say about this matter. The following is taken from the Annual of the Northern Baptist Convention, 1924, page 267:

#### Records of the Northern Convention.

##### Item 289:

The following report of the Committee on an Alternative Reading Course for Candidates for the Ministry was presented by Rev. A. M. Bailey, of Minnesota and, on his motion, after discussion by Rev. W. B. Riley, of Minnesota, was adopted:

#### Report on an Alternative Reading Course for Candidates for the Ministry.

In view of the fact that a previous convention decided upon what is known as a "Standardized" Ministry, and left to a committee the matter of proposing a "Reading Course", to be adopted by the several States in case it were their individual pleasure to do so, and in view of the additional fact that a number of States have already acted favorably upon that recommendation, suggesting a Course, a portion of which is non-acceptable to certain groups in our Convention, therefore, we recommend:

1. That this Convention affirm its belief that while it is clearly the province of the ascended Christ to determine his own ministry, and while we must for ever recognize His entire Headship of the church, including the calling to the sacred office of that ministry of the men who should fill it; and, while believing as we do that an educated ministry is increasingly necessary to the welfare of the church, therefore, we heartily advise every young man who believes himself to be the subject of such special and Divine call, to secure the best education possible.

2. And secondly, inasmuch as a good reading course is extremely helpful to this end, we advise that these same candidates for the ministry who are expected to do so, gladly undertake the same.

3. Thirdly, we agree upon the principle that an alternate course be printed, as alternate to and together with the original course in the minutes of

the Northern Baptist Convention, and that copies be provided each State Secretary; and, furthermore, that any one having read this Course may be regarded as having wholly met the reading course requirements involved in the thought of the Committee on Standardization.

4. Fourthly, that this action is to be interpreted as in line with the original action of the Northern Baptist Convention looking toward a Standardized Ministry and is in conformity with the evident policy of the denomination not to coerce individual opinion in matters of faith.

AMBROSE M. BAILEY, Chairman.  
GEORGE RICE HOVEY.  
W. B. RILEY.

### Here the Record Gives the List of Text-books.

The following are the only other references to the Reading Course in the Annual of the Northern Baptist Convention, 1924:

**Page 85, Item 101:**

"A motion relating to an alternative course of reading to that recommended by the Board of Education was presented by Rev. W. B. Riley, of Minnesota, and on motion of President C. A. Barbour was referred to the Committee on Resolutions, to be reported back to the Convention at a later session."

**Page 250, Item 259—"Report of the Committee on Resolutions":**

"Whereas, A plan and list for alternative course of reading for the preparation for the ministry has been offered to the Convention; therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Home Mission Society and the Publication Society be requested, for the enrichment of their courses, to give recognition to different schools of thought within the denomination, and to give liberty for an elective choice in their reading to those who follow the prescribed courses.

"We also call the attention of the Societies to the alternate list of books which has been presented to the Convention by Dr. W. B. Riley of Minneapolis."

**Page 253, Item 261:**

On motion of Max Schimpf, of New York, it was voted,

"To strike out from the resolution on reading courses for ministers all wording which would operate to refer the matter to the American Baptist Home Mission Society and the American Baptist Publication Society; and that the list of books be referred to a committee consisting of Sec. G. R. Hovey, Rev. W. B. Riley, and Rev. A. M. Bailey, with instructions to report to the Convention at 4.30 this afternoon."

Drs. Bailey and Hovey are not members of the Baptist Union. Dr. Ambrose M. Bailey, of Seattle, Wash. (not of Minnesota, as in item 289), was the President of the American Baptist Publication Society at that time; and Dr. George Rice Hovey was then Secretary of Education of the American Baptist Home Mission Society.

According to article 261, this Committee was appointed by the Convention.

The above are the only references to the Reading Course in the Annual, and the name of the Baptist Bible Union does not appear. The index for the Alternate Reading Courses reads as follows:

"Committee on, 253; report of, 267-269; printed in full, with original course, 267-272; resolution pertaining to, 85, 250, 253."

### Dr. W. B. Riley Gives the Facts.

Finding that Dr. W. B. Riley was a member of the Committee, we sent him a verbatim report of Mr. Warner's speech, and received the following in reply:

#### THE ALTERNATE READING COURSE OF THE NORTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION.

To the Editor of *The Gospel Witness*:

In the report that reaches the States of the recent Convention of Ontario and Quebec, I notice that certain things were said that call for correction, and necessitate this article.

For instance, one Rev. J. A. Warner, St. Clair Ave. Baptist Church, Toronto, is reported to have said that "the Baptist Bible Union presented the Alternate Reading Course proposing that if the young men looking to the ministry would compass that Reading Course, they would undertake to guarantee them ordination when they came before the Ordination Council." This statement has four or five mistakes, if not wilful mis-statements.

First of all, "the Baptist Bible Union in Convention" had nothing whatever to do or say concerning the Alternate Reading Course adopted by the Northern Baptist Convention in its Milwaukee session. I myself prepared and presented that Reading Course and moved its adoption before the Convention, whereupon the Convention appointed two others with me to go over the matter and report back. They did so, and our report was adopted by the Northern Baptist Convention without a dissenting voice, as I remember it. It is quite impossible, of course, for the Baptist Bible Union to guarantee ordination for anybody, inasmuch as the Baptist Bible Union is not called upon in connection with such ordinations.

The second thing which ought to be said is this: With many of the books of that recommendation I was familiar, having read them. I was not acquainted with Dr. Strachan in his works on theology. I was assured by one of the most conservative and scholarly men of the United States that he had read Strachan's book which he recommended, and that it was sound.

Professor Peabody on "Jesus Christ and the Social Question", I myself have read and found little occasion to criticize it. I have just now looked it over again and I do not in this hurried reading find one instance where Peabody raises any question as to the utter authority of Jesus on all subjects treated in this chapter, and it is very suggestive that his opening text is, "The life was the light of men". Also, in his opening chapter, he takes the views of the radical Socialists, and especially their position toward Christ, to serious task, and shows toward them utter antipathy.

Professor Vedder's book was written before Professor Vedder became a false teacher, and is free from that false teaching which characterizes his latest productions. In fact, my judgement is that the quotations presented in the argument in Canada were not from the books that we recommended, but from other writings from the pens of these teachers. I discussed with a few men the question of whether it was wise to present the book of any false teacher, and the judgment of some was that if the book itself were sound, we ought not to cut it out because the author had taught falsely elsewhere.

I shall now take pains to see whether the quotations from Professor Strachan are to be found in the volume we recommended. If so, it will be my privilege later to recommend to the Northern Baptist Convention its deletion. I shall also look up the matter at once of Professor Gregory. There are two of these gentlemen, one in America, and one a leading professor in Germany. I shall learn whether the statement is from the book recommended or in another volume, and whether the initials are correct. I was under the impression that it was American Conservative when I recommended him.

The list was a long one, and with the heavy duties upon me, it was not possible to read the last word of every author. Even at that, it contained a large number of known conservative men, and was a ninety per cent. improvement on the official list afore required of candidates for the ministry.

Let me further remark that overlooking a false remark in reading a book, can only be accepted as an approval of the book itself by those who are looking for places of possible criticism.

If these quotations are from the volume mentoned, we shall be grateful to Mr. Warner for having called our attention to them as they will enable us to correct our mistakes which we will gladly do.

My confidence in my book reader friend is such that I do not expect to find these quotations in the volumes mentioned in our catalogued list.

Personally, I am not in favor of putting into the hands of young and immature candidates for the ministry false teaching any more than I am in favor of permitting a professor to use his prestige of office and age to prejudice the thinking of student life, particularly when that prejudice opposes the eternal verities of God's Word.

Dr. Shields had nothing whatever to do with this list; so far as I remember, it was not even submitted to him.

I have been a member of the Northern Baptist Convention for nearly thirty years. I do my own thinking, and I am always responsible for my own action, and to charge this up to the Baptist Bible Union is a false charge, and could only have had one objective, namely, to furnish a new point of possible criticism of the great outstanding leader of fundamentalists in Canada.

W. B. RILEY.

The only reference to this matter in any copy of *The Gospel Witness* is as follows:

"The third decision of importance was the adoption of an alternate reading course for candidates for ordination. The reading course adopted a year or so ago was almost wholly modernist in complexion. It will now be possible for candidates to comply with the Convention requirements, and at the same time take a conservative course."

### Garbled Accounts to Deceive the Uninformed.

Thus it is absolutely demonstrated that there is no mention of the name of the Baptist Bible Union in connection with this course, either in *The Gospel Witness* or in the minutes of the Northern Baptist Convention. Yet Mr. Warner repeatedly declared that the name of the Baptist Bible Union was associated with it in both publications, and endeavoured to hold the President of the Baptist Bible Union responsible for the text-books. The best comment we can make upon Mr. Warner's action is to quote from his own speech: "*The proposition that I wish to make is this: That the reality and the soundness of any cause can be judged by the sincerity and the consistency of those who espouse and champion that cause. Or, putting the matter the other way: The hollowness of a cause, so far as the charges associated with that cause are concerned, can be shown by the insincerity and inconsistency of those who espouse and champion it.*" Let Mr. Warner explain his action if he can! It is by just such false statements as this, and such garbled quotations as the Chancellor was guilty of making from Dr. Orr at the Hamilton Convention, that the people have been deceived. But a day of reckoning is surely coming!

### The Famous Campbell Letter.

Now, Mr. President, I venture to refer to one or two minor matters in passing. It is suggested that Professor Campbell's letter was not written by himself. I do not know whether—

**PROFESSOR MARSHALL:** I never said that. I sa'd I didn't think that he had written it entirely on his own initiative.

**DR. SHIELDS:** Thank you, Professor Marshall. Professor Marshall says he thought it was not written entirely on his own initiative. I do not know whether it was or not. I know that I was in the South, and had absolutely nothing to do with it, and never a postcard passed between Professor Campbell and myself.

**MR. J. E. LONEY:** I know it was written by Professor Campbell himself without anyone. (Applause.)

**REV. C. J. LONEY:** And so do I, for I read it before it was presented. (Applause and laughter.)

**DR. SHIELDS:** Mr. Chairman, I suppose many of us have written letters which we have referred to friends after we had written them. I know nothing at all about it. Professor Campbell will have to answer for himself. I merely say that this great sinner had no more to do with it than the Man in the Moon.

**REV. J. G. CONNOR:** Mr. Chairman, I corroborate that. I had personal conversation with Professor Campbell, and he told me that he never consulted one living person.

**A DELEGATE:** That is right.

(Cries of "Hear, hear" and "Oh, oh".)

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Gentlemen, I think this whole matter had better be passed over. Mr. Marshall has withdrawn his statement. Let us get on with our business.

**DR. SHIELDS:** Now let us come to the great matter in hand after all. You have before you an amendment to the amendment. That amendment has in it much that we shall all desire to vote for; certainly the statement of doctrinal standards of the University which have been repeatedly presented to Conventions we could vote for again to-night. The position taken at certain Conventions the amendment proposes should be reaffirmed. Now, you will observe too that the amendment to the amendment joins three names together—the Chancellor, Dr. Farmer, and Professor Marshall—and if you vote for the amendment to the amendment you must vote for all three. (Applause, cries of "Hear, hear" and "We will".)

### We Did Not Say Prof. Marshall "Denies the Supernatural From End to End".

Now, Professor Marshall has given us a further exposition of his confession of faith made at the Hamilton Convention. One of the speakers, I think it was Dr. MacNeill, at the beginning said that Professor Marshall had been described as a man who rejected or denied the supernatural from end to end. I do not know who so described him. If you can anywhere find any place in anything that I have said or written to that effect, I should be very glad to have you point it out, because if I have done that, then I have done it in error, for I have said again and again in public places that Professor Marshall said at Hamilton, "I believe in the Virgin Birth"; and I do not see how any man can say that and at the same time deny the supernatural from end to end or through and through.

The Virgin Birth is to me a supernatural event, and Professor Marshall said that at Hamilton, and I have never called that in question except to say this: That in relation to other matters, nearly all of those who have taken extreme positions, on this continent at least, have not gone the whole modernistic road at once; they have gone step by step. I said to a certain gentleman, a man whom I greatly honoured and a man whom I believed—a man of distinction in this denomination; it was my privilege to be his Pastor for a number of years—and I said this to him: Mr. So-and-so, the great majority of people starting on your road will end in Unitarianism. (Cries of "Oh, oh".)

**A DELEGATE:** Name him.

DR. SHIELDS: I beg your pardon?

(Cries of "Go on" and "Take no notice".)

DR. SHIELDS: I thought somebody said "Name him".

THE DELEGATE: I said, "Name him," Mr. Chairman.

**"Generalities" or "Personalities."**

DR. SHIELDS: I have found it most interesting in these discussions that when we refrain from mentioning any names we are charged with being unfair and dealing in generalities; and when we name a man we are said to be most ungentlemanly because we have descended to personalities. How are you to avoid them?

### Prof. Marshall's Wrong Attitude to the Bible.

Now, I wish to say this, that Professor Marshall has taken a position this evening in respect to the Scriptures which I find it absolutely impossible to take. (Cries of "Hear, hear".) Now, you may call me a Plymouth Brother or a "Plym" without the Brother as you like, but I frankly say that I cannot fellowship the attitude Professor Marshall has taken only this evening towards the Old Testament Scriptures. (Applause.) He has certainly confirmed what the Dean in Theology says: That he has adopted "the moderate critical view, the Driver view, in respect to authorship and dates." (Cries of "No, no" and "He has".)

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: I never said that at all. I said that I adopted the Driver method, the Driver historical approach, but I am not at all in agreement with Driver on quite a number of questions relative to date and authorship.

DR. SHIELDS: Professor Marshall has told us that Driver is accepted everywhere in England. There are some here, however, who do not accept that position in respect—(Cries of "No, no".)

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. I never said Driver was accepted everywhere in England; I said that Driver's *Literature of the Old Testament* was commonly used in England as a text-book to introduce theological students to the problems of the Old Testament. (Applause and cries of "Take it back" and "Apologize".)

### The Great Moody Tests Our Professor.

DR. SHIELDS: I very gladly accept Professor Marshall's statement.

Now, Professor Marshall has spoken of the allegorical view of the Book of Jonah, and has expressed regret that he used that unfortunate phrase, that men regarding that book as historical would be looked upon in England as "uneducated fools." When Professor Curr was appointed to the Chair of Hebrew in McMaster University I happened to be in England, and I received a cablegram from a gentleman, not living in Toronto, telling me of his appointment. It happened that that morning a certain distinguished educator was in the service in Spurgeon's Tabernacle, and I showed him the telegram, and I said: Do you know anything about this gentleman? He said: Yes, I do; I had something to do with recommending him, I received an inquiry about him and, he said, I think he would pass Moody's test. And I asked for a refreshment of my memory in that matter, and he referred to the matter that has been quoted here to-night, that Moody had said that if the Bible said that Jonah swallowed the whale he would believe it. And this man told me that Professor Curr had made a similar remark. ("Hear, hear".) I asked him if he would put it in writing, and I have that letter somewhere among my own papers now, so that at least one gentleman from the Old Country accepted the historicity of the Book of Jonah—and I believe Professor Curr was not without scholarship. He was a man for whom I had the highest regard, and he came from the Old Country.

### Nothing More Injurious.

I do not think that such generalizations as that are particularly profitable, and I submit to you, brethren and sisters, that there is nothing more injurious than that sort of thing when offered to a company of young men—that if they are to be up to date they must adopt certain standards. What if a man is to be regarded as an uneducated fool? That is not the question. The question is:

What is the truth of the matter? (Cries of "Hear, hear"). I am quite willing to be so classed, as an uneducated fool; I frankly say that the word of our Lord Jesus on that matter is to me absolutely final. (Cries of "Amen".)

Now, I noticed that in Professor Marshall's statement in Hamilton he said that: "In all matters of morals and religion, the final word is with Jesus Christ, my God and Saviour." "In all matters of morals and religion." Now, anybody at all familiar with the attitude of the critical school, whether it be moderate or otherwise, knows that that view of the Scripture inevitably comes into conflict with the doctrine of an infallible Christ.

(Cries of "No, no", "Yes, yes", "Certainly", and "Absolutely").

Incidentally it will be observed that the suggestion that an infallible Bible and an infallible Christ stand or fall together, is greeted with cries of "No! No!" from some quarters. To what did these delegates object,—an infallible Bible or an infallible Christ? Certainly to one or the other or both. What becomes of the proud boasts of Dr. MacNeill and others that there is no Modernism in the Convention of Ontario and Quebec?

#### Christ and Jonah.

It is now said that it is vain to invoke the authority of Jesus Christ on critical matters. Driver himself says we have no means of knowing whether these questions of the authorship of the Pentateuch or of Jonah and other matters were ever submitted to Christ, nor have we any means of knowing what He would have said had they been submitted to Him. Now, I insist, dear friends, that the Lord Jesus Christ did regard the Book of Jonah as literal history. (Cries of "Amen" and applause); and I cannot for the life of me imagine what He meant when He said the men of Nineveh, the real men of a real Nineveh, shall rise up in a real judgment and condemn those real men of this generation for they, those real men of history, repented at the preaching of a real Jonas and behold a greater than Jonas is here. (Cries of "Hear, hear").

Now, you may call me what you like, but I say frankly to you that if this building were a thousand times as large, and it were crowded with the scholars of the world, and I had voice enough to make myself heard, at the risk of being called a Plymouth Brother, I would tell everybody that, for me, when Jesus Christ has pronounced upon a matter it is the last and ultimate word in the universe. (Applause).

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: May I say, Mr. Chairman, I am in entire agreement with Dr. Shields. The only difference between us is—(Cries of "Order" and "Sit down").

We leave it to our readers to study the words of our Lord in respect to the Book of Jonah, and to determine how it is possible for one to deny the historicity of that book and to accept the infallibility of Christ at one and the same time.

MR. DODDS: Professor Marshall, Dr. Shields didn't interrupt you when you were speaking.

DR. SHIELDS: I should be quite willing for Professor Marshall to speak, and I think it is his right. In the matter of a debate of this sort I think it would be fair to look upon Professor Marshall as not quite standing in the same position as other delegates. I think that he is entitled to special privileges. (Cries of "Hear, hear"). Now, so far as I am concerned —

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I have no desire for any special privileges.

DR. SHIELDS: Well, I intended it in good spirit, Professor.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: I accept your assurance.

DR. SHIELDS: Now, the Chairman has just whispered to me: "I wish



you would shake hands." I tell you frankly I should be the happiest man in Canada if I could discover that in all these matters I have been absolutely wrong. I would rather be wrong than right. I would love to discover that in these matters I am now discussing I have entirely misunderstood Professor Marshall. I should be glad to find myself in a position where he and I could stand somewhere on the same platform next Sunday and have a great evangelistic service together. (Applause).

### Professor's Denial of a Penal Atonement.

Now, dear friends, the purport, or at least the implication of much that has been said this evening is to the effect that I have deliberately misrepresented Professor Marshall. I may be very dense, but I have been unable to find in anything that Professor Marshall has written, save only in the pamphlet which was written in defence after a long silence—and a number of Scriptures relating to the blood of Christ were put together, and the Professor says he accepts them—in what sense he accepts them I don't know—(Cries of "Oh, oh")—except that this evening (Cries of "Shame.") What I mean is, on what—(Cries of "Oh, oh").

Did I interrupt, Brethren? Mr. Chairman, did I try to behave myself today? (Laughter).

We call attention again to the fact that whoever spoke in opposition in McMaster was heckled by the hoodlum element on the other side. At some points it was almost impossible to complete a sentence without interruption.

Professor Marshall has told us, at least—again I ask a question—I so understood him, that he rejects the idea that in the atonement of our Lord there was a penal element, the innocent suffering for the guilty. He quoted from a distinguished authority, if my recollection is correct, and said that it expressed his views. I do not wish to do Professor Marshall any injustice, but that has been my complaint, for that is the heart of the whole matter.

Now, Professor Marshall having told us that—and I wish the Professor would tell me whether I am correct or not—that he does reject the idea that the innocent was punished for the guilty, and that such view is not moral—I think he quoted Dr. Denney to that effect. Is that correct?

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: I do not care for the idea of the word "punished". "Suffered" for the guilty; "suffered" in our stead, but not "punished". That is the word. But I am not going to be drawn into a debate, into a discussion. (Cries of "Oh, oh".) I simply refuse to have questions put to me, to be catechised on the floor of this Convention. (Applause). I simply stated what Spurgeon's view was, and read—

DR. SHIELDS: Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to catechise. I simply want, now that Professor Marshall and I are face to face, to get a clear understanding—(Cries of "Oh, oh" and laughter)—of Professor Marshall's statement of the atonement.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL: I told you it. Spurgeon gives it perfectly. I have nothing more to add.

DR. SHIELDS: Now, Mr. Chairman and friends, I, too, read Spurgeon, and I am going to quote from Spurgeon. I think I am within my rights, am I? (Cries of "Amen" and "Yes").

Professor Marshall has said that he stands with Spurgeon in his view of the atonement. If, after I have read this, Professor Marshall will stand with Spurgeon, then I think all controversy would be about at an end:

### Spurgeon Agreed With Luther on Substitution.

If any man here should be in doubt on account of ignorance, let me, as plainly as I can, state the Gospel. I believe it to be wrapt up in one word—Substitution. I have always considered—

Now, you will remember the statement quoted about Luther's view being "crude". This is Spurgeon:

I have always considered, with Luther and Calvin, that the sum and substance of the gospel lies in that word, substitution, Christ standing in the stead of man. If I understand the gospel, it is this: I deserve to be lost and ruined; the only reason why I should not be damned is this, that Christ was punished in my stead, and there is no need to execute a sentence twice for sin. On the other hand, I know I cannot enter heaven, unless I have a perfect righteousness; I am absolutely certain I shall never have one of my own, for I find sin every day; but then Christ had a perfect righteousness, and He said, "There, take my garment, put it on; you shall stand before God as if you were Christ, and I will stand before God as if I had been the sinner; I will suffer in the sinner's stead, and you shall be rewarded for works which you did not do, but which Christ did for you". I think the whole substance of salvation lies in the thought that Christ stood in the place of man. The prisoner is in the dock; he is about to be taken away for death; he deserves to die; he has been a mighty criminal. But before he is taken away, the judge asks whether there is any possible plan whereby that prisoner's life can be spared. Up rises one who is pure and perfect himself, and has known no sin, and by the allowances of the judge, for that is necessary, he steps into the dock, and says, "Consider me to be the prisoner; pass the sentence on me, and let me die. Gentlemen of the court," he says, "consider the prisoner to be myself. I have fought for my country; I have dared, and deserved well of it; reward him as if he had done good, and punish me as if I had committed the sin." You say, "Such a thing could not occur in an earthly court of law." Ay, but it has happened in God's court of law. In the great court of King's Bench, where God is Judge of all, it has happened. The Saviour said, "The sinner deserves to die; let Me die in his stead, and let him be clothed in My righteousness." To illustrate this, I will give you two instances. One is that of an ancient king, who passed a law against a crime, and the punishment of the crime was, that any one who committed it should have both his eyes put out. His own son committed the crime. The king, as a strict judge, said, "I cannot alter the law; I have said that the loss of eyes shall be the penalty; take out one of mine and one of his." So, you see, he strictly carried out the law; but at the same time he was able to have mercy in part upon his son. But in the case of Christ we must go a little further. He did not say, "Exact half the penalty of me, and half of the sinner"; He said, "Put both My eyes out; nail Me to the tree; let Me die; let Me take all the guilt away, and then the sinner may go free." We have heard of another case, that of two brothers, one of whom had been a great criminal, and was about to die, when his brother, coming into court, decorated with medals, and having many wounds upon him, rose up to plead with the judge, that he would have mercy on the criminal for his sake. Then he began to strip himself and show his scars—how here and there on his big, broad breast he had received sabre cuts in defence of his country. "By these wounds," he said—and he lifted up one arm, the other having been cut away—"by these my wounds, and the sufferings I have endured for my country, I beseech thee, have mercy on him." For his brother's sake the criminal was allowed to escape the punishment that was hanging over his head. It was even so with Christ. "The sinner," He said, "deserves to die; then I will die in his stead. He deserves not to enter heaven, for he has not kept the law, but I have kept the law for him, he shall have My righteousness, and I will take his sin; and so the just shall die for the unjust, to bring him to God."

**Spurgeon Said Christ Was "Punished" For Us.**

Now, Spurgeon there uses the actual word "punishment". I remember reading a discussion years ago by Dr. Joseph Cook in one of his Boston lectures

on the atonement where he deals with that very word "punishment". I wish I had brought the book with me. Objection had been taken in Unitarian quarters in Boston to the use of that word "punishment", and the question had been asked: How is it possible that the innocent should be "punished" for the guilty? And if "punishment" they argue, then it must have some relation to the man who bears the punishment. Dr. Joseph Cook speaks of the careless use of words in that lecture, and he says it is part of the joy of life to him to contribute to more careful use of language in describing these great matters of the soul, and he says: Ask Mr. Spurgeon in what sense he used the term "punishment"; certainly he never meant that Jesus Christ was other than innocent, but that He did take upon Himself that which was the sinner's due, and suffered in his room and stead.

Here is another quotation from Spurgeon:

#### **Spurgeon Does Not Subscribe to Prof. Marshall's "Lax Theology".**

We are singular enough to believe in substitution. The blood upon the lintel said, "Someone has died here instead of us." We also hold and rest in this truth, that Christ died, "The just for the unjust, to bring us to God." We believe that He was made a curse for us, as it is written, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." The belief in the greatness of sin distinguishes Christians from Pharisees, and all other self-justiciaries; and the belief in substitution separates Christians from all those philosophic adulterators of the gospel who are willing to hold up Christ's example, but cannot endure His expiatory sacrifice, who will speak to you of Christ's spirit and the power of His teaching, but reject His vicarious death. We do not subscribe to the lax theology which teaches that the Lord Jesus did something or other which in some way or other is, in some degree or other, connected with the salvation of men: we hold as vital truths that He stood in His people's stead, and from them endured a death which honored the justice of God, and satisfied His righteous laws. We firmly believe that He bore the penalty due to sin, or that which from the excellence of His person was fully equivalent thereto.

I have pages and pages, which I won't read—(Cries of "Hear, hear")—all to the same purpose. I make no apology for saying that for years I have been a student of Spurgeon's sermons. I make no apology at all for accepting that view of the Gospel which that great preacher expounded. I know it is out of fashion to-day, but it is the substitutionary work of Christ that is written into our Trust Deed of McMaster University. (Applause,) and when that was written and referred to the vicarious sufferings of Christ, that word "vicarious" was used in the sense in which it was then ordinarily employed.

But there is just one other quotation I want to read for the reason that it belongs to almost the last period of Spurgeon's life. It is taken from his great Conference address when he was in the midst of the Down-grade Controversy; and this is what Spurgeon said on this very question, speaking of the Word:

#### **Spurgeon on the McMaster (Down-Grade) Controversy.**

To-day it is still the self-same mighty Word of God that it was in the hands of our Lord Jesus. How it strengthens us when we remember the many conquests of souls which we have achieved through the sword of the Spirit! Have any of you known or heard of such a thing as conversion wrought by any other doctrine than that which is in the Word? I should like to have a catalogue of conversions wrought by modern theology. I would subscribe for a copy of such a work. I will not say what I might do with it after I had read it; but I would, at least, increase its sale by one copy, just to see what progressive divinity pretends to have done. Conversions through the doctrine of universal restitution! Conversions through the doctrine of doubtful inspiration! Conversions to the love of God, and to faith in His Christ, by hearing that the

death of the Saviour was only the consummation of a grand example, but not a substitutionary sacrifice! Conversions by a gospel out of which all the gospel has been drained! They say, "Wonders will never cease"; but such wonders will never begin. Let them report changes of heart so wrought, and give us an opportunity of testing them; and then, perchance, we may consider whether it is worth our while to leave that Word which we have tried in hundreds, and, some of us here, in many thousands of cases, and have always found effectual for salvation. We know why they sneer at conversions. These are grapes which such foxes cannot reach, and therefore they are sour. As we believe in the new birth, and expect to see it in thousands of cases, we shall adhere to that Word of truth by which the Holy Spirit works regeneration. In a word, in our warfare we shall keep to the old weapon of the sword of the Spirit, until we can find a better. "There is none like that; give it me," is at present our verdict.

I cannot see in what respect it is possible for Professor Marshall, in view of what he has told us this evening—I cannot see how it is possible for Professor Marshall to say, "I stand with Spurgeon."

A DELEGATE: He can't.

We quote below a few more of the many references we had in hand at the Convention, showing the great Spurgeon's view of the Atonement:

**Spurgeon "Delighted to Preach the Doctrine of Substitution".**

It is our delight to preach the doctrine of substitution, because we are fully persuaded that no gospel is preached where substitution is omitted. Unless men are told positively and plainly that Christ did stand in their room and stead, to bear their guilt and carry their sorrows, they never can see how God is to be "just, and yet the justifier of the ungodly." We have heard some preach a gospel, something after this order—that though God is angry with men, yet out of His great mercy, for the sake of something that Christ has done, He does not punish them, but remits the penalty. Now, we hold, that this is not of God's gospel; for it is neither just to God, nor safe to man. We believe that God never remitted the penalty, that he did not forgive the sin without punishing it, but that there was blood for blood, and stroke for stroke, and death for death, and punishment for punishment, without the abatement of a solitary jot or tittle; that Jesus Christ, the Saviour, did drink the veritable cup of our redemption to its very dregs; that he did suffer beneath the awful crushing wheels of divine vengeance, the self-same pains and sufferings which we ought to have endured. Of the glorious doctrine of substitution! When it is preached fully and rightly, what a charm and what a power it hath. O! how sweet to tell sinners, that though God hath said, "Thou must die," their Maker stoops his head to die for them, and Christ incarnate breathes his last upon a tree, that God might execute His vengeance, and yet might pardon the ungodly.

\* \* \* \* \*

"Well," sayest thou, "I ought to have died." Christ hath died! "I ought to have been sent to hell." Christ did not go there to endure that torment forever; but he suffered an equivalent for it, something which satisfied God. The whole of hell was distilled into his cup of sorrows; he drank it. The cup which His Father gave Him, he drank to the dregs.

—Spurgeon's Sermons, Vol. No. 2; "The Curse Removed", pp. 289, 290.

But the man who receives the Bible as it is, he says, "Christ died for me, then my eternal life is sure. I know," says he, "that Christ can not be punished in a man's stead, and the man be punished afterwards. No," says he, "I believe in a just God, and if God be just, He will not punish Christ first, and then punish men afterwards. No; my Saviour died, and now I am free from every demand of God's vengeance, and I can walk through this world secure; no thunderbolt can smite me, and I can die absolutely certain that for me there is no flame of hell, and no pit digged; for Christ, my ransom, suffered in my

stead, and, therefore, am I clean delivered. Oh! glorious doctrine! I would wish to die preaching it! What better testimony can we bear to the love and faithfulness of God than the testimony of a substitution eminently satisfactory for all of them that believe on Christ?

—Spurgeon's Sermons, Vol. 4, "The Death of Christ", pp. 219, 220.

We stand to the literal substitution of Jesus Christ in the place of his people, and his real endurance of suffering and death in their stead, and from this distinct and definite ground we will not move an inch. Even the term "the blood", from which some shrink with the affectation of great delicacy, we shall not cease to use, whoever may take offence at it, for it brings out that fundamental truth which is the power of God unto salvation. We dwell beneath the blood mark, and rejoice that Jesus for us poured out his soul unto death when He bare the sin of many.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Israelite knew that when the angel went through Egypt he meant to exact a life at every house, and so he exhibited the blood, as much as to say, "The firstborn is dead here." The lamb has died instead of the firstborn, and virtually the firstborn is dead, and there is no cause for smiting, because the smiting has been done. So, when Jesus died His chosen died in Him, and their sins received the vengeance due in that day when on the accursed tree he yielded up his life a ransom for many. How can we die? We are dead in Him already, and have been buried with Him by virtue of our union with His blessed person. This is a most precious truth and those who hold it are thereby distinguished from the rest of mankind.

—Spurgeon's Sermons, Vol. 10, "The Sacred Love-Token", pp. 247, 298.

#### Using Orthodoxy to Credential Modernism.

DR. SHIELDS: Reference was made just now, or some time during this discussion, to some criticisms of an article, of an address by Dr. J. G. Brown. As a matter of fact, I didn't say a word about it. I read it, but I didn't criticize it. It was not that I did not see some things in it that I didn't like; but I said nothing about it. It was a great southern editor who wrote it, and I don't think our guests here this evening will be likely to speak lightly of a great denominational paper—it was not a personal organ, it was a denominational paper—and he resented the use of the name of Dr. John A. Broadus, when he was dragged into a discussion and made to credential the changed view of the Bible, which came to him in later life. He was classed with others, and the editor of that paper offered to a Professor of McMaster University the columns of his paper, and for the first time I knew it had come to his attention when I saw it in the paper. Then he said that there were hundreds of men in the Southern Convention who had sat at the feet of John A. Broadus who would testify that never once did they hear a word of sympathy for modernism fall from his lips.

I say, ladies and gentlemen, it is not fair to take great names like Broadus and Spurgeon and use them with unsuspecting people to credential this new thought. (Applause and cries of "Amen".)

I think there are plenty of apologies due, and certainly they are not all on my side—(Cries of "Amen")—when it comes to misrepresentation of fact. (Cries of "Hear, hear", "Question", and "Fair play".) Is it getting too warm for you? (Laughter and applause.) To those who are not acquainted with the present Baptist life of England, it may perhaps discredit a man to say that he has withdrawn from the Baptist Bible Union—(Laughter.)—not the Baptist Bible Union; I mean the Baptist Union of Great Britain.

A DELEGATE: Only for a time.

DR. SHIELDS: Who said only for a time? I beg your pardon.

ANOTHER DELEGATE: Speak up.

DR. SHIELDS: Whoever said so was not stating what is the fact. (Applause.) I beg your pardon. I have talked myself with those who were his associates, and with his son, who told me that he withdrew permanently, and that never while the resolution of censure remained upon the books of the

Baptist Union of Great Britain would the Tabernacle have any association with it. (Applause.) If anybody can prove to the contrary, I shall be very glad to accept it. (Cries of "Question, question".)

Though the McMaster interests had occupied by far the greater portion of the time taken in discussion, they would prevent, so far as possible, the presentation of the other side. These cries of "Question" were but a further evidence of the "spirit" of McMaster of which Dr. Farmer and others boast.

#### Professor Marshall's Low Estimate of Many Canadian Baptists.

I should have liked—I do not think it would be fair to hold a man responsible for a newspaper interview, but I have an interview here in a Coventry paper—I do not know who sent it to me; it came to me from England—in which Professor Marshall describes Canadian conditions particularly in relation to this controversy. This is in quotation marks:

Among the many other bones of contention raised was that Professor Marshall takes the parabolic view of the Book of Jonah and not the literal view, an action regarded almost as heresy by the literalists and verbalists.

"I have met people who declare that the world is flat because the Bible speaks of 'the four corners of the earth,' and who doubt the Copernican system of astronomy, still holding the view that the world is flat and that the sun goes round it," declared the speaker. "These fundamentalists hate science," the speaker declared, "while I feel that what is taught by biology, astronomy and geology, and all the other sciences must be part of divine revelation. If you believe in God you must believe that all the works of God are divine."

"They believe in the literal interpretation of Genesis 1, and the creation in six days, whereas the message of Genesis 1 is a religious message and not a scientific one. It shows that behind the whole structure of creation there lies the creative spirit of God. We have to interpret Genesis 1 in the light of the teaching of science."

I see no difference between that statement and the statement that has been made here to-night that Genesis is to be interpreted in the light of science.

#### The "Scientific" Attitude.

Now, Professor Marshall refers to some statement that was made at the Fundamentalist meeting in Toronto, with which I entirely agree. I am happy to be in perfect agreement with Professor Marshall on that particular point. I am weary of the men who on the question of evolution, for instance, on one hand say that the view of science is not to be relied upon as final in any realm, that human knowledge is progressive and we know but a little now, and therefore we are to accept Genesis in spite of seeming contradictions between science and revelation, and who then jump from Genesis to Jonah and attempt a scientific explanation of the Book of Jonah. I say that if the witness is not reliable in the one case he is a poor witness to drag into court in the other.

So far as I am concerned, I do not care if it can be proved that there cannot be found in any museum of the world a skeleton of any kind of monster that could have swallowed a man,—prove to me, if you like, scientifically in every way that there is absolutely nothing outside the Word of God to establish the truth of the literal historicity of the Book of Jonah,—my insistence is that it is a supernatural story all the way through. (Cries of "Hear, hear"). I hold it whether science consents or not or corroborates it, and if there never was such a fish, my Book says the Lord prepared him; and after he had done His work He could annihilate him next day. (Applause.) That does not affect the argument at all.

Now, my friends, the two things that concern me are these: First of all, Professor Marshall's attitude towards the Scriptures. I knew nothing about it; I did not ask for the letters that were sent me. Mr. Robertson did not send

the letters to me direct; they came to someone else. I put those letters together with a statement and submitted them to the Senate, and if you read the document which I presented, you will find I said it would be folly, it would be wrong to judge any man on such evidence, but I merely asked that enquiry should be made, because before that, after the London Convention, I had said: Now there is no issue before us. These chairs are vacant. If they are filled with men who are out of harmony with the standards of this denomination, immediately the controversy gathers around the person. But while the chairs were vacant, while there was nothing but a principle in the abstract at stake, I expressed the hope that the Board of Governors would do its utmost to guard us against a recurrence of the discussions which had taken place before.

Now, I think I was within my rights,—(Cries of "Amen")—absolutely within my rights. (Applause). I presented that; I passed no judgment on it at all. I did not know the gentlemen by whom the letters were written.

#### Would Not Justify the "Other Robertson Letter".

The letter that Professor Marshall has printed I frankly say I do not understand and would never attempt to justify. I told Mr. Robertson himself—he offered an explanation for that letter and he explained that it had to do with a particular article on the ministry, and that so far as that particular article was concerned he was satisfied—I said, "Mr. Robertson, that won't do. I don't think that is cricket." I told Mr. Robertson that if a man is arrested on any charge, or charged with anything, it is a British principle that the man charged is warned at once not to say anything, for if he says anything, it might be used against him; and I believe if the officer of the law fails to do that, nothing that he says can be used against him. I am not sure on that legal point, but I felt that that letter was not fair. I regretted to see it, although Mr. Robertson himself seemed to feel that he was justified on the grounds that there was a man in his church who had said to him, "Now, you criticized Professor Marshall. What is the matter with that?" He said, "Nothing at all." Then the man said, "Write and tell him so." I said, "Mr. Robertson, that might be all right if you had not asked Professor Marshall for other things he had written, but it looks to me to be unfair, and I won't excuse it anywhere." I say so on this public platform.

But Mr. Robertson is not the issue. This man sent those letters, and we simply asked that question, and then it was the Dean in Theology who said that Professor Marshall had adopted the general view of Driver. I said in the Senate—you will find it in the copy of *The Canadian Baptist*, the minutes of the Senate—I said: What the Dean in Theology had said had given me far more concern than the letters. I knew nothing about the man writing the letters; I knew nothing about the evidence there produced, but when the Dean in Theology said that he had personally interviewed Professor Marshall, and that Professor Marshall held that view, I asked him if he thought that the Baptists of this Convention would be prepared to endorse that. I think I was within my rights in doing that. ("Cries of "Hear, hear.") It was only when I found that it was not possible to discuss the matter in the Senate with any hope of enquiry, that I published the letters. I take full responsibility for having done so. I believe that it has been proved up to the hilt that our fears were well grounded. (Cries of "Amen" and applause).

#### The Professor's Elaborations Entirely Different From His Sermons.

At certain points Professor Marshall has elaborated some things that he said in his sermons, but I submit that the sermons themselves are one thing, the more elaborate explanation is an entirely different thing. I think I can read English, and I saw nothing of the sort in that which he had before preached or written.

Now, Mr. Chairman and brethren and sisters, you may do what you like. (Cries of "Hear, hear" and "We will"). Quite so, quite so. I have been in this denomination for some years too, and never, never until I challenged the article in *The Canadian Baptist* at the Convention of 1919,—never was one word whispered against me, and in 1919 I had been a Pastor in this denomination for twenty-five years. Before I went to Jarvis Street Church, which had

in it many of our denominational leaders, they investigated every page of my record, they wrote to every church where I had preached, they enquired of every pastor where I had held an evangelistic service, and with all my record from the beginning to the end before them they called me to that church. I continued there, and until 1919 there never was a ripple at any time.

I was Vice-Chairman of the Home Missions Board for nearly forty years, I gave the best of my life to Home Mission service, and then when my brethren here were otherwise occupied I had my share of the denominational burden.

#### **What the Pastor of Jarvis Street Did for McMaster.**

The late lamented Chairman of the Board of Governors when we discussed McMaster University together—I was the first in this denomination to introduce the budget, and I was the first Pastor to put McMaster University on the budget, and Jarvis Street Church—look at your records—gave as much to Christian education after that time as the entire denomination had given before;—(Cries of "Hear, hear")—and when for some reason, I do not know what, I was under criticism in the Board of Governors, I was told that the Chairman said, "Keep your hands off Mr. Shields. He has done more as Pastor of Jarvis Street Church for McMaster University than any pastor we ever had." (Applause).

#### **The 1919 Declaration.**

Now, it is only since 1919, since I carried this matter—Professor Marshall may say that the pulpit is no place for controversy, but I believe it is the place where we must bear faithful witness to the truth as we see it. (Applause). And when I came back from England that year, in 1919—other brethren have gone back twenty-eight years, and I think I may be justified in going back as far as that—when I came back from England in 1919, I came back with a great song of praise in my heart. I said: This thing that has worried us is out of the way. I was delighted to find on my arrival in Toronto on the Monday that the new professor, Professor Curr, had occupied Jarvis Street pulpit the preceding Sunday and that the church was full of his praises as a man of God,—I was delighted with it. It was Wednesday of that very week that I had this editorial recommending to us—now, mark you—recommending to us the adoption of the English attitude towards the Bible.

It said that scholarly and devout men had gradually brought their people to an acceptance of the modern view of the Scriptures and that these acrimonious discussions respecting the inspiration and authority of Scripture in England were at an end, but that unfortunately in this country, and especially in the United States, there were some partially educated and some very dogmatic preachers who still held to the traditional way.

I carried that into my pulpit and I said: Brethren, I cannot stand for that thing. (Cries of "Hear, hear"). No matter what it costs, I cannot stand for that thing. And I told them that at the forthcoming Convention—I preached on BHJah that morning—I would introduce a resolution and would find out where that Convention stood. I introduced that resolution, and the Convention supported it.

#### **Why Was the 1919 Pronouncement Omitted in 1926?**

How does it come to pass that with that overwhelming vote, the largest meeting that this Convention had ever held up to that hour, and one of the clearest pronouncements that was ever made by this body,—how does it come to pass that that is omitted from the statements in the report to-day as one of the times when the Convention committed itself to the doctrinal standards? What was wrong with that position in 1919? (Applause).

#### **Trying to "Get Shields Out of Jarvis Street".**

After that, brethren, the war began; and I am going to deliver my soul for once, with the Chairman's permission. After that I was not twenty-four hours older until I heard, it came directly to me: "We have got to get Shields out of Jarvis Street." And they have been busy at it ever since. (Cries of "That is right", "Atta-boy", "Question" and applause.) That, brethren, is the root of this whole discussion. (Cries of "No, no" and "Yes, yes") Yes, it is. (Cries of "No, no" and "Yes, yes"). It is the root of this whole discussion. (Cries of "No", "Yes", and "Question").



### I Utterly Reject Prof. Marshall's Position as Outlined.

I stand for the inspired and infallible Word of God,—(Cries of "So do we")—and I reject utterly Mr. Marshall's position as outlined here to-day. (Applause). And, furthermore, when the trust deed speaks of the divine inspiration and authority of Scripture, it does not represent or express the view expressed here by Professor Marshall this evening. (Cries of "No" and "That is right"), I stand for the absolute infallibility of Jesus Christ not only in matters of morals and religion. Talk about liberty of conscience and Baptist liberty and academic freedom! I repeat what I have said elsewhere: a true Baptist is a bond slave of Jesus Christ. (Applause).

### Dr. Gambrell's Commendation.

I have been charged with having criticized Dr. Gambrell. When I delivered an address in connection with the Forward Movement—it was printed with the stamp of approval of the Forward Movement; how he got it I do not know—but I have somewhere, I tried to find it the other day, an autograph letter from that great southern Baptist in which he says, "My soul rejoices in your pronouncement and I agree with every word of it. God bless you." I have it in his own handwriting somewhere.

### No Message Without the Gospel of the Blood.

Now, I stand where our fathers stood. You can call me Spurgeonic if you like. (Cries of "No, no"). Well I am; I am in my views of Scripture, I am in my views of the atonement—the just for the unjust to bring us to God. I believe that He suffered the penalty in our room and stead, and I join with my Brother Brown in saying: If you take that away from me I have no Gospel left. And I, too, can say by God's blessing, that that Gospel of the blood of Christ, dying in my room and stead does break human hearts, it does transform human lives, it does change homes, as it always did. (Applause).

### Would Protest Even if Alone.

I love my brethren. (Laughter). Well, such derisive laughter is not particularly creditable, even if I am altogether in the wrong. (Cries of "Hear, hear"). I leave this Convention to judge. You have heard the discussions this evening and I say: I am not alone by any means, I am not alone, but if I were, if there were not another man in this denomination, I would with all my soul protest against the continuance in McMaster University of that which we have heard to-night. (Applause).

(Cries of "Question, question" and "Linton, Linton".)

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen!

(Cries of "Linton, Linton").

THE CHAIRMAN: Give me a minute, men. It is after half-past eleven. There are men here who want to speak. I propose that we give Dr. Farmer a few minutes and close the discussion. (Cries of "Hear, hear", "Not at all", "Question", "Nothing doing").

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Linton has the floor.

REV. H. McDIARMID: Mr. Chairman, I rise to move that we give Dr. Farmer a few moments.

REV. JAMES T. PRIEST: I second it.

(Cries of "Linton, Linton").

THE CHAIRMAN: Remember, men, that Mr. Linton asked a few minutes ago if that meant the cutting off of other discussion, and I said not. I did not say when. But here we are, it is the will of the Convention.

(Cries of "Linton, Linton").

THE CHAIRMAN: If it is the will of the Convention to hear Dr. Farmer for a few minutes—(Cries of "Linton, Linton")—half a dozen others we are cutting off just for Mr. Linton, and he is no different from any other man.

(Cries of "Linton, Linton").

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion before the house, moved by the Rev. H. McDiarmid and seconded by the Rev. James T. Priest, that we hear Dr. Farmer for ten minutes, and close the discussion. (Cries of "No, no", "Linton"). All in favor of that please stand up. (Cries of "No, no, no", "Linton").

**A DELEGATE:** Mr. Chairman, I move an amendment.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The will of the Convention is that we hear Dr. Farmer and close the discussion. (Cries of "No, no" and "Dr. Farmer").

**MR. WILSON:** Mr. Chairman, may I say that you will never settle the discussion that way, by closing off men like John Linton.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** I am settling that by the overwhelming vote of this Convention. (Cries of "No, no").

**A DELEGATE:** I move for fair play.

### **A Vote to Cut Off Discussion.**

It will be observed that, according to the Chairman, the Convention overwhelmingly voted to hear Dr. Farmer and cut off discussion, thus preventing Mr. Linton and many others from expressing themselves on this important matter. Mr. Linton, at an earlier period, had fairly stated his desire to speak; and the Chairman's attitude at that hour justified his believing that opportunity would be afforded him. Yet the rabble crowd, for such they were, would have prevented his voice from being heard in the Convention. By formal motion, according to the Chairman's ruling, he was silenced. Only the better judgement of Dr. Farmer, in that particular, opened the way for Mr. Linton to speak. Mr. Linton had taken a prominent part in the controversy since the Hamilton Convention; his position was well known to the whole Denomination; and he was certainly not without a very considerable influence. Yet the McMaster "spirit" would have forbidden his speech. Had the decision of the majority prevailed, it would have been a disgrace to the Convention. Mr. Linton listened patiently throughout the day to the arguments on the other side; he indulged in no heckling, but gave every man a respectful hearing; yet the supporters of the institution which boasts that it welcomes truth from every quarter, tried to silence his testimony. It is only another illustration of "the reasonable liberty" for which McMaster stands! From what follows, we learn that Dr. Farmer was willing to give Mr. Linton a few minutes! Mr. Linton should have been permitted to speak as long as he desired to speak, even though the discussion had been pushed forward to the next day.

(Dr. Farmer takes the platform).

(Cries of "Linton, Linton, Linton").

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Dr. Farmer is perfectly willing that we give Mr. Linton a few minutes before he speaks.

(Mr. Linton takes the platform).

**A DELEGATE:** Take all the time you like, John.

### **Rev. John Linton's Speech.**

**REV. JOHN LINTON** (High Park Baptist Church, Toronto): Mr. Chairman and dear friends, I believe that I could say a word that would be helpful to our denominational work. My interest at the present time is absolutely impersonal; it is not for Dr. Shields' advantage. I desire to speak for a few minutes because I believe that the Convention made a great mistake a moment ago when they cut off the discussion. I will tell you why, because it is a very simple thing to hear Dr. Farmer and to close the discussion and to take your vote. The men on the other side from myself will certainly have an overwhelming majority. I know that.

What about it? It will settle some things that ought to be settled, it will

be a vindication of some things for which Professor Marshall was unfairly charged; and so far so good. But, dear brethren, as Mr. Smalley said, Where do we go from here? and you must think of the next year. If you are going to have the co-operation of at least one hundred Baptist churches—now, I give that as my own judgment, and I think I know these churches—if you want to have the co-operation during the coming year and in other years of one hundred Baptist churches who, altogether independent of Dr. Shields, are taking a stand on this issue, then you must, brethren, hear us out. (Cries of "Amen"). You must allow us to deliver our souls. You must give us an opportunity to explain the difficulties that we have in accepting the position that Professor Marshall has outlined to-night.

Just think! If you overwhelmingly defeat the amendment as it is, and as you will do, and send us back to our churches, do you need anyone to tell you what that means? How would you like to go back to your church without having had an opportunity to present your side fully? I am not unfair when I say that two-thirds of the speakers and much more than two-thirds of the time to-day has been consumed by those on the other side.

A DELEGATE: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not quite true.

MR. LINTON: I stand corrected.

THE CHAIRMAN: Discuss the report.

MR. LINTON: The report was part of the discussion.

MR. McCREDIE: Mr. Moderator, might I for the information of the delegates just give you the time of the respective parties so far? (Cries of "No").

**Time Consumed by Speakers.**

We print below Mr. McCredie's careful record of the time consumed by the various speakers:

Dr. Whidden, presenting report .....	11.25	12.10	45 minutes
Adjournment for lunch.			
Dr. Whidden, continuing) .....	2.00	2.15	15 "
Dr. MacNeill, moving adoption .....	2.15	3.02	47 "
Mr. Albert Matthews .....	3.02	3.45	43 "
Rev. W. J. Brown .....	3.45	4.12	26 "
Rev. G. W. Allen .....	4.12	4.28	16 "
Rev. J. M. Warner .....	4.29	4.48	19 "
Rev. R. R. McKay .....	4.48	4.55	7 "
Rev. W. S. Whitcombe .....	4.55	5.06	11 "
Rev. W. E. Edgar .....	5.06	5.24	18 "
Rev. James McGinlay .....	5.25	5.28	3 "
Discussions re point of order .....	5.28	5.34	6 "
Rev. James McGinlay, (continuing) .....	5.34	5.49	15 "
Rev. Robert Price .....	5.49	5.54	5 "
Rev. W. S. Whitcombe .....	5.54	5.55	1 "
Rev. Robert Price, (continuing) .....	5.55	6.13	18 "
Rev. John Galt .....	6.13	6.29	16 "
Adjournment for tea.			
Prof. L. H. Marshall .....	8.22	9.42	1 hr. 20 min.
Rev. W. Gordon Brown .....	9.50	9.58	8 minutes
Rev. W. C. Smalley .....	9.59	10.11	12 minutes
Dr. T. T. Shields .....	10.15	11.38	1 hr. 23 min.
Rev. John Linton .....	11.42	11.52	10 minutes
Dr. J. H. Farmer .....	11.52	12.00	13 "

MR. LINTON: Mr. Chairman, the difficulty is this, that I want to say a few words, I want to speak for about ten minutes concerning the thing that is before us, Professor Marshall's position.

A DELEGATE: Go ahead.

MR. LINTON: I am not at liberty to go ahead just now.

A DELEGATE: Speak as long as you like, John, the rest had the same chance.

### Three Reasons For Not Supporting Professor Marshall.

**MR. LINTON:** I want to submit three reasons why I cannot support the amendment to the amendment. I want to submit three reasons to Professor Marshall why I cannot defend his retention.

The first is, because this statement that he has made proves on the very face of it his sympathy with that which we label Modernism on this side, and which has been destructive of the prosperity of every church that has received it. (Cries of "No, no" and "Hear, hear"). Now, I listened without a word all day, too. "Some of our people are the narrowest of the narrow and others are the broadest of the broad, but all are one in personal loyalty and devotion to Christ."

Dear friends, our Baptist people do not believe that the "broadest of the broad," the out-and-out modernist, is as personally loyal to Jesus Christ as a Bible-believing Baptist. This Convention did not believe that when they by an overwhelming majority refused to satisfy the honouring of Dr. Faunce, because Dr. Faunce was one of "the broadest of the broad".

Therefore with this attitude towards modernism, that which is the greatest menace confronting the Church to-day, Brother Marshall is out of harmony altogether with our Canadian Baptist people. (Cries of "No, no" and "Yes, yes"). I believe that Professor Marshall ought to speak again to-night, or to-morrow morning, in answer to these questions. I do not see why, Mr. Chairman, we should close this to-night. But do as you like.

Secondly, Professor Marshall accepts as an allegory, as a parable, the miracle of Jonah. I should like respectfully to ask Professor Marshall to tell this Convention what he does with the Saviour's alleged verification of the miracle of the Prophet Jonah. Does Professor Marshall believe that the men of Nineveh will rise in the Judgment Day, as Jesus Christ said they would, or is that not true? If Jonah was not in the belly of the fish three days and three nights as Jesus declares he was, what is the meaning of the words of Jesus Christ? An honest presentation of the words, an exposition of the words of our Saviour concerning the rising up on the Judgment Day of those repentant Ninevites is due to every delegate here. If Professor Marshall can give me a reasonably fair answer to that question, certainly I would be glad to support his retention.

Thirdly, Professor Marshall said here to-night concerning the historical method of approach to the Scriptures, that the Driver view gives the student the right method. I have shown in my pamphlet, which has never been answered here to-day, and in that pamphlet there has never been one statement made that was ever false or anything like false,—and let it be known to this Convention that there are at least some who are taking the stand against the University's course whose conduct has been, as far as it was possible, above approach. Dr. Driver gives, then, the right method to the McMaster students, your future ministers, your own sons,—Dr. Driver gives the right method of approach to the Scriptures.

### Dr. Driver Denies What Christ Attests. .

Some reference to his book will show that a legitimate use of that very principle which Professor Marshall defends and himself accepts and commends to the students,—a legitimate use of that very principle means that before you go many pages you are face to face against the stated word of Jesus Christ. You apply that to the 110th Psalm. Dr. Driver takes that principle and applies it to the 110th Psalm. Jesus Christ said that the 110th Psalm spoke of Himself, "David testified of Me." Dr. Driver, by using his method—a legitimate use of his method, which leaves the supernatural out of it, mark you, discards the 110th Psalm. So that Professor Marshall is commending to our young students a method which he himself says—

**PROFESSOR MARSHALL:** May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Linton is confusing Driver's method with Driver's conclusions. He is giving us Driver's conclusions all the time.

MR. LINTON: Not at all. I say that a legitimate application of the historical method means that the statements of the Scripture are not accepted at their face value. (Cries of "No, no" and "That is right".) I can only say the man who says no to that has not read Driver.

A DELEGATE: Yes, I have.

ANOTHER DELEGATE: Mr. Chairman, may I rise to a point of order? (Cries of "Sit down".)

MR. LINTON: I have just—

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us give him one more minute. Keep quiet one minute.

#### More of Mr. McDiarmid's Muzzling.

MR. McDIARMID: Pardon me, I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. By an overwhelming majority the order was that Dr. Farmer was to come. Now, listen. We respect him, we admire his generosity, but Dr. Farmer had no right to give away the will of this Convention to Mr. Linton. Mr. Linton has simply been giving us a rehash of what we have heard again and again.

The Rev. Hugh McDiarmid appears here in a characteristic pose. It is a poor business making muzzles; it requires little skill—and less conscience. Mr. McDiarmid was the instigator of the iniquitous Home Mission resolution which put a muzzle upon our Home Mission pastors, and made it possible to use their uninformed churches to supply the Convention with proxy votes. Now Mr. McDiarmid, like Herod, because he saw it pleased the Jews, proceeded to take Peter also, and moves to prevent Mr. Linton from completing his speech.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was by common consent, Mr. McDiarmid, and you have taken more time than it would have taken Mr. Linton to finish.

#### Dean Farmer's Speech.

DR. J. H. FARMER: Mr. Chairman and Christian friends, Mr. Linton has three reasons he tells us for not being able to support Professor Marshall's continuance in McMaster:

First, his Modernism, which he did not define. And one of the great things we have got to learn is to define terms. Let us deal with what Professor Marshall has told us. We are dealing with him and what he thinks, and we are not dealing with an undefined thing called Modernism. (Applause.) That first point is utterly pointless.

Now, the second was about Jonah. Mr. Linton has had a year to investigate Professor Marshall and his views about the Old Testament, and the only thing that he has really found about Professor Marshall's view on any point in the Old Testament is this about Jonah. (Laughter, cries of "Oh, no" and "Order".) The Professor tells us frankly that he accepts the allegorical or the parabolic interpretation. I have myself personally accepted the historical interpretation—

A DELEGATE: Of course.

DR. FARMER: But am I going to split this Convention? or am I going to break fellowship with Professor Marshall on a point like that? (Cries of "Absolutely no" and "Yes".) Mark you, Professor Marshall has said most positively that if you make it clear to him that Jesus meant to authenticate that as history, then he would accept it.

#### Believes One Thing But Defends the Opposite.

I suppose in about ten minutes I could make a statement of the Book of Jonah that would show the great reasonableness of that view, although I accept the other view. I take one view. But surely among us Baptist people

on a point like that, where a man believes that the Book is spiritually inspired, it is simply a matter of interpreting it, and he can accept what Jesus said—Whatever that may be, it is a difference of opinion on what Jesus meant to say. (Cries of "No, no" and applause.) Mr. Marshall's intelligence in his address this evening is quite equal to that of Mr. Linton or Dr. Shields.

The third point he referred to is Driver. It does seem a strange thing that people cannot get into their heads the difference between Driver's results and Driver's method. Driver has been the mediator between radicalism on the one hand and conservatism on the other hand. Professor Marshall, if I remember correctly, told the students in the Summer Session that if he was putting a little diagram on the board he would put himself, not in the centre in the mediatory school, but away over close to the conservative position.

Here we observe the Dean in Theology at his favorite task. Believing one thing, he tells us that in about ten minutes he could make a statement of the book of Jonah that would show the great reasonableness of an opposite view. We have no doubt of it at all. We have never met a man so expert in championing the opposite of what he professes to believe. He tells us also that Driver had been the mediator between Radicalism and Conservatism, and that Professor Marshall puts himself "close to the conservative position". *Thus Dr. Farmer again endorses Dr. Driver and his view, and tells us that Professor Marshall is "close to the conservative position," which means that he is not a conservative. Yet, all the time Doctors Farmer, MacNeill, Whidden and others have been insisting that Professor Marshall is a conservative!* It was reported, we believe from the Ottawa district, that Dr. Farmer had said Professor Marshall was as conservative as he himself. We are beginning to believe that.

Professor Marshall's assurance to me that he believed the Bible to be inspired from cover to cover was one great assurance. The next assurance he gave to me was that he believed in the absolute infallibility of Jesus, that no word of error ever escaped His lips, that His words were divine. Hence He is God and His work is divine. I accept that and I believe him to be an honest man.

We confess our inability to make opposite principles agree. In this Dr. Farmer is an expert. To us it seems that Professor Marshall's attitude toward the authority of Scripture, specifically his view of the Book of Jonas, his attempt to explain the miracle of Gadara, his view of the Atonement,—all these things seem to us to be plainly contradictory to the statement Dr. Farmer makes here.

I think one of the saddest things in connection with this controversy on this continent to-day is that on the right hand and the left, men's veracity is questioned if they happen to disagree with men, with certain men, who constitute themselves the ultimate standard of authority.

Let me say a word or two—I must keep within my time. I was present when this denomination accepted the McMaster trust and the trust of the subscribers to the Canadian Literary Institute. I voted for that. It was a solemn moment.

#### **Board of Governors Have Betrayed Their Trust.**

The Board of Governors are charged today—mind you, all the men who have been managing the institution through the intervening years, including every Chancellor, including the Chairmen of the Board, and so on—all the members of the Board and those of us who have been in responsible positions in connection with the administration of the University, we are charged with betraying the trust. (Cries of "Hear, hear".) It is a serious charge. I deny it. (Applause.)

Dr. Farmer should be more careful in his statements. We do not know of anyone who has charged that all the men and every chancellor have betrayed the trust. We do say that the Board of Governors, as a Board, from 1910 until now, have betrayed the trust. We repeat the charge and we believe this issue of *The Gospel Witness* absolutely demonstrates its truth.

#### Does the Charter Countenance "Some New Vague View of the Scripture"?

I think I understand the language of that trust as well as any other man here. I frankly stated the situation in Hamilton last year. In that Senate meeting to which Dr. Shields refers I was perfectly frank about everything, at the Convention I was perfectly frank; I had nothing to conceal. The fact is that that statement in the Trust Deed about inspiration is this, let me read it once again:

The divine inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and their absolute supremacy and sufficiency in matters of faith and practice.

Now, one man may interpret that and say: I believe in their verbal inspiration, in their absolute inerrancy through and through in every matter. Another man says: Well, I cannot quite take that view. Brother Galt told us this afternoon he found something about a man two years older than his father; he cannot accept that.

The fact is nobody knows whether we have got the original Scriptures or not. We are talking about an absolute ideal when we talk about absolute inerrancy. Any man who has studied the Scriptures knows that we cannot be sure we have the original text of the Scriptures.

Another man says, as Professor Marshall says: I believe it is inspired from cover to cover, it is God's message to us, and wherever I open it I find God speaking to me, showing its authority on all matters of the religious life. Is that a right interpretation? Does that come within that statement there which I have just read from the charter? (Cries of "Yes".)

Let me read the way it reads in the Jarvis Street trust deed. Dr. Shields has never called our attention to that, I have noticed.

DR. SHIELDS: I have printed it several times, Dr. Farmer, and you will find it in *The Gospel Witness* several times compared with the Trust Deed of McMaster.

DR. FARMER: I know you have printed it in *The Gospel Witness*, but you have never called our attention to that as far as I know. It is this:

The divine inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and their absolute sufficiency as the only authorized guide in matters of religion.

That is the stand we have taken. The Bloor Street Convention took that stand—Oh, I could go back to Dr. Fyfe and quote him to-night if I had time—and in the light of that history this charter was drawn. In the Bloor Street Convention of 1910 we held to that position; the Ottawa Convention of 1919 was carefully tied up to that, and it was simply a re-affirmation of that, it did not narrow it a bit, and it meant that it is authoritative in the matter of religion; last year in Hamilton we re-affirmed the same thing, and we are going to do it again to-night. (Cries of "Hear, hear".)

#### A Blanket Denial.

To say we have betrayed our trust is utterly false. (Cries of "No".) I have been charged with being a conspirator to that end. I deny the charge utterly.

Now, I should like to have spoken longer, but I consider the hour; I consider your feelings. There are a good many things I should like to say.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** You have not spoken ten minutes; go on. (Cries of "Question".)

**Dr. Farmer Renews His Plea For "The Inclusive Policy."**

**DR. FARMER:** I have not spoken ten minutes? Well, then, let me say this word. I am asked to say that I cannot hold fellowship with Professor Marshall. We are asked in this Convention to say that we cannot hold fellowship with him and his views. We have heard a good deal to-day that raises some other problems. Shall I fellowship other people who may be orthodox, but whose ethics I cannot approve? (Cries of "Hear, hear" and "Question".) I tell you that by the New Testament itself I have my own views. My views are conservative, Dr. Shields being witness. He has never found any fault with my own personal views. I refuse to make my own personal views the standard for the whole great Baptist Denomination of this country. (Applause.) God has made us different; we are all alike. Mr. Edgar's illustration this afternoon about two men looking at the same mountain, one from one side and the other from the other side, is perfectly to the point. I see from my standpoint with my temperament, in the light of my experience, and I tell my brethren I see those things about God, about Jesus, and about His great salvation of the cross; another man looks at the same great cross from another angle and he sees some other things that I have not seen. Am I going to excommunicate him and try to force my views upon him? If I think he is mistaken I will lovingly seek to persuade him; I will not force him. We Baptists are against force in religion, we trust to sweet reasonableness, to persuasion, and we look to the fruit in the light and in the spirit of what we think to be the best doctrine as well as to the Scripture.

Jesus Himself, as has already been intimated to-day, vouches for that. The New Testament itself is not the book of one man, the gospels are not all written by one man. John did not give us them all. No, but God chose four men that they might stand at the four different points of the compass and look at the perfect Christ and then tell us what they thought of Him.

I remember in Florence looking at the statue of David by Michael Angelo. When I looked from one side I got one impression, when I looked from another side I got another impression, when I looked from another side I got another impression, and when I looked from still another side I got still another impression.

God posted these four men to look at Jesus from four different standpoints, the standpoints of their own personality and of their own experience, mark you, and in those four gospels they gave us an all-round view of our glorious Lord. And I say that one of the things we need to learn is to be as large and as varied as the New Testament, if we can possibly, to rise more and more nearly to the fulness that is in Christ Jesus Himself.

Paul did not try to drive the Pharisees out of the church who insisted that circumcision was necessary to salvation. One thing he did insist upon was that they should not excommunicate the Gentiles who were not circumcised. I think we have got to follow the New Testament in its spirit and in its largeness as well as in every other way. (Applause.)

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Gentlemen, we have come to the close—

**A DELEGATE:** Mr. Chairman—(Cries of "Question").

**THE CHAIRMAN:** We have come to the close of a most interesting and good natured discussion. I congratulate you upon your moderation during the whole day. Let me read now what is before you. First, the report as presented by Dr. Whidden, to which there is this amendment:

That while gladly recognizing the qualities of Professor L. H. Marshall as a man, and his ability as a teacher, this Convention is convinced by his own utterances that the theological views of Professor Marshall are out of harmony with, and involve an infringement of, the doctrinal standards embodied in the Charter of McMaster University, and the principles held by the Regular Bap-



tists of Ontario and Quebec; and that therefore his continuance as a professor in that institution would not be in the best interests of this Convention.

That is the amendment moved by the Rev. W. J. H. Brown and seconded by the Rev. G. W. Allen.

To this amendment there is this amendment to the amendment, moved by the Rev. J. A. Warner and seconded by the Rev. R. R. McKay:

That all the words after the word "that" in the amendment be struck out and that there be substituted therefor the words following:

In adopting the report of the Senate and Board of Governors this Convention re-affirms the previous declaration of the Bloor Street Convention of 1910 and the Hamilton Convention of 1925 touching the attitude of the University to the Bible, including the claim for reasonable liberty embraced within the terms of these Convention declarations and of the Charter and Trust Deed.

This Convention deplores and condemns the campaign of misrepresentation and slander carried on for months by the Editor of *The Gospel Witness* and certain of his supporters, including some students, against members of the Faculty of McMaster University and its governing bodies and against other Boards and individuals, and calls for the cessation thereof.

This Convention affirms its strong confidence in Chancellor Whidden, Dean Farmer, and Professor Marshall, and assures them of its sympathetic support in the work of Christian education in McMaster University.

Gentlemen, we will vote upon the amendment to the amendment. Let us do it quietly and as in the sight of God. The amendment to the amendment—all in favor of it please stand to your feet.

DR. MACNEILL: I would request that this vote be counted. It is not going to be by ballot.

A DELEGATE: I move it be by ballot, Mr. Chairman. (Cries of "No, no".)

ANOTHER DELEGATE: Mr. Chairman, couldn't we vote by associations?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, you cannot do it. Where are the scrutineers?

The Chairman of the Scrutineers tells me he practically knows how many are in the building. Will you be satisfied to count the negative votes? (Cries of "Yes" and "No".) All right, then, count the affirmative votes.

A DELEGATE: Mr. Chairman, I submit we can take a vote by ballot quicker than we can count the votes.

(The vote was then taken, and at 12.15 a.m. (Wednesday), the Scrutineers retired to make their report, the Convention proceeding to the election of members of the Board of Governors. At 12.40 a.m., the Chairman of the Scrutineers (Mr. Cady) presented his report.)

#### Result of Vote on Amendment to the Amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, Mr. Pady, Chairman of the Scrutineers, will give us the result of the vote taken on the amendment to the amendment to the report. Remember, brethren, this is only the preliminary vote in connection with this matter.

MR. PADY: There were 966 votes cast—708 for the amendment to the amendment; 258 for the contrary.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, gentlemen, we will have to put the report as amended. If you will move the adoption of the report as amended—

MR. URQUHART: Can you elect members to the Board of Governors before the report is adopted, Mr. Chairman?

A DELEGATE: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose we cannot declare the election. I would say we are within the bounds—the election has been made, but I would rule—

THE SECRETARY (REV. C. E. MacLEOD): This is the rule:

No election of any member of any board, unless otherwise decided by the Convention on a two-thirds vote, shall take place until the Board to which such election has been made has presented its report for the year then closing, nor until such report has been disposed of by the Convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, need I read the amended report? (Cries of "No".) Then all in favor of the report as now amended please stand.

(Delegates stand.)

A DELEGATE: What does that mean?

THE CHAIRMAN: It means the acceptation of the report as amended by the second amendment, the amendment to the amendment.

(To Delegates standing) Be seated.

All opposed will please rise.

(Delegates stand.)

The matter is carried. (Applause.)

### Dr. Vining's Resolution.

DR. A. J. VINING (College Street Baptist Church): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen: I think this Convention has expressed itself very clearly and firmly to-night, and a good many of us would like to know if this thing is going to be continued during the year, or have we to come to a decision to-night? We are a democratic body, and I ask permission, sir, to read the following resolution:

Resolved that this Convention of the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec in annual meeting assembled, while recognizing the right of any member of a regular Baptist Church to discuss in a proper Christian spirit the programme, policies and affairs of the Convention, views with deep concern and disapproval the unjust attacks made directly and indirectly for many months by Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D., upon its President, upon certain boards and members of boards duly elected by this Convention, upon the Chancellor and some members of the Faculty of McMaster University, and other Christian Brethren, by the publication of statements which Dr. Shields ought to have known to be false and misleading.

And that Dr. T. T. Shields here and now be given the opportunity to present an apology satisfactory to this Convention.

(Cries of "Shame", "No, never".)

I repeat, that it takes a gentleman—

A DELEGATE: You are a disgrace to your father, and I know him. (Cries of "Shame, shame, shame".)

ANOTHER DELEGATE: You are demanding from Dr. Shields what you would never do yourself.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may have your voice later.

DR. VINING:

Should he decline, this Convention requests Dr. Shields to submit forthwith to the Convention his resignation as a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster University, and that this Convention hereby advises the Jarvis Street Baptist Church, of Toronto, that Dr. T. T. Shields will not be an acceptable delegate to future meetings of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec—(Laughter).

A DELEGATE: Why don't you approve the "pope"?

DR. VINING:

—until the apology asked for by this Convention is made to and accepted by the Executive Committee for the time being of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

### Dr. A. J. Vining's Speech.

Mr. Chairman, I am quite convinced that McMaster University holds the same position in the hearts and affections of the vast majority of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec that Jerusalem held in the hearts of the Jews long ago: "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning."

A DELEGATE: Well, you will lose it.

DR. VINING: Ever since this miserable discussion commenced, a constant cry has been ringing in my ears and surging through every chamber of my soul: "Ye see the distress that we are in, how Jerusalem lieth waste, and the gates thereof are burned with fire." McMaster University has not been destroyed, neither shall she be destroyed. (Applause.) But the distressing thing is that we have a man in our midst who, according to newspaper reports, would destroy it if he could.

A DELEGATE: And you would crucify him upside down, if you had a chance.

ANOTHER DELEGATE: Give him some soothing syrup.

### Deliberate Misrepresentation.

MR. VINING: I am reading statements from the report of an address that Dr. Shields gave just a short time ago in his own church. (Cries of "Order".)

"Would it not be a glorious thing—Cries of "Order")

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Vining is within his rights.

MR. URQUHART: Mr. Chairman, I move that we do now adjourn. A motion to adjourn is always in order. I move that we do now adjourn.

A DELEGATE: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: A man cannot move to adjourn while another man is on the floor making an address.

DR. VINING: And nobody knew that better than Mr. Urquhart.

"Would it not be a glorious thing," he exclaimed amidst applause, "if the fires of God could be called down on McMaster University!"

A DELEGATE: Is that resolution seconded?

DR. VINING: Dr. Bowley Green seconds this, and he will speak to it in due time.

I submit to you that if Dr. Shields was sincere when he made that statement he is not worthy of a place in the Baptist ministry; and if he was not sincere, then I submit there is a better way of getting the attention of the public. If his intention was to stand in the full glare of the spotlight, there was a better way of obtaining that attention. It was just in this connection that he made the declaration that he was willing if necessary to split every church in the Denomination. (Cries of "No".)

DR. SHIELDS: No.

DR. VINING: I am reading, I have it right here.

DR. SHIELDS: Will you please read the whole statement, Dr. Vining.

DR. VINING: I shall be very glad to.

DR. SHIELDS: Well, read exactly what I said.

A DELEGATE: Read it all.

DR. VINING: Don't worry.

THE DELEGATE: We are not worrying.

DR. VINING: Now, gentlemen, there is a youngster back there interrupting me. Listen! I did a good day's work before that young fellow startled the world with his knowledge and became famous as the discoverer of mares' nests. (Cries of "Order".)

A DELEGATE: Do you refer to me?

DR. VINING: I have more respect for a toad catching flies in the vapor of a dunghill, than for some of you. (Cries of "Shame, shame", and "sit down".)

### Dr. Vining's Apology (?).

It was reported in the daily press that Dr. Vining had apologized to the Convention for using the above language. On this subject *The Canadian Baptist* refers to Dr. Vining in the following terms:

A McMaster supporter, who in the heat of the debate made a remark that even his warmest friends could not fellowship, appeared later on the platform to ask forgiveness of the one to whom the sentence was directed, of the Convention and of his God.

In his sermon in Walmer Road Sunday evening, October 24th, Dr. John MacNeill referred to this incident in the following words:

"Then I say this for his own sake. The tide never rose higher and that feast of love was never sweeter and more tender than in the moment when Dr. Vining made his noble confession before his brethren—not because he had moved a resolution; that was the will of the Convention, and it ought to have been moved and ought to have been carried; but he made a noble confession, and asked the forgiveness of his brethren if he had in any way departed from the spirit of Christ in the presentation of the resolution. Someone has said that the real test of a man's Christianity will appear in the way in which he deals with his sin once he has become conscious of it. If that is a test, then Dr. Vining proved himself to be a great and noble Christian, for he had nobility of soul enough to confess his wrong and ask forgiveness of his brethren, forgiveness of him whom he had wronged, and forgiveness of His God in the presence of all the people."

We should be glad to accept Dr. Vining's apology if by any means we could be persuaded of his sincerity. He made similar confession and apology before his own congregation the next Sunday morning after the Convention, acknowledging that he had been very bitter of spirit; and he said that this had come about through his reading of *The Gospel Witness*, and he therefore pledged himself to his congregation never to open another copy of *The Gospel Witness* for six months, nor to allow the name of Dr. Shields to pass his lips. We are sorry to have to refer to Dr. Vining in a page which he has pledged himself not to read, but in this matter necessity is laid upon us. It was because even Dr. Vining's friends hung their heads in shame at this revelation of a vulgar spirit, that he was driven to take some public action. Such remarks as that which offended the ears of all decent people are never made impromptu. The filthy simile had been premeditated and prepared for some occasion, if not for that one, for another. "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he."

Dr. Vining was to have been nominated to take Mr. Urquhart's place on the Home Mission Board the next day, but his public exhibition of vulgarity rendered it exceedingly unlikely that he could be elected, and for that reason a substitute had to be found.

when I have this is the impression he has made on my mind: "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Mr. Cameron preaches to the biggest congregation in Canada. I think without doubt he is the most popular minister in the Dominion, and whatever his topic may be, he turns as many people away a night at seven o'clock as would fill Jarvis Street Church, and no matter what the topic is, he preaches sin and salvation—the only hope of salvation is Jesus Christ.

MR. A. A. AYER: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to what has been said here, and I did not know anything about what was likely to occur, what the feeling was, but I just fancied myself off in some other place, in the United States, if you like, and viewing such actions as are being exploited here this afternoon right before me, I would say, "I want to get out of that state, I won't stay there."

DR. VINING: (Reading):

The modernist group have gained control of *The Canadian Baptist*.

Here is another gem:

They have certain paid officials of fundamentalist persuasion.

—(Cries of "Oh, oh".)

Here is another "gem of purest ray serene":

In this Convention—  
in another Convention.

**Small Group Responsible for Modernistic Trend in Denomination.**

—here in this Convention we have had the same thing. Only a small group of men, but men who are animated by exactly the same spirit that forbade the preaching of the resurrection in Jerusalem, and stoned Stephen to death; and these, in season and out of season, conspire to turn away the people from the faith.

That is from *The Gospel Witness* of December 13, 1923. Is that your conception of the ministers of this Denomination? Have we men in our Denomination who are willing to stone a man to death because he does not preach what other men think he should preach? (Cries of "No, no.") What a bad lot we are! (Cries of "Hear, hear.") Who are these men? Let this tireless tracker of tin tigers name the men in order that we may be put on our guard.

Then Dr. Shields makes out that modernism was being promulgated from McMaster University for nine years following the Bloor Street Convention of 1910. For that he blames the governing body. (Cries of "Oh, oh".) He says that it was an accepted fact in the Chair of Old Testament Exegesis. On November 12th, just after his humiliating defeat in Hamilton, he wrote as follows:

#### I. G. Matthews' Poison.

By retaining Professor I. G. Matthews in his position in McMaster for nine years after the 1910 Convention, the authorities of McMaster poisoned the springs of our denominational life.

Last month, September 9th, he repeats his charge, employing his favourite figure of speech. Dr. Shields is sure Professor Matthews was doing his deadly work for nine long years. And yet no man ever heard him utter on the floor of the Convention one single word of protest. Nine great Conventions and this man silent as the Sphinx. Why? Up to that time a great many of the prominent members of the Board of Governors were members of his church. There was no unpleasantness in the church at that time; they were in perfect harmony with their minister; but the hour came when they disagreed, and as a result the church was split, and then he had to start something to keep the minds of the Denomination off that split. (Cries of "Oh, oh" and "Shame".) Then he started this trouble.

#### Baptist Liberty!

I question the moral right of any minister to circularize the Denomination in the interests of his own church or in his own interests. (Cries of "Oh, oh".) What a pretty mess we would be in, brethren,—(applause)—if all men in our Denomination were as able to write as Dr. Shields is, to adopt that method, we would have a sweet time.

REV. A. PENMAN: That man who is talking, he had been allowed to speak in my pulpit, and then went around canvassing to procure votes. (Cries of "Oh, oh".)

DR. VINING: By a great stretch of the imagination, Dr. Shields calls his paper *The Gospel Witness*. He uses it to boost himself and everything he does. (Cries of "Shame".) He told us of the fundamentalists.

(The speaker attempts to quote from *The Gospel Witness*, but is interrupted by cries of "Time, time", "That is enough", and other exclamations.)

If Dr. Shields would be satisfied just to use his paper in this way we would not mind it so much. But nobody is safe, no person knows when he is going to be held up to ridicule and scorn. Listen to this, will you, to this correct gentleman:

We respectfully suggest that the Chancellor should get somebody to write letters for him. If he does not, McMaster will soon be known as McMaster kindergarten instead of McMaster University.

(Cries of "Oh, oh, oh".)

Let me also remind you of his gross and undignified tirade on the beloved Chancellor, delivered in his own church last June. Perhaps we ought to excuse him, perhaps we ought to take a charitable view, because I imagine Dr. Shields was somewhat bilious after his plans in the Association failed.

The Chancellor is not worth wasting gunpowder over, he is the weakest mortal that ever—

(Cries of "Shame" and "Oh, oh".)

Who is this, Mr. Chairman, who speaks? It is none other than Dr. Shields, the man who talks about love and the Holy Spirit. This is the man who assures us in his paper that he has never felt the slightest bit of bitterness toward anyone of the dear brethren with whom he has had to contend. (Applause and cries of "Oh, oh".) This is the devoted man who tells us that for eleven long years he prayed day and night with tears and sought by all the means in his power to overcome and remove the obstacles that were standing in the way of a great spiritual revival. Four thousand and fifteen days of weeping! Mr. Ryle and Mr. Matthews will have a lot to answer for in the days to come! (Cries of "Oh, oh".)

But the Chancellor got off easily in comparison with Dr. Mullins. You know who he is? He is President of the World's Great Baptist Alliance, he is President of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, and he was likened, as was pointed out this afternoon, to a cheap and crooked horse-trader. (Cries of "Order, order", "Shame" and "Question".)

A DELEGATE: Mr. Chairman, could we not have our minds refreshed by a re-reading of the text of the resolution? We did not hear the resolution over in this corner. I would request that we have a re-reading of the text of the resolution.

DR. VINING: This is the text of the resolution:

Resolved that this Convention of the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec in annual meeting assembled, while recognizing the right of any member of a Regular Baptist Church to discuss in a proper Christian spirit the programme, policies and affairs of the Convention, views with deep concern and disapproval the unjust attacks made directly and indirectly for many months by Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D., upon its President, upon certain Boards and members of Boards duly elected by this Convention, upon the Chancellor and some members of the Faculty of McMaster University, and other Christian brethren, by the publication of statements which Dr. Shields ought to have known to be false and misleading;

And that Dr. T. T. Shields here and now be given the opportunity to present an apology satisfactory to this Convention.

Should he decline, this Convention requests Dr. Shields to submit forthwith his resignation as a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster University, and that this Convention hereby advises the Jarvis Street Baptist Church, of Toronto, that Dr. T. T. Shields will not be an acceptable delegate to future meetings of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec until the apology asked for by this Convention is made to and accepted by the Executive Committee for the time being of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

(Cries of "Shame, shame".)

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Bowley Green.

## Dr. Bowley Green's Speech.

DR. BOWLEY GREEN (Emmanuel Baptist Church, Toronto): Mr. Moderator and Christian friends: I rise to second the resolution. (Cries of "Shame".) Not a bit of it. (Cries of "Shame".) Not a bit of it. (Cries of "Shame".) Just wait a moment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, give Dr. Green his opportunity. (Cries of "Fair play".)

### The Gentlemen With the Cushion.

DR. GREEN: I will see they do. For purposes of identification, I think I ought to make just one or two remarks. I am quite new in the Convention: Some years ago there was a notable book written by an Englishman who called himself "The Gentleman with a Duster." Now, I am not the gentleman with a duster, but I am supposed to be the gentleman—the delegate—with a cushion. I do not think you get it, do you? (Cries of "No, no".) Well, I will read it; I am not going to quote very much. I rather enjoyed it. In a sermon preached September 16th:

Shame on you, preacher, for sitting on the fence! I know a preacher not a hundred miles from here—

This was preached, of course, in Jarvis Street Baptist Church.

—not very many blocks from here—

You will locate him by and by.

—who always carries a cushion with him to Convention, so he can sit on any kind of a fence, with comfort!

(Laughter.)

Well now, I think that generally shows pretty good sense on any man's part.

He is always there.

I wish I could say the same of the gentleman who preached this; he is very seldom here except on a day like this. (Applause.) So you see, I am supposed at this very moment to be sitting on a cushion on the fence. But more than that, I am somewhat decrepit.—(Cries of "Amen")—And not more than a year ago I reminded the astute and ingenious editor of *The Gospel Witness* of Nephisheth, who was lame of both feet. Do you remember that? (Cries of "Sure" and "Go to it".)

And moreover, it is a long way to travel—for the next bird, my logic, he has to go to Australia. I have been to Australia, I do not think the editor of this paper has been to Australia, and I have seen the particular animal to which he refers on its native heath. I was told that in a sermon I preached mine was kangaroo logic—whatever sort of logic that may be. I know what sort of an animal the kangaroo is. And do you know the Editor of *The Gospel Witness* owes me a good deal, for on one occasion he was referred to in my presence as "Kangaroo Shields", and I rebuked the man for fastening a name like that on to a brother minister. (Applause.)

A DELEGATE: Awfully good of you.

DR. GREEN: In the first place, let me say that I and hundreds of ministers in this Convention and thousands of members of Baptist churches in this Convention do not regard the issue of this Convention as one of doctrine or

theology. (Cries of "Hear, hear".) Yesterday we listened to several very notable deliverances, one by our noted brother, the Rev. J. B. Moore. (Applause.) I was glad to find that I had not lost my taste for preaching. Why, brethren, I never heard a poor sermon until I began to preach myself,—(cries of "Amen")—never, and I was lifted and thrilled and helped by the sermon we heard yesterday morning, and I and hundreds of ministers and thousands of Baptists were in the heartiest accord with the theology of that sermon.

Then we heard a remarkable address by Mr. Benson, of India, and the evening closed with an address by Dr. L. R. Scarborough that I for one shall never forget. I found that in all these deliverances there was not the remotest odour of heterodoxy in any one of them, and yet there was absolute unanimity in this Convention regarding those addresses. There was no dissent.

**A DELEGATE:** How could there be?

**DR. GREEN:** Now, I know the Associations pretty well. This is my fifth Convention. During the five years I have been in Ontario and Quebec I have visited three and four and five conventions each year, and I have come in contact with many ministers, with many preachers.

#### **Dr. Green Fails to Recognize Any Modernists Here.**

I said when I was in Ottawa some time ago—you perhaps might like to hear about that—someone wrote me that he—that is, the man with a cushion—someone wrote me that he delivered an address in Ottawa some time ago when he said, "I don't know a single modernist preacher in the Convention of Ontario and Quebec." That was true, and I don't, I don't, I don't know a single brother who stands in the pulpit whose honour and honesty as a preacher of the Gospel I question in its sincerity and in its evangelistic power and zeal.

Whatever may have been said to the contrary to-night, the issue before us, beloved, is not an issue of doctrine or theology. It is an issue, not of theology but of conduct, not of doctrine but of practice. The issue before us, at any rate many of us believe, is not the personal belief of a McMaster University professor, but the issue before us is the practice and conduct of the editor of a semi-religious weekly paper. (Applause.) The issue so far as I am personally concerned, so far as my church is concerned,—the issue is not Professor Marshall; the issue is Dr. Shields. (Cries of "No, no" and applause.)

**A DELEGATE:** That is what you try to make it.

**DR. GREEN:** The divisions which unhappily exist in some churches are not occasioned by differences in doctrine, but by subtle and mischievous propaganda. (Cries of "Oh, oh".) Don't be in any hurry, beloved, the votes are not counted yet, it is only half-past one. Just a moment. I shall get through with this very quickly. I have not got my cushion with me to-night. I do not always have it with me when I preach.

We have been told there are sides, Dr. Shields tells us there are sides. We were told before this Convention had been opened sixty minutes that there are sides.

**A DELEGATE:** Sure.

#### **Is He Off the Fence or Over the Fence?**

**DR. GREEN:** And I believe there are; there are sides, and I am on one of them,—(Cries of "Hear, hear")—and to-night at any rate I have not the cushion, and I am not on the fence. (Applause.) But I want to ask: Who has created these sides and who has made the fence? God knows there were scores of us who did not want sides. (Cries of "Hear, hear".) I tell you I did not want to take sides.

I was with ministers at the Convention in Hamilton. At the place where I was entertained there were three men, and they were talking about the condition, and there were tears in their eyes because they did not want sides. Who compelled us to take sides? Who built the fence? I will tell you. (Cries of "Go on".) I am going on, I am not nearly through yet. My decrepitude has not taken hold of me yet and my feet are still going strong. (Cries of "Go ahead".)



Brethren, I shall never forget, never, the afternoon of the Toronto Convention—Association—when Dr. Farmer—I don't know much about Dr. Farmer—Oh yes, I know him when I see him, but I don't know very much except by repute, I have shaken his hand half a dozen times—but I have heard a great many say very wonderful things about him. But if he has lived and given his best to us for fifty years, he comes pretty near deserving the best we have to give him. (Applause.) And Dr. Farmer, the Dean of Theology, had to get up in that Association and say that he did not recommend a modernist, and in doing it, mark you, he called God to witness. It has come to a pretty pass, beloved, if the Dean of Theology or any man has to call God to witness when he makes a statement. (Applause.)

We agree with Dr. Green on this point, and remind him of the Scripture, "Let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil."

A DELEGATE: That is right.

DR. GREEN: And on that occasion, as on this occasion, Dr. Farmer said that before God—and he read a letter to you from the Park Church denying the statement that had been made in *The Witness*—Dr. Farmer said it was a lie, and I was amazed at the silence of my brethren who did not get up there and then demand of Dr. Shields what he was going to do with that challenge when he was called that. (Applause.) I was amazed at the shrinkage of my manhood that I could sit there and hear Dean Farmer make that statement as he did make it and for me to keep my seat; but I had not been long in that Convention, and I remembered that at Walmer Road a young man was rebuked for speaking because he had been in the Convention for only about four years.

### Dr. Farmer and Dr. Huddlestone.

The report respecting Dr. Farmer's recommendation of a modernist to the Park Church, Brantford, reached us from the family of one of the members of the Pulpit Committee. Dr. Farmer himself admitted having a meeting with the Committee and discussing Dr. Huddlestone, and said that he suggested that they ascertain his theological opinions from himself. While Dr. Farmer evidently did not commend him on theological grounds, there is nothing to show that he did not rather approve of his being called. Nobody suggested that he took the initiative, but the name was submitted to Dr. Farmer by the Pulpit Committee, and all that Dr. Farmer can tell us is that he recommended them to discover the gentleman's theological opinions from himself. Certainly someone in Brantford quite close to the Pulpit Committee received the impression that the Committee, from their interview with Dr. Farmer, were encouraged to think of the gentleman in question. It is amazing to us that Dr. Farmer's memory can be so utterly blank in some instances, and so perfectly clear and active in others, that he is ready to call God to witness. We are still unconvinced on this matter.

Lest our readers should have short memories, we publish the article from *The Gospel Witness* and the letter of Dr. Farmer to *The Canadian Baptist*. We reply to Dr. Green by asking what Dr. Farmer is going to do with the sworn testimony of a former deacon of Walmer Road Church? So far, the Dean has been content to tell us that he does not remember.

## IS THIS TRUE?

We have been informed that Dr. J. H. Farmer has very strongly recommended Dr. A. L. Huddleston of Halifax to the Park Baptist Church of Brantford. What we know of Dr. Farmer's activities in recommending men to churches leads us to believe that this report is exceedingly probable. Furthermore, it would be just like Dr. Farmer to recommend such a man as Dr. Huddleston.

However orthodox Professor Farmer may be, the record of his recommendations shows conclusively that he is able to recommend Modernists with great heartiness. We have no doubt that our compromising Dean would be glad to see a man like Dr. Huddleston established in this Convention. He could be absolutely sure that he would stand by the University, even if they proposed Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick as Chancellor. In *The Gospel Witness* of September 24th last we published a letter from the Maritime Provinces by the Rev. J. B. Daggett of Prince Edward Island, giving an account of the Maritime Baptist Convention held at Wolfville, N.S., August 26th to 30th, which was attended by upwards of four hundred persons. We quote a paragraph from Mr. Daggett's letter:

"The splendid spiritual tone that was maintained throughout the Convention, was a complete answer to the modernist element, which found an expression in a paper read by Dr. Huddleston of Halifax, upon what he called 'The Religion of the Future' in which he declared we ought to be thankful for Dr. Fosdick who had brought a new idea and conception of religion. His paper fell like the proverbial water on the duck's back. It ran off and left no mark."

We wonder if the Park Church, so long noted for its orthodoxy, has so declined from the faith that it will willingly call to its pulpit one who is in accord with Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick? Surely Dr. Farmer knows Dr. Huddleston's position! If it be true that he recommended Dr. Huddleston to Brantford, and we are morally certain that it is true, we have in this fact further evidence of the quality of Dr. Farmer's loyalty to evangelical truth.

## ANOTHER PERSONAL WORD.

Editor, *Canadian Baptist*:

May I ask you to insert the following letter which is self-explanatory:

"Dear Dr. Farmer—

It is with the deepest regret that the members of the pulpit committee of our church have seen the heartless attack upon yourself in *The Gospel Witness* of May 20th, under the heading "Is This True?" We all know that what is written there concerning yourself is most emphatically untrue, and we deeply deplore the fact that your kind endeavour to help the church, when your help was asked, should meet such a malicious reward. It will be evident to you, as it is to us, that some ill-disposed person or persons are using your name for the sole purpose of embarrassing our church in its choice of a pastor, and of offering gratuitous insult to a Christian minister who has been invited to preach for it.

You did not recommend the minister to us. He was in fact highly commended to us by others. When, after these recommendations, you were asked concerning him and others, you replied with great frankness, suggesting that we ascertain his theological opinion from himself.

It is idle, of course, for us to say what indeed you must know, that we have the fullest confidence in your own Christian orthodoxy.

Yours sincerely (signed) C. S. Tapscott, Chairman Pulpit Committee, Park Baptist Church, Brantford.

How Dr. Shields can indulge in this recklessness of statement I am at a loss to understand. It is apparently a part of a settled policy to discredit me in the eyes of the denomination, and is of a piece with the resolution passed at the Jarvis Street protest meeting, which I have already answered.

J. H. FARMER.

**A DELEGATE:** Where was your cushion?

**DR. GREEN:** I should again, mark you, under similar conditions rise and demand and ask what Dr. Shields is going to do with the lie that was given to him, because I take it that if a man has any spirit and any honour he will come pretty near doing something with that lie. I should. I should. (Applause.)

Then if Dr. Shields declines to do anything, I want to know what the Association is going to do with Dr. Shields. (Applause.) Ah! I am familiar enough with Baptist usage to know that we as a Convention cannot do very much with Dr. Shields; but the Association can, and the Association ought to. I think that a bundle has been tied up and thrust down the throat of Dr. Shields to-night as a bundle of lies, and he steered as clear of that as it was possible for him to clear. (Applause.)

### Who Swallowed "The Bundle of Lies"?

By the time the reader has arrived at this stage of the proceedings, and has had opportunity to study the dishonesty of the Chancellor in his garbled reports, the deliberate mis-statements of Rev. J. M. Warner, and the utter misrepresentation of Professor Marshall, we believe he will reach the conclusion that the "bundle of lies" to which Dr. Green refers is in someone else's throat.

Now I am coming to a close. If I have lost confidence in Dr. Shields, and if my brethren have lost confidence in Dr. Shields, it is because Dr. Shields has compelled me to lose confidence in him. I did not want to lose confidence in Dr. Shields, I did not want to count myself on the other side from Dr. Shields or from any brother. He has compelled me to if I have lost respect or confidence; and I must say that I have very little confidence in the words of Dr. Shields after the things I heard that he had said about me. Why, they were kindly said for the most part. I never lost a bit of sleep about it, not a bit. I thought indeed some of the things were rather amusing. But if I have lost respect and esteem for Dr. Shields, it is because that Dr. Shields by his attitude has compelled me to lose that respect, he has alienated me. I do not suppose he is much mortified, but I think I am. And he has alienated hundreds of his brethren,—(Cries of "Hear, hear")—and he has alienated hundreds of the Baptists of this Convention. (Applause.) Three years ago in the Emmanuel Baptist Church there was not a man who would not have voted for Dr. Shields and followed his leadership; to-day I challenge anybody to find a single man who has any confidence in any statement that Dr. Shields makes.

**A DELEGATE:** My brother and sister in Emmanuel Church will challenge that. It is a lie.

**DR. GREEN:** I was a little out of breath and I thank you for the respite.

If our readers could have seen the rage of Dr. Green as he "breathed out threatenings and slaughter", they would understand this sentence: "I was a little out of breath", and they would understand, too, that it were as futile to attempt to reason with him as to attempt to answer a mad man. We are very sorry for Dr. Green. We suppose he will soon move on to other pastures, as he has been accustomed to do.

We are told there is a fight on, Dr. Shields says so,—

**A DELEGATE:** We believe him, too.

### Dr. Green Calls for a "Split."

**DR. GREEN:** Well, if there is a fight on—(Cries of "Hear, hear")—just a moment—if there is a fight, let me say there are hundreds of ministers and

laymen, valiant men, chivalrous men, resolute men, Christian men, who will not rest until these unhappy conditions are removed and our denomination knows once more the days of honour and the days of peace. (Applause.)

We are told there may be a split in the Denomination. Well, if we cannot get rid of this unsavoury and un-Christian spirit, in the name of God, let the split come,—(Applause)—and let these men who cannot believe in their brethren, who cannot trust their brethren, let them in heaven's name get out,—(Applause and cries of "All right")—that we may be left to get along with the work of the Lord.

These things are crippling the Lord's work. If slandering the brethren is Satan's work, if robbing men of God of their good name is dishonourable, if disrupting churches and sowing disunion is wicked, if undermining the health of noble and Christian men is cruel, then I beseech Dr. Shields to come to repentance,—(Applause)—for he has committed every one of these offences,—(Laughter)—

A DELEGATE: You are the judge.

DR. GREEN: —because I know of no other way. I want to thank you gentlemen for your smiles,—

A DELEGATE: You are welcome.

DR. GREEN: —I want to thank you for your good will. You know it is true. (Cries of "Take it back" and "No, no".) You will find it out later. Then you like the way I said it? (Cries of "No, we don't like the way you said it".)

There is one simple way of remedying this, and that is for Dr. Shields and it may be, some of his henchmen to be men enough to acknowledge that they have grievously sinned and grievously offended. (Cries of "Oh, oh".) I believe, mark you, it is the only way back. (Cries of "Hear, hear" and "Prove it".) Lest you think I have told you all I know, I am going to close, but I tell you I could go on a little more.

I second the resolution.

Our only answer to Dr. Green is to say that we have absolutely nothing to withdraw, and that our only regret is that we did not begin the fight earlier, and that we have not been able to carry on the battle more vigorously. We only wish that *The Gospel Witness* had a circulation a hundred times greater, that we might fight this battle on a longer front.

Dr. Green is undoubtedly the "gentleman with the cushion." We congratulate ourselves that we were able to describe him so accurately, and that he had conscience enough left to recognize the description and identify himself. Someone has called attention to the fact that there are many supposedly orthodox men who are able, with composure, to occupy a neutral position when the honour of Christ and His Word are at stake; but the moment they are personally reflected upon, they abandon their neutrality and go to war. Dr. Bowley Green is a fine example of this principle: where the very foundations of Christian faith are at stake, he is the "gentleman with the cushion", but where his own personal interests are concerned he becomes at once the gentleman with the club. We are undisturbed by Dr. Green's fulminations; we hope he feels better now that he has got it out of his system. His speech was not a fall, but a revelation; everybody now knows where Dr. Green stands.

(Cries of "Question".)

#### Rev. J. B. Kennedy Appeals Against Unfair Slander.

REV. J. B. KENNEDY: There has been a motion made and seconded, and I say this Convention would be unfair if they would not allow somebody to defend the character of the gentleman who has been so vilely slandered.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** There is a motion before the house that the previous question be now put. I wonder if you know what the previous question means. The previous question does not stop this debate. The previous question shuts off any amendment, but the previous question means that we may go on and debate it just the same. (Cries of "No".) Yes, it does.

**A DELEGATE:** Forty minutes.

**REV. CHARLES PETTIT:** Mr. Chairman, before the Rev. J. B. Kennedy speaks, I should like to ask him a question. May I?

**MR. KENNEDY:** Certainly.

**MR. PETTIT:** I should like the Rev. Mr. Kennedy to tell us how and when he got his membership in the Ontario and Quebec Convention.

**MR. KENNEDY:** My membership? He wants to know where I got it. Well, I got it from Almighty God. I was born again, I was born of the Spirit, I think about forty years ago. That is where I got my membership in the Ontario and Quebec Convention. (Applause.) That is only the beginning. I will tell you where I got my membership. I will explain the whole matter to you.

**MR. WILSON:** May I ask a question? Is Brother Pettit questioning the right of Mr. Kennedy to be a member of this Convention? Is he doubting the fact that Mr. Kennedy is a member of Jarvis Street Church?

**MR. KENNEDY:** I do not think it is worth while going into this.

Mr. Holland Pettit was some sort of an official of the First Avenue Church, and, we believe, Chairman of the Enrolment Committee. The Rev. J. B. Kennedy, now retired from the active pastorate, has spent nearly all his ministerial life in the Convention of Ontario and Quebec, being for somewhere about twenty years Secretary of the Home Mission Board. Mr. Kennedy is an honoured member of Jarvis Street Baptist Church. Mr. Pettit's question is only one more evidence of the breathing of threatening and slaughter which animated the McMaster defenders throughout the Convention.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Gentlemen, this whole business is out of order. Just now there is a motion for the previous question. So that brethren may not misunderstand the previous question, let me read the rules of order:

The Previous Question.—In the Parliament and Legislatures of Canada, the previous question, as it long existed in the English Commons—an ingenious method of avoiding a direct vote on the question—it still in force. No form of proceeding is less understood in public assemblies than this method of bringing a meeting to a direct vote on a particular question. If a question is before a meeting a member may prevent any amendment by proposing that the previous question be now put. The Chairman will propose the motion like any other, but this does not mean that the meeting is precluded from continuing the discussion.

Now, men, you think it does. The rules of order says it does not.

**A DELEGATE:** Good for you.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** I do not think you want the previous question. You are trying to stop the debate, that is all.

**A DELEGATE:** Mr. Chairman, may I speak to the point of order?

**THE SECRETARY:** May I read to you the procedure by J. C. Bourinot?

**THE CHAIRMAN:** I was reading Bourinot.

**THE SECRETARY:** This is it, only condensed:

The previous question, until it is decided, shall preclude all amendment of the main question and shall be in the following words: "That this question be now put." If the previous question be resolved in the affirmative, the original question is to be put forth with without any amendment or debate.

That is Bourinot, page 36.

MR. URQUHART: Look at page 13.

A DELEGATE: What is the date of your edition?

THE SECRETARY: In the year 1894.

MR. URQUHART: That is not the present practice.

A DELEGATE: That is the parliamentary practice.  
(Cries of "Question".)

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question is called for, I simply wanted to state to you men that that does not cut off discussion.

MR. URQUHART: That is right, I have the latest edition here.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am ruling it does not.

THE SECRETARY: Then you are against Bourinot.

PROFESSOR NEW: Mr. Chairman, can we get to it this way: By not putting this in the form of the previous question, but putting it in the form of a question for closure, which is perfectly in order in parliamentary procedure? We have closure in the Canadian parliament to-day. That would be simply a motion similar to the motion that was carried here a short time ago in connection with the main debate. It would be in order to move. That this debate be now terminated. That would close the debate.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I read further, men?

The misapprehension that generally exists as to the proper use and the necessary consequence of the previous question has arisen from confusing the rules of legislative assemblies of the United States with the parliamentary rules of Canada.

What you men say applies to the United States, it does not apply to Canada.

MR. URQUHART: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Bourinot says it applies to the United States, not to Canada.

MR. GRANT: I move that there be no further debate, and that the question be now put.

REV. HARRIS WALLACE: I second the motion.

A DELEGATE: I can answer that question. Mr. Kennedy is a member of Jarvis Street Baptist Church, and as such member has a right at this Convention, having been called as a delegate.

MR. PETTIT: Mr. Chairman, may I relate in about three sentences the circumstances? (Cries of "No".)

MR. KENNEDY: I am not ashamed of it. I will give you the sum and substance—

(Cries of "No" and "Go to the question" and "Question, question".)

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a question before the house. The question before you is, that we now put the question and that there be no further debate. This is moved by Mr. Gideon Grant and seconded by the Rev. Wallace Harris of Ottawa—Wallace, of Ottawa.

MR. URQUHART: Mr. Chairman, speaking to a question of privilege, can you put that motion when a person is on the floor to speak? You have to wait until he finishes.

MR. KENNEDY: I could have made a good speech while you people were squabbling over the rules.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is before the house.

MR. KENNEDY: I said it would be a shame for this Convention to dismiss and not give a man a chance that knows Dr. Shields to defend his character. (Cries of "Question".) I say we should be ashamed.

MR. SMALLEY: Mr. Chairman, I should like just to make this suggestion at this time. There is a very serious resolution before this Convention. It brings no joy to any one of us. But I do think that the motion to suspend or close the issue at this juncture would be very unfortunate if carried. I believe, sir, that since the statements have been made, and we have the proof of the

statements, as far as I am concerned there is only one person that I think this Convention should hear, and that person is the one who is directly charged. He is here and we know he is well able to look after himself. If the statements are true that have been put in *The Gospel Witness*, and he can prove them, let us have the proof and go after the people that he is after; if they are not true, and he won't take them back, let us pass the motion. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I have hesitated to put this question. It is a tremendously serious thing we are doing.

MR. GRANT: I will accept the suggestion of the last speaker and withdraw my motion, with the consent of my seconder, and move, Mr. Chairman, that Dr. Shields be heard.

(Cries of "Kennedy".)

THE CHAIRMAN: Has Dr. Shields a statement that he will make?

**The Highest Honour of a Life-time.**

DR. SHIELDS (taking the platform): Mr. Chairman and Brethren. I count it the highest honour of my life to have earned the displeasure of such a spirit as has been manifested in the last two speakers. (Applause.)

MR. GRANT: Mr. Chairman, I move that there be no further debate, and that the question be now put.

MR. HARRIS WALLACE: I second the motion.

(Disorder.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Order, men. It is moved again by Mr. Grant and seconded by Mr. Harris Wallace—I have forgotten the motion—that the question now be put without further debate. Shall we have it read?

(Cries of "Question".)

I don't think we need read it again. You know what it means.

MR. SENECA BAKER: Do you want to split this Denomination on this?

ANOTHER DELEGATE: Mr. Grant's motion is that we now take the vote. Ask the Convention if they agree to vote. (Cries of "Oh, oh".)

THE CHAIRMAN: We are not voting on the motion, are we?—(Cries of "No".) We are voting on the question: Will we now take the vote?—(Cries of "Yes".)—If you are in favour of taking the vote, vote yes.—(Cries of "Yes".) If you are opposed, vote no.—(Cries of "No".)

I cannot tell, brethren. If you are in favour of taking the vote, please stand to your feet.

(Delegates stand up.)

Sit down, please. If you are opposed, please stand to your feet.

(Delegates stand up.)

There is absolutely no question, men and women, that the vote is carried by a large majority.

The question now before you is the resolution that has been presented. All in favour of that resolution please stand to your feet.

(Delegates stand up.)

A DELEGATE: Mr. Chairman, we didn't hear it called, we were out.

THE CHAIRMAN: That will do. Those opposed, stand.

(Delegates stand up.)

It is carried by a large majority. (Applause.)

The proceedings closed at 1.45 a.m.

## BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Lesson 9.

Fourth Quarter.

November 28, 1926.

Vol. 1.

T. T. SHIELDS, Editor.

No. 4.

### THE PRAYER OF JESUS.

Lesson Text: John, chapter 17.

**Golden Text.**—"Father, I will that they also, whom Thou hast given Me, be with Me where I am; that they may behold My glory, which Thou hast given Me: for Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world." (John 17: 24).

Here our great High Priest intercedes in our behalf. As He prays the Cross is immediately in view, but now the Blood has been shed, and with His own Blood He has entered into Heaven itself, there to appear in the presence of God for us.

#### 1. THE SON RENDERS HIS ACCOUNT TO HIS FATHER.

1. "The hour is come", the hour appointed from all eternity, the hour referred to in the Garden, the hour to which Abraham, Isaac and Jacob looked forward, of which Moses and the Prophets spake, the hour of all hours, the most pregnant and potent hour of all time and of eternity, for in this hour good and evil, righteousness and unrighteousness, truth and untruth, light and darkness, heaven and hell, God and the Devil, will meet and do battle. 2. The honor of the Father is involved in the honor of the Son. "Glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son also may glorify Thee". No view of God that belittles Christ can possibly be honouring to the Father. Here we are taught that the glory of the Father and of the Son are one, and that all men must honour the Son even as they honour the Father. In view of modern teaching, it is well that we should keep this in mind. The view of the universe that removes God from immediate control of His world, and pushes Him back beyond incalculable periods of time, and reduces Christ to the level of a man, has no agreement whatever with Scripture. 3. The glorification of Christ is related to the authority which He has received from His Father to give eternal life to as many as the Father has given Him. Men seek authority for their own profit, and in order that they may command the obedience of others for their own advantage. But Jesus Christ has authority over all flesh, indeed, all authority in Heaven and on earth, but it is exercised in the giving of life. He is absolutely sovereign, and He exercises His sovereignty for the salvation of men. 4. Eternal life consists in knowing God through Jesus Christ (vs. 3). We receive eternal life as a direct bestowment of the Spirit of God, and that comes to us through the knowledge of God. But we have life in Him also in the sense of the enjoyment of being. Really to know God is to know all things through Him, by whom all things were created. This is to be educated in the true sense for time and for eternity, and to be able to put the universe under tribute for our pleasure. 5. The work of Christ was to glorify God. Throughout His ministry He always spoke of God; He was a witness for God; He was the Word of God. It was impossible that anyone should hear Christ or see Him or touch Him without being made aware of God, for He Himself was, and is, God. Yet there is in the world to-day a religion which bears Christ's Name which practically excludes God. It makes much of time and of the things of time; it makes much of man and of the relationships of man; but for all purpose excludes God and mentions Him in a supposedly complimentary way, as having something to do with the beginning of things. Such a religion is far removed from the religion of Christ. 6. Christ finished His work. He never left anything undone, nor will He ever do so. How marvellous to reflect that a work of eternity was compressed within so brief a span! 7. He revels in the remembrance of the glory which He shared with His Father before the world was (vs. 5), and prays that He may be shown to be one with the Eternal Father. Here, surely, we



Word of God and to Jesus Christ as His infallible Son and my Saviour,—if that splits, I am ready to split every church in the Denomination. (Applause.)

DR. VINING: Mr. Chairman, I expect Dr. Shields knows how to split churches right enough.

A DELEGATE: So do you.

DR. VINING: I wonder what our Baptist fathers, our mighty dead, our glorious and glorified dead, would think if they could appear in our midst this evening?

A DELEGATE: Don't mention it.

#### Poor Little Jarvis Street!

DR. VINING: Davidson and Jackson and Dadson and McGregor and Grant and Castle and Rand and Trotter, and many others just as able and just as devoted. I am thinking at the present moment of Dr. B. D. Thomas, father, brother, friend, that magnificent character whose home-going has left us all so lonesome. I am sure those of us who knew him best and loved him most are devoutly thankful that God called him to Himself before he witnessed the work to which he gave the best years of his life banged and battered and marred and scarred.

There was a time, however, when the spirit of love and good fellowship and mutual confidence pervaded all our activities. But a change has come,—(Cries of "Yes, Sir")—a disgracefully pathetic change,—(Cries of "Yes, Sir")—and that change, I believe, has been brought about by the conduct of one man.—(Cries of "No")—who acts at times, so it seems to me, as if he were wholeheartedly in league with some unseen power to smash everything that does not harmonize with his views or fit into his programme or which had not its origin in his own brain.

This modernism! I am sick and tired of modernism, and I think the time has come when we ought to deal in some very plain speaking, we ought to let Dr. Shields know that we heartily disapprove of his tactics, that we loathe them absolutely un-British and un-Christian, as cowardly and contemptible. Has modernism invaded our Baptist pulpits? Dr. Shields says it has. This is what he says:

One of the rankest modernists in Canada occupies a pulpit only a few blocks from where I stand.

That is from *The Gospel Witness* of September 16, 1926, page 7. He also quotes from a letter which he claims he received from an Anglican lawyer, "of distinction", of course, a man whose home is in Toronto but who is on a visit. This is what this distinguished lawyer says in the letter to Dr. Shields:

"The Baptist minister here—is an enemy of the Cross, as no doubt you know. He says that John 3, 3, 'ye must be born again', is an isolated passage, and that the nurses in the hospitals and the heroines in the picture shows are all saviours, and so on."

#### Unchristian to Deal in Personalities—Let Us Have the Name!!

That is from *The Gospel Witness* of September 9, 1926, page 12. Dr. Shields is very fond of quoting letters without giving the names of the writers. Why not let us have the name? He does not scruple to report a private conversation he is supposed to have had with a man years ago.

Who are these modernists, I ask, in our pulpits who seem determined to drive our denominational ship on the rocks? Many of the pastors feel just exactly as I do, that it is unfair to them to leave them under this cloud of suspicion. I think the time has come when this stalwart strangler of straw men should come out of the mists of tautology and the pickpocket bunk of insinuation and point the accusing finger at these men that we may be put on our guard. I do not believe a word of it. I know the Baptist ministers of this Convention just as well as Dr. Shields, and I challenge him to produce a single man in this Convention who is an enemy of the Cross of Jesus Christ.

Dr. MacNeill has just finished celebrating twenty years of pastoral work in Walmer Road Church. I have not heard him preach very often, but I think

### The Letter of Dr. Vining to the Man He Insulted.

But again someone will say we are uncharitable in our refusal to believe in Dr. Vining's sincerity in this respect. Some days ago we received a letter from the gentleman to whom Dr. Vining's unsavoury words were addressed. The letter was a copy of a letter sent to Dr. Vining. The latter, therefore, identified the person whom Dr. Vining had publicly insulted. Both *The Canadian Baptist* and Dr. MacNeill declared that Dr. Vining had asked the forgiveness of the man he had wronged. With the letter received from that brother to-day there was enclosed a letter received by him from Dr. Vining, which we print below. Any candid reader will be able to judge of the depth of Dr. Vining's contrition.

College Street Baptist Church,  
College St. and Palmerston Ave.,  
Toronto, Oct. 30, 1926.

Mr. W. G. Potter,  
Hamilton, Ont.

Dear Mr. Potter:

I think from the opening lines of your letter dated Oct. 26th, that it is abusive in its nature and it will do no good to read it. I am therefore returning it unread. I have read enough of that kind of thing in *The Gospel Witness* during the last two years to do me the rest of my life.

I am sorry I allowed the people of your side of the house to provoke me and nag me into saying something I should not have said. You doubtless have seen by the Press that I expressed regret before the delegates, and sorrow for the way I spoke and asked forgiveness of all concerned. I can do no more.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) A. J. VINING.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order.

(Cries of "Sit down, sit down".)

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Vining withdraws the statement.

MR. WILSON: I wish to ask a question, Mr. Chairman,—if it is possible for Dr. Vining and some other members of the Convention to vote on such a resolution as this in a Christian spirit with an expression such as has fallen from his lips at this moment?

A DELEGATE: Satanic.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Vining withdraws the statement.

MR. WILSON: I ask the privilege of a question.

(Cries of "Shame, shame".)

A DELEGATE: Let him do it himself.

DR. VINING: Dr. Shields has asked me to read what he said. I am reading from the report as it appears in the daily paper. (Cries of "Oh, oh".) I am following his request.

Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D., Pastor of the Jarvis Street Church, spoke late in the evening.

(Cries of "Oh, oh".)

"Would it not be a glorious thing," he exclaimed amid applause, "if the fires of God could be called down on McMaster University!" And that he was willing to split every church in the Denomination if necessary.

Would Split Churches Only Through Loyalty to Christ.

DR. SHIELDS: Mr. Chairman, may I explain to Dr. Vining that it is the fire that we all want, I hope, the fire of Pentecost, to which I referred. (Applause.) And furthermore, I say that if absolute loyalty to the Bible as the

have Deity unveiled. Read Proverbs 8:22-31. In view of such a passage as this, unless we utterly reject John's Gospel, we are compelled to look upon Jesus Christ as God manifested in the flesh. 8. He has manifested His Father's Name to His disciples. He has shown His disciples who and what God is (vs. 6), saying, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father" (14: 9). 9. He has communicated the very words of God "For I have given unto them the words which Thou gavest Me". Here the Son claims much more than He has been the Revealer of the character of God by His own character and example, but He declares that the actual words which He has spoken were received from the Father, and that He has given them to His disciples. If the Son Himself was given not the word, but the words of God, is it not reasonable to accept the claim of the writers of Scripture that their very words were Divinely inspired? 10. Christ certifies to the faith of His disciples: "They have received them, and have known surely that I came out from Thee, and they have believed that Thou didst send Me". Knowing what is in man, He recognized that the faith of His disciples was genuine, and He certified to that fact before the Father. Is not this what He meant when He said, "Whosoever therefore shall confess Me before men, him will I confess also before My Father which is in Heaven. But whosoever shall deny Me before men, him will I also deny before My Father which is in Heaven" (Matt. 10:32, 33).

## II. HE INTERCEDES FOR HIS OWN.

1. He prays for such as have received Him as the Son of God: "I pray for them". Here we may learn the condition upon which we may obtain an interest in the intercessions of Christ. He prays for those who have believed in Him and whom the Father has given Him. 2. But He does not pray for the world: "I pray not for the world". We are told that the world lieth in the wicked one; the world has no intercessor. As Abraham prayed for the righteous in Sodom and Lot was saved in answer to his prayer, so Christ prays for believers who must still live in the world; but He prays not for the world. Who would willingly remain in the world thus exposed to Divine wrath with no intercessor to stand between the dead and the living that the plague might be stayed? How terrible the fate of those for whom Jesus Christ does not pray! 3. The Father, the Son and Holy Spirit have common unity of interests in believers. "And all Mine are Thine, and Thine are Mine; and I am glorified in them". 4. The High Priest prays that His disciples may be kept. He knows with what temptations they are beset and by how many enemies they will be opposed. Only God can keep us, but He can and will, for the heirs of salvation are "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation". 5. He prays that the Father will keep them through His Name. What is the name of God but what God really is? When Christ declared that He had manifested the Father's name, He meant surely that He had manifested His love, His mercy in one word, His grace, and only by that Divine power can believers be preserved. 6. Christ prays that believers may have His joy fulfilled in themselves. There is no Scriptural warrant for the assumption that the religion of Christ is a melancholy religion. It is a religion of joy which finds expression in joyous countenances, in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs. Though he was a man of sorrows He drank more deeply of the springs of joy than any man who ever lived; and He came to this world and lived and died that He might open a way into the Divine presence, where there is fulness of joy and pleasures for evermore. 7. Christ sums up His earthly ministry by saying, "I have given them Thy Word". What an example for us! What greater contribution can we make to the world than to give men the Word of God? 8. Believers are hated of the world because they have received God's Word. It is ever so, and from the beginning Satan has hated the Word of God, and he hates it still, and, so far as he has power, will take vengeance upon those who stand by God's Word. 9. He prays that they may be preserved from the evil that is in the world, not that they should be taken out of it. We are not called to live a cloistered or secluded life; we are not to be taken out of the world either by death or by incarceration in a monastery or nunnery; we are to mix with men of the world and yet be from the evil. 10. He prays that they may be sanctified through the truth of God's Word. Sanctification

is a process. It is not something to be received instantaneously as is justification, but a process carried on in the soul by the application of the principles of the Word of truth. It is by means of the exceeding great and precious promises we are made partakers of the Divine nature, not of one, but of many, and the more we appropriate, the greater the fulness of Divine life in the soul. Sanctification in the thought of Christ could not have meant an instantaneous step from a state of sinfulness to a state of sinlessness, for He never was other than sinless, yet He said "For their sakes I sanctify Myself". As a mother feels her responsibility to maintain her health as best she may for her children's sake, so, for the sake of believers, Christ sanctified Himself, or dedicated Himself, or set Himself apart for the work of our salvation. 11. He prays for all believers to the end of time (vs. 20), and for them that they all may be one in Him. There is nothing here to justify that passion for organic union of all religious bodies which may be based upon human contracts or prescribed by Acts of Parliament. It is for spiritual unity Christ prays, a unity comparable to the unity of the Godhead. Such unity, in the nature of the case, must be spiritual to have any existence in fact. 12. He then prays for the preservation of all believers unto eternal glory, that they may be where He is (vs. 24).

## THE AMBASSADOR OF GOD.

A Sermon by Dr. W. B. Hinson.

In the Scripture that was read there is to be found a sentence to which I call your attention. "I have received that which I delivered unto you, how that first of all Christ died for our sins according to the Scripture, and He was buried, and rose again, and was seen."

Remembering that I am privileged to speak to many of my brethren in the ministry I would in the first place call your attention to the fact that the clause, "I have received," defines the function of the preacher. The preacher is a man charged with the tremendous, exhilarating, crushing responsibility of bringing from God a gospel to man. He in this is the unique speaker. He is not in the class of rhetorician, lecturer, debater, reciter, originator of a message. It is his business to put his ear up to heaven and then with his lips tell to earth what he has heard. This consciousness will have a mighty effect upon the man himself. There will come to him solemnity, power, poise, carefulness, and carelessness, as he realizes that his message originated in God. This consciousness also will have a mighty effect upon the people to whom he delivers the message. "Speak," said the old blind Greek, "that I may see you." And the ambassador of God does not talk very long before there is begotten in the souls of men the consciousness that through him they are actually listening to God. "I have yet to speak on God's behalf" is a consciousness that floods the soul of the preacher with a holy exhilaration of a mighty responsibility, and floods as with an ocean tide the consciousness of the people to whom he speaks.

And then still remembering that I have to speak somewhat to preachers this morning, I venture in the second place to say the clause "I have delivered" defines largely the function of preaching, and under the mighty consciousness that a message has been received from God must the man of God stand up to declare that message to those who listen. And you will see ere I mention it how interlocked are these two statements. If the preacher is sure his message has been derived from God, how tremendous an influence that fact will exert upon the manner of the delivery of his message. The greatest preacher who ever walked the earth, God Himself incarnate in Jesus, delivered a marvelous message, but He delivered it in a marvelous way. O the rippling and murmuring of streams one hears when listening to the Christ! O the crash and roar of multitudinous seas that throbs and thunders in the same message! How lightnings flash and thunders roar, and how the still small voice is both heard and felt! To know the message is of God is to have taught to that one something of

which homiletics never dreamed in the matter of presenting the message to the audience. The writer of the text gives us one little hint as to the effect of a God-given message had upon his own method of presenting the Gospel. He says, "As though God entreated, as though Christ besought, we pray you to be reconciled to God."

"Oft when the Word is on me to deliver,  
Leaves the illusion and the truth lies bare,  
City or throng, the desert or the river  
Melts in a lucid paradise of air.

Only like souls I see the folk thereunder,  
Bound who should conquer, slaves who should be kings,  
Hearing their one hope with an empty wonder,  
Sadly contented with a show of things.

Then with a rush the intolerable craving  
Shivers throughout me like a trumpet call,  
Oh to save such, to perish for their saving,  
Die for their life, be offered for them all."

That is the natural consequence of a realization that one's message is of God.

But having said those two introductory words I call your attention to the subject of this preaching: Who does it concern? What is it about? "I have received that which I delivered unto you, how that first of all Christ—Christ." The preacher who to-day abides by that declaration is in the line of an illustrious ancestry. For I ever recall how when Jesus walked the earth He did nothing but call the attention of men from everyone else, even from Moses, to Himself. "Come unto Me, believe on Me, follow Me," is, as you know, the massive message of the Master. And if another illustration were sought, you have it in Paul himself, "I determined to know nothing among you save Christ and Him crucified." Whenever you ask him for his objective in time or eternity, swift comes the answer, "That I may know Him and the power of His resurrection." You need only refresh your memory slightly to recall how the mighty masters of evangelism who are gone, without a single exception put Christ first. Oh but we must talk to the people about creation. Christ is the Creator. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." Whoso talks about creation without putting Christ first is using an unchristian method of approaching an audience. And whatever you touch in the great horizon of revealed truth, it begins to quiver and send you back to the central fact of the Christian religion—the Lord Jesus Christ. First of all, Christ. We do this in our exigencies, or religious experience, my brothers.

I remember being called one night in a far-off city to go and see

a woman who was suddenly stricken and was manifestly dying, staying in a hotel. I shall never forget the sight I saw that night. A woman sinking down into the cold waters; and two little girls, possibly five and seven, on her bed. And when I entered, that woman looked up at me and said, "Are you a clergyman?" I said, "Yes." And she asked, "Do you know how I can get to heaven?" I replied, "I do." And I told her of Christ first, and the first thing I told her about Christ was He died that we might be forgiven. The Holy Spirit did His work in that hotel, and that woman passed over joyously into the consciousness of sin forgiven. And then taking two rings off her fingers she put them on the thumbs of those little children and said to them very seriously, with unutterable love and yet with a calm confidence, "When you grow up remember your mother. Keep those rings, and always bear in mind that your mother is in heaven through the death of Jesus Christ." You may know something else that does that sort of thing, but before God I avow my ignorance of anything except the cross of Christ, and the Christ put first, who will accomplish that kind of good.

First of all, Christ died for our sins. We have none? Then I have no further word for you. But if you stand in the great line that has the kingly psalmist and the penitent publican in it, and if you with them say, "God be merciful to me the sinner," then I come with this gospel of I Corinthians 15:3. "Christ died for our sin." He said so Himself. With these distracting noises about us it is well for us to get right back to the Lord Jesus Christ and ponder His mighty affirmations. Hear one of them, "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me." "Christ died for our sins." Hear those who knew Him best, as they express themselves in regard to this fact. "Christ suffered for sins," writes Peter, "the Just for the unjust to bring us to God." "The blood of Jesus Christ," says John, "cleanseth from all sin." "Christ died for the ungodly," is the utterance of Paul the Apostle. And when the seer of Patmos was privileged to look into the four-square city he declares that he heard a great multitude saying, "Unto Him who loved us and washed us from our sins in His own blood be the glory." They are telling me in these strange days that to believe this is to be old-fashioned. Well, not to believe this is to be something a great deal worse than old-fashioned. They are telling me to-day that if we believe this sort of doctrine we are at the end of the procession. It might be well to stop and get a definition as to the kind of procession they are talking about. While I can stand with Paul and Peter and the two Johns and Jesus Christ I am uncon-

cerned as to the procession, and the being old-fashioned, and all the rest. There is one thing sure. While I am diligently striving to keep every possibility of a controversial thought out of our meditation this morning, this old gospel that Paul talks about in this motto text of mine has succeeded in bringing multitudinous millions of men to the Lord Jesus Christ and into the Kingdom of God, and I do not see anything else upon the broad earth that is worthy of being called its competitor. "He died for our sins according to the Scripture."

Now Paul had a Bible but it was a very inferior Bible to your Bible. He had the old Testament. And I have wondered occasionally whether when he wrote that sentence, "according to the Scriptures," he was thinking about Isaiah 53. They tell me in some quarters that is only a description of an anonymous Israelitish hero. Yes? But I tell you what I found happening in my experience as I moved along towards God and heaven, that when I can get a sin-convicted soul to make singular that which in Isaiah 53 is plural, a transformation takes place in that soul utterly beyond all human explanation. They are on the golden floors of heaven this morning, the men and women to whom I have said, Look at this verse: "He was wounded for our transgressions. He was bruised for our iniquities. The chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed." Now then make that plural singular, and in the exercise of God-given faith say, "He was wounded for my transgressions. He was bruised for my iniquities. The chastisement of my peace was upon Him, and with His stripes I am healed." The English people have a proverb, "Speak well of the bridge that carries you over." In the hearing of God I will do that now. This bridge, "Christ died for our sins according to the Scripture," carried me over. It carried me over from condemnation into justification. It carried me over from Sinai to Calvary. It carried me over from death to life. And may my tongue rot between my jaws ere I cease to affirm, "Christ died for our sins" gets us into a consciousness of being at one with the Eternal God. And I in my ignorance have failed yet to find any other single thing that does.

"And He was buried." Oh in the early days of my life I looked at that clause and thought little of it. "He was buried." For I was full of lusty life and all my friends were about me, and what had I to do with the grave? But one day the old woman who used to rock in her wicker chair and sing tremblingly—

"Guide me, O Thou great Jehovah,  
Pilgrim through a barren land,  
I am weak but Thou art mighty,  
Hold me with Thy powerful hand"—



slipped out and "was buried" became an utterance more beautiful than a rainbow, with richer significance than the purple glow of the dawn. And then the old man, straight as a rifle-barrel, crowned with a mane of white hair, fearless of eye, he too passed away into the unseen glory. And "he was buried" became increasingly beautiful to me. I really dislike mentioning this illustration that suddenly comes crowding into my memory but I cannot help myself. I have always been the kind of person who has to say what demands utterance. Sometimes I wish I could change the propensity. But I attended a funeral a few weeks ago. I had nothing to do with the planning of the service, and they sang as the first hymn, "Beautiful Isle of Somewhere," and they sang as the second hymn, "This is the end of a perfect day." I do not know anything about the person whose body I buried. If he were an agnostic that first song would be a little bit appropriate. But I imagine him sailing on in search of a beautiful isle of somewhere. I do not know what he must have been to have merited the second hymn, "This is the end of a perfect day," but I do know if when that body that has served me well for long lies quiet in a casket, if any one should sing, standing by me, the line suggesting that I am wandering around hunting a place I cannot find, where all the geography given me consists of "somewhere," I will do my best to scratch the box I am in and scare that singer inside it! "He was buried."

"Christ leads us through no darker rooms  
Than He went through before;  
No one into His Kingdom comes  
But through the open door.

Why should we tremble to convey  
Their bodies to the tomb?  
There the dear flesh of Jesus lay  
And left a long perfume."

That is as much better than "Beautiful Isle of Somewhere" as God's manna was better than the wilderness sand to the Israelites.

"And He rose again." He rose again. Do you know the most beautiful poem of agnosticism has in it a verse that talks about the possibility of a dead Christ? It is this:

"He is dead, for hence He lies  
In a lorn Syrian town,  
And on His grave with shining eyes  
The Syrian stars look down."

Is that so? What effect had that upon the life of the man who wrote it? Turn back to Matthew Arnold's Dover Beach and you will see the effect of a dead Christ on a human life.

"For the world which seems to lie before us  
Like a land of dreams,  
So fair, so beautiful, so vast,  
Has really neither life, nor love, nor light,  
Nor certitude, nor peace, nor balm for pain,  
But we are left as on a darkening plain  
Filled with confused alarms of struggle and flight,  
Where ignorant armies clash by night."

That is the legitimate outcome of a belief in a dead Christ. He arose.

A somewhat noted man says he is puzzled by Christ's resurrection. He well may be. But a host no man can number is solaced tremendously by the fact of Christ's resurrection. Mary saw Him and the women. Peter saw Him, as did James. The ten saw Him, and afterward the eleven. And will somebody sometime in some place preach a sermon on poor Thomas who has been known for nineteen hundred years as the doubter, and we do not know anything else about him. And yet he is the man who said, "There now Jesus is going down to Bethlehem and they will kill Him. Let us go and die with Him." And he is the man I am thankful to God for till this moment, because he did what I would have done. He said, "I will not believe in that resurrected body until I put my finger in the mark of the nail." And you see this man kept with the people who did believe in Jesus although he could not believe and accept the faith himself. And Christ drew near and said, "Thomas, there is my hand and the mark of the nail." I do not know but I cannot think Thomas ever touched that mark in the palm. I think he dropped to his knees and said, "My Lord and my God." He arose! Let there be no uncertainty about it. Let us remember in the Acts of the Apostles when the Apostles preached till they turned the world upside down, they were continuously preaching Jesus and the resurrection. And let us turn away occasionally and talk about the mighty fact Christ rose from the dead. We do it on Easter Sunday. It is a good thing we have Easter Sunday or else in some quarters we should never hear of the resurrection at all.

I must hasten to the close. "He rose again and He was seen." Now I purposely omitted some of the witnesses who saw the risen Lord, when quoting a sentence from which I stopped. "And He was seen"—that was written twenty-five years after the resurrection of Jesus Christ. "And He was seen of about five hundred brethren at once." And twenty-five years afterward the Apostle said in the Scripture my brother read, "The greater part remain, though some are fallen asleep." And I am halting here a moment not so much to show you how a quarter of a century after Christ went to heaven there must have been two hundred and fifty-one men who at the same time and in the same place saw Him with the eyes of the body, as to call your attention to this fact—a sight of the resurrected Jesus changed life into a remaining, and changed death into a falling asleep. Write me out an application for a religion that does that sort of thing. It turned life upon the earth into a remaining. They walked with God because they had seen the risen Christ. They held their simple faith amid all the conflicting noises of the world. They were sure when others were uncertain. They remain. And if anyone in mind even is disparaging that sentence, I would like to remind you that our great Saviour said we were to be as men who wait. Death? It changed death into a falling asleep.

Once in England I happened to be passing a little churchyard where they buried folk out in the thinly settled country. A heavy

mist was falling, but I stopped to listen for I heard untrained voices singing a hymn, and this is what they sang—

"Asleep in Jesus, blessed sleep,  
From which none ever wake to weep,  
A calm and undisturbed repose  
Unbroken by the last of foes."

Some are fallen asleep. Your mother and my father, your husband, your wife, your son, your daughter—they are fallen asleep. My concern is this at the present moment—the Christ who died for your sins and was buried and rose again, if He was so seen by you your life is a remaining, and when you look towards death you see nothing but a beautiful sentence, "He giveth His beloved sleep."

This then is the gospel that Christ believed and taught. This then is the gospel that Paul accepted and proclaimed. This then is the gospel which is Jesus Christ.

Throwing out a chance question in a meeting, "What is a Christian?" to my amazement a young man rose in the audience and said, "Why a Christian is a Christ-ian. He is a man who has accepted Christ as Saviour. He is a man who has accepted Him as Saviour and Lord." And I said, "Who are you?" He said, "I am ———. I was a Roman Catholic until to-night. Now I am a Christ-ian, a Christian, a man who believes Jesus is my Saviour and my Lord."

My brethren, will you let me very quietly, and I think humbly, and I am sure firmly, say to you in the midst of all this distraction let us hold fast to Christ. In the midst of all the turmoil and the strife let us keep near to the Son of God who is the only Saviour. In the midst of all the hopelessness, all the distrust, and all the despair, let us tell the story of the cross, of the massive love of God disclosed in Jesus Christ. They are talking all the world over about what alone will save our civilization from destruction. They are all wrong. Jesus Christ alone can save an individual, a church, a nation, or the world. He can do it. For—

"I know a land that is sunk in shame,  
Where hearts grow faint and tired,  
But I know of a name, a precious name  
That can set that land on fire.

Its sound is as thunder, its letters are flame,  
It's the name of Him who from heaven came,  
The One who to-day and all days is the same,  
It's Jesus, Jesus, Jesus, Jesus."

Oh let us gather around Him and stay with Him till the day break and the shadows flee away, and then throughout Eternity we will follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth. Amen.

# INDEX

	Page
Alexander, Rev. David, corroborates Dr. Shields' statement.....	119
Allen, Rev. G. W. ....	
And Ossington Ave. ....	31
Quotes Scripture on human depravity .....	68
Quotes First Ave. sermon .....	68
Quotes Prof. Marshall respecting human depravity .....	67
Speech of .....	66
Ambassador, The, of God	
Sermon by Dr. Hinson .....	163
Amendment restated .....	142
Amendment to amendment .....	69
Amendment to amendment restated .....	143
Association, Regular Baptist, Resolution on .....	15
Atonement, <i>Canadian Baptist</i> ignores .....	10
Authority of Christ, Prof. Marshall .....	44
Adjournment:	
Of morning session .....	29
Afternoon session .....	30
Adjournment of afternoon session .....	88
Ballot, Secrecy of, violated .....	4
<i>Baptist, The Canadian</i>	
False report of .....	10
Ignores Atonement .....	10
Bible Union	
Dr. Riley's letter on .....	22
Bingham, Dr. H. H., Dr. MacNeill refers to .....	56
Board of Governors, Dr. Shields' membership of .....	11
Bootleggers Censure the Detective .....	11
Brotherhood of Baptist Colleges, Dr. MacNeill on .....	34
Brougher, Dr. J. W., Dr. MacNeill refers to .....	55
Brown, W. Gordon	
Comments on Prof. Marshall's speech .....	98
Length of speech .....	9
Prof. Marshall on school days .....	96
Professor Marshall and Science .....	115
Replies to Prof. Marshall .....	97
Speaks of revival .....	114
Speech of .....	114
Says Prof. Marshall calls substitutionary atonement crude .....	116
Brown, Rev. W. J. H.	
Length of his speech .....	9
Speech of .....	62
Brown, Prof J. G.	
Justifying Modernism .....	41
Secures Proxies .....	8
Building, The Convention .....	3
Bundle of lies, who swallowed .....	155
Cameron, Rev. W. A., Named in Modernist group .....	40
Campbell, Prof. P. S.:	
Dr. MacNeill refers to .....	39
Referred to by Prof. Marshall .....	91
Retirement of .....	29
Censure by Convention .....	13
Christian Education, Dr. MacNeill on .....	33
Clemenceau, Prof. Campbell compared to .....	39

## INDEX—(Continued)

	Page
Convention:	
In an uproar .....	113
Decision in a nut-shell .....	12
Report of in New Testament .....	5
Cranston, Mr. J. H., Named in Modernist group .....	40
Cross, Dr. George. Referred to by Dr. Strong .....	34
Crozer, Referred to by Dr. MacNeill .....	34
Curr, Prof.:	
On Jonah .....	125
Quoted .....	14
Debate, Length of .....	12
Decision of the Convention in a Nutshell .....	12
Defend Himself, Will a Man .....	24
Delegation of the Convention .....	7
Depravity:	
Human—Professor Marshall on .....	104
Total Human—Professor Marshall on .....	48
Disciples of Christ—Doctrines Taught in McMaster .....	17
Divider—Who is the .....	35
Dixon, Dr. A. C., Dr. MacNeill refers to .....	55
Doctrinal Preaching—Prof. Marshall recommends a minimum .....	82
Dragon's Teeth—Dr. MacNeill speaks of .....	35
Driver, Dr.:	
Rev. W. J. H. Brown on .....	63
Rev. John Linton on .....	138
Professor Marshall on .....	93
Duncan, Rev. C. R.—Secures Proxies .....	8
Ecclesiastical Authority, Reference to .....	32
Education, Christian—Dr. MacNeill .....	33
Edgar, Rev. W. S.	
Length of Speech .....	9
Speech of .....	75
Evening Session .....	89
Exploded Charges,—Proved to the Hilt .....	43
Exploded—Dr. MacNeill says charges are .....	42
Farmer, Dr. J. H.:	
Believes One Thing—but defends the opposite .....	139
Defends Looser View of Scripture .....	41
Governors' Trust .....	140
On Dr. Huddleston .....	153
On Jarvis St. Church and Satan's Opposition .....	37
Park Church, Brantford .....	154
Prof. Marshall Contrasted with .....	81
Renews his plea for the Inclusive Policy .....	142
Says Prof. Marshall is Close to Conservative Position .....	140
Speech Of .....	139
T. T. Shields on .....	9
"Spirit" referred to .....	32
Falsehood—Dr. MacNeill Statement re Dr. Dixon .....	55
Forward Movement for McMaster .....	29
Fox, Mr. E. C., Names in Modernist Group .....	40
Future, What of the? .....	15
Gadara, Prof. Marshall on the miracle of .....	81
Gadarene, Prof. Marshall on .....	111
Galt, Rev. John:	
Length of speech .....	9
"Missionary to cab-drivers" .....	88
Speech of .....	88

## INDEX—(Continued)

	Page
<i>Gospel Witness:</i>	
Copies of this issue .....	14
Circulation of .....	14
Graham, Dr. W. F., Remark about "machinery" .....	11
Green, Dr. Bowley:	
Knows no modernists here .....	152
Off the fence on over the fence .....	152
Spirit referred to .....	32
The gentleman with the cushion .....	151
Hamilton Convention, Dr. MacNeill refers to .....	37
Hinson, Dr. W. B.:	
Sermon by .....	163
Home Mission Board, muzzling resolution .....	12
Jonah:	
Rev. W. J. H. Brown on .....	63
Prof. Curr refers to .....	125
Prof. Marshall on .....	48
Jesus and Inspiration: Prof. Marshall on .....	47
Kennedy, Rev. J. B.:	
Again ruled out .....	88
Appeals for fair play .....	156
Speaks .....	29
Keirstead, Prof. E. M.:	
Linton's story of ballot .....	4
Quoted by Rev. W. J. H. Brown .....	64
Dr. Whidden on retirement of .....	27
Keyser, Dr. L. S. ....	24
Linton, Rev. John:	
Announces he desires to speak .....	117
Convention votes not to hear .....	136
Length of speech .....	9
Offered ten minutes by Dr. Farmer .....	136
On Dr. Driver's position .....	138
Speech of .....	136
Story of Dr. Keirstead's ballot .....	4
Three reasons for not supporting Prof. Marshall .....	138
London Convention referred to .....	60
Luther, Martin:	
Confession of faith .....	20
Old article concerning leadership of .....	20
On the atonement, quoted by Mr. W. J. H. Brown .....	64
Machine, Nuts in .....	11
Massee, D. J. C.:	
Dr. W. B. Riley replies .....	21
Dr. MacNeill refers to .....	55
Matthews, Mr. Albert:	
Dr. Sanderson Incident .....	57
On Dr. McCrimmon .....	58
Length of Speech .....	9
Speech of .....	57
Marshall, Prof. L. H.:	
And the "Scientific" Attitude .....	132
And the faith of the students .....	84
As bold as two Mons .....	90
W. Gordon Brown replies .....	97
Confession of .....	42
Caricatures Orthodoxy .....	103
Censures Editor of <i>The Prophet</i> .....	95
Denies the heart of the Gospel .....	87

<b>INDEX—(Continued)</b>		<b>Page</b>
Denies Penal Substitution .....		127
Expresses thanks to Dr. Shields .....		89
Exemplifies admirable spirit .....		96
First Ave. Sermon quoted .....		49
<i>The Gospel Witness</i> analysis Confession of Faith .....		43
Hamilton address quoted .....		49
Himself true and every man a liar .....		109
James St. Sermon quoted by Rev. W. J. H. Brown .....		65
On Jonah .....		101
Length of Speech .....		9
Low estimate of Canadian Baptists .....		132
Misquotes Dr. Shields .....		124
Member of Open Communion Church .....		17
Misrepresents Spurgeon .....		100
On "narrowest of narrow" .....		43
No objection standard .....		110
Objects to word "punishment" .....		127
Omits important paragraph in Dr. Denney .....		100
On Plymouth Brethren .....		112
On the uneducated Fool .....		103
On Romans 7 .....		105
On the miracles .....		110
On juvenile human nature .....		104
On human depravity .....		104
On The Baptist Union of Great Britain .....		104
On baptism and church membership .....		50
On Dr. Driver .....		93
On Professor Campbell .....		91
On English and Canadian view of Jonah .....		102
On Rev. John Dodd's Quotation .....		109
On Driver's method and conclusions .....		95
On Saint Bernard preaching to the fish .....		106
On Mr. Robertson of Liverpool .....		90
On Romans 3: 26 .....		87
On the atonement .....		86
On the supernatural .....		49
On clues to the miracles .....		49
On Wesley and Spurgeon .....		85
Quotes <i>The Gospel Witness</i> with approval .....		106
Quotes C. H. Spurgeon on temper .....		89
Quotes letter from Robertson .....		91
Quotes Dr. Orr on Higher Criticism .....		93
Quotes Dr. James Denney of punishment .....		99
Refuses to be catechised .....		127
Recommends minimum of doctrinal preaching .....		32
Says "thou West" .....		111
Spirit referred .....		32
Speech of .....		88
Telegram referred to .....		20
Tells a story .....		89
Walmer Road sermon .....		45
Would please Drs. Farmer and McNeill .....		101
Mesley, Rev. W. F., Declares for self-support .....		46
Methods, McMaster .....		12
Mission Circle, Resolution on .....		13
Resolution of .....		16
MacDougall, Mr., rises to a point of order .....		75
McGinlay, Rev. James:		
On Dr. Farmer .....		77
On Dr. Farmer's promise .....		78

## INDEX—(Continued)

	Page
Length of speech .....	9
Prof. Marshall a "Liberal Evangelical" .....	78
Put to sea .....	77
The resourceful .....	77
Speech of .....	75
Speech on bootleggers .....	11
McKay, Rev. R. R.	
Speech of .....	73
Length of speech .....	9
Seconded amendment to amendment .....	70
McKay, Dr. A. C., referred to .....	29
McMaster University:	
Forward movement .....	29
Methods .....	12
Spirit .....	12
Summer session at .....	28
Needs cleaning out .....	68
McMaster University Charter:	
Professors and Tutors .....	17
Violated by appointment of Professors Matthews and Marshall ....	17
McMaster Monthly, W. S. Whitcombe on .....	73
MacNeill, Dr.:	
Baptist Bible Union .....	53
Dr. Shields and the Board .....	53
Length of his speech .....	9
Named in Little group .....	40
On the Robertson letters .....	42
Spirit referred to .....	32
Speech of .....	33
St. Thomas Convention .....	36
Standing in wilderness .....	33
Telegram refers to .....	20
Untrue statement of .....	36
New, Prof. C. H.:	
In an attempt to be clever, is amusing .....	113
Named in Modernist Group .....	40
Newton, Referred to .....	34
Oakwood Ave. Church declares for self-support .....	16
Ossington Ave.—Rev. G. W. Allen .....	31
Orr, Dr. James—Quotations from <i>Problem of the Old Testament</i> .....	94
Paedo-Baptists—Why Educate under cost? .....	26
Parson, Prof. E.—Quoted by Dr. Strong .....	34
Penman, Rev. A.—Rebukes Dr. Vining .....	8 and 150
Pettit, Mr. Holland—Estimates 50 Proxies .....	8
Pistol, Click of—Chancellor's Reference to .....	30
Dr. MacNeill Refers to .....	54
Plymouth Brethren—Professor Marshall on .....	112
Porter, Dr. J. W., on Professor Marshall .....	51
Prayer, Place of .....	13
Price, Rev. Robt.:	
Challenges Mr. Whitcombe .....	30
Interrupts W. Gordon Brown .....	115
Length of Speech .....	9
Speech of .....	79
Whitcombe and Brown reply to .....	85
Priesthood of Christ—Professor Marshall on .....	47
Private and Public Statements—Dr. Shields on .....	118
Professor—Witness Nominates .....	14
Professorial Nobodies Referred to .....	14



## INDEX—(Continued)

	Page
Religion Natural—Professor Marshall on .....	48
Resolution, An Innocuous .....	11
Resolution Passed by Stanley Ave. Church .....	15
Resolution Re Regular Baptist Association .....	15
Resurrection, Prof. Marshall on .....	46
Riley, Dr. W. B.—	
Letter in Moody Monthly .....	21
Gives Facts on Alternate Reading Course .....	122
Robertson Letters, Dr. MacNeill on .....	42
Sanderson, Dr. Frank:	
Confession of .....	59
Named in Modernist group .....	40
Scarborough, Dr. MacNeill refers to .....	54
Scripture, Inspiration of, Prof. Marshall on .....	47
Scrutineers'	
Appointment .....	3
Report .....	143
Searchlight Quoted .....	31
Shields, Dr. T. T.:	
And St. Thomas Convention .....	36
Asks Question of Rev. J. M. Warner .....	119
Charges Rev. J. M. Warner with deliberate inaccuracy .....	120
Denies Responsibility for Prof. Campbell's Letter .....	124
Explains telegram re Dr. Bingham .....	118
Gospel of the blood .....	135
Length of speech .....	9
Lifts the veil a little .....	134
Private and Public statements .....	118
Proves Professor Marshall misrepresents Spurgeon .....	131
Quotes Spurgeon at length .....	128-131
Quotes official records on alternate reading course .....	120-121
Replies to Mr. Albert Matthews .....	118
Says he will speak when ready .....	113
Says case of mistaken identity .....	111
Speech of .....	117
Treats Dr. Vining's resolution with contempt .....	159
Unacceptable as delegate .....	11
Slanderer—Who is he? .....	39
Smalley, Rev. W. C.:	
Length of speech .....	9
Speech of .....	116
Spanish Inquisition referred to .....	31
"Spirit" of McMaster in Convention .....	32
Spirit of McMaster .....	12
Spurgeon misrepresented by Prof. Marshall .....	100
Stanley Avenue Church, Hamilton, Resolution of .....	15
Stewart's, Mr. E. P., letter .....	31
Stillwell, Rev. H. E., reported .....	74
Straw, Threshing over old .....	33
Strong, Dr. A. H., quoted .....	34
Substitutionary Atonement "Bold" and "Crude"—Prof. Marshall.....	45
Summer Session—Chancellor discusses .....	28
Table of time consumed by various speakers .....	137
Telegram Editorial .....	20
Thompson, Rev. W. J. ....	19
Time limit to speeches proposed .....	116
Time-table of speakers. Mr. C. C. McCredie's .....	9
Truett, Dr. George, Dr. MacNeill refers to .....	54

## INDEX—(Continued)

	Page
Urquhart, Thomas:	
Advice concerning bequests .....	17
Letter from .....	6
Moral obligation re Woodstock .....	17
Rises to point of order .....	75
Vicarious Suffering of Christ, Prof. Marshall on .....	44
Vining, Dr. A. J.:	
Active in securing proxies .....	8
Apology of .....	146
Apology not sincere .....	146
In Modernistic group .....	149
Letter of, to man he insulted .....	147
Dr. MacNeill refers to apology of .....	146
Moves resolution .....	144
Objects to personalities; asks for names .....	148
On Baptist liberty .....	149
Resolution .....	10
Rev. A. Fenman rebukes .....	150
Says Dr. Shields would split denomination .....	147
Speech of .....	145
Spirit referred to .....	32
Telegram refers to .....	21
Vugar remarks to a certain delegate .....	146
Wallace, Dr. O. C. S., referred to .....	29
Walmer Road:	
Convention .....	25
Sermon of Prof. Marshall .....	45
Sermon of Rev. W. J. H. Brown on .....	66
Warner, Rev. J. M.:	
On the Baptist Bible Union .....	70
Length of Speech .....	9
Misrepresents <i>Gospel Witness</i> and <i>Northern Baptist Annual</i> .....	123
Moves amendment to amendment .....	69
Nominated as Professor .....	14
On alternate reading course .....	71
On insincerity .....	70
Repeats his false statements .....	119
Speech of .....	70
Secures proxies .....	8
Whidden, Chancellor:	
Chivalry of .....	30
Discusses Summer session .....	28
Length of his speech .....	9
On Prof. Campbell .....	27
On Dr. Keirstead's retirement .....	27
Quotes Dr. Orr .....	94
Speech of .....	25
Tells a story .....	30
Whitcombe, Rev. W. S.:	
Answers Price's challenge .....	80
Length of Speech .....	9
Speech of .....	73
Wills and Testaments, Advice concerning .....	18
Wilson, Rev. A. P., discusses point of order .....	75
Woodstock College:	
Closing of, Dr. Whidden refers to .....	25
And Moulton, <i>Gospel Witness</i> ' criticisms .....	25
Reference to .....	25
Dr. F. Sanderson .....	25
Mr. Thomas Urquhart on .....	17