

# The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

IN THE INTEREST OF EVANGELICAL TRUTH, AND SENT FOR \$2.00 PER YEAR (UNDER COST), POSTPAID, TO ANY ADDRESS, 3c 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. 49.

TORONTO, APRIL 14th, 1927.

Whole No. 259.

## RELIGIOUS BOLSHEVISM

**T**HERE are many varieties and many degrees of Modernism; but Modernism of every variety, and of every degree, is distinguished by the fact that it repudiates the authority of the Bible as the Word of God; and this, in turn, carries with it the rejection of all religious authority objective to the man himself. This involves, in a word, the setting aside of the revelation of God in Christ as contained in the Scriptures, and the establishment in its place, of human reason. Thus man becomes a law unto himself. And this fact the Scripture attests: "The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Modernism therefore, when it is finished—and, indeed, in its very nature and essence—is lawlessness.

All the world knows the meaning of bolshevism; the outstanding example of its character and fruit is Russia. The methods of lawlessness, both in its political and religious expressions, are alike. By secret and unscrupulous means the very heart of the Russian Empire was eaten out, so that it collapsed suddenly like a great tree whose heart had been eaten of worms. It is thus religious bolshevism—which is complimented by the name of Modernism—eats the heart out of evangelical organizations and institutions.

The methods of McMaster at Ottawa were typical of its methods of the last nearly eight years. Like a swarm of pestilential rodents, Modernism's subversive principles have gnawed their way in the dark into every cupboard of the denominational house.

*The Toronto Star* of April 11th intimates that the session of Parliament just closed was open session for lobbyists. The headline says:

### "SWARM OF LOBBYISTS FEATURE OF SESSION.

Members Buttonholed Almost to Death on Public and Private Measures." Following are three paragraphs:

"The close of the parliament of 1927 will bring to an end the open season for lobbyists. Not since the days of the old railway barons has there been such lobbying in the corridors of parliament as during this session."

"The principal pests, however, have been hired lobbyists, mostly lawyers, seeking to influence members by specious arguments."

"A recent bill affecting a religious denomination brought down an influential lobby several days before the bill came up. Generally speaking a religious matter can give rise to a more intense lobby than anything else. The tremendous lobby on the church union question is still a matter of recent history."

Who were the members of the "influential lobby" who were in Ottawa some days before the Bill came up? We shall have to exclude Dean Farmer and Dr. W. T. Graham, not because they were not influential, of course,—but because they did not leave Toronto for Ottawa until the noon train the day before the Bill was considered. They were preceded—for how long a time we cannot say—by Chancellor Whidden and Dr. John MacNeill. Chancellor Whidden told the Private Bills Committee that he felt rather at home. Dr. Whidden was a member of Parliament for a little while—he probably learned the way of the lobbyist from experience. But what a spectacle: the Chancellor of McMaster University, and the Pastor of Walker Road Church, canvassing a company of men for their votes—many of whom, doubtless, were not even professing Christians! But these "influential" Baptists went to Ottawa begging favours of members of a secular assembly, asking for authority which would enable them to silence within the Baptist Convention the criticism of those who had proved to the hilt McMaster's shameless violation of her trust!

If the proposed Bill was a just measure, why did not its proponents depend for its justification before the Private Bills Committee upon an open and frank exposition of its merits before the Committee in the presence of its opponents? Chancellor Whidden's and Dr. MacNeill's "lobbying" was a confession that their guilty consciences knew it was an unjust measure which could be justified only by the ways and methods of those who love darkness rather than light.

We do not view this matter as having any personal bearing. It makes little difference whether a man is black or white, red or yellow, if he stands for the Word of God, he meets the same opposition as was accorded the Word Incarnate. And the devil always finds in the false religionists of the day certain "influential lobbyists" who will justify their application for the help of the secular arm by saying, "It is not lawful for us to put a man to death."

But all this is sheer Bolshevism. We have just received a letter from a missionary in China in which he says, "Modernism is a form of Bolshevism. In reality, these two sinister forces are one in their efforts to dethrone the God of the Bible and His Christ; and their activities are practically identical, as witness the tactics that are being pursued by the National Christian Council, the leaders of which are two notorious foreign modernists, and several Chinese modernist secretaries, at least one of whom sat at the feet of Harry Emerson Fosdick at Union Seminary."

This writer continues:

"We over here cannot but burn with indignation on reading the utterly false, misleading reports that are being given out by Dr. Hume, President of Yale in China. He must know that his own institution is in the hands of the Reds and that Hunan Province is practically denuded of missionaries since the Nationalists, of whom he speaks in such glowing terms, have come into it. And such progress has Bolshevism made during the brief period the Reds have been in control that a missionary from there says that in his district the children were not only shouting, 'Down with foreigners! down with imperialists!'; but, 'Down with teachers! Down with parents!'; as well. How missionaries can so deliberately misrepresent the situation is beyond comprehension."

Thus Modernism works its way at home and abroad: it is the enemy of the church, the enemy of the state, the enemy of all organized society, the enemy of the home, and the enemy of the individual—it is sheer lawlessness!

## REGULAR BAPTIST MISSIONARY AND EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY OF CANADA.

We would remind our readers that while a permanent Secretary-Treasurer has not yet been appointed, the acting Secretary-Treasurer of the new Society is Rev. G. W. Allen, 75 Delaware Ave., Toronto 4, Canada, to whom all contributions may be sent, and all enquiries addressed.

## THE ALLIES OF MODERNISM.

Many people find themselves frequently puzzled by the fact that some men who are soundly scriptural in their teaching and preaching, find their fellowships among those who deny, and seek to destroy, the things which they themselves profess to believe. In any Baptist Convention where loyalty to the Word of God is the issue, when a vote is taken involving the practice as well as the profession of such loyalty, the vote registered against evangelical faith by avowed modernists is invariably comparatively small; the larger part of the vote in favour of Modernism almost always is polled by those who profess to be fundamentalists. This is true of every Baptist Convention of which we have knowledge. The evangelicals who thus vote with modernists, and who, by so doing, give aid and comfort to the enemies of the gospel, always hotly resent being classed as modernists themselves.

The above considerations have suggested the title of this article.

It is our conviction that Modernism is a moral and spiritual malady; it is a disease which issues in spiritual death. We may therefore find an analogy which will aid us in the understanding of many apparently contradictory religious situations in those things which, in the physical realm, assist in the spread of disease.

If the germ of any plague were without allies, and were not supplied with congenial culture-beds, the disease would die out. Hygiene is the branch of medical science that relates to the preservation and improvement of health, rather than to the cure of disease. One does not need to be a doctor to be enabled to enumerate some of the allies of some of the diseases which afflict humankind. Food may lack any positive poisonous quality, and yet may be so wanting in nutritious elements as to leave one who depends upon it for sustenance, exposed to the attacks of disease.

We remember a woman who was so fearful that her house would become dusty that the windows were never opened, and the unventilated rooms became veritable pest-houses.

Every public health inspector gives special attention to sanitation. A filthy house will soon become a centre of contagion from which all manner of diseases will spread. Not long since we saw an official red placard on a house which read something to this effect: "Warning! Disease-carrier lives here". If our memory is correct the disease was named as diphtheria. The person living in that house was not suffering from diphtheria, but was a carrier of diphtheria germs to others.

All who have frequented sea-ports will have observed the large discs, funnel-shaped, on the hawsers which fasten the great ocean liners to the pier. They are there to prevent the ship's rats, so often carriers of bubonic plague and other Oriental diseases, from coming on shore. A rat-infested house is not likely to be a healthy place to live in.

It is a matter of common knowledge that young people who are accustomed frequently to spend long hours upon the dance-floor, and to rob themselves of sufficient time for rest and recuperation, fall an easy prey to disease. Nor is it to be denied that vanity may sometimes prove the ally of consumption. When women, for the sake of appearing well, and conforming to fashion's ways, deprive themselves of such clothing as is necessary to a proper protection from the blasts of winter, inevitably they lessen their powers to resist disease.

We have frequently been told by surgeons, when enquiring as to the prospect for a patient's recovery from a serious operation, that a patient who has abstained from the use of all narcotics has a better chance than one who has substituted stimulants for food.

All these considerations will, by analogy, suggest some explanations of the spread of Modernism. A preacher who does not expound the Word of God, who is orthodox so far as he is anything theologically, but who is really incompetent to feed the flock of God, does not build up, either in himself or his people, a healthy evangelical constitution sufficiently strong to throw off the modernistic germs that fill the very atmosphere of our times. Or, on the other hand, an orthodoxy that is merely intellectual, and wanting in the energy of the Holy Spirit, and therefore has no direct relation to character or conduct, is likely to be allied with such a sluggish conscience as will register no objection to modernistic fellowships. However evangelical in theory a man may be, though he be altogether scriptural in his preaching, if either the preacher or the church

be prayerless, the eggs of Modernism will hatch somewhere about the place. Daniel kept his soul healthy, and avoided the religious contagions of his time, by keeping his windows always open toward Jerusalem. The germs of Modernism cannot live in the church or the preacher who would breathe deeply the atmosphere of heaven itself.

Some churches become culture-beds for Modernism because the house is never cleaned—the world, the flesh, and the devil, run riot within, and the cellars are alive with disease-laden ideas imported from educational centres where infidelity is rife.

And there are professors and some preachers who ought to wear a red placard to the effect, "Warning! This orthodox gentleman is a carrier of the germs of Modernism." Men who substitute policy for principle, and compromise for conviction are religious plague carriers. They may hold fast their own profession but they disseminate doubts to the destruction of others.

Moreover, worldliness in all its forms, religious indifference, while devoid of positive modernistic qualities, the fact that such an attitude of mind is lacking the sound health of a positive, exuberant faith, affords hospitality to any and every germ of unbelief.

Is it not true also that churches and preachers who cannot be called modernists, or who cannot be charged with having imbibed any sort of intellectual contagion, but who dissipate their energies in a treadmill of non-productive organizations, who try to feed the soul on religious programmes instead of on gospel principles, are so enervated by their giddy round of religious dissipation that they become light as chaff, and are therefore "carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive."

But what shall we say of ministerial vanity as an ally of Modernism? Sometimes we have thought that our whole educational system tends to develop in the minds of students such a love of position, and such a passion for applause, that our colleges and seminaries, instead of producing an army of biblical prophets, produce flocks of ministerial peacocks! Before Judas actually betrayed the Son of God, when he was approached by the religious leaders of the day, he secretly enquired, "What will ye give me?" And many a professedly evangelical preacher seems to be ever asking that question. We do not suggest that such are bought with money, but many an one who was numbered among the faithful disciples of Christ has sold his Lord, not for thirty pieces of silver, but for a place on a convention programme, or for a promise of professional influence to secure a good church; or, perchance, for the prospect of an honorary degree. Men who receive honour one of another, and who are inspired by a passion for worldly preferment, will ever find it impossible in the hour of crisis so to believe as to be true to God.

Pride and ambition reigning in orthodox minds are the traitors within the gates which open the gates of the city for Modernism to enter. If churches and pastors were fed on the Word of God, and read more of the Bible—and fewer books about the Bible—if ministers would depend for success in their churches upon steady growth, resulting from a proper diet, their spiritual health would be so exuberant as to throw off the modernistic bacilli which infest the thinking of the day.

### SOME PAGES FROM HANSARD.

We print below a report taken from *Hansard* of April 1st, 1927, pages 1891 to 1893. These pages record the discussion of the Baptist Convention Bill in the House of Commons. Many will be grateful to Sir George Perley for raising the question of the fairness of the Bill during its discussion in the House of Commons. We should like to offer a few observations on the remarks of Mr. Ralston. The Bill was defended in Parliament by one who had to confess, "I am perhaps not too conversant with the facts out of which this bill has arisen."

Mr. Ralston said: "The purpose of the bill, as I understand it, is to bring the organization known as the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec into line with the organizations of that body existing in other parts of Canada." The argument of the lawyer who handled the Bill before the Private Bills Committee, and of Chancellor Whidden and Dr. MacNeill, was to the effect that all the other Conventions had a similar clause in their constitutions. We have had all these constitutions carefully examined since that time, and on the

authority of three lawyers who have examined them, we are authorized to say that there is not in any Canadian Convention Constitution such a clause. In this respect, Mr. Ralston was in error, as he repeated only what had been told him.

He was equally mistaken in what he had to say about vested rights. Clause thirteen of the will of the late Senator, the Honorable Wm. McMaster, reads in part: "Desiring not only that the control of the income of the endowment herein bequeathed for McMaster University shall be entirely in the hands of the Board of Governors appointed by the denomination but that so soon as the condition of my estate having reference to the realization of the assets and the payment of other claims, will admit, the principal of such endowment shall be vested directly in the Corporation of the said University and under the control of the denomination through the said Board of Governors."

Once again also we print the Trusts of the Deed of McMaster University:

The trusts in said deed in so far as they refer to Religious teaching are 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 attributes, the total and universal 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 Ghost, 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."

The words in the above quotation printed in bold type (the emphasis being our own) give a definition of the Regular Baptist Denomination "whereby is intended Regular Baptist Churches exclusively composed", etc. Thus the control of McMaster University is committed to the Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec through their appointed delegates who, assembled in Convention, elect the Board of Governors. The exclusion of any Regular Baptist Church, while it remains a Regular Baptist Church, would deprive that church of its proportionate vested right of control in the McMaster estate.

#### Letter From Mr. G. F. Calder of Lachute.

The following letter from Mr. G. F. Calder of Lachute was sent to Sir George Perley following a telegram advising Sir George Perley of the action of the Lachute church. We have little doubt that other churches throughout the Convention will be heard from. *The Gospel Witness* will be glad to publish the names of churches who take action as churches; and will be glad also to hear from individuals or groups throughout the Convention who are opposed to the measure that has just passed Parliament. No names will be published, but we should like to have the name of the church to which the persons protesting belong.

Lachute, March 30th, 1927.

Sir George Perley,  
House of Commons,  
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir George:—

As intimated in my telegram, I am writing you in connection with a Bill to amend the Incorporation of the Baptist Convention. I do not know just at what stage this Bill is at, but no doubt you will find some way of placing the views of the majority, in fact a very large majority of the

Baptist people in Lachute and other parts of the County of Argenteuil, before Parliament. I have personal knowledge of our opinion in Lachute, and the information I have at hand leads me to believe that the opposition to this measure is very pronounced in Dalesville, Harrington and Grenville, the locations of all the other Baptist Churches in the county.

The enclosed resolution was passed at Lachute with only one dissenting voice.

No doubt you are aware that there is no such body in Canada as the Baptist Church, but there are quite a large number of Baptist Churches, each independent as to its internal management, but all subscribing to a common faith. Some of these churches are self supporting, others are not, the strong helping the weak through the organization known as the Baptist Convention, which becomes a sort of clearing house for the several Funds of the Churches. This Convention is made up of delegates from each church. It will thus be seen that the whole denomination has a vested interest in all the assets then controlled by the Executive of the Convention. I understand that the object of the Bill is to vest in the Convention the right by a three-fifths vote to arbitrarily declare what constitutes "harmony and co-operation with the work and objects of the convention." It gives the power to unseat all members of the convention who do not comply with the ideas expressed by the three-fifths. Some of our churches are of opinion that the teachings in McMaster University do not comply with the Trust Deed of the property given by Senator McMaster to the whole denomination. Consequently, if they dare to criticize, three-fifths of the delegates may unseat the balance and take from them whatever vested interest they may have in the Convention. To make this clear let me draw an analogy. Parliament is composed of elected members (delegates) from the several constituencies in the Dominion. The Baptist Convention is composed of elected delegates from the several Baptist Churches in Ontario and Quebec. Parliament is controlled by an executive committee, called the Cabinet or Government, who hold office subject to the pleasure of the members. The Baptist Convention has an executive composed of the various Boards who hold office subject to the pleasure of the delegates. The Cabinet of parliament brings down its budget for the year, which is discussed and either passed or rejected. The executive of the Convention brings forth its budget, which is submitted and discussed and voted upon. Now can it be supposed for one moment that the Imperial Parliament would give a constitution to Parliament of Canada, which would enable the government supported by three-fifths of the members of the house to declare the seats of the other two-fifths vacant, and disfranchise their constituents, because the minority voted against the budget of the Government? And this is just what the Bill before the House enables the Convention to do. If a church feels that they have reasonable grounds for not giving financial aid to McMaster, but prefer passing their contributions to another institution of a similar character in the denomination, the Convention is taking the power to refuse to seat delegates from such church, by declaring that the such delegates were not in "harmony" with the ideas of the majority. Thus the independence of the individual church is destroyed.

\* \* \* \* \*

Pardon the length of this communication.

Yours very truly,

G. F. CALDER.

### EXCERPT FROM "HANSARD".

(The following is reprinted from the pages of "Hansard", the official record of the proceedings of the Canadian Parliament.—Ed. "G.W.")

#### Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

The House in committee on bill No. 153, respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec—Mr. Edwards (Ottawa)—Mr. Johnston in the chair. On section 1—Proviso.

SIR GEORGE PERLEY: I would like a little explanation about this bill. I am rather surprised to see that there is no provision in it for protecting

vested rights that have been acquired previous to this date. It seems to me that that is a very unusual omission from a bill of this kind.

Then I find that section 1 provides that the convention, on a three-fifths vote of the delegates present at any time, may pass a regulation that some of the delegates shall no longer be entitled to attend the convention, and that some of the churches may no longer select delegates for the convention.

I have received a communication from Lachute, which I did not get in time to present to the private bills committee yesterday, and as it expresses my views I shall take the liberty of reading it:

"That the members of the Lachute Baptist Church hereby express their entire disapproval of the amendment proposed to the act incorporating the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec for the following among other reasons:

1. That it is destructive of the independence of Baptist Churches.
2. That it would give to a three-fifths vote at any convention the power to declare by resolution what is or is not in harmony with the objects of the convention, while the resolution may be entirely out of harmony with, and destructive of, the principles and doctrines held by the denomination, and through this resolution absolutely to cut off any church from its vested rights as a free and independent Baptist church in the convention.
3. That every Baptist church in the convention is possessed of vested rights in certain trust and endowment funds held for the work of the denomination, and the cutting off of any church from sending delegates to the convention would automatically nullify all their interest in the said endowment and trust funds.
4. That it clothes the convention with such powers as would inevitably imperil the freedom of the ministry.
5. That it would tend to bring the domestic affairs of the churches into discussion in the convention, either to prove that a church is out of harmony with the convention, or to enable a disappointed minority in a church to appeal to the convention to justify themselves against the minister or pastor and the majority supporting him.

(Sgd.) G. F. CALDER,

S. GOLDSWORTHY,  
Church Clerk."

I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that this bill has been carefully considered by the committee. I am not a member of the private bills committee myself, but it seems to me that these two objections to the bill are very serious ones. In the first place, there is no saving clause in regard to the vested rights of any community of the Baptist church, and further, it seems to me hardly in order that three-fifths of the members present at a convention should be able to pass a resolution excluding the delegates from some of the Baptist churches, or a resolution that certain Baptist churches should no longer have the right to send delegates to the convention. I should like to have some explanation of these matters from some member of the committee who is conversant with them.

MR. RALSTON: I am perhaps not too conversant with the facts out of which this bill has arisen, but the sponsor for the bill is not here to-night, and he asked me if it did come up to say a word in explanation to the committee.

I am sorry that my hon. friend from Argenteuil was not at the committee, because I can assure him that if he had been there he would have listened for at least three hours to a complete discussion of all the points to which he has referred by gentlemen who were thoroughly in touch with them and would have been able to give him very much more close range information than I can.

In a word, the purpose of the bill, as I understand it, is to bring the organization known as the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec into line with the organizations of that body existing in other parts of Canada. I understand that the Baptist convention is incorporated in British Columbia and the Western Provinces, and there they have the usual powers of any domestic corporation as to discipline, as to the conduct of their affairs, and who shall send delegates. Down in the Maritimes, particularly in New Brunswick, there is a similar act of incorporation, but the Maritime Baptist Convention is not, I understand, incorporated as a convention.

I would draw the attention of the committee to this, that a convention which

is not incorporated has, I think, in law the power to do exactly what is suggested in the section to which my hon. friend has referred, so that all that is sought here is to supply an omission in the old act of 1889, in which it is provided that each regular church is entitled to send delegates, and nothing is said whatever as to the disciplinary powers which may be possessed by the convention, in case it becomes necessary or is thought advisable to use those powers. In the case of any club or domestic organization, its domestic affairs are under its control, but I understand that this body is advised that because of this omission there is doubt whether they have power to control who shall and who shall not send delegates to the convention. The purpose of this section is to supply that omission.

With regard to property rights, may I just say a word? The Baptist churches throughout the world are autonomous bodies. Each church owns its own property. The convention or the co-operative assembly through which they work has no property whatever, and has no interest in the property of the churches, so the body which is incorporated here holds no property, and has no interest in the property of the individual churches, and all that the churches may do, and the only interest they may have in the co-operative work, is to send delegates who can vote on various matters that come before the convention, with regard to the good of the denomination and relating to the objects for which the convention is brought together. In that connection I want the committee to have the fullest information, because there are two or three boards which are appointed by the convention, namely, a board to hold funds for the home missions, a board to hold and administer funds for foreign missions, and a board to administer superannuation funds for aged and infirm ministers. The convention as such has no property in the fund whatever. The funds are contributed by the individual churches and all the convention does is to nominate the members of the board. My hon. friend from Argenteuil probably does not know also that under the act which incorporated McMaster University this convention is authorized to appoint a board to deal with matters pertaining to that educational institution. That is not under this act, but under the act incorporating McMaster University, and so, as was pointed out before the committee, in connection with the question of property rights it would seem as though those who go to vote at the convention have no more interest in the property which is being administered by those boards whom they elect than the persons comprising the governor-in-council which elects the board of the Canadian National Railways would have in the property of the Canadian National Railways. I therefore think that the suggestion which was made to the committee is sound, that if you insert what is called a saving clause with respect to property you give some astute lawyer an opportunity of saying, "Well, Parliament must have thought, notwithstanding the apparent plain provisions of the act, that there was some property interest somewhere", and probably an argument would be founded on that basis. I submit that it would be unwise and unnecessary to insert such a provision, because if you look at the proviso proposed it is purely a section for the purpose of excluding the church from sending delegates to the convention and does not purport to affect property. I submit there is no such thing as property in this concern, and the operation of this association is such that it does not normally acquire property.

The other proposition was as to the three-fifths vote. My suggestion to the committee is that the usual procedure for action by such a corporation is to proceed by a majority vote—majority in matters of discipline as well as matters in connection with property and the general affairs of the corporation. In this case I understand that it was the idea of the promoters of the bill that whoever it dealt with might be assured that there was no desire captiously to interfere with the attendance of anybody at the association, and so, the three-fifths majority was suggested. In the ordinary case I think it would be fifty per cent.

I desire to refer to another matter. Under the provisions of this act, it does not come into force until it is ratified by the convention itself, which gives full notice to all interested of the possibility of action under this legislation. Although I am a member of the denomination, I do not happen to be a member of this convention. I understand there are some 508 churches in the convention and that a protest was received—any hon. member can correct me if I am wrong—or sent in by thirty-five churches to the people who are opposing this bill. The further statement was made that a protest has been received from



individual members of 120 churches in all, but when it was analyzed, it was found that that meant that one individual member of a church might count as one of the 120. So that I think, as the matter stands, the bill represents the desire of 508 churches, with the exception of 35, and with the exception of some individual members from some 35 other churches.

**SIR GEORGE PERLEBY:** My hon. friend says there are no property rights involved, and I am quite sure he is stating it as he understands it. Sometimes errors are made in a matter of this kind. Would there be any objection to putting in a clause safeguarding any vested rights, a clause similar to that which has been put in other bills? We inserted such a clause in a bill a few minutes ago.

**MR. RALSTON:** I anticipated that suggestion, and I made what seems to me to be the only answer which could be made to it, namely, that I have no idea that there is any property of which any church referred to in section 1 will be deprived. I have not exhausted my investigation, but I have taken some pains to get information and I cannot see that there is any likelihood of any church being deprived of property interest by being refused the right to send a delegate to this convention. I do suggest, therefore, being a member of the bar myself, that it would be unwise and would be unduly casting a cloud on this association if we insisted that, as a condition to this corporation getting the power that other corporations have, they should have something added that would in a left-handed way suggest that somebody had property rights when apparently none exist.

**MR. GUTHRIE:** I think it is well that the committee should understand that this is a private bill and cannot be amended without notice.

**MR. SPENCE (Parkdale):** I think if the hon member for Argenteuil had been at the meeting of the committee yesterday he would have agreed with everything the hon. minister said. I endorse every word which has been uttered by the Minister of National Defence. This bill will have no effect on the endowment fund or superannuation fund. Before the committee we had Rev. John MacNeil, Doctor Shields and others. Already the thirty-five ministers represented by Doctor Shields have started a seminary college of their own and have withdrawn their support from the organization. The committee on private bills yesterday carried the bill unanimously, and there is nothing else for us to do; therefore I hope the measure will pass through the House without further discussion.

Section agreed to.

### THE COMING ASSOCIATIONS.

The Convention hierarchy is making every preparation for an onslaught upon the Associations. McMaster University will be represented at every Association, whether their representatives are invited or not. They will do as they have done in former years, force themselves upon the Associations, and bring all possible pressure to bear, both by public speech and by skillful "lobbying", in which they are such masters, to induce the Associations to approve of the iniquitous measure that has just passed Parliament. We suggest that the defenders of the faith should submit a resolution in every single Association throughout the Convention, and force a discussion of the issues involved. It is no longer a question merely of Professor Marshall and his teaching; nor yet of Dean Farmer and his compromising; nor even of the Governors in their violation of a sacred trust: the question before the Convention now is, Will the representatives of Regular Baptist Churches approve of the dishonest proposal which will enable a majority of three-fifths to rob a minority, whether one church or fifty, of their vested interest, financial and otherwise, in the organizations and institutions of the Denominations?

### A WORD OF CORRECTION.

Last week the name of Immanuel Baptist Church, Hamilton, was inadvertently included in the list of churches represented by individual or group protest. The fact is, Immanuel Church passed a resolution protesting against the Bill, and as a church stands solidly in opposition to it. We regret this mistake, and had we had time to give the matter a more careful consideration, we believe we should have detected it, because we know so well the spirit of the Pastor, Rev. J. G. Conner, and his splendid church.

## The Jarvis Street Pulpit

LISTEN! SOMEONE IS AT THE DOOR!

A Sermon by the Pastor.

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Morning, April 10th, 1927.

(Stenographically Reported.)

"I sleep, but my heart waketh: it is the voice of my beloved that knocketh, saying, Open to me, my sister, my love, my dove, my undefiled: for my head is filled with dew, and my locks with the drops of the night.

"I have put off my coat; how shall I put it on? I have washed my feet; how shall I defile them?"—Solomon's Song 5: 2, 3.



YOU know something of the tender significance of "the song of songs, which is Solomon's"; it is a disclosure of the very heart of our Beloved; it speaks of the experiences, not only of the Lover of our souls, but of the spouse herself. In the text before us a separation has taken place between her soul and the Lord. She has fallen asleep, but she hears someone knocking at the door. Yet her heart is awake, and she hears a voice saying, "Open to me, my sister, my love, my dove, my undefiled; for my head is filled with dew, and my locks with the drops of the night." But she is disinclined to disturb herself, indisposed to make the effort to open the door to receive Him; so she answers, "I have put off my coat; how shall I put it on? I have washed my feet; how shall I defile them?"

Is it not a fact that all believers need frequently to have their minds stirred up by way of remembrance? Do we not all need to sing,—

"Tell me the story often,  
For I forget so soon;  
The 'early dew' of morning  
Has passed away at noon."

Are we not all aware of periods of spiritual declension, when fellowship with the Beloved has been interrupted? when we have ceased from our service in His Name? when we have just idly betaken ourselves to our couches, and have fallen asleep, putting off our coat, laying aside our duty, refusing to accept our legitimate obligations? In simple ease we have slept while the Beloved was absent from us; and He has come to us so often knocking at the door, as we read this morning, "Behold, I stand at the door, and knock; if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." I speak this morning especially to those whose fellowship has been interrupted, whose strength is impaired, whose joy is at low ebb, whose lights of testimony have been dimmed, in the hope that we may hear, all of us, once again, the voice of our Beloved, and come into that intimate fellowship and communion which it is the privilege of every believer to enjoy.

I.

The text is THE RESPONSE OF THE SPOUSE TO HER BELOVED'S GRACIOUS CALL—for He does call, He is not content that we should sleep, that we should spend our lives in isolation, separated from Him. Even as I read that text to you this morning, while many of you would not attempt perhaps an exposition of it, yet in your heart of hearts you said, "I know what that means. I do not need any exposition of that, for I too have heard the voice of the Beloved knocking at the hour of midnight." Perhaps some of you have been in some quiet country place where hills surrounded, and, calling to a friend, you have thrown out your voice strongly, only to hear the hills cry back to you in echo your gladness or your grief. And there are many such quiet glens in Scripture where we may hear the echo of our own experiences, which lead us to feel that we are on familiar ground, and that Someone is speaking Who tells us all that we ever have done.

I should like you to note the *urgency of the call* which awakened this response in the heart of the sleeper, for the Lover comes at nightfall when the sun is down, when the streets are deserted, and when the majority of people are locked in slumber. It is not customary for us to make our calls at night:

"They that sleep sleep in the night." If someone were to come knocking at your door at the midnight hour, you would immediately conclude that that person was bent upon some urgent business, otherwise he would wait until the morning. And the picture here is of the husband coming to the house where he expects a welcome will be awaiting him. Other houses are dark, the lights are all out, the inmates are asleep; but reaching his own house he expects to find the door on the latch, and someone waiting to greet him. Instead of that, he finds the house in darkness, and the beloved of his soul asleep—not expecting him, nor caring that he is absent.

My dear friends, it is only the grace of God that keeps any of us. Every one of us, even since we have put our trust in Christ, have, at some time or another, tried to do without Him; we have run in our own way; we have sought to satisfy ourselves with other delights than those which we find in the presence of our Beloved. And night comes down, and many a professing Christian, consciously out of fellowship with God, holding no commerce with the Skies, hearing no voice from the blessed Book, having ceased to pray, or to hold communion with God, lapses into a spiritual slumber, as though they would be content to remain without the Lord. But how gracious it is of Him that He does not allow us to sleep without disturbing us. He comes even at the midnight hour, knocking at the door, and saying to us, "Open to me, my sister, my love, my dove, my undefiled"; "Behold, I stand at the door and knock"—not only did you not save yourselves in the beginning, it is not only true that you did not take the first step in the direction of the Lord, but that He Himself wooed and won you; but if you are a Christian at all, and if you have in any measure held fast to the profession of your faith, it is because He has loved you with a love that would not let you go. Urgently He calls, even at night-time, that we should awaken and open the door to Him.

Oh, if there be anyone here this morning who is conscious of this distance, I beg of you to hear His word, for it is evening-time with you if that be so, for when He departs it is midnight with the soul always.

And then there is a *peculiarity* about this call of His, it cannot be mistaken. You see the figure: she is asleep, but her heart waketh. A brother told me the other day that his wife could sleep quite soundly amid many noises, they did not seem to disturb her at all; but if the baby just uttered the faintest cry, she was instantly awake—other voices could not awaken her, but she always responded to the voice of the child. You mothers know all about that; you sleep but your heart is always awake, it never rests. (So is it with the Christian: we may sleep, but if we are really His, the heart is always wakeful while He is absent; we never can be really and profoundly satisfied without Him.)

And when He comes, His call is recognized. There was a knocking at the door, and a voice breaking the silence of the night—she was half asleep, but she said, "I should know that voice anywhere, it is the voice of my Beloved. There is only one voice like that." Do you know what it is? The old theologians used to talk about the "effectual calling of grace", and I rather like it. The Good Shepherd said, "My sheep hear my voice." When Mary saw Him after the resurrection, she supposed He was the gardener until He called her by name, saying, "Mary", and instantly she knew Him, and fell at His feet, saying, "Rabboni; which is to say, Master." Sometimes you hear the preacher, and it is only the preacher's voice to you, you do not hear anything else; but there is another time when, though the preacher speaks the words, it is not the preacher you hear, you say, "That is the divine Voice I hear this morning, it is the voice of God's Word, it is the voice of my Beloved."

It may be that He has been calling some of you during the week in ways that I cannot explain; you have heard Him knocking at the door, and calling you by name, bidding you awaken and open the door, and let Him in.

And then *how very personal* it was—to open to Him. He says not, "Open to anyone"; but "I have a special right to come at any hour, and demand that the door be opened to me,—open to me! Why have you locked the door against me?" Oh, the sorrow of it, that God's people should very often open the door to everyone but to the One Who has the right to enter! And He calls to us to open the door. I appeal to you this morning, you young people who have taken the name of the Lord Jesus upon you, have you really opened every door to Him? or have you shut Him out of some departments of your life? Is there some reservation? Do you hear Him saying, "Open to Me, to Me, to ME,

let ME in here. I demand the right to share these experiences with you"? Very personally does He call; there is no mistaking it when He calls His own by name.

And then what a very *practical* word it is too: He does not propose that they should talk through the shut door. He does not propose that they should hold communion while thus partially separated; He says, "Open, let Me in, open, let there be nothing between Me and thee, but receive Me into thy presence, and the full measure of thine affection." Oh, my friends, I cannot explain what that means, to open the door, but you know what it is, you know very well what it means when the Lord Jesus comes demanding admission—you know what opening the door means. It may mean one thing to one, and another thing to another; but it does mean this at least, absolute surrender to Him, that everything may be removed between us and Him, that there may be no breach in our fellowship, no interruption whatever in our communion,—“Open to me.”

I wish I had time to dwell on this: how He multiplied terms of endearment! “My sister”—of the same nature with Himself, for we are made “partakers of the divine nature”. “My love, my dove, my undefiled”! Oh, how infinite His grace, how matchless His mercy, when He can come to anyone of us, and call us His “undefiled”! It is because His blood washes away all our sins, and His grace makes it possible for even poor sinners to dwell in His holy presence.

And then how *pathetic* the call: “My head is filled with dew, and my locks with the drops of the night.” The figure is that of one who has been standing there a long time. So long has he been waiting that his bushy locks, which, when she is in fellowship with him, she admires so much, and declares that they are as “black as a raven”—oh, how she admires him!—but he says, “My head is filled with dew, and my locks with the drops of the night. Why do you shut me out? Why don't you let me in?” I remember once reading in a sermon of Spurgeon's his saying, “Even as I speak to you I know that my dog is waiting at yonder door, and he will go no where without his master; and though I should stay here all the night long, yet he will wait for me, and he will be there at my call. But”, he said, “even the dogs in their devotion put us to shame, because we shut the Lord of Glory out of our lives, we will not let Him in.”

There is not one of us who has not heard this call—full often has this preacher heard it—“My head is filled with dew, and my locks with the drops of the night.” When at last He comes in, we see our folly and are led to exclaim:

“Lord, what am I, that, with unceasing care,  
Thou didst seek after me, that thou didst wait,  
Wet with unhealthy dews, before my gate,  
And pass the gloomy nights of winter there?  
O strange delusion! that I did not greet  
Thy blest approach, and oh, to heaven how lost,  
If my ingratitude's unkindly frost  
Has chilled the bleeding wounds upon thy feet.  
How oft my guardian angel gently cried,  
'Soul, from thy casement look, and thou shalt see  
How he persists to knock and wait for thee!  
And, oh! how often to that voice of sorrow,  
'To-morrow we will open,' I replied,  
'And when the morrow came I answered still, 'To-morrow'.”

Oh, He waits for us—what shall our answer be?

## II.

Look at THE ANSWER SHE MADE TO HIM, “I have put off my coat; how shall I put it on? I have washed my feet; how shall I defile them?” She has deliberately conditioned herself so as to be unable to open the door to Him! There are some wives who never sleep until their husbands come home; however late he may be, he may be always sure that his wife is waiting. But there are others who do not care; and this is the picture of the spouse who is unconcerned: he is not home at nightfall, so she deliberately puts off her coat and prepares herself for the retirement and slumber of the night, locks

the door, and goes to sleep. And when at last He comes knocking and calling to her to open the door, she has this excuse to offer, "It is too much trouble to get up, to robe myself for your reception. I have put off my coat; how shall I put it on? I have washed my feet; how shall I defile them? I cannot open the door to you at this time of night; stay out until my rest is ended, until the hour of my convenience shall strike."

Sometimes the believer, when losing the sense of the Divine Presence and fellowship, is restless and dissatisfied, and refuses to put off her coat. She says, "I will wait for Him. I pray, but no answer has come—but I will keep on praying. I sought him whom my soul loveth; I sought him, but I found him not. But I will seek him yet again; I will not give sleep to mine eyes, nor slumber to mine eyelids, until I find out a place for the Lord, an habitation for the mighty God of Jacob. I will be ready when He comes." But there are others who deliberately put off their coats, they lay aside their tasks, they cease to receive instruction, or to acknowledge themselves in the service of the Lord. And when at last the call comes, there is so much to do, so many things to be undone, so much preparation to make, before He can be received with gladness, that they answer like this spouse of the text, "I have put off my coat; how shall I put it on?"

It is a sad thing when you see people doing that. There is a word in one of our Lord's parables about His return, where, by implication, we are exhorted to be as those who wait for their Lord, so that when He shall come to the wedding we shall be all ready to open to Him immediately. And there is a way of waiting for His return, for the restoration of fellowship, when the soul says, "I will do everything I possibly can do, I will be ready against the day of His visitation, that I may open the door immediately when He shall call."

I wonder if some of you have put off your coats? I heard a tale during the week of someone whom I used to know so well in Christian service, someone who seemed to be devoted to the Lord Jesus, but who is out of fellowship altogether, and has even put off the coat of his profession, has ceased to hold fast the profession of his faith, and is saying bitter things against God, deliberately setting himself to do without Christ. I wonder is there anyone here like that? I remember when one came to me some time ago and said, "I want you to have my name taken off the church roll", I asked her why. "Oh well", she said, "I am not enjoying my Christian life as once I did." And I said, "Why is that?" "Well", she replied, "I don't see why we should deny ourselves what are called worldly pleasures—I rather enjoy them." And I said, "You have been going to such places, have you?" "Yes, a little." Then I asked, "Is there not a better way? Will you not come back to the Lord?" And she said, "I don't want to, I don't want to give up these pleasures." She wanted to put off her coat, she wanted to say, "I know He is gone, and I will not even call Him back. I will put off my coat, and when He comes I will tell Him I cannot open the door"—but she did not mean it, she was sleeping but her heart was waking. Blessed be God, she did not put off her coat, and she is to-day in the Lord's service—I think she is here this morning—and I know she is glad she did not shut the Lord Jesus out of her life.

Oh, are there any of you young people tempted to say that? "Well, let us abandon it, we have made a profession of religion, but have lost the joy of it, and now I have put off my coat, and I will not bother putting it on again. I have washed my feet; how shall I defile them?" My dear friends, is there not a better way than that? If you have put off your coat, and it is a trouble for you to put it on, then open the door anyhow. Do you remember how He came the first time? Do you remember how He found you the first time He came, when all your righteousness was as filthy rags? And when at last you opened the door and He brought the light and glory of His presence with Him, although you thought you were all dressed up, you were ashamed of yourself when you saw Him. The other day I was going out of my house and the hall was a little dark. I took the whisk from the table, and brushed my coat—and I thought I was fairly respectable! But when I got out in the sunlight I said, "This will not do at all, I must go back!" Ah, when He comes He brings the sunlight with Him, and even if you have put on your coat, you will find it is a pretty shabby coat, and that you have to let Him in just as you were in the beginning. Therefore, let Him in that way, and if you cannot put on your coat, open the door, let Him come in anyhow.

"I have washed my feet; how shall I defile them?" You see the figure: she had prepared for rest, and between her couch and the door outside of which her Lover was waiting, there was the track to mark, and she said, "I cannot do it. Wait until the morning." But, my friends, you never defile your feet, however far you have to go, through whatever mire you have to walk—you never defile your feet when you go to open the door to the Lord Jesus. Moreover, I will tell you they are never washed until He washes them. Do you remember that sweet story of how the Lord Jesus rose from supper, and laid aside his garments; and "took a towel, and girded himself, and began to wash His disciples' feet"? When he came to Peter, Peter said, "Lord, dost thou wash my feet?"—and he declared, "Thou shalt never wash my feet." And Jesus said, "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me." Open the door, and He will attend to the cleansing; just receive Him, and the moment He comes, dear friends, the breach will be healed. He will not put you on probation, He will not lecture you, He will not say, "Well now, I forgive you, but mind I have not forgotten it. Don't you ever do it again, or there will be trouble"—that is not the way He does it. "Their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." He blots them all out; and the moment the door is open and we receive Him, He receives us to His heart as though we had never sinned. Oh, that we might return to that place of happiness and fellowship this morning!

Shall we pray that it may be so? O Lord, wilt Thou call sinners to Thyself this morning; wilt Thou recall any who have got out of fellowship with Thee; and ere we leave this place this morning, may we all be led to rejoice in the assurance of sins forgiven. May we leave this place in company with the Lord Himself, delighting in His companionship, rejoicing in communion with Him Who is the Lover of our souls. We ask it in His name, Amen.

## BAPTIST BIBLE UNION SENIOR LESSON LEAF

Vol. II.

T. T. SHIELDS, Editor.

No. 20

Lesson 7.

Second Quarter.

May 15th, 1927

### PAUL AND SILAS AT PHILIPPI.

LESSON TEXT: Acts, chapter 16.

GOLDEN TEXT: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved."—Acts 16: 31.

#### I. FROM ANTIOCH TO TROAS WITH PAUL AND SILAS.

1. Paul's second visit to Lystra and Derbe. It was at Lystra (14: 8-10), the lame man was healed. On this occasion we are introduced to Timotheus to whom two of Paul's epistles were later addressed. (a) He was the son of a believing Jewess, and we learn from II Tim. 1: 5 that his mother's name was Eunice, and his grandmother's, Lois, who also was a believer. It is a privilege to belong to the third generation of believers.

2. He had a good report of the brethren at home. Timothy became a preacher, but he began to work in his own church—he made a reputation for piety and earnestness at home.

3. It was probably the good report Paul heard of Timothy at home which led him to desire his company. The way to get a larger opportunity is to make the most of what we have.

4. While Paul had stood out against the imposition of circumcision upon the Gentiles, since Timotheus was half a Jew, to avoid causing unnecessary friction and opposition, he counselled submission to the Jewish rite. There is a policy which is legitimate—when it involves no surrender of principle. Compare the case of Titus who was a Greek by both parents, and therefore a Gentile (Gal. 2: 1-5). Titus was included in "certain other of them" (Acts 15: 2) who accompanied Paul and Barnabas to the Jerusalem Council. Paul would not consent to his being compelled to be circumcised.

5. Paul and Silas, now joined by Timothy, visited certain cities here unnamed, in which Paul had previously preached, and they delivered the decrees embodied in the decision of the Council at Jerusalem. By this means, the churches were established in the faith that salvation is by faith alone, and

increased in numbers daily. All this results from Paul's firm stand against error (Gal. chapters 1 and 2). Observe the far-reaching effect of one man's faithfulness; and, by implication, we may learn that churches will be established in the faith, and will increase in number daily, just in the measure in which the Word of God is faithfully expounded.

6. Phrygia and Galatia were next visited. Though nothing is here recorded of the result of their ministry in Galatia, this was probably the visit to which Paul refers in his epistle "unto the churches of Galatia". His reception there, and the blessing which followed, may be judged from Gal. 4: 13-15. On his first journey Paul did not go beyond Antioch in Pisidia.

7. "Forbidden of the Holy Ghost" (vs. 6, 7). How significant the fact that the Holy Ghost forbade their going to Asia, or to Bithynia. It shows God has His plans for His people and His church. In present-day missionary operations surely we should seek to know the mind of the Spirit. How denominational comity, and other things, have organized the Holy Ghost out of it all!

## II. THE MISSIONARY PARTY AT TROAS.

Troas played an important part in Paul's journeyings. See II Cor. 2: 12, 13; Acts 20: 5-13; II Tim. 4: 13. The vision of the man of Macedonia (vs. 9-12). In His own way God still directs His servants. We need to revive the idea of a direct call from God for particular service.

## III. PAUL AND SILAS AT PHILIPPI.

1. They went to a prayer-meeting, and found only women there. Some "big" preachers may be above addressing small meetings—but what great matters grew out of this small matter!

2. The conversion of Lydia: (a) The Lord opened her heart. That is likely to take place when preaching follows the prayer meeting. (b) She was baptized, and her household—who also believed (v. 40). (c) Her new-found life expressed a natural desire for fellowship.

3. The damsel with the spirit of divination: This partially-demented creature, possessed of an evil spirit, was made use of by certain men who made gain of her occult powers. She was, however, made to tell the truth about these men. A parallel is found in Gadarene, whose spirits cried, "We know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God". Paul commanded the evil spirit to come out of her.

4. When religion interferes with business, and prevents men from getting gain, there will always be trouble (v. 19). In such case, any excuse will do, and it is easy to set a whole city in a frenzy, including the magistrats.

5. The preachers in jail. Nothing is said of Timothy. Perhaps his voice had not been heard publicly, and the wrath of the multitude fell on the two principals. It seemed as though they had fallen on evil times: forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the gospel in certain places, they were not forbidden to go to jail! How should preachers behave in jail? They prayed and sang at midnight. Certainly these preachers believed in keeping people awake.

6. The Lord has different ways of opening jail doors. The angel opened the iron door for Peter without a sound—and his chains fell off. In this case, an earthquake shakes everything open and loose.

7. Converts in jail. Almost a suicide, the jailor repented, believed, and was baptized; and rejoiced. It is worthy of note that it is said of the jailor that he believed in God with all his house (v. 34).

8. Paul stands on his rights as a Roman citizen.

## INTERNATIONAL SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSON

May 15th, 1927.

Comments by the Editor.

PETER AT PENTECOST.

Acts, chapter 2.

**GOLDEN TEXT:** "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."—Acts 2: 38.

**LESSON TEXT:** Acts, chapter 2: 1-21.

The Feast of Pentecost (fiftieth) the Feast of Weeks, (Lev. 23: 15, 16) was observed seven sabbaths after the Passover. "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us." He showed Himself alive for forty days. The disciples waited in the upper room ten days, and then the day of Pentecost

was fully come. Thus the account of the coming of the Holy Spirit honours the Old Testament Scriptures, and records His advent as fulfilling the Old Testament types.

### I. HOW THE HOLY SPIRIT CAME.

1. From heaven. All good gifts are from above. 2. As a mighty wind. In the third chapter of John the work of the Spirit is likened to the wind. In Ezekiel, chapter thirty-seven, the prophet was instructed to prophesy unto the wind. Wind is invisible, but mighty. It may, however, be heard and felt, yielded to, or resisted. Thus the Holy Spirit. 3. It filled the house. The Spirit of God should be the atmosphere the Christian breathes. Our proper dwelling place is in the heavenlies (Eph. 1: 1-6). 4. The Spirit is likened to fire. He purges; He illuminates; He consumes. 5. He is like unto tongues for He comes to interpret the Word of God and to organize the church that she may be the mouthpiece of God. 6. He is God's gift to every believer; His ministry is not restricted to an official class. 7. They were filled with the Holy Ghost. We must be filled with something. It is our privilege to yield ourselves with every capacity dominated by the Spirit. 8. They spake with other tongues. This must be distinguished from unknown tongues. These men spake so that the assembled people could understand them in their own language. Thus the church's ministry is stamped as designedly supernatural from the beginning. We shall later in our studies see that the Holy Spirit's coming is not necessarily associated with a miraculous gift of tongues. 9. The presence of the Holy Spirit attracted the multitude. So He makes the gospel magnetic still. 10. The Spirit speaks only of the wonderful works of God. Only as we deliver the message of God to the world through Christ may we expect the Spirit's ministry. 11. There are always some who are without spiritual discernment, and who will mock at divine things.

### II. HOW THE SPIRIT WROUGHT.

1. Through Peter. Peter had played a cowardly act at the trial of Christ, but now he stands up as a giant. The Holy Ghost can convert cowards into conquerors. 2. Speaking by the Holy Ghost, Peter quoted Scriptures. Holy Ghost preachers and teachers always use the Word of God. 3. Peter found in the fact of Pentecost a fulfilment of prophecy, (vs. 17-21). 4. Wherever men are filled with the Holy Ghost they will be able to describe their experiences as a fulfilment of God's Word. 5. It would appear that both men and women had their part in the testimony of Pentecost. Beyond doubt there is a place for the testimony of women as well as of men.

### III. HOW PETER PREACHED CHRIST.

1. As a man approved of God by miracles and wonders and signs. In our zeal for the deity of Christ, we must not forget His real humanity. He is bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. The miracles and wonders which He wrought by the power of God were His divine credentials. 2. Peter declared His death and resurrection to have been fore-ordained (vs. 23, 24). It is idle to speculate as to what might have happened had Christ been received by those to whom He was sent. He was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. His death and resurrection were no accident, but were all according to the divine plan. He was "delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God." 3. Peter skillfully blends two great principles; while declaring that the death of Christ was according to the predetermined purpose of God, he yet declared that it was by wicked hands He had been crucified and slain. No finite mind can reconcile these two principles of absolute divine sovereignty and human responsibility, but that they are principles which operate in every human life, everyone must admit. 4. The death and resurrection of Christ are here shown to be according to the scriptures. We cannot too strongly emphasize the place of the inspired scriptures in apostolic preaching. Whatever may be said of the modern attitude which belittles the Word of God, the apostolic preachers found their weightiest arguments in the scripture itself. Indeed, it is indisputable that with these inspired men, the inspired scriptures represented a final authority. It is worthy of note also that this preacher did not argue respecting the inspiration of scripture, but took it for granted and quoted it as a lawyer would the statutes of the realm. Teachers and preachers can make no mistake by following apostolic example in this matter. The major part of Peter's reported sermon consisted of direct quotations from scripture. If preachers and teachers would spend less time reading books about the Bible and more time committing the words of the Bible itself to memory, their testimony would be vastly more effective. 5. But Peter also expounds the Psalm he quotes. He shows first of all that the words of David could not possibly have applied to David himself, but that he spoke concerning Christ (vs. 25-29). He refers also to the foresight of the inspired writer. Although David had lived many years before, he was enabled to anticipate the death and resurrection of Christ, and speak of it as an accomplished fact: "He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ". This principle runs all through the prophetic scriptures. We read, "The scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham". Had we the spiritual discernment to recognize it, we should find that all history has been prophetically anticipated. 6. The exaltation of Christ was proved by the experience of believers (v. 33). It was because He had been by the right hand of God exalted, He had shed forth this, the presence and power of the Holy Spirit. Thus the Lordship of Christ was attested by the Holy Ghost (v. 36). The evidence of Christ's authority on earth proves His authority in heaven. Only by the presence and power of the Holy Spirit can the Lordship of Jesus Christ be established in the hearts of men.

### IV. THE RESULTS WHICH FOLLOWED THE SERMON.

1. Peter's hearers were "pricked in their heart". 2. Made audible response to the sermon, and his congregation became a great meeting of enquirers; "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" 3. Peter told the enquirers to repent and be baptized. On what authority does the modern preacher omit the second part of this answer? We are sent to summon men to repentance and faith, but we are also commissioned to baptize them. 4. They were promised the gift of the Holy Ghost. Does not our modern preaching and teaching fail in this respect also, that too often we are content to have people make a profession of faith without showing them that it is their privilege to receive the Holy Ghost? 5. It is significant that we are told, "They that gladly received the word were baptized". 6. Those who were baptized were added to the company of believers. 7. The new converts were diligently taught: "They continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers." 8. They persevered. 9. The church increased by daily additions.