

# 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.

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. 43. TORONTO, MARCH 3rd, 1927. Whole No. 253.

## The Jarvis Street Pulpit

IF ONLY THE LORD JESUS WOULD COME BACK!

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis St. Church, Toronto, Sunday Morning, February 27th, 1927.  
(Stenographically reported.)

"And Mephibosheth said unto the king, Yea, let him take all, forasmuch as  
my lord the king is come again in peace unto his own house."—2 Samuel 19: 30.



VERY interesting chapter of history is connected with this text: You will recall the story of David's grace to Mephibosheth recorded earlier in this book. David had made a covenant with his friend Jonathan in the days when Saul was still king, and by the terms of that covenant, David had promised that he would not cut off his kindness from Saul's house for ever. Years passed, and David came to the throne; and in remembrance of his covenant he inquired, "Is there yet any that is left of the house of Saul, that I may shew him kindness for Jonathan's sake?" And they told him of one, Mephibosheth by name, who lived "in the house of Machir, the son of Ammiel, in Lo-debar". Mephibosheth was lame—he was lame on both feet, not on one, but on both, an utterly helpless man. But a man called Ziba was commissioned to carry the good news of the king's gracious purpose to Mephibosheth, and Mephibosheth was brought to Jerusalem, and into the presence of the king; and the king said to him, "Fear not: for I will surely show thee kindness for Jonathan thy father's sake, and will restore thee all the land of Saul thy father; and thou shalt eat bread at my table continually" as one of the king's sons. And Mephibosheth did obeisance to the king and said, "What is thy servant, that thou shouldest look upon such a dead dog as I am?" Mephibosheth was brought into the king's household, was made a member of the king's family, he sat daily at the king's table as one of the king's sons.

But some years later trouble came upon Israel, and Absalom lifted up his hand against his father. This brilliant, dashing, young Absalom, a man of attractive personality, for a time seemed to carry all Israel with him. Day by day, news was brought to David of some new defection from his ranks: Ahithophel, the king's counsellor, joined the conspirators, and day by day Absalom's followers multiplied, while the people that were with David diminished, until at last they brought him the news that "the hearts of the men of Israel are after Absalom". Then David left his city, and, like a Greater than he, went up

the slope of Olivet weeping as he went up; but saying that if the Lord took pleasure in him, and favoured his return again to the city, He would bring him back in triumph, but if not, the will of the Lord should be done.

That was a time of testing in Israel. There were some, however, who stood true to the king: Barzillai, the rich man, provided the king sustenance while he lay at Mahanaim; he sent out his servants to minister to his master while his master was in exile. And Mephibosheth planned to do the same thing. He commanded Ziba to saddle his ass, and to prepare provisions in abundance, that he might follow David into exile, that he, too, might share the king's privation, and minister to him of all that he had. But Ziba deceived him, and went out to meet the king alone; and when David saw Ziba without Mephibosheth, he said to him, "Where is your master? Why did not Mephibosheth come?" "Oh," said Ziba, "he is staying back there in Jerusalem, and he says to-day shall the house of Israel restore me the kingdom of my father. Mephibosheth has turned traitor!" And David, being only a man, said, "Thine are all that pertained unto Mephibosheth. I give you Mephibosheth's estate."

But at last the tide turned: Absalom's forces were defeated in the wood of Ephraim, they were utterly routed; Absalom himself was slain; the hearts of the men of Israel, as by a great spiritual revival, were turned back again to David; and they began to vie with each other in their zeal for the king's honour, and to compete with each other in their activities in bringing the king back again to his own house. And when the king was returning, "Mephibosheth the son of Saul, came down to meet the king, and had neither dressed his feet, nor trimmed his beard, nor washed his clothes, from the day the king departed until the day he came again in peace." And when he came, king David remembered that hour of bitter disappointment when the one he had befriended was reported to have forsaken him, and he said, "Wherefore wentest not thou with me, Mephibosheth?" And this was the answer, "My lord, O king, my servant deceived me: for thy servant said, I will saddle me an ass, that I may ride thereon, and go to the king; because thy servant is lame. And he hath slandered thy servant unto my lord the king; but my lord the king is as an angel of God: do therefore what is good in thine eyes. For all of my father's house were but dead men before my lord the king: yet didst thou set thy servant among them that did eat at thine own table. What right, therefore have I yet to cry any more unto the king?" And the king, feeling somewhat humbled that he had too readily listened to Ziba's slander, said, "Do not speak to me any more about it; thou and Ziba divide the land." "Oh," said Mephibosheth, "we will have no quarrel about that; let him take all, he can have it all; I do not care for the property, so long as my lord the king is come back to his own house in peace—that is what I want."

I shall use that story of Mephibosheth's loyalty to illustrate what I conceive to be the ideal attitude of believers in the Lord Jesus Christ toward their rightful Lord and King to-day.

#### I.

First of all, WHILE MANY TURNED THEIR BACKS UPON DAVID, MEPHIBOSHETH STOOD ABSOLUTELY UNMOVED IN HIS DEVOTION TO HIS LORD. It was popular, at a certain time, to be on Absalom's side; it became very unpopular to speak a good word for David. The leaders of Israel turned their back upon the king, even such an one as Ahithophel—Professor Ahithophel! the man of superior wisdom, the man whose word has been even as a divine oracle!—even Ahithophel forsook David, and accepted Absalom as his lord instead. It was a day when men considered their own interests; when men were willing to accept any one as king, so long as the king provided them with meat; it was a day when policy was substituted for principle, and expediency for conviction; when men turned their backs upon the traditions of the past; when men cared nothing for what God had said respecting His own anointed—and the multitude clamoured for Absalom. But Mephibosheth, amid all this confusion, stood unmoved in his personal devotion to his rightful lord and king.

Surely, dear friends, there is an analogy here to present-day conditions. In certain quarters it is popular to assume that, religiously, nothing really matters; we must be "bread-minded"; we must be charitably-disposed toward all the

varying views of the day; we must allow ourselves to be carried about by every wind of doctrine; we must not be positive—certainly we must not be dogmatic in our views respecting religious matters! "Be not righteous over much; neither make thyself overwise: why shouldst thou destroy thyself?" Why contend for the faith? Why stand fast by the essentials of the gospel? Why be over-particular? Why not join with the multitude? Well, what is your name, Ahithophel, or Mephibosheth? Mephibosheth was absolutely unmoved by all the winds that blew. To him there was but one king; no other could ever sit upon the throne with Mephibosheth's consent, no other hand should wield the sceptre, no other brow should wear the crown—he had but one king, and that king was the Lord's anointed. God help us, in the midst of all the changes of the day, to stand unmoved in our personal devotion to the Lord Jesus Christ!

I have been amazed, dear friends, to observe that even among ministers the uppermost question seems to be, "What is the direction in which I may reap the largest profits? Where may I find the most congenial position? What company of people will contribute most to my promotion? Will it pay to stand by the faith? Does fundamentalism"—if I may use a much-hated word—"promise promotion, worldly honour, position, and emolument? If not, then so far as I am concerned, I will follow Absalom"! Yet the Lord has always had some who, in the midst of it all, have stood true to the Lord Jesus Christ.

I have been asked in a good many places, "What is the use? what prospect have we of success?" There was a day when it was an unusual thing to hear men question the Deity of Christ; it was unusual to hear the crown-rights of the Lord Jesus disputed. In a city like Toronto you could go into almost any church and be sure of hearing a word that would be honouring to the Lord Jesus Christ. Now the reverse is true.

I think I will tell you a story which Brother Loney told me only yesterday; it is illustrative of the drift even in the Baptist denomination. You know the stand that the Stanley Ave. Church has taken for the faith; and it was reported that about forty members were likely to leave Stanley Ave. Church. (As a matter of fact, I believe it is doubtful whether more than a dozen will leave.) So quite recently a certain person telephoned a well-known member of Stanley Ave. Church, and that person introduced himself as a member of the Unitarian Church, the First Unitarian Church of Hamilton. He said they had been unable to carry on, they had become disorganized, they had given up their services—but they had read that forty people were likely to leave Stanley Ave. Church, and they thought if they could get hold of the forty, they might be able to rejuvenate the Unitarian Church! And I understand the Unitarians did hold a service, and they reported that they had seventeen Baptists in the Unitarian service! (Understand these were not reported as coming from Stanley Ave.) Now this Unitarian said that, so far as he was able to make out, Professor Marshall was a fine fellow, and very much in agreement with them. The Chancellor of McMaster and Professor Marshall enjoy the rather unenviable distinction of being highly praised by our neighbouring Unitarian minister! I do not charge the Chancellor with holding Unitarian views; but the Unitarians recognize that he is leading McMaster University in their direction.

That is the drift of the times everywhere, and we are asked what we can do. I published a few weeks ago an article about a certain foreign missionary by the name of Fielder. Some of you read it in *The Gospel Witness*, and Mr. Ketcham showed me last week a letter which I am going to publish this week from Mr. Fielder himself. The Foreign Mission Board had reported that after six months at Newton Theological Seminary this doubtful missionary had become thoroughly orthodox—and I shall publish this week a letter over Mr. Fielder's own signature, to the effect that it is folly for anyone to suppose that he has changed, or could change. His letter will show that all that he had learned at Newton was to be a little more careful of his phraseology; to use the language of orthodoxy, and make it mean the very opposite of what it does mean! I tell you, my friends, we are in a day when Absalom is more popular than David, and when the rights of our Lord Jesus Christ are everywhere disputed.

I say, I have been asked again and again, What is the use? Can you stem the tide? Can you turn back the multitudes to God? Can you stop this drift

in the direction of unbelief? My answer to that is, that that is none of our business: our business is to be loyal like Mephibosheth. He could not fight, he could not wield the sword for his lord, he was lame on both feet, he was dependent upon his servant even to be carried to the king; but I will tell you what he could do, he could mourn the king's absence. And from the day that David left Jerusalem, after the oriental fashion, Mephibosheth mourned: he did not dress his beard, he did not change his clothes, he bowed his head in shame and humiliation, saying, in effect, "When the king comes back again he will find that this heart of mine is beating true to him, and he will find that I never joined with the crowd in approving of Absalom; I have done all that a poor lame man could do, I have mourned the absence of my Lord; and I will be loyal to him though I go down alone to the grave, weeping because of his rejection." Mephibosheth was of such a temper, that he was willing to stand alone for his lord: Mephibosheth said, in effect, "Majorities shall have no influence with me. If all the men of Israel go after Absalom, there is at least one man who will be true to the king to the very end." Can you say that?

## II.

WHAT WAS THE SECRET OF MEPHIBOSHETH'S LOYALTY? How did it come to pass that this lame man was so devoted to the king?

Well, in the first place, *he owed everything to the king*. He said, "All of my father's house were but dead men before my lord the king. I was left yonder in Lo-debar; on account of Saul's transgression I had forfeited the family inheritance, I was lame on both feet, I was hungry and friendless; and the king in his mercy brought me from Lo-debar to Jerusalem, from poverty to plenty, from friendlessness to companionship with himself, from being an outcast from Israel, he made me one of the king's sons—and whatever other people may say, I have myself had such a personal experience of the king's grace that for me it shall be David or nobody. David, and David only shall be my king for ever!"

Ah, the great question is, What has the King done for me? I cannot understand how any man who has seen his own lost condition, how any man who in utter bankruptcy of soul has come to our David in his lameness, in his impotence, in his utter helplessness, and has received of the King's bounty, and has been made a member of the Royal Family, sitting at the King's table—I say, I cannot understand how any man who has had a real experience of the redeeming grace of God in Jesus Christ, can take any other than one position in this dark day. But I am bound to say that when I see men leaving David for Absalom, when I hear men saying that one king is just as good as another, and one religion is just as good as another; that we must learn what we can from Buddha, and Confucius and all the rest of them, and that we must make a composite religion, by combining these things with whatever is good in the Christian religion—I say, men who talk after that fashion, can never have seen Christ, they cannot have seen Him, they cannot have tasted of the dainties of His table, they cannot have been made to sit in joyous, happy, fellowship with the Son of God. It seems to me there must be a serious lack in the experience of men who turn thus readily away from the Lord Jesus Christ.

Oh, young people, what has the Lord Jesus done for you? Has He forgiven all your sins? Has He satisfied the hunger of your soul? Has He clothed you in the garments of His righteousness? Has He brought you into His family? Has He made you, not only a child, but if a child an heir of God, and a joint heir with Jesus Christ? Has He promised that He will restore to you all the land of Saul thy father? Has he taught you to sing,

"In Him the tribes of Adam boast  
More blessings than their father lost?"

Has He restored to you the years that the locust hath eaten? Has He made you really a prince of the blood? If that be so, could you ever turn away from Him? John said, "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" Could there be anyone else than Jesus on the throne for you? Oh, I trust not!

May God forbid that anyone shall ever take the place in your hearts which belongs to the Lord Jesus Christ alone!

Mephibosheth had had such experience of grace, and was so indebted to the king for his bounty, that he could not consent to anyone's ever taking David's place. That, my friends, is the foundation of it all; that is what we need to-day, that believers should be "rooted and built up in him, and established in the faith, as ye have been taught." That was the secret of it all. No one could steal the heart of Mephibosheth, because, without reserve, he had given his heart to David, the Lord's anointed.

### III.

Then just a word or two about SOME OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF MEPHIBOSHETH'S LOYALTY. What did his loyalty lead him to do? *It led him to consecrate all his substance to his lord*; all that Mephibosheth had in that day of rebellion was given to David. David did not receive it, but so far as Mephibosheth was concerned, it was given to him, yielded up to his service, just as truly as was the substance of Barzillai, the Gileadite. How far have we gone in our loyalty to Christ? Is it lip-loyalty? Or does it involve on our part any sacrifice? Has the principle of the Cross entered into our lives? Are we ready to yield life itself for Christ?

I pass that to say this, that *Mephibosheth's loyalty was superior to the influence of an unfaithful servant to the king*. I suppose he was never tried and tested so much as when Ziba betrayed him. Ziba was the evangelist, if I may so put it, through whose ministry Mephibosheth had been saved. That is to say, Ziba had been David's messenger to bring Mephibosheth from Lo-debar to Jerusalem; and yet, in the hour of trial, the very man who had brought the message which had meant salvation to him, turned his back upon him, and betrayed him, and slandered him.

Have you ever been betrayed by a friend? Have you ever been disappointed in some loud professor of religion? Have you ever seen men who perhaps have been ministers of the Cross to your own soul, turn their back upon the Lord? Would it have been surprising if Mephibosheth had said, "This is the time when everyone is feathering his own nest, when everyone is considering his own interests, this is the time when the principle which seems to rule every one is 'Every man for himself, and the Devil take the hindmost'. Ziba has proved a traitor. Why should I stand out alone in my loyalty? Why should I continue to make sacrifice?" Ah, that was not how Mephibosheth talked, because it was not how he thought—he knew how unfaithful Ziba had been, but Mephibosheth said, "That does not affect my personal relation to the king; and though everyone else should prove false, I will be true."

The more people we see turning away from Christ, dear friends, the more determined we ought to be that we will not turn. "To whom shall we go?" He has "the words of eternal life."

Then I think this is especially worthy of note: *Mephibosheth cared more for the king's person than for his property*. For there was another thing that was still more difficult for Mephibosheth to understand, and that was the king's own action, even the king seemed to be a party to Mephibosheth's suffering, even the king had said, "Thou and Ziba divide the land I have divided your inheritance, and the worst enemy you ever had has got half of it. Now what are you going to do?" "Well," said Mephibosheth, "he can take the other half too. My devotion to David is not based merely upon the material gain that has accrued to me from my connection with him. It is true that when I came to him first, I came as a hungry man, and I was grateful for the provisions of his table; but as I lived in his presence, I ceased to think of the palace, and of all the good things on the table, and I fell in love with the king himself. Since then I have been so in love with him, that if he should take everything else away from me, if only I may have my king I shall be happy. Ziba has half my property—well, he may have the other half. If he takes all, yet leaves me David, I shall esteem myself to be richer than ever I was or could be without him."

Oh, that is true Christian loyalty and devotion. I know that, in the beginning of our experience as Christians, we may think much of the streets of gold, and of the jasper walls, of freedom from pain, and the fact that there are no

shadows there, there is no night there; but as we go on with Him we come at last to recognize that the chief glory of heaven is the presence of the Lord Himself. Then we can sing as we do in one of our hymns,

"Where Jesus is, 'tis heaven there."

Have you had some difficult experience? Have you had some reverses in business? Have you lost part of your property? Has Ziba got it? "Oh yes, sir, I trusted a man—he was a Christian and I trusted him, yes, and he professed to be a Fundamentalist—but he got the better of me, and I have been rather bitter ever since." Well, just keep your eyes on the Lord, and never mind Ziba, let him have it all, let him have it all; if you have Christ, you have everything. And so Mephibosheth said, "There is only one thing I have been living for, and that was for the king to come. I wanted him to come back, I have been unhappy ever since he has been away; but now that my lord the king has come to his own in peace, I have no desire ungratified, I am satisfied, I am absolutely content. I have lived for only one thing, to see the crown on his brow again, to see him ride in triumph through the streets of his capitol city. Now that he is come my utmost desire is fulfilled, for I find my highest good in the king's supremest glory."

Oh, are you among those who "love His appearing"? Can you say, "Even so, come, Lord Jesus, I care not what happens if only the Lord Jesus will come back again. If He would but come back to His house in peace, if I could see all His enemies under His feet, I would be willing to let everything else go; and all that men count gain, these I gladly count loss for Christ." If I know my own heart, I would rather have the Lord Jesus come to-day than anything else that could possibly come to me. I am longing for Him to come; I confess sometimes I get tired waiting; Ziba is a bit of a problem to me—I have met the gentleman. I have his address! My difficulty is that he belongs to a numerous family, there are so many Zibas; and the sorrow of it is, he not only calls himself an evangelical, but a Fundamentalist! Oh, may it be our daily prayer that we may never walk in his footsteps, but that we may live wholly for the King!

Well, did you come this morning feeling a bit down? I said to Brother Browlee in the study just now, "My mind is just benumbed to-day, just depressed and weak." I felt that I could not think, and must speak on that which is nearest to my heart. And perhaps when the mind is stagnant, the heart can speak. At all events, there is only one thing I know, there is only one thing I can tell—I fear I cannot tell you that very well this morning—but I know it, and I know it is true:

"My Jesus, I love Thee, I know Thou art mine!  
For Thee all the pleasures of sin I resign;  
My gracious Redeemer, my Saviour art Thou!  
If ever I loved Thee, my Jesus, 'tis now!"

I wonder if we could sing that hymn? It is not on the sheet, but we have it in our minds; let us sing it:

"I love Thee, because Thou hast first loved me,  
And purchased my pardon on Calvary's tree;  
I love Thee for wearing the thorns on Thy brow;  
If ever I loved Thee, my Jesus, 'tis now!"

"I will love Thee in life, I will love Thee in death,  
And praise Thee as long as Thou lendest me breath;  
And say when the death-dew lies cold on my brow,  
'If ever I loved Thee, my Jesus, 'tis now!'"

"In mansions of glory and endless delight,  
I'll ever adore Thee in heaven so bright;  
I'll sing with the glittering crown on my brow,  
'If ever I loved Thee, my Jesus, 'tis now!'"

## Editorial

### THE FIELDER CASE AGAIN.

By the courtesy of the Rev. R. T. Ketcham, of Elyria, Ohio, to whom the letter was addressed, we publish herewith a letter from Rev. Cecil G. Fielder, a missionary of the American Foreign Mission Board to Assam. In our issue of February 3rd we published extensive excerpts from Mr. Fielder's statement of his doctrinal views. To say that the statement was "shocking" to a great multitude of Baptists is altogether an understatement of the facts.

One thing, however, must be said in Mr. Fielder's favour, in respect both to his former statement, and his letter here published: he is refreshingly frank. He is, we suppose, a young man, fresh from college. He begins his career as a modernist out-and-out, and does not hesitate frankly to state his position. We may expect such schools as Newton Center, Crozer, Rochester, Chicago, and others, to produce men who will enter the ministry wearing a modernist coat. This, of course, is due to the growing popularity of modernistic views among so-called Baptists, and while such popularity is to be regretted, such frankness as Mr. Fielder's will make the task of identification much easier. At present, our difficulty lies chiefly with older men who began as orthodox preachers, but who, having imbibed Unitarian views, cleverly disguise their changed position by using the terms of orthodoxy to express Unitarian ideas.

In the following letter we have printed certain passages in bold-faced type. This emphasis is ours, not Mr. Fielder's. We have also numbered these passages, one to eleven, in the margin for convenience of reference in our comments which follow the letter:

#### A Letter From the Rev. Cecil G. Fielder.

(The emphasis in the following letter is ours.—Ed. G. W.)

28 Lennox Avenue,  
White Plains, N.Y.,  
February 22, 1927.

Rev. Robert T. Ketcham,  
819 Middle Avenue,  
Elyria, Ohio.

My dear Brother Ketcham:

I am now able to reply to your letter of January 24th.

I regret that under the circumstances I cannot see my way clear to comply with your request for a copy of the statement I read before the Board, which was the statement previously presented to the ordaining council. I already have met the most rigorous examination in the council and before the Board,—probably as severe a cross-questioning as any person in our denomination has ever had to submit to,—in which all the major points of view in our denomination, and especially your own, were represented. Thus I have successfully met all requirements, and see no reason for submitting to further questioning. I am sure you will agree with me that it would be intolerable that persons who already had met the requirements should be called upon for further questioning by any self-constituted groups.

The Board's statement was a summary of the outstanding points brought out by my paper and the subsequent questioning. Please note that you are mistaken in including the Virgin Birth among the subjects mentioned in the statement. As I understand it, it was the Board's purpose in presenting such a detailed statement to say, virtually, "Here is a man who believes in these major points of the Christian faith. Surely, regardless of differences among us, one who holds such a faith is entitled to an unquestioned place in our fellowship."

A statement like the Board's has one disadvantage, viz., that the specific terms used are subject to various constructions, according to theological viewpoint. But I was careful to use the terms as employed by widely accepted theologians, and to be so explicit as to my meaning that no

one could possibly misunderstand me. The result was that I was favourably passed upon by both the council and the Board, in the latter case the action being all but unanimous.

- 2 I should be amazed if anyone who really knew anything about me considered that this summary indicated any radical change of view on my part. Read the points over again. (1) From my earliest childhood I have believed in "a personal, holy and loving God, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ". (2) The Trinity also I have always accepted, although I never had so full a knowledge of its meaning as now. (3) Pre-existence I never had made the subject of special study until recently, but I found that my conception of Christ had been essentially at one with some of the most helpful teaching on this subject. And so it goes, all the way down the list. When I had opportunity to present my Christian faith in person to representative groups of my fellow Baptists, I won a favourable response without fail. And I am confident that I could continue to do the same
- 3 thing, any time, anywhere, provided the groups were truly representative. This has been my basic contention from the beginning, that I represented in general a goodly part of our denomination, and that if such were the case I could serve our denomination as a missionary in all good conscience. That is as much as any man can say. No missionary now on the field can say more. No man can represent the viewpoint of all Baptists, for Baptists do not represent, and never have represented a uniform opinion on matters
- 4 of doctrine. So long as a man can make a good case for himself on the basis of the teachings and spirit of Jesus, such a case as would be approved by any considerable group within our denomination, that man has a right to serve in the denominational enterprises of the Baptist church. This is
- 5 in accordance with the genius of our denomination. We were conceived of the spirit of non-conformity, born to non-conformity, took our earliest steps in non-conformity, have lived our entire denominational life in non-conformity, and that in this late day any group within our denomination should attempt to enforce its particular point of view upon all members of our denomination argues either the most lamentable ignorance of our denominational history and spirit or an even more lamentable determination to disregard that history and spirit for the sake of limiting our
- 6 denominational teaching to one particular point of view. It is understandable that there could be a Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy in denominations which are committed to definite credal statements. But such a controversy in our Baptist church, with all its glorious heritage of freedom and its known history of the widest diversity of thought, is the greatest of anomalies. Where Baptists are living up to their principles, there is no place for such a thing. For the Baptists have ever stood for freedom of thought, and the name we most delight to honour is that of a man who suffered untold pains not for the establishment of a church body in which one point of view should prevail, but, rather a church in which there should always be free opportunity for growth and progress without reproach and without that persecution which up to his time had accompanied every effort to launch out in the free spirit of Christ. To think that we should live to see in our day a section within a church so conceived and so dedicated rising up to condemn others among them who are serving God in accordance with the provisions of our very founders, and attempting to drive from fellowship and service good Baptists with whom they happen not to agree! What could be further from the spirit of Roger Williams, John Clarke, Isaac Backus, Hezekiah Smith and James Manning?
- 7 So I take my stand squarely on my rights as a Baptist. Never at any time have I believed or taught anything which it was not thoroughly proper for a Baptist to believe and teach. Many thousands of Baptists now holding positions of honour in our churches hold essentially the same views, I am sure. My contention that I represent in general a goodly part of our denomination has been abundantly proved. The statement I wrote in Assam has been read by many Baptists, persons of maturity and experience, mostly conservative in thinking, and, together with a fair presentation of the whole situation, has gained their whole-souled expressions of confidence in my fitness and right to serve as a missionary of our denomina-
- 8 tion. Persons high in the councils of our denomination have read it,



without my having brought it to their attention, and later have voluntarily told me of their approval. One leading member of our denomination told me that he could not but be in favour of my return to Assam, since my point of view so closely paralleled his own.

And yet, as I told the Board, "I recognized the shortcomings of the paper, especially when used for purposes other than those for which it was originally intended. I can see that sentences were so phrased as to be open to misconstruction. I can understand also the difficulty which persons used to a more formal or technical theological phraseology would have with my untechnical terms. I was not used to writing for wide reading, and perhaps took it too much for granted that others would read into terms the same meanings that they held for me. Furthermore, some of my points, while good, it still seems to me, so far as they went, were not adequate presentations of the subjects they were intended to cover."

In the second paper, upon which the Board dismissed the theological 9 charges against me, I tried to remedy these defects. I used the accepted theological terminology and treated some of the subjects more fully. But, as I told the committee of the Board that waited upon me, I felt that the considerable change mentioned in the Board's statement was rather by way of amplification and greater adequacy of statement than any radical departure from the general point of view which I had held before. That amplification was sufficient to make clear to some what apparently had not been clear before and to satisfy them entirely as to the soundness of the views I hold.

10 Please remember that I owe both my ordination and the dismissal of the charges against me to large extent to the vote of conservative people, who felt convinced after hearing me that there was nothing else to do. Many of my most helpful friends are persons of very conservative theology.

I think you can understand, then, my unwillingness to send you a copy of the statement. To do so, in the light of the action of the ordaining council and the Board would be altogether out of accord with Baptist spirit and practice. As justly might I demand to know by what right you were 11 functioning as a pastor of a Baptist church. I wish I might comply, as it is my constant wish to be generous; but I already have gone as far as any man could go in my efforts to be loving and conciliatory. From start to finish I have not been willing to take any advantages to myself, and have assumed great disadvantages. I have gone not only the "second mile" but the tenth mile, and more, in one long sustained efforts to reveal the love that animated me, in the hope that love and patience would succeed in winning the hearts of such as yourself, for whom I have nothing but the kindest feelings and to whose rights as Baptists no one has had greater regard than I. But such forbearance ceases to be a virtue and becomes sin if it means ultimately yielding one's principles, and I believe that it has now come to that point with me. How joyously I would fall into step beside you in the service of the Saviour we both love, respecting your opinion and feelings, and seeing underneath individual differences one common devotion to Him who is the Lord of our lives. It takes much gracious forbearance to be a Baptist, for by the very nature of our church we are called upon to accept and work with persons who hold views widely divergent from our own. Our denomination is undergirded by a glorious faith in the godliness and acceptability of persons who differ, in the ability of brethren to dwell together in amity under trying circumstances. And I have had experience enough to know that it can be done, through that grace which is "sufficient" for us, if we will but give it full sway in our hearts. I am ready; are you? My heart is warm, my face is smiling, my hands are outstretched. Come; let's hoe it together!

Sincerely,

Your brother in Christ,

(Signed) CECIL G. FIELDER.

#### The Editor's Comments on Mr. Fielder's Letter.

In the following comments we refer to the passages we have printed in black type in Mr. Fielder's letter. The numbers above each paragraph refer to the numbers printed in the margin with Mr. Fielder's letter:

**Number One.**

Mr. Fielder frankly tells Mr. Ketcham that he was mistaken in including the Virgin Birth as among the subjects mentioned in the Board's statement. Mr. Fielder does not accept the Virgin Birth, and therefore he does not accept the Scriptures which clearly set forth that doctrine as a fact. Notwithstanding, he is endorsed; and charges of holding erroneous theological views are dismissed by a Committee of the American Foreign Mission Board.

**Number Two.**

Mr. Fielder emphatically declares he has not radically changed his views. Therefore his statement, as published in this paper four weeks ago, must be accepted as representing his present theological view with substantial accuracy.

**Number Three.**

Mr. Fielder is confident he can vindicate his position before a company of Baptists anywhere, "provided the groups were truly representative". He also declares that he has from the beginning been a "representative" Baptist—that is, representative of views held by a large number of Baptists, and therefore "could serve our denomination in all good conscience".

**Number Four.**

Here our friend says that as long as a man can make out a good case for himself on the basis of the teachings and spirit of Jesus—(this is pure Unitarianism—"the teachings and spirit [small "s"] of Jesus". Already he has set aside the authority of Scripture on the virgin birth of Christ), and can secure the approval of "any considerable group"—he has a right "to serve in the denominational enterprises of the Baptist Church".

And what is "the Baptist church"? Strictly speaking, and historically, Baptists are not, and never have been a denomination, if by that is meant an ecclesiastical organization with centralized authority in which the individual church is but a subordinate part. The local church is the all-important element in Baptist enterprises. Friend Fielder's ecclesiology is utterly unbaptistic—the worst that could be said of it is that it is as unscriptural, and therefore as unbaptistic as his theology.

**Number Five.**

"We were conceived of the spirit of non-conformity." Non-conformity with what? Does Mr. Fielder conceive of the Baptist genius as a kind of religious bolshevism which aims at the destruction of every established order in the universe? Is a Baptist a non-conformist in the sense of refusing to conform to anything and everything as opposing every objective standard, and as being a law unto himself? This is not the Baptist genius, this is the genius,—the very essence of anarchy, it is not non-conformity in the historic Baptist sense, but sheer lawlessness; and is of the Lawless One, Antichrist himself. Baptists have been non-conformists in the sense of claiming the right to believe and obey the Scriptures, and of refusing to conform to the requirements of the state in matters of religion. Non-conformity never did mean that Baptists were free-thinkers, devoid of any objective standard of truth. Mr. Fielder is as unhistorical as he is unbaptistic and unscriptural. He had better study the history of non-conformity as it relates to Baptists.

**Number Six.**

A Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy among Baptists, Mr. Fielder says, "is the greatest of anomalies", which is equivalent to saying that an audit in a mercantile house, or a day of inspection in a bank, would be "the greatest of anomalies"! In the last two instances, it would be inevitable, providing the multiplication table is a mathematical finality. If it were not, an adding-machine would be one of "the greatest anomalies". And if the whole Baptist position is founded on the conviction that the Bible is the inspired, infallible, and authoritative, Word of God, a Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy in the Baptist denomination is not only not an anomaly, but is the natural and inevitable result of our being Baptists.

**Number Seven.**

The position Mr. Fielder takes is that Baptist churches have no standards

at all except that of "freedom of thought". The Baptist Church is broad enough to include anybody and everybody! What about our insistence upon a regenerate church membership? This involves an acceptance of scriptural teaching on this subject, and our whole doctrine of the church grows out of that position. If Mr. Fielder is right we have no right to lay down any terms of membership at all, whether of an experience of regeneration, or of obedience in baptism; anyone who wants to be a law unto himself may be a "Baptist"; and, becoming a "Baptist," on such terms, he may with honour accept a position as a missionary, teacher, or pastor, and receive Baptist money, and claim the right to teach whatever he likes! This is even worse than Unitarianism—this is absolute lawlessness, and is essentially unethical and anti-Christian.

#### Number Eight.

The missionary from Assam tells us that "persons high in the councils of our denomination" have read and approved his statement, and "one leading member" told him he could not object to his return to Assam because he believed practically the same thing. Of this there can be no doubt. The leadership of the Northern Baptist Convention is essentially Unitarian, not Baptist. Much of the money given to Foreign Missions in the Northern Convention is used, not to foster evangelism and bring lost sinners to Christ, it is not used to propagate Baptist principles at all, but is used to propagate Unitarianism, and in some cases, it is used to promulgate views which make radical Unitarianism look conservative!

#### Number Nine.

The lines in black type in this paragraph indicate that Mr. Fielder's change was a change of phraseology. He "used the accepted theological terminology". Newton Center taught him to be more subtle in his speech! He need not deny the "vicarious" death of Christ. He could use "the accepted theological terminology" with a new content. What else can this paragraph mean in view of Mr. Fielder's insistence that he has not changed his views?

#### Number Ten.

Mr. Fielder has been endorsed by conservatives. Of course! There is no Modernism in the Northern Baptist Convention—the battle is between Conservatives and ultra-Conservatives! Dr. Fosdick is an *evangelical*! When will orthodox Baptists awake to recognize this trick of the devil? The most radical and destructive critics call themselves "conservative", and in the name of theological conservatism,—and with the consent, and sometimes with the support, of blinded or indifferent fundamentalists, destroy the foundations of Evangelical Christianity.

#### Number Eleven.

There is this difference: a missionary enterprise claiming the support of all the churches stands in a slightly different position to the church which maintains itself. Notwithstanding, Mr. Ketcham, or any fundamentalist pastor, I doubt, will be ready always to give an answer to him that asks him concerning the faith that is in him.

Mr. Fielder shows the true Modernist attitude. Modernists are ever putting Fundamentalists on the defensive. They break into churches, and colleges, and missionary organizations, like a burglar; but when they are caught red-handed in their work of destruction, they demand to know by what right anyone dares to interfere with their nefarious programme! Mr. Fielder refers to his "efforts to be loving and conciliatory". How good of him! Bible-believing Baptists who have been giving their money in trust to the American Baptist Foreign Missionary Board, we venture to believe, are more concerned that missionaries who are supported by their gifts should be true to the gospel of Christ, than that they should exert themselves to be "conciliatory" toward those who expose their errors.

If anything were wanting to prove that the Foreign Mission work of the Northern Baptist Convention is entirely controlled and directed by Modernists; and that the representations of the Managing Committee to the contrary, are sheer unmitigated hypocrisy, Mr. Fielder's letter has supplied that lack.

### MUSSOLINI OR THE KING OF ITALY—WHICH WOULD YOU PREFER TO BE?

Some kings have lost their crowns: the King of Italy, while retaining his crown, seems to have lost his sceptre. We read a story recently to this effect: Mussolini brought a document to the King for his signature. While signing the document his majesty dropped his handkerchief. Picking it up, Mussolini expressed the hope that the King would allow him to retain it as a souvenir; to which the King replied, "I fear not. That is the only thing you have left me into which I am still allowed to put my nose."

Under such circumstances, which would you rather be, Mussolini or the King? If you had your choice of either a crown or a sceptre, which would you choose?

In a letter from a brother in the Northern Baptist Convention these words occur: "The matter is somewhat complicated by the disposition of some to sell out their convictions for high office. 'The presidential bee' accounts for some strange happenings during the past few years."

But what is the presidential office in the Northern Baptist Convention? It is a crown but not a sceptre; it is an empty honour. The king who occupies that throne, except when the Convention is in session, has little left to him but a pocket handkerchief! The men who control the Boards are the Mussolinis. And they do not care who wears the crown, so long as they wield the sceptre. Presidents may come, and presidents may go—but the ecclesiastical hierarchy goes on for ever.

It is noteworthy that recent presidents of the Northern Baptist Convention have not been of a pronounced Modernist colour. In profession they have approximated the true blue of orthodoxy. The reason is that the Modernist Baptist Mussolinis prefer to put the presidential crown upon orthodox heads, while they retain the sceptre for Modernist hands. For one thing, it arouses less suspicion,—or, rather, it allays suspicion. The Convention must be orthodox when it elects a conservative president! Beside, could anyone devise a better way of keeping the necks under prominent orthodox heads sufficiently pliable to move the said orthodox heads about a little, than by dangling the presidential crown in mid-air so that it may fall upon a head that is worthy?

But there is a strong word from the Lord bearing upon such matters: "I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive. How can ye believe which receive honour one from another, and seek not the honour that cometh from God only?" The passion for honour and preferment cuts at the root of faith. Only as we seek the honour which cometh from God only, despising the world's cheap rewards, even as Moses held the treasures of Egypt in contempt, and as our Lord despised the shame of the Cross, is it possible to believe God with a faith that issues in an obedience unto death.

*The Watchman-Examiner* says it was recently informed that the president of the Northern Convention for next year has been selected; and registers its objection, not to the person selected, whoever he may be, but to the idea of his being selected months before the Convention which is supposed to elect him meets. But this is common practice nowadays in many Conventions. The Convention is permitted to elect the man whom some Baptist Mussolini selects. No man who loves truth and reality would want such a tinsel honour. When an office can be pre-empted by the will of a group which must be small in relation to the great body the office is supposed to represent, it proves that it is but a political prize which can be handed at will to a politician whose pliability has earned the favour of the machine.

We do not belong to the Northern Baptist Convention; but we have had opportunity of studying the working of its machine. Sometimes, in our own Convention, we have ventured into the realm of prophecy. Who will be the next president of the Northern Baptist Convention? It will not be a Mussolini: it will be a Fundamentalist king who has been allowed to retain his handkerchief!

*The Gospel Witness* nominates Rev. J. C. Masee, D.D., of Boston. Somewhere we have read the saying of the Highest, "Verily I say unto you, They have their reward."

**"THAT GOOD PART, WHICH SHALL NOT BE TAKEN AWAY".**

**Editor's Note:** We reprint the following article from the editorial page of the February 24th issue of "The Western Recorder", Louisville, Ky.

Doing our work in a theological environment which is made more exacting by the high teaching service for nearly two generations of a great school of theology, we shall yet without searching the books or even having a session with our Greek New Testament venture to recall some of the teachings of the beautiful Scripture passage from which the heading is a quotation.

"Now it came to pass as they went, that He entered into a certain village. And a certain woman named Martha received Him into her house. And she had a sister called Mary which also sat at Jesus' feet and heard His word. But Martha was cumbered about much serving and came to Him and said, 'Lord, dost Thou not care that my sister hath left me to serve alone? Bid her therefore, that she help me'. And Jesus answered and said unto her, 'Martha, Martha, thou art careful and troubled about many things. But one thing is needful. Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her.'"

The greatest of all marvels is that the Son of God, by whom all things were created and who sustains all things, should have come into this world and lived the life of a man and died the death on the cross that man might be saved from his sins.

Of a piece with this matchless marvel is the simplicity and love with which He who knew all things entered into the most intimate concerns of human life, with all of their imperfections and deficiencies, and by His divine touch lifted them up to the height of love and wisdom and opened the way to their purification and exaltation.

Martha was a splendid woman. Who, whatever his sex, does not hold a place of appreciation in his heart for the competent housewife? It is certain that our Lord appreciated Martha. How gently He spoke to her when He found it necessary to try to get her to see that good which lay beyond the devoted and loving offices of her strenuous housewifery. There is much drudgery in housekeeping and we are in full sympathy with the effort through modern mechanisms to lessen that drudgery. But our heart goes out with ten-fold more appreciation to faithful women we have known who wore themselves out making their homes a heart-heaven for men and children than we have for the so-called "new woman" who proposes to dodge all drudgery and responsibility, even to the bearing and rearing of children, and who allows Satan to make her think she will in this way find "self-expression."

One wonders which "self"? The self of sweet Mary of Bethany found its expression in sitting at the feet of her Lord and learning of Him. When the keen insight of her love caused her to understand His words that He must die and rise again, before any of His other disciples understood, it led her later to anoint His head with precious ointment in Simon's house and wipe His feet with her tresses.

The self of Martha led her joyously to labour that He might have the best that her home and her deft housewifery made possible—not the best which was within her privilege, as He tactfully sought to show her, but the best which her practical nature knew to offer as a tribute of her heart's love.

The self of the modern woman and her male counterpart who are heard in press and market-place exalting the rights of "self-expression"—what self is it they mean? Usually, alas! the self of selfishness, covetousness, self-indulgence, sensualism. One wearies as he contemplates the self-deception it exhibits and grieves at the tragic spiritual death it entails.

Though two sisters in a home our Lord was fond of visiting afforded the occasion for this teaching, the truth taught applies to human kind regardless of sex. Surely the over-strung nerves of an over-stimulated life never in all the world more dramatically suggested the need of giving heed to this teaching than they do to-day. Here are all of our mechanisms. Some are used to make money. Some are used to amuse us. Some are used in an effort to save labour and give leisure. Instead of leisure, these time-saving mechanisms oftener than not lead men to the speed of the machine, whether in work or "recreation." Mr. Henry Ford's millennium has not arrived. It will never

arrive along his proposed line of worklessness. Worklessness is not a blessing; it is a curse, just as over-work may be a curse.

But how we all need to learn what the Saviour taught Martha through commending the spiritual receptivity of her gentle sister Mary as better than Martha's activity? Housekeeping was good, but spiritual receptivity was better. Kind acts are splendid, but deeper and more needful is the ability to sit at the feet of the Christ and drink in His spiritual teaching. The anxious cares which gather around most of us in our daily toil will pass away. The things which occasion it will be taken away. But that good part which was chosen by Mary shall not be taken away from her or from any of us.

A year ago with our friend, Pastor J. R. Kyzar, of Bardstown, we had the privilege of going through the Gethsemane Monastery, out in the beautiful country near Bardstown. As we wandered through the great piles of buildings, our imagination harkening back to all of the romance and mystery of the portrayals by Scott and other writers of the monastics of medieval Europe, our emotions were intrigued by the concept which lay behind the complete separation on the part of the inmate monks from the ordinary cares, anxieties, longings and outlooks of the world.

We do not accept the monastic idea, for we believe that it is the teaching of Christ that we are to touch the world and overcome it, not run away from it. But untold thousands of professing Christians are not touching the world to overcome it, but are rather touching it to become absorbed in it and its blandishments and to allow the powers of soul and body to be exhausted by it. They have, so to speak, become Marthas, full of this care and that and the other, but unable to find time for quiet meditation, for prayer, or for reading the Bible, unable to hear what our Lord Jesus has to say for the nurturing and strengthening of their famishing souls. To listen when He speaks, to learn when He teaches, lovingly to receive what His divine love would give bountifully—this is "that good part which shall not be taken away." Unhappy and dissatisfied and fretful without it, many like Martha are unaware of the underlying cause of the trouble. How unspeakably poor will be we children of a mechanized and speeded-up material life, when we can no longer pace our flesh and blood to the speed of steel-hearted machines, if we have not learned the blessed secret that Mary's receptive heart grappled. Bankrupt! Untold thousands are near bankruptcy already.

Lord, Thou who knowest all things, Thou who from the first knew what man would be up against in his twentieth century life in the midst of his Broddiganian mechanisms of steel and chains and speed, we pray that Thou wilt help us that our souls shall not be crushed by these things. Help us, we pray, that our souls shall be able to master these things instead—master them and use them for Thee. Help us that our souls shall be able to assert their right to live; that they may refuse to be cheated out of the holy opportunity to know Thee and that wisdom of love which Thou hast plainly taught is the better part which shall not be taken away. Help us, Lord, for without Thee Thy people are not able to master and control for good the unexampled mechanisms which they have made in the foolish belief that they would bring only good. For there is in them that which would enslave us and by their exactions shut us off from Thee. Amen!

## BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. II.

T. T. SHIELDS, Editor.

No. 2

Lesson 1.

Second Quarter.

April 3rd, 1927

### PETER'S MINISTRY (Continued).

#### LESSON TEXT: Acts, Chapter 10: 23-48.

#### I. How Providential Circumstances Reveal the Purpose of Heavenly Communications (vs. 23-33).

1. A proper understanding of the circumstances of life depend upon direct communication with God. Peter was prepared to understand the coming of Cornelius' servants by a heavenly vision. We have the Word of God. In principle, all that God will ever say to His creatures is in the Bible. It is every

believer's privilege by the direct illumination and teaching of the Holy Spirit, to understand God's will for him. Only as we hear Him speak can we understand and utilize the circumstances of our daily lives. 2. Only as such communications are received in faith will circumstances unfold to our understanding: "And on the morrow Peter went away with them." The secret of usefulness in the Christian life is simple obedience to heavenly impulses, as they are communicated to us through the Word by the Spirit. 3. Called hearers are just as necessary as called preachers: when God has commanded a man to listen, he is sure to be an attentive hearer (v. 24). 4. It is natural for men to feel a profound respect for a man sent of God, as Cornelius felt for Peter. If preachers would preach, or teachers would teach, to such hearers, they must be sure they are themselves sent of God (v. 25). 5. But however a man is honoured of God as a messenger, he must be careful to give all glory to God (v. 26). 6. Open confession is good for preachers and teachers. Peter told Cornelius and his friends how pride and prejudice had been overcome by the heavenly vision (v. 28). 7. A preacher accepts a call, and demands to know why he was sent for (v. 29). If this lesson were for preachers and teachers, they would find a suggestive subject for meditation here. 8. Spiritual hunger is likely to find gratification in fasting and prayer (v. 30). If Christians, or seekers who may fear to call themselves by that name but who hunger to know more of God, or churches needing pastors, or classes needing teachers, would follow the example of Cornelius, they would be sure to be answered by divinely-sent messengers (vs. 30-32). 9. An ideal attitude (v. 33) for the assembling of a Bible class or congregation of worshippers—a teacher may well press the enquiry here, Are we here to hear all things that are commanded of God?

#### II. Peter's Message to the Gentile World.

1. It is well to bear in mind that this is a new departure: the gospel is given a wider field, and the church a broader scope, than men at first supposed. This is the beginning of hope for that larger part of the world to which we belong. 2. The larger scope of the gospel gives Peter an enlarged conception of God; he discovers that God is no respecter of persons—a lesson very necessary for a Jew to learn (v. 34). But there are Gentiles, too, who need to learn this lesson, for there is a possibility of some of the Lord's people imagining that they are His special favourites. The gospel, however, is for all classes who will acknowledge themselves to be sinners. 3. A genuine fear of God will always issue in righteousness of life (v. 35). 4. Cornelius had evidently heard of Jesus of Nazareth (vs. 36-38). Notwithstanding, he needed Peter's personal instruction. One may know much, and profit little. 5. Personal witness to the truth of what men have heard, is God's way of making truth effective (vs. 39-41). 6. The death and resurrection of Christ, with the promise of judgment, and salvation through faith, was Peter's message (vs. 39-43).

#### III. The Holy Spirit's Testimony to the Word of Truth.

1. The Holy Spirit was given to those "who heard the word". Only as the Word of God is preached may we be sure that the Holy Spirit will come. 2. The Holy Ghost surprised Peter's companions: they were "astonished . . . because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost". God is always surprising His people. 3. Yet this divine anointing unmistakably indicated the direction of the divine purpose. 4. Notwithstanding the Spirit had been poured out upon such as heard and believed, Peter commanded them to be baptized with water (vs. 47, 48). There are some people who persuade themselves that if they have the Spirit of God, they do not need to be baptized with water; but here is one instance in which the baptism of water followed the pouring out of the Holy Spirit. 5. It is worthy of note that this instance of baptism of the Spirit parallels the experience of the disciples at Pentecost. We shall later see that this was referred to by Peter as a proof that God had granted the Gentiles repentance unto life. But these two instances—the case before us, and that of Pentecost in the second chapter of Acts—stand alone in apostolic experience.

#### A BLESSED DAY IN MOUNT PLEASANT ROAD BAPTIST CHURCH.

The Evangelistic Band of the Toronto Baptist Seminary conducted the evening service at Mount Pleasant Road Baptist Church, Toronto, last Sunday; and a blessed time was experienced, six or seven professing to accept

the Lord as Saviour. At the beginning of the service the Pastor, Rev. Alex Thomson, warmly welcomed the members of the Band, and gave the service into their charge; several of them thereafter taking part. A sermon of great power was preached by Mr. Frank Roblin, while others gave inspiring words of testimony. The meeting went on until after ten o'clock, and ended with real rejoicing in the hearts of the Lord's people.

The morning service was also one of blessing, with Mr. William Fraser as the speaker. Several came forward for consecration. The presence of the Lord is felt in all the services of this church, souls seeking Christ for several Sunday evenings in the public service.

### CONVENTION EXECUTIVE'S APPLICATION TO PARLIAMENT.

The following notice appeared in *The Globe*, Toronto, Saturday, February 26th—it speaks for itself!

#### Application to Parliament

#### THE BAPTIST CONVENTION OF ONTARIO AND QUEBEC

NOTICE is hereby given that application will be made to the Parliament of Canada at its present session for an Act amending the Act passed by the said Parliament, being Chapter 105 of the Acts of the Session of 1889 as amended by Chapter 38 of the Acts of the Session of 1910-1911, empowering the said convention to make or pass rules, by-laws or resolutions affecting the conduct of its affairs or any matter relating to its objects, or declaring that any church the conduct or attitude of which, in the opinion of the said convention, is not in harmony and co-operation with the work and objects of the said convention, shall cease to be entitled to send any delegates to the said convention or to have its delegates who may then be in attendance at such meeting continue as delegates thereat.

DATED at Toronto this 21st day of February, 1927.

R. L. KELLOCK, 60 Victoria Street, Toronto, Ontario, Solicitor herein for the Applicants.

### A WORD TO ALL OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

Did you receive a personal letter from the Editor? Many have answered, and their letters to date (this is written in Elyria, Ohio, and we have not exact figures) have brought us about a thousand dollars for *The Witness* Fund. The fiscal year for *The Witness* will end March 31st. We are profoundly grateful for the fellowship of many who have helped us to carry the burden of this publication. The editorial work on this paper for the nearly five years of its existence has not cost one cent. It has been a labour of love, a great missionary and educational enterprise touching nearly all parts of the world. We trust our subscribers who have not yet answered our letter, will do so as soon as possible.

We may later publish some extracts from some of the letters received. They have filled us with joy and gratitude, as we have learned of the blessing *The Gospel Witness* is carrying to many. The Editor of this paper is pressed with many cares, and it would lighten his burden greatly if *The Witness* family would all help just now. During the past year our enlarged editions have been equivalent to an extra five months' expense crowded into one year. In any event, we ask our readers to pray for our *Gospel Witness* Fund, and get ready to join us in our hallelujah when the month shall end in victory.

### LAST SUNDAY AND NEXT.

The attendance at the School last Sunday was 1,122, several hundred of whom were in the Pastor's class. Dr. Shields preached morning and evening, the morning sermon appearing in this issue of *The Witness*. Several responded to the invitation at both services.

Next Sunday the Regular Monthly Communion and Reception Service will be held at the close of the evening service. New members will receive the hand of fellowship, and every member of the church who can possibly do so is urged to be present.