

The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF EVANGELICAL PRINCIPLES AND
IN DEFENSE OF THE FAITH ONCE FOR ALL DELIVERED TO THE SAINTS.

\$2.00 Per Year, 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. 7. No. 8.

TORONTO, JULY 5th, 1928.

Whole No. 322.

Greatest Compliment Ever Paid Individual Church and Pastor

On Thursday, June 28th, the Baptist World Alliance unanimously elected Rev. John MacNeill, D.D., Pastor of Walmer Road Baptist Church, Toronto, as its President. *The Toronto Star* of June 29th published a collection of photographs of Dr. MacNeill, and his family, his house, and church, under the heading, "Toronto Pastor Heads Baptist Church Throughout World". This has been interpreted by some of the Toronto papers as a very high compliment to Dr. MacNeill and the church he serves. No doubt such an interpretation is abundantly justified.

Personally, we have never had much sympathy with the idea of an alliance of the Baptists of the world, because we have felt it to be opposed to the Baptist genius. When a union of all the Baptists of Canada in one Convention was proposed twenty or more years ago, we vigorously opposed it, on the ground that the territory of the Dominion of Canada was so vast that it would be impossible to keep the direction of the work in the hands of the churches who would support it; and that its direction would ultimately fall into the hands of a group of salaried officials who, because their expenses were paid out of denominational funds, would be the only people who could afford to attend every Convention.

That our fear for such a Canadian Baptist Union was not without ground, in the principle involved, is proved by the Northern Baptist Convention, which was not, at that time, as a Convention, in existence. At every meeting of the Northern Baptist Convention the salaried officials of the state Conventions and the Northern Con-

vention hold the balance of power, and all of them have the privilege of voting, so that the delegates from the churches might just as well stay at home. The result of any discussion is a foregone conclusion. The salaried secretaries will vote for themselves, and for their bread and butter. The same would have happened in Canada if such a union had been effected.

The principle applies to the Baptist World Alliance. Probably very few of the delegates who attended the meeting of the Alliance in Toronto had attended any other meeting of that body; and while the Alliance has no legislative power, theoretically, we shall show in this article that it has already arrogated to itself the right to speak for all the Baptists of the world. It is really but an enlargement of the principle involved in the famous story of the Tailors of Tooley Street who are said to have begun their deliverance with some such words as these, "We, the people of England".

The Toronto Star tells us that Dr. MacNeill "Heads Baptist Church throughout World". Of course, we used to speak of Baptist "churches". We supposed that every individual Baptist church was sovereignly independent. We would not, however, be understood as holding any intelligent Baptist responsible for the headline to which we have referred: we quote it only to show the impression made upon the lay mind. And if the Baptist World Alliance, which claims to be representative of the Baptists of the world, does not clearly instruct the people respect-

ing Baptist principles and practices, what organization may be expected to do so?

Passengers may sleep soundly as the train takes the switch at the parting of the ways, and do not know that the train has entirely changed the direction of its course; and they wake up in the morning to find themselves hundreds of miles away from where they would have been had not the course of the train been changed at the switch. Students of church history will not find it difficult to discover many a switch in the past which was quietly taken without observation by the people at the time, but which nevertheless affected the whole course of ecclesiastical history. And we reassert what we have intimated at different times before, that the Baptist World Alliance, in its endeavour to organize the Baptists of the world, and to exercise their united influence even in political matters, is out of harmony with Baptist tradition, and is alien to the Baptist genius.

When the Northern Baptist Convention was organized, the great Dr. H. C. Maybè uttered a prophecy to the effect that it would in time become a menace to Baptist liberty. What was true of the Northern Baptist Convention will be more emphatically true of the Baptist World Alliance. The headline of *The Toronto Daily Star* to which we have referred is symptomatic of a general ignorance of the genius of Baptist independence. But the Baptist World Alliance, in the grip of Modernists and near-Modernists, will be quick to presume upon this ignorance, and we shall find a little official group, actually represented in some instance perhaps in half a dozen men assembled in committee, presuming to speak in the name of all the Baptists of the world.

We do not credit the leaders of the Baptist World Alliance with deliberately fashioning a machine for this purpose: we point out that the tendency toward centralization is characteristic of the time. Industrially, commercially, financially, educationally, and religiously, there is a pronounced tendency toward standardization of type, and centralization of authority. We do not profess such expertness in the interpretation of prophecy as some of our extreme premillennarians boast; but we are driven by the logic of events to recognize that the tendency in all departments of human thought and activity is toward the suppression of individualism, and the development of collectivism. And it is not difficult now for one to visualize a day when no man shall be permitted to "buy or sell, save he that has the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name." Baptists who are Baptists indeed, and who are willing to abide by the simplicity of New Testament principles, should wake up before the enemy, in the Baptist name, comes in like a flood.

But perhaps our readers will be interested in the account of the election of Dr. MacNeill to the Presidency of the Baptist World Alliance. *The Toronto Star* of June 28th contained the following report:

Five thousand Baptists from all over the world unanimously chose Rev. Dr. John MacNeill of Toronto as the president of the Baptist World Alliance.

The pastor of Walmer Road church was the recommendation of the nominating committee, presided over by Dr. L. R. Scarborough of Texas.

"A great Christian, a proclaimer and defender of the truth, a spiritual statesman, a divinely endowed leader,

a winner of men, and a marvellous builder of the Kingdom of God," was the tribute of Dr. Scarborough to the new president.

He said the nominating committee kept in mind that so far all the presidents had come from Britain or the United States, and the committee held that the honour should not be restricted to any one large group.

There came a tense moment when Rev. Dr. George Truett, presiding, put the motion and called for the vote. The whole convention rose en masse.

"If there be one messenger to this alliance," said Dr. Truett, gavel upraised, "who is opposed to this motion, let him stand."

No one stood.

"It is unanimous," said Dr. Truett. Then, with the delegates all standing, Dr. MacNeill was escorted to the platform, and Dr. Truett took his hand and pledged him the alliance support both in prayer and practice.

We should have been disinclined to offer any comment on Dr. MacNeill's election had he not himself put a certain interpretation upon it. And here let us forestall our critics. We have read many times that our stand for the faith was the result of frustrated ambition. So far as the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec are concerned, anyone at all conversant with the facts, if they had an infinitesimal fragment of honesty in their makeup, will readily admit that had we been willing to acquiesce in McMaster University's programme, and to accommodate our message to the demands of Modernists and worldlings, we might easily have occupied any position the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec had within their gift. We will dare to anticipate the charge of egotism in making this statement, that any man of honesty in the Denomination will acknowledge our statement to be indisputably true.

The Apostle Paul gloried in his independence and said, "It were better for me to die, than that any man should make my glorying void." We openly declare that we would rather surrender life itself than yield one whit of our liberty as a teacher of Baptist individualism.

That does not mean that we are opposed or indifferent to co-operation. Throughout our ministry we have been a co-operating Baptist, and the official records of the Denomination will show that in this respect we have not been behind any living Canadian Baptist. We are still a co-operating Baptist, and count it our greatest joy to co-operate with all Baptists who believe the Bible to be God's word, and who stand uncompromisingly for the faith of our supernatural gospel.

We venture to affirm that no man living has done more to laud Dr. John MacNeill for his eminent platform ability than we have done. He was for years a man whom we delighted to honour, and we have been gently rebuked by him on at least one occasion for publishing what he deemed an exaggerated estimate of his ability. When coming to Toronto, to what was then very generally regarded as the premier Baptist church of the Denomination, and which has since more than doubled both in membership and financial strength, the Jarvis Street Baptist Church, we looked forward to years of happy fellowship with one we had regarded, at a distance it is true, as a great man. But let us give Dr. MacNeill's own interpretation of the significance of his election as President of the Baptist World Alliance.

We print below an excerpt from an interview with Dr. John MacNeill, by R. E. Knowles, in *The Toronto Daily Star* of June 29th. The emphasis in this quotation are ours:

"You are considered, generally, an enthusiastic denominationalist. Is that correct?" "That's far too violent a definition. I am a loyal son of my church—but not so as to interfere with the broadest fellowship. *Probably one thing that has prompted the opinion you quote is that for seven or eight years I have been in the forefront of the fight for the very life of our denomination—you know what I mean—and of McMaster University.* I regard our triumph now as complete, however. This recent McMaster achievement—think of it. \$1,500,000 raised by 60,000 Baptists! It is glorious! That's their answer." And the Highland light of battle shone from the strong Scotch features.

"Are you a Fundamentalist or a Modernist?" "Neither. I dislike the terms. I'm a progressive conservative."

Church Cradled in Fight.

"Don't you think the alliance convention has rather overproclaimed the glories of the Baptist system, its liberty, freedom from this and that, and so on?" The new president smiled charitably. "Oh, no, you must remember our church was cradled in that fight. It was always on the defensive. That is, naturally, its out-breathing of a precious tradition—that's all."

"Will you throw the great influence of your new office on the side of actual union with other evangelical churches?" A ponderous pause ensued. Then: "At present I honestly believe the Baptist Church can best fulfil its function by retaining its individuality."

"But what is your ultimate ideal?" "A form, some form, the best form whatever it may be, of united power. But there is great peril—we have had proof of it in Canada lately—of forcing union too rapidly. This, however, I will say, that I deplore and discourage all this 'we are the people' spirit and talk. Our brotherhood should be complete. My own closest clerical friend in this world is a United Church of Canada minister."

"Who is he?" "George Pidgeon. And Davies, Pidgeon and myself are a trinity of congenial spirits."

"Dr. MacNeill," I began, folding up my notes, "what is your reaction to this sudden thing?" "What thing?"

"This tremendous bound to one of the topmost pinnacles of the religious world?" I had plenty of time to arrange my notes. At length John MacNeill (what a four-square name!) began to speak. "My natural sensation is one of chastened pride that this honor has come, not so much to me, as to the Canadian Baptist church—and to our whole Canadian citizenship. *And a very deep joy springs from the assurance that this action of the Alliance in choosing me is a vindication, a glorious vindication, of our position and our strivings in the great battle we have been through in Toronto and Ontario. I am humbly and solemnly thankful for this—the Baptists of the world have spoken. Their voice none can misunderstand or ignore.*"

"Give me one message, one comprehensive word, for the Canadian church—for the churches of every name from coast to coast," I requested. "That word shall be brief," said the new president, a minute or two later. "Tell them this. That I shall count myself happy and blessed if I can lead or can help my fellow Christians to recover the mystic secret of the apostolic days. Thus, and thus alone, shall the church repeat her unforgotten triumphs."

Before commenting on the above we quote again from *The Toronto Daily Star* of June 28th:

The Baptists of the world have decided to honor a Toronto man with the presidency of their world alliance, which represents 10,000,000 people.

Three Toronto men have been considered by the nominating committee, and rumor has it that the trio are Rev. Dr. John MacNeill of Walmer Rd. church, Rev. W. A. Cameron of Yorkminster church and Albert Matthews, leading Baptist layman and Toronto broker.

Rumor also has it that Dr. MacNeill is likely to be the choice though there is a distinct feeling among the delegates that it is time there was a president elected from the laity.

We are not surprised that in his interview with Mr. Knowles, Dr. MacNeill should have replied to the remark, "You are considered generally an enthusiastic denominationalist?", by saying, "That's far too violent a definition." We should think it is! Dr. MacNeill is authority for the statement that such an opinion must be due to the prominence he had taken in the controversy which has raged for several years in the Convention of Ontario and Quebec. Prior to the Ottawa decision of 1919, when the Convention almost unanimously adopted a resolution against Modernism, proposed by the Editor of this paper, it was exceedingly difficult to get Dr. MacNeill to take any interest in denominational work. Others were permitted to bear the burden. But we never heard of Dr. MacNeill's rendering any conspicuous service to the Denomination until he took a foremost part in defense of Modernism in McMaster University.

Dr. MacNeill describes the controversy as "the fight for the very life of our Denomination". If the life of our Baptist denomination depends upon the support of such views as that of Professor L. H. Marshall,—

"I cannot subscribe, as an honest man who knows the facts, to this doctrine of inerrancy and infallibility, and I won't;"

or such views as those of Dr. George Cross, of Rochester Theological Seminary, who said:

"And now after the lapse of all the intervening centuries it is still an open question whether after all it was not misleading to call Jesus the Christ;"

or if "the very life of our Denomination" depended, not only upon the rejection of the expiatory work of Christ, but upon the mocking repudiation of it, by Professor Marshall in such terms as the following:

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

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

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

If "the very life of the denomination" depends upon the maintenance of such teaching, then there is no doubt Dr. MacNeill has fought for the life of the Denomination. We were, however, simple enough to suppose the the "very life" of a Baptist church, or of a collection of churches (mis-named a "denomination"), depended upon their uncompromising loyalty to the Bible as the Word of God, and to Jesus Christ as the Son of God. Dr.

MacNeill, if he has ordinary intelligence, and we believe he has, must know that, implicitly or explicitly, his side of the controversy in which he has taken such a leading part, has denied all these great principles. But be that as it may, to anybody at all familiar with Dr. MacNeill's record, Dr. L. R. Scarborough's introduction of him was incomparably comical. To call Dr. MacNeill "a defender of the truth", or "a spiritual statesman", requires a tremendous stretch of the imagination.

Our Walmer Road friend has, through the years, consistently defended, and participated in, a campaign of misrepresentation and calumny that had not even a nodding acquaintance with the truth.

But our friend is neither a Fundamentalist nor a Modernist, but a "progressive conservative"! The fact is, the Pastor of Walmer Road is not, in any sense, a theologian. When the stage is properly set for his appearance, when he has been given time to glean in many fields, Dr. MacNeill is able to make a most creditable oratorical display, but he has little appreciation of the value of words. He is not a logical, or in any sense, an accurate thinker. His oratorical instincts lead him often to sacrifice sense to sound, but he is lacking in the intellectual penetration and discernment which would enable him finely to discriminate in thought and speech between things essentially different.

We should be reluctant to hold Dr. MacNeill responsible for the theological implications of the course he has pursued. We believe that in sentiment he is much more orthodox than his extraordinary behaviour of the last few years would indicate; and the most charitable construction that can be put upon his conduct is that he is intellectually incapable of perceiving the anomalies and paradoxes which his course involves.

Our readers, however, will observe the too general trend of thought in the Baptist World Alliance. One writer in *The Toronto Daily Star* said:

My faith in the Canadian west as disclosing most fully some of the most significant ideas and ideals of the future Canadian was strengthened by the brief but pregnant and noble speech of Dr. Rennie (Reekie) of Regina. In a session in which the loyalty to distinctive Baptist principles and antagonism to any relaxation of Baptist separateness was running high, Dr. Rennie with quiet frankness affirmed that the Church was built on the acknowledgment of God in Christ and on that only, that Jesus did not instruct His followers to make baptism a sine qua non, that a Church that would exclude any man in whose heart Christ dwelt excluded Christ, and that every Church must follow Christ in His fellowship and stop only where He stops.

It will be observed that Dr. MacNeill earnestly believes that "the Baptist church can best fulfil its function by retaining its individuality". But what is "the Baptist church" we should like to know? We used to hear of Baptist "churches", even as we read of "the churches of Galatia" and other places in the New Testament; but the "Baptist church", with a centralized government, is surely somewhat of a new thing under the sun. And Dr. MacNeill believes that we should retain our individuality "for the present". Are we to understand him to suggest that the time will come when Baptists ought to surrender their principles? What do the great hosts of Southern Baptists, for example, think of this loose talk about surrendering the ordinance of baptism, and not making it a term of membership in our churches? Beyond question, as the Baptist World

Alliance has endorsed, as we shall see, the most extreme forms of Modernism, so it stands very largely for open membership and open communion.

Dr. MacNeill's church is not an open membership church as yet, but it has long been distinctly open communion. But if our readers will refer again to Mr. Knowles' interview, they will see that Dr. MacNeill acknowledges that his ultimate ideal is "a form, some form, the best form, whatever it may be, of united power". And is this a Baptist who is speaking? We have drifted far when such views can be entertained by any man in a responsible position. But Dr. MacNeill tells us that "there is great peril—we have had proof of it in Canada lately—of forcing union too rapidly." We were informed, when Dr. MacNeill returned from England after his overseas experience—we will not say war experience, because he was always far enough from danger—that he expressed his determination to work for union. Dr. MacNeill tells us his closest clerical friend is Dr. George Pidgeon, the man whom Canadian Presbyterians look upon as being chiefly responsible for the wrecking of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, which compelled true Presbyterians to rebuild their shattered house. We have often wondered why such men as Dr. Pidgeon and his colleagues, who forced a part of the Presbyterian Church into a nominal union, and who did it in such a way as to engender a bitterness that can scarcely die down in a generation, escape the opprobrium which has been heaped upon those of us whose only offence has been that we desired to abide by the great principles for which Baptists have stood, and to hold in its purity the faith once for all delivered to the saints.

It is not without significance that the new President of the Baptist World Alliance finds his affinity in the man who, perhaps more than any other one man, was responsible for cleaving the Presbyterian Church in Canada in twain.

But Dr. MacNeill apparently reserved the most important deliverance for the conclusion of his interview when he said,

"And a very deep joy springs from the assurance that this action of the Alliance in choosing me is a vindication, a glorious vindication, of our position and our strivings in the great battle we have been through in Toronto and Ontario. I am humbly and solemnly thankful for this—the Baptists of the world have spoken. Their voice none can misunderstand or ignore."

There is no possibility of mistaking the import of this remark. The great conflict in the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec issued in the application to Parliament for power to refuse to receive delegates from Jarvis Street Church. As we shall elsewhere show in this issue, the passage of the Bill through the Private Bills Committee was secured by a wholesale misrepresentation of fact for which Dr. John MacNeill was chiefly responsible. Now the Pastor of Walmer Road tells us that he has been selected as President of the Baptist World Alliance as his reward, as a "vindication" of his course in having thus fought Jarvis Street Church and its Pastor; to what he calls a triumph that is "complete". In his election Dr. MacNeill has the modesty to tell us "the Baptists of the world" have spoken, and "their voice none can misunderstand or ignore."

Are we then asked to believe that the Baptist World Alliance deliberately set itself to approve of the course

taken by Dr. MacNeill and those with him in the controversy which has rent the Convention of Ontario and Quebec asunder? Let us examine this extraordinary statement.

We are told the Baptists of the world number about twelve millions, and we are asked to believe these twelve million Baptists have interested themselves in our local discussion, and that they have selected Dr. John MacNeill because of the leading part he has taken in the controversy as their President, in order that thereby they might express their commendation of him, and their condemnation of Jarvis Street Church and its Pastor.

What is the history of our controversy? The present dispute began in 1919, and has continued with ever-increasing fury until this day. In 1919 the Convention, by an almost unanimous vote, approved of a resolution protesting against Modernism, proposed by this Editor. Dr. John MacNeill endeavoured to take a neutral position on that occasion, although everybody knew that he was benevolently disposed toward the side that went down in overwhelming defeat. Then the Modernist Soviet said, "We have got to get Shields out of Jarvis Street", and after a year and a half of underground effort, the conspiracy showed its hideous head in the spring of 1921. A battle royal was fought which continued for six months, and resulted in the discomfiture of the revolutionaries; and in 1922, three hundred and forty-one of them withdrew their membership. An attempt was made to rally the Convention to the support of the defeated company in October, 1921, but it was frustrated. In 1922, under the utterly flagrant partisan Chairmanship of Professor A. L. McCrimmon, the revolutionaries obtained a victory in the Convention by the passage of a resolution endorsing McMaster, and censuring her critic. In 1923, at Montreal, there was not much fighting; and we think it is fair to say that such gains as were obtained were on our side. In the fall of 1923 we protested against the conferring of a degree upon Dr. Faunce. In January 1924 McMaster Senate, by resolution, read us out of the Convention, informing the Convention that they could no longer work with us. But in London in the fall of 1924, the Convention refused to vote confidence in the University for the first time in her history, and by a unanimous vote, at eleven at night passed a resolution which this Editor moved, censuring the University for its action, and instructing the University never to repeat it; after which we were re-elected as a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster University.

Following the London verdict the enemy gnashed their teeth, and determined to reverse it; and to effect their purpose they deliberately brought from England a man whose coming the late Dr. Farmer said he knew would cause trouble. That Professor Marshall is a Modernist everybody now knows, and anybody with any discernment at all ought to have known it from his first utterance at the Convention in 1925. By a heavy proxy vote at the Conventions of 1925 and 1926 McMaster University secured endorsement of her position by a majority vote.

But during those years McMaster imported from abroad several speakers to help them in their campaign against Jarvis Street. Included in this number were Dr. George Truett, of Dallas, Texas; Dr. E. Y. Mullins, of Louisville, Ky.; Dr. L. R. Scarborough, of Fort Worth,

Texas. In addition to that, they carefully canvassed the whole constituency, and by the use of the most shameless falsehoods, which it was impossible for anyone to follow, they poisoned the springs of our denominational life.

But are we to understand that just as Belgium had long been called the "cockpit of Europe", so Canada had been selected to play the part of the cockpit of the Baptist world in which the great conflict between Fundamentalism and Modernism should be fought to a finish? We know that it has been a very severe fight, but we supposed that it was largely local. But Dr. MacNeill would have us believe that when McMaster had pressed into its service his own and other influential churches in Toronto, the Home Mission Board, the Foreign Mission Board, the Publication Board, the Women's Foreign Mission Society, the Woman's Home Mission Society; and after it had imported men from the Southern Baptist Convention, and men from the Northern Convention, such as Dr. Shailer Mathews and Professor George Cross, that they summoned reinforcements from across the sea. Professor Marshall came to prepare the way, and then the Baptist World Alliance came. They came by shipload from England; they came from Sweden, and Norway, and Germany, and Russia, and Czecho-Slovakia, from India, from China, from Japan, from New Zealand, from Australia, from South Africa, from the Islands of the sea, they came by ship, by train; and hundreds, perhaps thousands, came by motor car. They came from every province in Canada, and every state in the Union, from the South American republics, and every other corner of the earth—and for what did they come? Especially that they might elect a Canadian as their President, in order that they might express their disapproval of the campaign conducted by Jarvis Street Church and its Pastor; at the same time, their high appreciation of the heroic service rendered the Baptist denomination by the valiant pastor of Walmer Road Baptist Church!

Thus we are told "the Baptists of the world have spoken"; and no one can "misunderstand or ignore their voice". Our answer is this: we are altogether too modest to accept Dr. MacNeill's compliment; for if this were true, it would, beyond question, be the highest compliment ever paid to any church or pastor. Think of it! The Baptists of Ontario and Quebec had failed. They summon help from the east and west; they go to the south; they get the Northern Convention; they impress the Southern Convention; they bring them from mission fields, from the Antipodes, from Europe, from Africa, from Great Britain—the representatives of twelve million Baptists, all to censure Jarvis Street, and commend Dr. MacNeill! *The fact is, we do not suppose that five per cent. of the twelve million Baptist ever even heard of either of us!* Somewhere we have met with the suggestion that Dr. John MacNeill is a very humble man. If that be true, in view of the sentiments expressed in the interview we have printed, let all the world be thankful for his humility, for if he had been proud, or self-conceited, what would have happened to the rest of the world!

But let us examine into the case more closely. *The Canadian Baptist* of July 5th—and we suppose there is no higher authority in this matter—is our authority for the statement that over seven thousand registered. But this, it would appear, included visitors, for *The Toronto*

Star printed the report of the Registration Committee as follows:

"Total Official Registration: 7,407. Delegates: 5,147. Visitors: 2,260. This record does not include the great number of casual visitors."

We presume our contemporary's reference is to the total registration, and that the number of delegates registered was 5,147. When Dr. MacNeill was elected, *The Canadian Baptist* says, four thousand delegates arose and cheered when Rev. George W. Truett, acting-President, presented the new President to the Alliance. Thus the twelve million Baptists were represented by four thousand delegates at the time Dr. MacNeill was elected.

But how was his election brought about? We have already reported that the Chairman of the Nominating Committee was Dr. L. R. Scarborough, of Fort Worth. We have not the names of the other members of the Nominating Committee, but we have already reported that two other Toronto men were considered for the Alliance Presidency: Rev. W. A. Cameron, and Mr. Albert Matthews. Obviously, then, the Nominating Committee felt that the new President should be a Canadian. That, of course, was a courtesy to be shown to Canada in view of the fact that the Congress was held here. And of all Canadian Baptists, three were selected.

We know all three of them, and we know the Chairman of the Nominating Committee. A more bitter, ecclesiastical, politician, or a more virulent, venomous enemy of Fundamentalism and Fundamentalists cannot be found on the American continent than the orthodox Dr. L. R. Scarborough. We shall be greatly mistaken if Dr. Scarborough does not soon follow his friend and colleague in Texas, Dr. S. F. Groner, into retirement from Baptist leadership. But Dr. Scarborough was President of the Nominating Committee. No man outside of Canada knew more about the Canadian situation than Dr. Scarborough. He sat through the long educational session of our Convention of 1927, which lasted from eleven o'clock one morning until three o'clock the next. He heard Professor Marshall make his statement. He declared that Professor Marshall's position would never be tolerated in the Southern Convention; yet he fought on the side of those who opposed the men who sought to rid the Convention of the blight of Marshallism.

The Nominating Committee was therefore shut up to three men.

Mr. Albert Matthews.

What about Mr. Albert Matthews? Mr. Matthews is a Baptist layman who, for some years, has played a leading part in Baptist affairs. Once he was our very intimate friend. "We took sweet counsel together, and walked unto the house of God in company." And to this day we feel the warmest affection for him, and cherish the memory of those days of fellowship, and remember how earnestly we hoped that in him God had laid His hand upon a man who would stand like a rock against the encroachments of Modernism. Mr. Matthews at last went over to the other side. We confess our disappointment, but we gladly acknowledge that he is too true a man, too genuine a Christian, too much of a gentleman, ever to open his heart to the bitterness which has characterized most of the men on McMaster's side. Mr. Matthews failed us in the battle, but so far as we know, he has never been bitter, or ungentlemanly, not to say,

unchristian, in his attitude. We cannot forget his earnest prayers,—indeed, literally, his strong cryings and tears for the salvation of men while he was still a deacon of Jarvis Street Church.

Mr. Matthews has made a great contribution to the Convention of Ontario and Quebec. He has given of his time as few men have done, and he has given of his means. When we were Vice-Chairman of the Home Mission Board there was no more faithful member of the Board than Mr. Albert Matthews.

It was our pleasure in 1923, at Montreal, to speak in the interest of his Presidency, and to insist that as the Vice-Presidency had several times been thrust upon him, the Convention ought to insist upon his accepting the Presidency. A year later, with great joy and satisfaction, we moved in the London Convention for the re-election of Mr. Matthews for two reasons: because we believed that personally he was eminently worthy of a second term of office, and because we had hoped that after the unanimous vote on the educational issue of the night before, under his Presidency the Denomination would sail on tranquil seas.

Dr. Scarborough Had to Find an Enemy of Shields.

But Dr. Scarborough had to find somebody who would stand out before the Baptists of this Continent as the very embodiment of opposition to Shields and his associates. Therefore Mr. Albert Matthews would not do. He had not learned to hate. He could not allow himself to become so bitter as to forget to behave like a gentleman.

What About Rev. W. A. Cameron.

Mr. Matthews being out of the question, what about Rev. W. A. Cameron? We have never agreed with Mr. Cameron's theology, but we have always gladly paid tribute to his great ability. Sometimes his detractors have said to us that his great congregations in the Uptown Theatre were to be accounted for by the fact that his services were held in a theatre; but we have always replied that that might account for a few services, but that could not explain the sustained interest of six or seven years. We wish profoundly that Mr. Cameron stood solidly for the Book and for redemption through the blood. He would then, beyond question, be one of the most effective evangelical preachers of the Continent. But though Evangelical Christians cannot claim him as a true evangelical, fair-minded men must acknowledge his powers of leadership, and recognize that the erection of his new house of worship is a really great achievement.

Moreover, we have always admired this in Mr. Cameron, that he makes no pretense to orthodoxy. He openly takes his place on the side of theological liberalism. His frankness and honesty in this respect are to be commended. Although we have never been in agreement with Mr. Cameron's theology, and although his vote and influence have been on the other side of the controversy, we are happy to say he has never been *nasty*. Even at Ottawa, when he led the charge of the defeated hosts, he behaved like "an officer and a gentleman"; and so far as we knew, has behaved in a similar fashion throughout this controversy.

Therefore the election of Mr. Cameron as President of the Baptist World Alliance could never have been interpreted as a special endorsement of McMaster's campaign against Jarvis Street. Mr. Cameron was too

much of a gentleman to qualify for the position. He had not sufficiently learned how to hate.

Therefore, Only One Choice.

There remains but one other possibility among the men of prominence in the Denomination. What did they want? Of course we do not suppose that Dr. Scarborough would tell all the members of his Committee his reasons for favouring Dr. MacNeill. Unfortunately, we have been unable to obtain the names of the Nominating Committee, but we suppose the usual practice was followed, and men were selected who would be representative of the whole Baptist World Alliance constituency. Naturally they would look for guidance from one who was familiar with the local situation, in view of the fact that a Canadian must be elected.

What Did Dr. Scarborough Want?

What, then, did Dr. Scarborough want? We are far from being disposed to say to Dr. Scarborough, "Thou art worth twelve million of us", but we have not the shadow of a doubt that the choice of Dr. John MacNeill was largely Dr. Scarborough's choice in the Committee, under the inspiration of those with whom he had associated in the Ontario and Quebec Convention. What, then, did Dr. Scarborough want? He must find a man who had been conspicuous for his opposition to Dr. Shields. Not because Dr. Shields had ever done Dr. Scarborough any great injury, but because he had been known as a friend of Dr. J. Frank Norris, of Fort Worth, Texas; and that, to Dr. Scarborough, would, of course, be an utterly unpardonable sin. But he must find somebody who would stand out as the very incarnation of hatred of that which is known as Fundamentalism, and of those who are known as Fundamentalists:

Dr. MacNeill Eminently Qualified.

Certainly, therefore, no one could be found who would more completely meet the requirements of the situation than Dr. John MacNeill, Pastor of Walmer Road Baptist Church, Toronto. It was known that Dr. John MacNeill had repeatedly, in public, accused the Pastor of Jarvis Street of the commission of the unpardonable sin. To charge a man with that is, beyond question, to consign him to perdition; and as Dr. John MacNeill was on record for having thus stigmatized the Editor of *The Gospel Witness*, nothing could be more appropriate than to nominate him for the Presidency of the Baptist World Alliance.

If that was what was wanted in the President of the Baptist World Alliance, we congratulate Dr. Scarborough on the choice of Dr. John MacNeill. But to say that the four thousand delegates in Congress Hall, by their vote for Dr. MacNeill, thereby commended him for his defense of McMaster, and for his virulent attacks upon the Jarvis Street Pastor is to talk the utterest nonsense. We repeat: perhaps not five per cent. of the Baptists of the world had ever heard of either of us.

Many Fundamentalist Delegates.

Moreover, in that company there were hundreds who were our personal friends. One foreign delegation came to us in a body, and through an interpreter, told us that they desired us to know that they appreciated our stand for the faith, and were solidly with us. One pastor from a prominent church in the capital of Sweden came to *The Gospel Witness* car, and asked if that was the latest

issue that was on sale, saying he was a subscriber to the paper, and would be glad to have the latest copy. We have subscribers in nearly all the countries of Europe, and *we are sure the Baptists of the world did not express themselves in the vote for Dr. MacNeill at Congress Hall.* There are few Baptist ministers in Canada—we doubt if there is even one—who has such a wide correspondence with Baptists of the world, as the Editor of this paper. The fact is, this paper circulates in twenty-four different countries. We have about three thousand ministers who read the paper every week, and thousands of others who are not ministers. The truth is, many, many times more Baptists read *The Gospel Witness* every week than the entire registration of delegates and visitors to the Baptist World Alliance. And these thousands of Baptists must be included in the twelve millions, and if they were so opposed to our stand, and so approved of Dr. MacNeill's course, as Dr. MacNeill would have us believe, we do not suppose they would continue their subscriptions to this paper.

To sum the whole matter up, Dr. MacNeill's name was put forward by the Nominating Committee, and the Nominating Committee was almost certainly dominated by Dr. L. R. Scarborough, he, in turn, was naturally the tool of our local enemies, and of the enemies we have made in the Northern and Southern Conventions, because of our stand for the faith. It is only another political gesture, and is part and parcel of Modernism's methods everywhere and all the time. The four thousand delegates would have voted for anyone the Nominating Committee recommended.

Because no delegate voted against Dr. MacNeill's election it is declared that he represents 12,000,000 Baptists. Are we therefore to assume that because only some of the Southern brethren, and *The Gospel Witness*, protested against the presence on the programme of such men as Prof. L. H. Marshall, Dr. Shailer Matthews, and Dr. T. R. Glover, twelve million Baptist approve of their teaching?

Do twelve million Baptist approve of this from Dr. Shailer Matthews' book, *The Church and the Changing Order*, P. 60.

"The church should welcome all arguments that prove men may believe in God and have communion with Him and be blessed in living with Him even if criticism should destroy the historical Jesus."

Do twelve million Baptist approve of this from Dr. T. R. Glover, in his book entitled, *The Pilgrim*, page 239,

"It is the function and the duty of every man to think and decide for himself as to life, and among other things to determine whether he counts Jesus reliable as an observer, if not as a guide. It is worth while, then, to remark that Jesus has no responsibility for this trivial treatment of evil—none. It is surprising to note how often, in the language of his day, picture-language not literal but intelligible to everybody, he refers to the worm and the fire, to darkness and gnashing of teeth. 'How can you escape the damnation of hell?' he asked some people once, with a directness which, if we had the decency to be candid, we should call rather un-Christian in our sense, whoever used it. A man who deliberately put himself in the way of men who would undoubtedly crucify him—who did it with his eyes open—cannot be saddled with responsibility for our flimsy views of right and wrong. *The first step to win the respect of reasonable and sensible men and women for his religion must be to confess our disloyalty to Him on this issue, and to attempt to draw His sharp distinction between right and wrong.*" (Emphasis ours.).

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

"A Lying Spirit From The Lord"

A Sermon by the Pastor, Dr. T. T. Shields.

Delivered in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Friday Evening, June 29th, 1928, (simultaneously with the closing meeting of the Baptist World Alliance.)

(Stenographically Reported.)

Personally, I had some misgivings as to the wisdom of attempting to hold extra services here during the progress of the Baptist World Alliance meetings. When men are gathered from all parts of the earth, among them many men of great distinction, it seemed almost absurd to open our doors, especially when it was known that our testimony would not be in agreement with the general trend of things at Exhibition Park. And yet many hundreds have attended our services every evening, and I think we may reasonably hope that the testimony given has not been in vain.

What is the situation? I think it has been demonstrated that many men have occupied positions of prominence in the programme of this Alliance who reject the authority of Holy Scripture. Some of them reject the cardinal doctrines of the gospel: the essential Deity of Christ, carrying with it His virgin birth, and the great central truth of the gospel, His expiatory death, or, the expiatory value of His death, His literal resurrection, and His coming again. I think that is not open to question. No one having any appreciation of the value of language at all will dispute with me when I say that men who deny everything fundamental to evangelical faith have occupied positions of prominence on the Alliance programme; and, so far as I know, no word of public protest has been uttered against their teaching.

I do not believe that the delegates to the Alliance accept that teaching in any general way. I am confident that brethren from Russia, and Germany, and Sweden, and some from England, and many from the United States, and from the Islands of the sea, reject and repudiate these doctrines. Notwithstanding, it is the way of Modernists to obtain positions of prominence in the programmes of large meetings, get themselves and their utterances into the press, and create the general impression that the great company have credentialed their views. But for our protest in this place, nobody would ever have suspected from anything that has appeared in the press, or from any word uttered from the Alliance programme, that the Baptists of the world were not one in their rejection of the authority of Scripture. And it will be published to the ends of the earth that the Baptist World Alliance has approved of these radical views.

Our own papers described the meeting in Yorkminster Church as being under the leadership of Professor Marshall and Dean Shailer Mathews, and the impression goes abroad that these men were the mouthpieces for great multitudes of Baptists, who, if they are driven to a choice between science and the Bible, will accept science. The truth is, there are great multitudes of Baptists, numbered by the million, who still hold to the faith of Christ.

But what is the explanation of this defection here and

elsewhere? The very best explanation to be found anywhere is always to be found in the Word of God, and I desire to show you that these heresies are not new. Let me read you a portion of the eighteenth chapter of the second book of Chronicles, or rather the whole chapter:

"Now Jehoshaphat had riches and honour in abundance, and joined affinity with Ahab. And after certain years he went down to Ahab to Samaria. And Ahab killed sheep and oxen for him in abundance, and for the people that he had with him, and persuaded him to go up with him to Ramoth-gilead. And Ahab king of Israel said unto Jehoshaphat king of Judah, Wilt thou go with me to Ramoth-gilead? And he answered him, I am as thou art, and my people as thy people; and we will be with thee in the war.

"And Jehoshaphat said unto the king of Israel, Enquire, I pray thee, at the word of the Lord to-day. Therefore, the king of Israel gathered together of prophets four hundred men, and said unto them, Shall we go to Ramoth-gilead to battle, or shall I forbear? And they said, Go up; for God will deliver it into the king's hand. But Jehoshaphat said, Is there not here a prophet of the Lord besides, that we might enquire of him? And the king of Israel said unto Jehoshaphat, There is yet one man, by whom we may enquire of the Lord: but I hate him; for he never prophesied good unto me, but always evil: the same is Micaiah the son of Imla. And Jehoshaphat said, Let not the king say so. And the king of Israel called for one of his officers, and said, Fetch quickly Micaiah the son of Imla. And the king of Israel and Jehoshaphat king of Judah sat either of them on his throne, clothed in their robes, and they sat in a void place at the entering in of the gate of Samaria; and all the prophets prophesied before them.

"And Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah had made him horns of iron, and said, Thus saith the Lord, With these thou shalt push Syria until they be consumed. And all the prophets prophesied so, saying, Go up to Ramoth-gilead, and prosper: for the Lord shall deliver it into the hand of the king. And the messenger that went to call Micaiah spake to him, saying, Behold, the words of the prophets declare good to the king with one assent; let thy word therefore, I pray thee, be like one of their's, and speak thou good. And Micaiah said, As the Lord liveth, even what my God saith, that will I speak. And when he was come to the king, the king said unto him, Micaiah, shall we go to Ramoth-gilead to battle, or shall I forbear? And he said, Go ye up, and prosper, and they shall be delivered into your hand. And the king said to him, How many times shall I adjure thee that thou say nothing but the truth to me in the name of the Lord? Then he said, I did see all Israel scattered upon the mountains, as sheep that have no shepherd: and the Lord said, These have no master; let them return therefore every man to his house in peace. And the king of Israel said to Jehoshaphat, Did I not tell thee that he would not prophesy good unto me, but evil? And he said, Therefore hear the word of the Lord; I saw the Lord sitting upon his throne, and all the host of heaven standing on his right hand and on his left. And the Lord said, Who shall entice Ahab king of Israel, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead? And one spake saying

after this manner, and another saying after that manner. Then there came out a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said, I will entice him. And the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go out, and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And the Lord said, Thou shalt entice him, and thou shalt also prevail: go out, and do even so. Now therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil against thee. Then Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah came near, and smote Micaiah upon the cheek, and said, Which way went the Spirit of the Lord from me to speak unto thee? And Micaiah said, Behold, thou shalt see on that day when thou shalt go into an inner chamber to hide thyself. Then the king of Israel said, Take ye Micaiah, and carry him back to Amon the governor of the city, and to Joash the king's son; and say. Thus saith the king, Put this fellow in the prison, and feed him with bread of affliction and with water of affliction, until I return in peace. And Micaiah said, If thou certainly return in peace, then hath not the Lord spoken by me. And he said, Hearken, all ye people.

"So the king of Israel and Jehoshaphat the king of Judah went up to Ramoth-gilead. And the king of Israel said unto Jehoshaphat, I will disguise myself, and will go to the battle; but put thou on thy robes. So the king of Israel disguised himself; and they went to the battle. Now the king of Syria had commanded the captains of the chariots that were with him, saying, Fight ye not with small or great, save only with the king of Israel. And it came to pass, when the captains of the chariots saw Jehoshaphat, that they said, It is the king of Israel. Therefore they compassed about him to fight; but Jehoshaphat cried out, and the Lord helped him; and God moved them to depart from him. For it came to pass that, when the captains of the chariots perceived that it was not the king of Israel, they turned back again from pursuing him. And a certain man drew a bow at a venture, and smote the king of Israel between the joints of the harness: therefore he said to his chariot man, Turn thine hand, that thou mayest carry me out of the host; for I am wounded. And the battle increased that day: howbeit the king of Israel stayed himself up in his chariot against the Syrians until the even: and about the time of the sun going down he died."

You have in that bit of history an inspired record of present-day apostasy, of every apostasy. It is entirely up-to-date, and I should like you to look at three or four simple elements in this history, and I think it will minister to the strengthening of your faith.

I

You have, first of all, in Ahab A PICTURE OF THE NATURAL MAN, an illustration of what human nature really is, and of what human nature will do. The Bible does not concern itself so much with principles in the abstract: the principle of the incarnation is to be found on every page. That is why the Bible is so largely occupied with the biographies of men, good men and evil men, in order that in the characters and destinies of good men we may see the value of the principles of righteousness; and that in the characters and gradual—sometimes gradual, sometimes sudden—destruction of evil men, we may see the great principle that "The wages of sin is death," exemplified. As a matter of theory some of our Modernist friends deny utterly the old-fashioned doctrine of total depravity, but while they deny it theoretically, they exemplify it almost to perfection. They are themselves the proof of the very doctrines they deny.

Look at Ahab, a man who was wrong at heart. That was the trouble with Ahab. It would be useless to attempt to amend his character from without, to bring to bear upon him any reforming principle. If Ahab was to be changed, if his character was to be developed, and

ennobled, and made God-like, then the remedy must be more than an external one, it must be radical, it must go to the root of the trouble; for no one can read Ahab's record without seeing that he was a man who was bad at heart. His desires were of the earth, earthy; he was a fleshly man, a worldly man, a man who lived for time and sense, and who had no conception of spiritual values whatsoever. That is the state of the natural man who has been untouched by the Spirit of God. That is true notwithstanding Professor Marshall's sneer at the scripture quoted to him respecting the carnal mind, "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing," and his coarse and vulgar rejoinder, "Well, did I say there was any good in the liver? Did I say there was any good in the lights?" That from a professor! But the Scripture is perfectly explicit when it says that "the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, nether indeed can be."

You cannot rightly appraise the value of any religion—and I use that broad and comprehensive term—unless you view it in its relation to human nature as it is; for what is religion for if it is not to help us, to enable us to do what we of ourselves are unable to do? That is our problem to begin with; whatever the professors may say, it is true, for all history, all observation, and all experience, confirm the truth of it, that human nature is hopelessly depraved; and no kind of religion is of value to any of us unless it can remake us at heart, unless it is sufficiently radical to change our whole nature and make us new creatures. That is axiomatic. You cannot walk down the streets of Toronto without seeing that that is what man needs, a religion that will make him, by some means, a new creature.

Ahab was a man whose will was strong in the direction of his own desires. His evil affections determine the course of his will. He wanted things that were wrong; and because he wanted them, he was determined to possess them. The truth is, my friends, that the minds of men and the wills of men are against God. That is what the Scripture says—not that we are at enmity with God, but that human nature in its very essence, in its warp and woof, in its inherent qualities, is a bundle of enmity against God; that its very nature is opposed to God, so that you cannot bring the two together unless you change the carnal mind, and make it like unto the nature of God Himself. That is the miracle, and no other religion is of value to us than that which can thus bring our rebellious natures into agreement with the holy nature of God. Ahab was set against God, against the law of God, against the plans of God, against the purposes of God. He is described as a man who "did sell himself to work wickedness in the sight of the Lord."

That is true of everybody. Some men get drunk, some men steal, some men wallow in all kinds of iniquity; but there are some people, like Ahab, whose sin is of a very respectable order, for Ahab's sin was that of covetousness. There is nothing especially to indicate that Ahab was given to the grosser sins of the flesh, but he coveted Naboth's vineyard, he coveted Ramoth-gilead—he coveted everything he could get, and was determined to have it at all costs, even at the price of blood. He was determined to have things that were not his own. There are no two people who have identically the same weaknesses, the same besetments, the same temptations; but human nature is alike in this, that sin,—sin that is in-

herent, finds some expression in the life; it finds one expression in one character and another in another; but no man, if he knows his own weakness, can afford to hold in contempt a man whose sin is more apparent than his own. We may be delivered from these grosser sensual sins, and yet be inordinately proud, and envious, and covetous; and all these sins are just as much sins of the flesh as the sins that men reprobate so strongly. But the sin that is in our hearts will find expression somehow in every one of us, and there is no man here, or up yonder in the Alliance, that, apart from the grace of God, does not want to have his own way. Is not that what the Scripture says, "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way." That is our state, that was Ahab's state, and that is the state of the carnal mind always. It always wants to have its own way, to map out its own course, to be independent of God, to be itself as God knowing good and evil. It is the age-long temptation, my brother, there is nothing new about it at all.

That is human nature, and the worst of it is that *Ahab sought religious sanction for his own wilfulness.* Ahab wanted no change of heart, no change of character, no change of course, but to do just exactly according to his natural desires. "Yet," said he, "I must, in the doing of it, be a religious man; I must have my own way approved by religion." Therefore Ahab devised a religion that would let him have his way, and he had four hundred prophets paid to approve of everything he did, to cheer every time he appeared, and to promise him success in the way of his own desires. That is what Ahab did, and that is what men want to-day; men want to be religious—everybody wants to be religious—but they want a religion that will not disturb them overmuch. They want a religion that will permit them to go to their offices from Monday till Saturday and do exactly as they please, make money, get on at anybody's expense—they desire a religion that will not be inconvenient. That is what young people want—some young people, and older people too—a religion that will permit them to find their own pleasure in their own way, and that will require no sort of reformation or repentance on their part. That is a picture of human nature.

Do you think that is true? I know certain people talk much about universal brotherhood, especially when they go to religious meetings, but you do not find it in the business houses of the city. It is all talk. There is no reality in it at all, it is sheer cant. The guiding principle with the natural man is to shape his course with a view to obtaining the greatest good for the greatest number, as I heard someone say, the greatest number always being number one!

II.

This story tells us of **TWO KINDS OF RELIGION**—two kinds of religion. One was represented by four hundred prophets. A majority is very impressive. It is a great thing to say, The majority are on our side. It may sound very egotistical to say it, but the truth is, in respect to religious matters, the majority are invariably wrong. You cannot determine ethical questions, much less spiritual matters, by a majority vote. And I have the greatest authority for that statement, for He Who is our Master said that there is a wide gate and a broad road, and many there be that go in thereat. If you want

to be on the majority side, my friends, you will go by the wide gate and the broad road, for the majority are always there. On the other hand, there is a straight gate and a narrow way, and few there be that find it. But our Lord promised His benediction to the few that find it. "Fear not," notwithstanding the talk about "this *great* Denomination! This *GREAT* Denomination! This *great* Congress!"—"Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."

You are not going to get the kingdom by legislative processes, nor by any kind of political manipulations. Ahab had the majority on his side, and they were all prophets, four hundred of them, private chaplains—and when a man needs four hundred preachers to keep him straight, he is naturally pretty crooked. I confess myself to be not without some suspicion of those movements which need so much credentialing. A certificate of character is a very good thing for those who need it.

What was the outstanding characteristic of this religion that was so popular? What was it? Well, it promised Ahab success in the direction of his own desires. It said to Ahab, "Certainly, certainly; if you want Ramoth-gilead, take it, and God will help you take it. Whatever you want, take it, and the Lord will be with you." I heard a man say once that the natural man is a Roman Catholic. By which he meant that Roman Catholicism was agreeable to the natural man. Whether that be true or not I do not say, but I do know that Modernism is agreeable to the natural man, and that every natural man is naturally a Modernist, in the sense that he wants no restrictions, no heavenly directions, no prohibitions; he wants to do his own way, and his own pleasure, and to prosper in the direction of his own desire, and his own will.

In other words, *this religion is the product of evolution!* It comes out of the man himself; it is the kind of religion he wants, and that is evolution. Men can adopt that religion without any revolution of life, or repentance, or reformation, of any kind. Never from the beginning did the devil ever devise anything more popular, more agreeable to the natural mind, than the doctrine of evolution. It nullifies sin, and every element of divine revelation, and comes to congratulate man on his upward progress, and tell him if he keeps on long enough he will arrive at Ramoth-gilead, and it will be his. I do not wonder that Modernism, which rejects the Word of God, which rejects the supernatural character of the Book, which repudiates the doctrine of man's fallen estate, but, on the other hand, magnifies human nature, and tells men we are a fine lot, we are getting on splendidly, and that in ten millions of years from now we shall arrive—I do not wonder that men like that religion; it is the most palatable thing in the world. And while it has a new name, it is exactly the same religion that Ahab had, that every apostate has—it is a religion that is agreeable to the natural man, and is evolved out of man's natural desires. It is a religion of naturalism as opposed to a religion of supernaturalism.

When Ahab asked the judgment of four hundred prophets, and they said, "Go and prosper," what difficulty, what intellectual difficulty, had Ahab in the way of believing the testimony of those prophets? Look at the psychology of the thing. Here he is, his army is all ready, and he says to his neighbor, "I am going to war with the king of Syria, and Ramoth-gilead is the prize.

I am going to call the prophets and see what they say." And they said, "Go!" Was there any difficulty with Ahab's believing that message? No, he had nothing to do in order to believe it. He was going that way, and the four hundred prophets came along to give him a push in the direction of his own desire. Sometimes you wonder why it is that the tenets of the times are so readily imbibed. Why is it that men with intellects can believe in Modernism? Because that nonsense is agreeable to their own minds. When that is planted in the natural man it is planted in a soil that is congenial; in fact, it is indigenous to the natural mind. It requires no repentance, no reformation, no humbling of the heart; man can go on in his own sinful way.

That is what men are asking for to-day, and that is the kind of religion that is being provided, a religion that will never disturb anybody's conscience, a religion that will not keep anybody awake on Sunday because of what happened last week, a religion that will not bring up the records of the past for divine adjustment; but a religion that says we are all climbing the golden stairs; we have nothing to fear from the past, and everything to hope for the future. We are better than our fathers, we are at the top of the race, the acme of evolution, or, at least, the last product; and we are going on. I do not wonder when people have been flattered after that fashion that they clap one another on the shoulder and say, "You are a fine fellow"—hail fellow, well met. There is no bowing of the head, no breaking of the heart, no humbling of the spirit, before God. "Go up to Ramoth-gilead; for God will deliver it into the king's hand." The only god the Modernists know is the god that promises to reinforce their own wills in the direction of their own carnal desires. It is no wonder men like Fosdick come out in defense of companionate marriage, and proclaim the doctrine of self-expression. That is what Modernism is; disguised with all sorts of scholastic camouflage, at heart it is the upgrowth, the outpouring, of the natural expression of the corrupt hearts of men.

Put beside that *another kind of religion*. Micaiah the son of Imla was its representative. What did he know about Ahab's going up to Ramoth-gilead? What was Micaiah's opinion about the wisdom of Ahab's course? He had no opinion. He expressed no opinion. What he said was, "I do not know what I shall say yet, but as the Lord liveth, whatever he saith unto me that will I speak." They said, "Do not be revolutionary, do not be singular, do not be eccentric, do not be egotistical, do not set up your judgment against the rest. We will tell you something quietly: the king has already asked four hundred prophets, and the majority are on his side. Come on, join the majority." Did you ever hear that? (Laughter.) Join the majority! Why should you stand up and make yourself singular? Everybody else is doing it, therefore you do it. Everybody else believes it.

I remember an old minister once, when that argument was brought forth in a ministerial meeting, "Everybody believes it, everybody is saying it. All the theological seminaries teach it, all the text-books state it—join in with the majority"—the old man said, "That may be good advertising"—by the way, he was a Methodist not a hundred miles from here—"but as I came to this meeting this morning I saw on the billboard, 'Everybody smokes ——— tobacco (naming it, but I am not going to advertise it for them). Now that may be good ad-

vertising, but it is not true, because I am somebody, and I do not smoke that kind of tobacco—or any other kind. You cannot win me by saying that everybody believes it. Here is one servant of God who testifies against the whole business, for I do not believe a word of it." Modernism carried in McMaster, it carried in our Convention with proxy votes, for that is the trick of Modernism to make it carry always. They did the same thing in the Baptist World Alliance, and are publishing abroad that all the Baptists of the world believe and teach Modernism.

This prophet said in effect, "I do not know a thing about Ramoth-gilead, and I know nothing about Ahab, but I am the mouthpiece of God, and whatever He tells me I will repeat." And when this preacher came—we shall have more to say about him in another connection—when he came, and Ahab asked him exactly the same question that he asked the four hundred, and received from Micaiah exactly the same answer, why did he not turn around to Jehoshaphat and say, "There now, Jehoshaphat, it is unanimous. Four hundred prophets, plus Micaiah. Now we are on safe ground"? Ahab did not expect the same message from Micaiah, and he suddenly became possessed of a passionate desire for the truth and said, "How many times shall I adjure thee that thou say nothing but the truth to me, in the name of the Lord?" Why did he not say that to the four hundred prophets? Some people talk about us here in Jarvis Street as though we were seeking prominence. Do you know what? I could put myself on the front page of every city newspaper in the United States and Canada Monday morning. How? By borrowing one of the Modernists' sermons and preaching it, by telling men to go up to Ramoth-gilead and prosper. They do not expect me to say that! They expect it somewhere else. But were a Fundamentalist to say the same thing they would wonder if he were ill! Or if he had suddenly become converted by the Baptist World Alliance! It is a fact. There are fifty pulpits that could preach such a sermon next Sunday without comment, but if it were preached from this pulpit, the whole Continent would hear of it. Why? Because in their heart of hearts they know that they are asking for a religion that will leave them alone in their sins, that is why. That is the philosophy of Modernism.

Then Micaiah delivered his second message. There was a tone of irony in that first one. Ahab knew that was not the final word. But the prophet came as though he would mock him: "I know what you want. You have asked four hundred prophets, and they all said, parrot-like, what you wanted them to say. Let me be a parrot and say the same thing." "But," said Ahab, "I did not expect you to be a parrot. Come on, now, what have you to say?" "Just this: I had a vision. I saw the Lord and I heard Him say, I did see all Israel scattered upon the mountains, as sheep that have no shepherd: and the Lord said, These have no master; let them return therefore every man to his house in peace. If you go up to Ramoth-gilead, you will never come home again." He spoke the very opposite from that spoken by the four hundred prophets; one man against four hundred. And Ahab said, "I told you so. I never did hear that preacher preach that he did not scold. Did I not tell thee that he would not prophesy good unto me, but evil?" Yes, that is the attitude of the natural man. But, my friends, when the prophet gets a revelation from God, and speaks God's

word instead of his own word, it always smites the human conscience, it always breaks the human heart, it always humbles human pride, it always forbids men to do their own wills, and it always tells them that in the way of self-will is death. People do not like it, and because they do not like it they want the testimony of the four hundred. Can you see those two religions?

III.

Then look at HUMAN NATURE, for a moment, IN ITS RELATION TO THESE TWO POSSIBILITIES.

First of all, there are two men concerned, Ahab and Jehoshaphat, and I have spoken only of Ahab. Jehoshaphat was a good man in the main, and *when he was at home he behaved himself*. And here was a proclamation for the Israelitish king—no, the Israel-Judean Alliance! It was an alliance between Israel and Judea, and these two are arranging the programme. Ahab, Chairman of the Committee, put four hundred prophets of Baal on the programme, and if it had not been that Jehoshaphat attended the Convention, Micaiah would not have had a chance to speak at all. Is not that up-to-date? Why is it that there is here and there an evangelical note sounded? Why are a few evangelicals put on the programme? Because Jehoshaphat, who believes God's Word, has no more sense than to join affinity with Ahab who denies it. Jehoshaphat is a type of the Fundamentalist who is a Fundamentalist at home, and a practical Modernist abroad. When he is at home he worships God: when he attends the Convention down in Samaria, and Ahab makes a complimentary speech, Jehoshaphat replies: "I am as thou art, and my people as thy people; and we will be with thee in the war. We are all one, we enjoy a glorious unity." Do you see it? That is the Baptist World Alliance exactly!

Now look: *Ahab could believe the testimony of the four hundred prophets without repentance or reformation*, but here is a psychological principle, and it is a profound doctrinal principle, because the doctrinal principles of the Word of God inhere in the nature of things. What had Ahab to do in order to believe the message of the Fundamentalist Micaiah? What had he to do? What was it? It was this: Ahab, demobilize your army. Set aside your ambition, go home, and stay home, and desist from the course upon which your heart is set.

That was the message. What had he to do in order to believe it? He had first of all to repent, and without repentance he could not believe. What is the psychology of saving faith? That no man can possibly believe until he has first repented. Do you see that? The gospel challenges you. It lays the axe at the root of the tree, and unless you are ready to have the whole tree down and cast into the fire you cannot believe. But if you are willing to give up your old life, the flesh with the affections and lusts thereof, and nail it to the cross of Christ, then it is possible to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and be saved. "Repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ" always go together, and you cannot have saving faith without heart repentance. The reason some men do not believe is because they will not repent. The secret of evangelical faith is just there: "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness." With the head you can believe anything. Anything! But with the heart you can believe that which is akin to the nature of the heart, and while the heart is deceitful you can believe only that

which is not true. If you have a heart that is quickened by the Divine Spirit and made like unto God, then with the heart you can believe unto righteousness; you can receive the truth "in the love of it." But "faith and a good conscience" go together. Part company with a good conscience, and you part company with faith. If you set your heart upon Ramoth-gilead, and resolve, 'I will have it no matter what the prophets say, I will have it no matter what the Bible says,' you will never be able to believe the Bible while in that attitude, but you will find it easy to say, Amen, to whatever the prophets of Baal declare.

IV.

I come now to the MOST SOLEMN PART OF ALL. I have touched upon this principle before perhaps, but I tell you frankly that for years I was afraid to read in public the scripture I read to-night. I did not understand it. I believed it, but I did not understand it. If anybody had asked me to explain it, I could not have done so. What is it? Micaiah said, "I saw the Lord sitting upon his throne, and all the host of heaven standing on his right hand and on his left hand. And the Lord said, Who shall entice Ahab king of Israel, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead?"—the day of judgment for Ahab had arrived, and the Lord said, "Who shall entice Ahab king of Israel, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead? And one spake saying after this manner, and another saying after that manner. Then there came out a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said, I will entice him. And the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go out, and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And the Lord said, Thou shalt entice him, and thou shalt also prevail: go out, and do even so. Now therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil against them."

I wonder Professor Marshall did not stumble on that passage and give it as one of his objections to the doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture. That is one of the profoundest passages in the Scripture, and it proves the inspiration of Scripture. No man would have dared to write that who wanted to magnify the Lord. Listen: left to himself, wanting to exalt Jehovah, without divine inspiration, no man would ever have represented God as releasing a lying spirit to go into the mouths of all Ahab's prophets.

What is the explanation? It is just this. What was Ahab's record? Read it, and you will find that *the one thing against which Ahab had set himself was the hearing of the word of the Lord*. Ahab did not want to hear the truth, and he destroyed the men who dared to tell him the truth. And if—now mark this well—if Ahab had had his own way up to this hour there would not have been left on earth a single man who would have dared to tell him the truth. He cut off the head of every witness to the truth so far as he had power to do so. He spent his whole life saying to God in a thousand ways, "I hate the truth. I will not hear the truth. I want a lie, give me a lie, let me live a lie. Let me live after the bent of my own deceitful heart." And at last *God let Ahab have what he wanted!* Hear this solemn truth: If God were to let you and me, anyone of us, have what we want, we should be in hell. The worst judgment that can fall upon any man is for God to withdraw all restraint, and to allow

the man to gallop headlong to the precipice. He will go to Ramoth-gilead every time. And four hundred prophets will encourage him in his going!

Is there anything in the New Testament like that? Oh yes.—“For this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.” Ask God for a lie, and you may get what you want. I believe sometimes judgment falls upon a church like that, a church that resists every true prophet that is sent to it. There are modern Jerusalems to whom it might be said, “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee: how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate: and verily I say unto you, Ye shall not see me, until the time come when ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.” God withdraws His Spirit from some churches; He removes, to use the New Testament phrase, the candle-stick out of its place, and the church dies. Instead of witnessing for Christ, it is given a prophet possessed of a lying spirit. The people ask for it, and at last they get it.

A denomination may do the same thing. A denomination may reject the truth of God's Word and say, “We do not want prophets to preach the truth to us. Give us a lie”; and the Lord will let them have their own way at last. I believe the Lord has allowed the Convention of Ontario and Quebec to have its own way, and while they supposed they were getting victory, the judgment and the withering curse of Modernism, fell upon them; and with accelerated speed they have been going down the hill ever since, and where they will be five years from now only the Lord can tell. Individuals, churches, educational institutions, denominations, are all parts of the great movement, and the general principle will operate, so that at last when this sinful world has utterly rejected the gospel, they shall have a strong delusion, and believe a lie, and they shall not see the Judge until He rends the heavens and comes down to take “vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Do not be disturbed, my dear friends, by the present apostasy. It cannot last forever. “Our God is a consuming fire”: let us take heed to be always on His side of every controversy.

Let us look at the situation as a whole for a few minutes. Here are Jehoshaphat and Ahab and the four hundred prophets; and “Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah had made him horns of iron, and said, Thus saith the Lord, With these thou shalt push Syria until they be consumed.” What a big man he was! Afterward when Micaiah had borne his testimony, “Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah came near, and smote Micaiah upon the cheek, and said, Which way went the Spirit of the Lord from me to speak unto thee?” Yes, this is the day of Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah. What an important man he is! Yes, he is a little bit of a McMaster student, two by four, who votes with the hierarchy, and thereby suddenly becomes a big man! Micaiah was alone, but I think he looked and said, “Oh Jehoshaphat, oh Jehoshaphat, in the camp of the enemy, fighting on the side of the enemies of the Lord. I came to speak because you asked for me, and when I had given my testimony in the

presence of Ahab, you had not the courage to say, “That is the truth. Let us listen to Micaiah.” Ahab said, “We will dismiss this Fundamentalist.” So he called the captain of the guard and said, “Put this fellow in the prison, and feed him with bread of affliction and with water of affliction, until I return in peace. I shall be back, and will attend to you, Micaiah.” And the loyal preacher simply lifted up his voice and said, “If thou certainly return in peace, then hath not the Lord spoken by me.” So they took him away.

The battle started, and Ahab said to Jehoshaphat—the Modernist said to the Fundamentalists—“I will disguise myself, and will go to the battle; but put thou on thy robes, and everybody will think that the whole battle is being led by the Fundamentalist. Nobody will know where I am.” So Jehoshaphat, with all his royal robes, got into his chariot and went to the battle. The king of Syria had given commandment to the captains of his chariots, “Fight ye not with small or great, save only the king of Israel. Get him, and you will get the crowd.” When therefore they saw Jehoshaphat with his royal robes, and all the marks of royalty upon him they said, “There he is”, and every man drew his bow to bring Jehoshaphat down. But Jehoshaphat was not such a brave man after all! What cowards these Fundamentalists are when they go to battle with Ahab! Really one would have supposed he would take his medicine! But when he saw all the enemy were concentrating upon him he said, “I am not the king of Israel. I am not a Modernist. Do not shoot me”! Did you ever hear that? You say the Bible is out of date? They have not got that in the evening papers, but I am sure it happened this afternoon!

But a certain man drew a bow at a venture; putting his hand to his quiver and putting his arrow to the bow, he shot at a venture, but as he did so, an unseen Hand was laid upon his, and, guided unerringly, the arrow shot on its way. Then the disguised Modernist said, “He has found me. Turn thine hand, that thou mayest carry me out of the host; for I am wounded.” And “about the time of the sun going down he died”, and they took the chariot down to the pool of Siloam, and as they were washing the royal blood away, the dogs came and licked his blood “according to the word of the Lord” that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, “In the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth shall dogs lick thy blood, even thine.” And Modernism, naturalism in religion,—Sadduceeism of old times, and the Modernism of our day—inspired by a lying spirit, took a man from the proud position of king of Israel, and brought him literally to the dogs. That is what it always does. Always!

What shall we do? My friends, we do not fear for the Book.—“About the time of the sun going down”! When the sun at last shall set upon this earth's long day of trial and conflict, and the dark night shall fall whose thick blackness shall be broken at last by the rising of the Sun of Righteousness with healing in His wings—“about the time of the sun going down” it will come to pass according to the word of the Lord. Not one jot or tittle of this Word shall fail till all has been fulfilled. “Let God be true and every man a liar”!

Meanwhile, did I know that some teacher, having lost his reason and possessed by some evil, destructive, spirit, were putting poison into the drinking fountain of which

the children will drink; did I know that behind the drug-store counter there was a disguised murderer who changed every physician's prescription, and instead of compounding a healing draught, were putting in a poisonous drug, thus digging a grave; did I know that on the train there was an engineer determined to pass all signals, to court danger, and to destroy himself and his cargo of living freight; did I know that a company of men were now conspiring to break into some household to-night when father and mother and a family of beautiful children are locked in slumber, and to despoil the house of all its treasures, and fill it with some poisonous gases that would prevent their ever waking to see the light of another day—if I knew that men were thus abroad poisoning the springs of life, turning health to disease, planning plunder and murder, ought I to whisper polite things to men of such criminal instincts? Or ought I to report it to the police, and, failing help in that direction, ought I merely as a man if I had to do it alone, leap into the breach, and by some means endeavour to put an end to their fiendish programme?—"Peace, peace, when there is no peace"? God helping us, we will never so prophesy.

I heard some years ago, before the West had developed as it has since, a story of a transcontinental train crossing our western prairies in the dead of night, and in the midst of winter when the thermometer registered twenty or thirty below zero, and a blizzard was raging. On the train was a woman with four little children going home. She was sitting in the car with her children, not much used to travelling. She was rather nervous about her station, and as the conductor came through she said, "Conductor, I am to get off at such a station, will you please tell me when I come to it?" "Certainly, madam, your station is the next stop." "Thank you, sir." After a while the train slowed down and came to a standstill. The woman said to a passenger near by, "Is this where I get off?" "Yes, madam, the conductor said the next

stop." She gathered up her parcels (it was in the days before vestibule trains), and with her children got off the train. The train sped on into the zero night for nearly an hour. Presently as it was slowing down the conductor came in, and looking around, he said to this man, "Where is that woman with her children?" "She got off." "Got off! Where?" "She got off at the last station. I told her that was the place." "You told her! Man, that is out on the prairies miles from human habitation. A woman with four little children alone in a prairie blizzard thirty below zero!" He pulled the rope, ran through the train, gave his directions to the engineer, and the train pushed back for nearly an hour, until they came to the place; and there beneath the snow they found a woman and four little children frozen to death—because some man undertook to direct them when he did not know the way.

Brethren, our pulpits are filled with men who do not know God, who do not know His Word, who do not know the gospel of the blood, blind leaders of the blind, verily they are the devil's executioners. Our theological seminaries are turning them out by the hundred. To say nothing of being Christians, if we are men, we will swear before high heaven that to the last drop of our blood we will oppose this damnable traffic in human souls; and expose not only the Ahabs, but the cowardly, conspiring, Jehoshaphats who help Ahab on in his work. We need not be troubled though we stand alone, for our God is with us, and some day, some day, God pity us! some day we shall have to give an account. I could pray that God would terminate my life to-night rather than suffer me to live ever to say one word that would destroy men's faith in the Word of God, or to turn men away from their only Saviour. This is no child's play, my brethren, it is the war of the ages that will end only when Jesus Christ rends the skies and comes down. May He help us to live for that great and glorious day!

What a Newspaper Man Said of Dr. J. C. Masee in Toronto

The following excerpt is from a report of Dr. Masee's address before the World Alliance in Toronto, written by Frederick A. Wilmot, Religious Editor *Providence (R.I.) Journal and Bulletin*, Travelling Editor, *The Christian Leader*:

This great southern preacher, who is now under the cultural discipline of Boston, is one fundamentalist who knew enough to quit fighting and to throw his entire strength into converting men to the gospel. His greatest sermon will probably always remain the one he delivered at the Washington convention of the Northern Baptist Convention, when he confessed that he was tired of fighting and asked that great body with him to declare a six months' moratorium on controversy and to devote their entire energies to evangelism.

Dr. Masee was the flash of light through the dark clouds of controversy, which began about eight years ago, and in which Dr. T. T. Shields and other disturbers were so prominent at Seattle, "the irreconcilables."

The glory of the achievement of the recent Northern Baptist Convention at Detroit, which was the most harmonious gathering in years, is the fruit of Dr. Masee's humility, which in spite of his theology has endeared him to all Baptists.

Boston Influence.

I rather smile when I hear Dr. Masee disclaiming the value of culture, and taking a poke at the Unitarians. I remember when Dr. Masee first came up from the South. He was a "fire-eater" in those days, a red-hot controversialist. A sermon that he delivered at the opening of Dr. Milford H. Lyon's tabernacle campaign, in New Bedford, Mass., in 1923, will ever remain in my memory as an orthodox sermon of the strictest type.

Dr. Masee may not think that Boston is having any effect upon him, but he is a vastly changed man from when we went there first. He is more cultured in speech and more tolerant in spirit. Unitarian Boston will either crush or smooth off the roughest diamond, if you give it time enough.

Do not misunderstand me. Dr. Masee will never be mistaken for a modernist nor a deep scholar. To many his theological conceptions are fantastic, but he gets the crowds and has a record for conversions. Of course, Tremont Temple is not a fair test of a preacher's popularity. This great institution is always crowded to the doors. It is the social headquarters for New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Baptists in Greater Boston.

The Unveiling of Dr. John MacNeill

For the information of many readers who may not know the history of the case, the following article is reprinted from the issue of "The Gospel Witness" of May 5, 1927.—Ed. "G.W."

For a long time we have regarded the fulminations of Dr. John MacNeill with an equanimity akin to indifference. Although his course in the present controversy long since almost entirely destroyed our respect both for his religious intelligence and for his motives, regard for his office and for his denominational position, made us reluctant to say anything which would disillusion his deluded followers; while consideration for his own repose forbade our disturbing his complacently-ensconced imagined superiority. By force of circumstances, however, we are at length driven to believe that longer silence on some matters, and continued leniency in others, would work serious injury to the interests of many who have no responsibility for McMaster University's campaign of misrepresentation in which Dr. MacNeill has played so conspicuous a part. From a high sense of duty, therefore, we propose to deal with the writings and speeches of Dr. MacNeill with slightly less reserve than we have hitherto exercised; but if in this article, in our description and definition of the subject in hand, we confine ourselves to the comparative degree, our readers will understand that our superlatives are held in reserve in the hope that Dr. MacNeill's discretion will not challenge their mobilization.

We regret that it is longer impossible, apparently, to discuss the principles at issue in the Denomination without, at the same time, discussing the persons responsible for their dissemination. The Editor of *The Gospel Witness* has already been charged with dealing in "personalities"! We have avoided it wherever it has been possible. But what shall be said of our opponents? Ever since we crossed the path of McMaster University in an effective way at the Ottawa Convention in 1919, that institution has been engaged in a campaign of personal abuse. They have been reinforced by two of the largest Baptist churches in Toronto; they have pressed into their service *The Canadian Baptist*; they have mobilized for their purposes the Home Mission Board, and impressed the officers of the Foreign Mission Board; by a raid upon many of the smaller churches they packed the Convention at First Avenue with proxies; they spent the whole day in abusing one man; and after refusing to hear opponents of McMaster University on account of the lateness of the hour, they gave nearly two hours of the Convention's time, past the midnight hour, to two speeches whose vulgarity would have disgraced the worst traditions of Billingsgate; they have established themselves in the Executive of the Convention, and through their own representatives and paid Secretaries in that body, have applied to Parliament for legislation for the express purpose of dealing specially with one person.

McMaster's Torrent of Vituperation.

Let our readers remember that for nearly eight years we have had not one moment's respite from McMaster's torrent of vituperation. She has sent her agents through the length and breadth of the Convention; on railroad trains, in pulpits, in the homes of the people, in Associational meetings, and at all sorts of special services, she has prosecuted her campaign—never discussing the issue, never attempting to reason, always denouncing, always cursing one man; and all of them saying the same thing, "Shields is a liar". Their heresies, their breaches of trust, their political machinations, their Tammany methods, their brazen falsehoods, have been exposed again and again; and never in one solitary instance have they disproved a single thing that has been printed in this paper. We have confined ourselves to fact; we have discussed the principles at issue; we have given line upon line, and precept upon precept; we have proved our position, as independent, unbiased, observers have again and again acknowledged, up to the hilt—and McMaster has only the detected criminal's answer, "Liar".

If now we brush aside all the conventions, and give attention one by one to the disturbers of the peace, examining and

publishing their records, analyzing their characters, exposing their hypocrisies, and, by so doing, making the pages of *The Gospel Witness* an ecclesiastical rogues' gallery, we shall do so because it is necessary to warn the people of their danger. Some, even of our friends, may shrink, as they see *The Gospel Witness*'s surgical staff week by week wheel some patient into the operating-room. Let our friends, however, rest assured that we shall operate only where an operation is proved to be absolutely indispensable. We hate the operating-room; and if in this number we are observed performing a minor operation, we hope our readers will believe that we regret the necessity, and that we enjoy it scarcely more than the patient.

With these few explanatory remarks we will proceed to our task.

Dr. MacNeill A Spoiled Boy.

A spoiled boy, pampered and petted by McMaster University as one of her products, whose abilities distinguish him, in some degree, from the dead level of mediocrity to which high honour most of the graduates of distinction of that institution have attained, the Pastor of Walmer Road, in the part he has played in this controversy, has assumed that McMaster's maternal smug satisfaction in the accomplishments of even the dullest of her children, represents the intelligence of our Baptist people; and on this score, Dr. MacNeill apparently expects to be lauded for a performance which entitles him to rank among those who are too dull to differentiate between distinction and disgrace. If Dr. MacNeill's estimate of Baptist intelligence in these Provinces be even approximately correct, McMaster University has led the Denomination to a level of religious intelligence as devoid of spiritual enlightenment as Dr. MacNeill and his McMaster associates are destitute of principle. If such arguments as Dr. MacNeill's produce any other effect upon the minds of Baptists than revulsion and reprobation, the Convention's official apostasy is only equalled by the Denomination's intellectual bankruptcy.

In *The Canadian Baptist* of April 28th there was an article which had before appeared in *The Globe*, Toronto, by Dr. MacNeill. In *The Canadian Baptist* it bears the title, "Question of Conduct, Not Creed". In this article Dr. MacNeill attempts a reply to our article in *The Globe* of a week earlier, by making a futile effort to justify the amending Bill which recently was passed at Ottawa.

We are happy to be even in partial agreement with Dr. MacNeill,—in this respect, that our present denominational controversy is undoubtedly fundamentally a question of conduct rather than of creed, our difference being relative to the identity of the persons whose conduct lies at the base of the controversy. The Book teaches us that "faith and a good conscience" are so joined together that separation results in the destruction of both. It is when conduct is permitted which is destructive of a good conscience that men put away faith and make shipwreck; and, conversely, when faith is stripped of its moral quality by complete relegation to the intellect, a man's conduct becomes the transcript of the tables of his heart from which such ethical principles as his faith contained have been expunged. Hence the conduct of Dr. MacNeill and his associates is, of course, the fruit of the creed of their heart; and the time-serving, truth-denying, faith-destroying conduct of McMaster during recent years is the inevitable result of the emptiness of her erstwhile professions of orthodoxy.

Dr. MacNeill Says Doctrine Not the Issue.

Dr. MacNeill attempts to answer our charge that McMaster is "teaching that which is subversive of Christian faith", by saying, "It cannot be too strongly stated that the existing difference between Dr. Shields and the Convention is not one of doctrine." Dr. MacNeill has a good memory

for some things, as we shall later show. Much of what he says in regular discourse has been memorized from sources without his own mental storehouse. Perhaps he has so accustomed himself to impress his memory by repetition that he can persuade himself of anything which is often enough repeated. In this respect Dr. MacNeill has denied the truth so often that belief of the truth seems to have become to him impossible. Was it a doctrinal question for which we contended at Ottawa in 1919? Was it a doctrinal question that provoked the debate in Walmer Road Church in 1922? Was it not on doctrinal grounds we protested against the honouring of Dr. Faunce in 1923-24? Was it against the doctrine of Professor L. H. Marshall we protested in Hamilton in 1925, and in First Avenue Church, Toronto, in 1926? Does Dr. MacNeill not know that the late Dr. Elmore Harris' contention with McMaster University was over questions of theology? Has Dr. MacNeill's mind become so impervious to truth that he does not know that there is not even an infinitesimal element of truth in his statement?

"Nothing in the Bill to Settle Any Religious Controversy."

The Walmer Road Oracle tells us, "Nothing in the bill purports to settle any religious controversy whatever." Will he then tell us what the Bill purports to do? Has it any relation to the present controversy? If it has, is it not designed to "settle" it? Obviously, then, the controversy is not "religious" at all! That the Bill has been drawn to "settle" the controversy there can be no doubt. But it can only "settle" it as Herod's sword "settled" John the Baptist, as the Pharisees' stones "settled" Stephen, as the sword of another Herod "settled" James the brother of John, and "purported" to "settle" Peter also because it pleased the Jews!

But no: we are all wrong! The Oracle of Walmer Road has spoken! The philosophy of the higher criticism—the theory of the composite character of the Pentateuch, "the Driver view", the question of the historicity of Jonah, the miracles of the New Testament, the significance and purpose of the death of Christ, and whether He, the Innocent, bore the "punishment" our sins deserved, the question whether the physical body of Christ did actually rise from the dead,—these and other matters, either have nothing to do with the present controversy, or nothing to do with religion, because the Bill has much to do with the controversy, but nothing to do with religion! But the Bill had nothing to do with these great matters of faith! Please do not argue, let no one attempt to produce his cause or bring forth his strong reasons—the Oracle has spoken! What more will anyone dare to ask? Reason? The Oracle does not condescend to reason: he is above reason and independent of it. It would be folly to quote *The Canadian Baptist*—even the special number containing the official stenographic report of the Educational Session of the Hamilton Convention, or the official report of the Educational Session of the First Avenue Convention. These are published by the Convention's authority, but it were useless to cite them to the Oracle, because they are full of discussion about "the Driver view," the miracles, the atonement, the resurrection, the book of Jonah, man's natural state, the new birth, and many other theological questions, and the Oracle asserts that matters of doctrine and religion have nothing to do with the question at issue. This the Oracle asserted before the Private Bills Committee in Ottawa, and now proclaims it to all the world. Of course it would be wicked to appeal from the decision of the Oracle! It would be useless to quote this great organ of opinion, for Dr. MacNeill never reads it! We know that, for when we sent him a copy by special delivery, it was returned marked, "Returned unopened". We are only sorry the Oracle will not read this issue of the paper, and will thus miss the truest portrait of himself ever put on paper.

He says the Bill does not purport to settle any religious controversy whatever. The Oracle is impervious to information, contemptuous of evidence, superior to reason, independent of fact, indifferent to truth, and subject only to the limitations of his own mind.

Listen to the Oracle!

Therefore let us listen to the Oracle, for here at last wisdom is found, and this is the place of understanding! Though "the depth saith, It is not in me; and the sea saith It is not with me," though "it is hid from the eyes of all living and kept close from the fowls of the air", we now know it resides with the Oracle of Walmer Road! "The legislation aims to give protection against disorderly con-

duct." Ah, now we have it! The Oracle hath spoken well. "Disorderly conduct"? Certainly any lawful assembly should be thus protected, and especially one called Christian, and still more especially an assembly called Christian and Baptist. How shocking that any one should be guilty of "disorderly conduct" in a Baptist assembly! Who could it be? We supposed the ordinary laws of the land were sufficient to protect us against "disorderly conduct". But no!—a special Act of Parliament had to be obtained to authorize the regulation of the "disorderly". It would appear, however, that our Ottawa legislators were reluctant to grant legislation to deal with those guilty of "disorderly conduct". Therefore the Oracle went to Ottawa, and a few lesser luminaries accompanied him. He and they must have had a very uncomplimentary opinion of human nature. Indeed, the Oracle and his satellites must have believed in the total depravity of human nature, Professor Marshall to the contrary notwithstanding, for they spent several days in Ottawa "lobbying" and begging the purblind legislators to pass a perfectly reasonable Bill to protect them against "disorderly conduct"!

"Who Were the "Disorderly" People?"

Of course such protection was necessary or the Oracle would not have asked for it. But who were the "disorderly" people against whom the Convention sought protection?

It Was Not the Rev. John Linton.

It could not have been the Rev. John Linton, because he behaved like a gentleman, was as meek as a lamb, and sat down like a good boy as soon as he was told to do so. It could not have been the little man in the choir whose collar, buttoning behind, was strangely suggestive of a not very gentle low-set creature who sometimes barks as well as bites,—no he was scarcely "disorderly", he only hissed and shouted himself red in the face, and thumped with his hands, and looked so savage that one might have feared, had he been big enough, he would have eaten up everybody in sight! No, he was not the "disorderly" one, for the Oracle sat hard by him and rather encouraged, or, at least, did not rebuke his vociferation.

It Was Not Professor New.

Then who could it be? It was surely not Professor New. It is true he was noisy and behaved sometimes like one accustomed to street brawls. Once or twice he endeavoured to outdo the Oracle in his oracularness. But the genial and harmless professor was not "disorderly", he only played the goose, and they do not pass acts of parliament to regulate geese.

Surely Not the Editor of this Paper.

Of course there were many other performers who distinguished themselves on that never-to-be-forgotten day. But could it be possible that the Oracle intends a reflection on the well-known dignity of the editor of this paper by suggesting that under any circumstances whatsoever he could be "disorderly"? Perish the thought! If the Oracle himself cannot provoke him to disorderliness nothing on earth can—and he cannot!—unless it be "disorderly" sometimes to regard the Oracle as being funnier than Mark Twain!

Will not somebody please say a good word for this poor editor just once! Did we not behave at the Convention fairly well? Once we provoked the ire of the Oracle by asking a question; but except for that we listened quietly from eleven in the morning until ten at night, and said nothing.

Who Was "Disorderly"?

Who then was "disorderly"? Ah, can it be possible we have guessed at last? Could it be aimed at Dr. A. J. Vining? His vulgar tongue bowed everybody's head in shame—unless perhaps it was the head of the Oracle, for from his Walmer Road pulpit, the Oracle extolled him for having been manly enough to apologize for his shameful speech—an apology which was as insincere as his polluting words had been inexcusable.

The Oracle concludes his first paragraph by saying: "Conduct and not doctrine is the present issue". As we recall the double dealing of Dean Farmer; the prevarication of Prof. Marshall in his endeavour to twist his utterances in England into harmony with his profession in Canada; the shameful—indeed, the absolutely criminal violation of the secrecy of the ballot at the Hamilton Convention, and the partisan appointment the second time of the offender, with others, as scrutineer at First Avenue; the vulgar and silly speech of Chancellor Whidden at the Toronto Association; the muzzling of Home Mission pastors; the intimidation of

students; the vulgar speech of Dr. Vining; the spirit of the Executive as expressed in the amending Bill; the "lobbying" of the Oracle and his associates; the shameless one-sidedness of *The Canadian Baptist*, and the utter disregard for truth displayed by the McMaster apologists for Modernism, *we are* inclined to believe that the Oracle has unwittingly stumbled on a little truth when he says, the issue is one of conduct—it is, albeit of doctrine, too.

The Oracle Speaks Again.

But our Oracle must be heard still further:

"Dr. Shields says no amendment is needed, as under the existing Act any Regular Baptist Church departing from the faith and practice of such churches thereby forfeits any right to send delegates to the Convention." This is perfectly true, but not to the point. The point is that a Regular Baptist Church may refuse to co-operate with other Regular Baptist Churches in supporting the work of the Convention and conduct itself in such a way as to obstruct and oppose the Convention's work. Should not the Convention have the power to say to a church: "If you will not work with us, you should not work against us and continue to be a member of our body?"

But what if one help to build a house and has a part interest therein, and what if one day a stranger enter and proceed to upset the order of the house, and use the furniture and utensils for the defilement of the house? And suppose the one who had helped to build and was part owner should oppose the intruder, and say, "You shall not use this house for some other purpose than that it was intended for, I will not be robbed of that which is my own, nor consent to be dispossessed of my dwelling". What if then certain other members of the household, being drunk with his wine, should join hands with the intruder in the pollution of the house, and should say to those who object, "If you will not work with us, you should not work against us, and continue to be a member of our body", and forthwith call the police to put the objecting member of the family on the street?

"Work With Us"?

"Work with us"! Come, dear Oracle, work with you at what? Magnifying the Bible as God's Word? Yes; *we will work with you in that*. Preaching the gospel of the grace of God with its central theme redemption through the blood? Yes; *we will work with you in that*. Proclaiming Jesus Christ as the Incarnate God, as the supreme Authority,—as Saviour and Lord, Who came once to earth as a Saviour, and Who will come the second time as a Judge and the King? Yes; *we will work with you in that!* Where? In McMaster; enthrone Jesus Christ there and we will support it! On Home Mission Fields, in foreign lands, everywhere and in everything by which Christ is thus preached, *then we will work with you*.

"Work with us"? In teaching young men and women much of the Bible is not true? *Never!* Work with you in teaching men that to regard the Old Testament Scripture as Jesus Christ regarded it is to take rank as "an uneducated fool"? Work with you in teaching that the miracles of the New Testament admit of psychological explanation; that Christ did not bear the "punishment" our sins deserved?—work with you in casting a doubt on the literalness of the resurrection of Christ? *Never will we work with you in these faith-destroying undertakings*. Work with you in making muzzles for the prophets of the Lord; work with you in sending missionaries to India and Bolivia who will mock at the Precious Blood, and substitute "The Christ of the Indian Road", for the Christ of Calvary's Cross and the empty grave, and the opened Heaven and coming glory? **NO! A THOUSAND TIMES NO! WE WILL NEVER WORK WITH YOU IN THESE THINGS; BUT WE WILL CONTEND WITH YOU!** We will not surrender the house to those who would pollute it with their soul-destroying heresies. We will contend against you by every legitimate means, and, God helping us, we will paralyze your efforts to subvert the faith of Canadian Baptists!

Dr. MacNeill on Constitution of Various Conventions.

In no paragraph in his article does the Walmer Road Oracle disclose his real self more clearly than in paragraph three, in which he attempts an answer to our saying: "Dr. MacNeill states what is contrary to fact in saying that nearly all the great Baptist Conventions in the United States and Canada have such powers". He then insists that all the Conventions have such powers as we have denied

they possess, and adds, "One would have thought that the constitutions of these outstanding Conventions would have been consulted before a public charge of this nature was made and especially with the well-known case of the Texas Convention on record."

Our answer is that all these constitutions, with the exception of Texas, had been consulted. With what result? How shall we describe Dr. MacNeill's brazen untruthfulness? Was he so frenzied with rage when he read them as to be unable to understand them? Or, has he grown so accustomed to preaching other men's sermons without detection, as to assume he can say anything he pleases without fear of being brought to book? Before the Private Bills Committee, the lawyer for the Bill argued that every other Convention in Canada possessed such powers as the proposed Bill conferred. One of the members of the Committee remarked to the effect, All you are asking then is for a Bill that will bring the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec into line with the other Baptist Conventions in Canada? To which the lawyer replied in the affirmative. To this Dr. MacNeill and Chancellor Whidden assented. We asked for the proof but the only proof forthcoming was the unsupported assertion of the Oracle and his friends! And now Dr. MacNeill has the audacity to repeat his assertion. So far as it relates to our Canadian Conventions we brand Dr. MacNeill's statement as an unmitigated falsehood. We affirm that the Bill passed the Private Bills Committee and the Canadian Parliament by a systematic campaign—for once we must speak with utter plainness—and say the Bill passed in exactly the same way as McMaster has saved herself from the denominational reprobation by a campaign of lying. No other word will do. Ugly as is the word it is no uglier than the thing it describes.

What does the Bill provide? We will use the Oracle's language: "It empowers the Convention by a three-fifths vote to declare that a church, the conduct or attitude of which in the opinion of the Convention is not in harmony and co-operation with the work of the Convention, shall cease to have representation."

Northern Convention Constitution.

The section of the article of the by-laws of the Northern Convention to which Dr. MacNeill refers for proof is as follows:

(a) Any Baptist church in the United States may appoint one delegate and one additional delegate for every hundred members provided the church during the year immediately preceding the annual meeting of the Convention shall have co-operated in the financial support of the work of at least one of the co-operating organizations of the Northern Baptist Convention, or the work of the Ministers' and Missionaries' Benefit Board of the Northern Baptist Convention, or the work of the Board of Education of the Northern Baptist Convention."

This citation is on a par with the Oracle's treatment of the whole question in dispute; the facts of the case never come within his purview. The section from which the above is quoted is the only section dealing with membership in the Northern Convention.

Any Baptist church in the United States which gives one dollar to one of the Co-operative Boards, or to the Board whose work is analogous to our Superannuated Ministers' Fund may send delegates to the Convention. Or should a church fail to contribute within the year before the Convention, though it could not send delegates that year, by sending a contribution the next year it would automatically renew its membership. But there is no power in the constitution to disfranchise a church. Furthermore, at Seattle, in 1925, the Law Committee gave as its opinion, and the Chair so ruled that the Constitution did not define a Baptist church, and that therefore they had no constitutional power to exclude the delegates of the Park Ave. Church, New York, even though that church had ceased to be a Baptist church in everything but name. When an amendment to the Constitution was sought at Washington last May defining a Baptist Church as composed exclusively of baptized believers, it was tabled, and a simple resolution to the same effect was defeated.

The Amending Bill.

The Bill Dr. MacNeill is sponsoring gives the Convention power to disfranchise a church which is "not in harmony and

co-operation with the work and objects of the Convention." Nothing could be broader than that. "Harmony" may mean anything. But the provisions of the Bill we shall discuss a little later: we are here dealing with the fact that the section of the Northern Baptist Convention Constitution, which Dr. MacNeill cites as analogous to the provisions of the amending Bill, provides only that the church shall make some contribution to at least one of the Boards of the Convention. Jarvis Street Church contributed to the Convention Boards during last Convention year \$6,378.09. But no matter how much we may contribute, no matter what measure of financial co-operation we may give, the amending Bill gives a three-fifths majority of the Convention power to declare us "out of harmony", and therefore to disfranchise us.

Dr. MacNeill's Northern Convention Statement Absolutely False.

Did not Dr. MacNeill know when he wrote what he did about the Northern Convention in *The Canadian Baptist*, that he was setting his pen again to an absolute falsehood? We have not the Constitutions of the Texas or of the Southern Baptist Convention before us at the moment. We are concerned mainly with the fact that before a Canadian Parliament Dr. MacNeill and his friends pleaded for a Bill that would bring our Convention into agreement with the other Baptist Conventions in Canada. Again we say that what Dr. MacNeill said in Ottawa, and writes in *The Canadian Baptist*, is utterly untrue. We have had the statutes searched, and the following is sent us as a reliable legal opinion on this matter:

Dr. MacNeill Equally False in Representation of Canadian Conventions.

Dr. MacNeill continues to adhere to his statement that the Convention of the Maritime Provinces and the four Conventions of Western Canada all have the powers conferred by the Bill recently passed at Ottawa, but he does not quote the Sections of the Acts to which he refers. An examination of these Acts has been made by several Solicitors, and they report that in none of these Acts is there a clause conferring power to discipline or disfranchise a Church. In these Provinces the Conventions are incorporated, but in Ontario and Quebec the Convention is not incorporated but the various Boards are the bodies incorporated. To these Conventions in the three Western Provinces power has been given to make "rules, orders and regulations not contrary to the laws of the Province nor to the Act, nor to the Constitution and Statutes of the Convention as they shall deem necessary for the conduct and government of the Corporation." A very similar clause is in the New Brunswick statute, but these clauses are for procedure merely in the carrying on of the business of the Corporation.

It will be noted that these clauses are very similar to the 2nd clause of the recent Ottawa bill which is as follows:—"The said Convention may from time to time make or pass rules, by-laws or resolutions not inconsistent with this Act with regard to the conduct of the affairs of the said Convention or to any matter to which the objects of the Convention extend." If the Acts of the other Provinces gave power to discipline or disfranchise a Church, why did Dr. MacNeill and the other proponents of the Bill ask for greater power than is granted in Clause 2? Because they well knew that the power desired to disfranchise a church was not granted by Clause 2, so the iniquitous power granted in Clause 1 to disfranchise Churches was asked for. Is it not clear that the Acts incorporating the Conventions in other Provinces have not the power conferred by the recent Legislation—by the very form of the Ottawa Bill.

To show how entirely different the Act incorporating the Convention of the Western Provinces is from the Ontario and Quebec Act let me quote the incorporating words of the Western Statute which are as follows:—

"There shall be and there is hereby constituted and established a body politic and Corporate under the name of the Baptist Convention of Western Canada which Corporation shall consist of Charles W. Clark, William A. McIntyre, Henry B. Stiles, D. Bruce Harkness and Edgar J. Tarr and such persons as now are or may hereafter from time to time become members of any Baptist

Church within the Province of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia".

Assuredly there is no power in the Convention to discipline a Baptist Church under this Statute and there is given no description of a Baptist Church in the Act. In the Ontario and Quebec Act the Baptist Churches who are entitled to send delegates are those known as "Regular".

I might add that while the Act was passed by the Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta Legislatures it has not been passed by the British Columbia Legislature.

Dr. MacNeill Reveals His Animus.

Dr. MacNeill runs true to form in the following statement, and, in doing so, he lets the proverbial cat out of the bag—and it is a real cat with nasty claws:

"The power of the Texas Convention was obtained under an amendment to the original Act of Incorporation passed by the State Legislature and was acted on by that Convention in 1924 when the delegates from the First Baptist Church, Fort Worth, Texas, were excluded from the Convention. This is the church of which Dr. Shields' friend, Rev. J. Frank Norris was and is the pastor."

Dr. Scarborough's Influence.

One of the most bitter persecutors of Dr. Norris in Texas has been Dr. L. R. Scarborough. We were introduced to Dr. Scarborough, although we had met him before, by Dr. Norris in Houston, in the hotel, in some such words as these: "However Dr. Scarborough and I may disagree, we always manage to keep on speaking terms." Dr. Scarborough was no doubt the author of the Texas amendment. He was the guest of the Ontario and Quebec Convention in Toronto last October. A resolution was passed during the Convention in First Avenue in the following terms:

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

We have not the copy before us, but unless we are greatly mistaken, a resolution almost identical in form was passed either in the Texas or in the Terrant County Association. There is little doubt that Dr. Scarborough was chief advisor to Dr. MacNeill and his friends on the occasion of his being here last October. Commenting on the McMaster situation, the *Baptist Progress*, of Dallas, Texas, has this to say:

"The bill reads much like the ninth article of the Constitution of the Texas Baptist Convention"—

so that even at that distance the hand of the Texas Joab was discerned. "Birds of a feather flock together."

Dr. Scarborough and Dr. MacNeill Equally Unreliable.

Dr. Scarborough has learned how to be all things to all men. When he was here he was asked by one of the brethren concerning two points: whether Professor Marshall's view of human depravity would be accentuated in the south; to which he replied an emphatic negative, saying, "We go all the way". He was then asked whether Professor Marshall's view of the Atonement would be accepted in the South; again he emphatically replied in the negative, declaring that the view of the Atonement as read by Dr. Shields from Spurgeon, was the view held in the South. Yet, having said that in plain and unmistakable language, thus admitting that Professor Marshall would not be accepted in the South, he returned to the South and wrote an article on "Dr. Shields' Unwarranted Attack", or words to that effect, and on the ultra-orthodoxy of Canadian Baptists. But apparently both Drs. Scarborough and MacNeill are filled with personal hatred to the point of irresponsibility.

Convention Attitude Changes From Year to Year.

Dr. MacNeill dissents from our criticism of the Bill as "a new law to deal with an established order of things", and adds: "It would thus appear that 'the established order of things', which must not be altered, is the situation in which our Convention now finds itself", etc. We would remind Dr. MacNeill that no church in the Convention prior to the meeting of the Convention in First Avenue Church last October, so far as we know, withdrew support from the Convention Boards. In spite of all the vitriol Dr. MacNeill

and his associates have been breathing out upon us of recent years, we had continued to support the Boards of the Convention up to last October. The amending Bill was sponsored at Ottawa by Mr. Gordon Edwards, a member of the First Baptist Church, Ottawa, and also supported, among others, by the President of the Convention, Dr. W. T. Graham. An examination of the reports of these two churches, compared with the financial report of Jarvis Street, will show that Jarvis Street Church gave considerably more to denominational objects than these two churches combined. Jarvis Street earnestly desires to co-operate with all the Boards of the Convention in the work for which these Boards were organized and incorporated; and we would remind the Walmer Road Oracle that in 1924, only two years ago, when he and others had done their utmost to influence the Convention, the Convention refused a vote of confidence in the University; and though the Pastor of Walmer Road Church nine months before had breathed out threatenings and slaughter against us at a Senate meeting, and joined with others, had passed a resolution telling the Convention that co-operation with this writer was longer an impossibility, the Convention passed a resolution which we had the honour of moving, by unanimous vote; and re-elected us to the Board of Governors of the University. This inflicted an indescribable humiliation upon Dr. MacNeill and his associates, but the fact that one resolution was rejected, and the other was passed, is indisputable.

We would further remind Dr. MacNeill that by a system of shameless trickery the last Convention was packed with proxy Toronto voters. Who can doubt that Dr. MacNeill and his friends hurried to Ottawa to get the amending Bill passed, in an endeavour to make a repetition of the London Convention an impossibility?

Dr. MacNeill an Echo, Not a Voice.

Again our Oracle objects to our "vested rights" argument. Dr. MacNeill's analogy, referring to the appointment of members of the Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railways is sheer piffle: it is not an analogy at all. It was cited by Colonel Ralston in the Private Bills Committee, and repeated in the House of Commons; but Colonel Ralston admitted at the beginning that he did not know what he was talking about—and abundantly proved it in his speech. But Dr. MacNeill is so in the habit of using material provided by other people that he could not resist the temptation to repeat, parrot-like, what Colonel Ralston had said. It is useless to hold an argument on such a subject with the Oracle of Walmer Road. We have already remarked that he is superior to reason, and independent of fact, and indifferent to truth. Anyone with an infinitesimal grain of common sense knows that the Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec have a vested right of control in every Board of the Convention. The Bill at issue, not content with providing for the expulsion of a delegate from the Convention, claims the right to disfranchise the church from which the delegate comes. There could be no reasonable objection offered to any deliberative body making laws for the regulation of its members, and for the expulsion of such as do not submit to its authority; but the Convention derives such authority as it possesses from the churches and not the churches their authority from the Convention—in other words, the Convention is the servant, and not the master, of the churches; and when the Convention arrogates to itself the authority to disfranchise the church, it is, in principle, sheer anarchy, for the original authority is vested in the church.

The Principle Involved.

There are several cases in British Parliamentary history which afford precedents illustrating this principle. The famous Wilkes case is especially to the point. Falling under the displeasure of the Government of the day, Mr. Wilkes was expelled from Parliament, and the Speaker issued a writ for a new election. The expelled member was re-elected by his constituents and sent back to Parliament, whereupon Parliament refused to admit him and contended that Parliament's displeasure constituted in itself an incapacity to sit in the House on the part of the expelled member, and seated in his place the candidate who had been rejected by the electorate. This case resulted in a great political storm, for it was recognized that if this principle should be allowed, it would mean the end of democratic government.

Thus the new Bill would make it possible for the Convention to visit its displeasure upon the head of any and every critic of any of the Boards, and expel him from the Convention, for the one and only offence of holding by his convictions of truth, and, by their standards, criticizing the Convention's work.

Dr. MacNeill a Law Unto Himself.

But what is to be expected from Dr. MacNeill? In our answer to his third paragraph we have proved that he is utterly disdainful of the truth. He reminds us of an old gentleman who was once Clerk of the Jarvis Street Church, a very excellent man, but who, in his later years, was almost stone deaf. But he was passionately devoted to his office, and flattered himself that his records were always strictly accurate. On examining the church roll, however, we found not a few names of persons whose names were also written on the tombstones in the cemeteries—presumably their bodies lay somewhere beneath the sod; but that was no proof to our worthy Clerk: as long as he had their names in his book, and not crossed off, to him it seemed to be proof positive that they were still alive. Indeed, one might have supposed that to have one's name recorded in the roll book of Jarvis Street Church ensured one's being the rival of Methuselah. We do not suggest that the Oracle of Walmer Road Church is either blind or deaf, but he seems to have drifted into the assumption that when he has spoken, even the most stubborn facts are impotent to disprove his statements.

Dr. MacNeill "Out of Harmony" With the Truth.

We have just glanced over Dr. MacNeill's sermon, "The Ongoings of God", and we have been reminded that he has the daring to identify Professor Marshall's teaching on the Atonement with that of C. H. Spurgeon. He repeats the lie—yes, let us say it in black and white, and with emphasis. It is a word of three letters, it is an ugly word; but it is a word which everybody understands—he repeats the lie which Professor Marshall told when, on the floor of the Convention, he said, "I stand with Spurgeon". No greater falsehood was ever breathed outside of the pit itself than that which Professor Marshall stated, as all the facts of the case abundantly prove. We had hoped that Dr. MacNeill had sufficient intelligence to appreciate the facts, and sufficient honesty to admit them; but we have been disappointed in either one or both particulars.

The rest of Dr. MacNeill's article is all of a piece: he denies that the Bill would affect the right of any minister in respect to the Superannuation Fund, and denies that the Bill would provide for the suppression of evangelical testimony within the Convention. The fact is that the Bill provides for the suppression of anything within the Convention with which three-fifths of the members are not in accord. The Bill is a club. One of the members of the Private Bills Committee so suggested when, with a very superior air, the Chancellor said that he hoped it would not be necessary to expel anyone!—to which this Private Bills Committee member replied, taking his pipe from his mouth the while, and smiling broadly, "What you want then is just a club to keep them in order", or words to that effect.

Again, our impeccable critic makes a show of indignation at the suggestion that he and his associates could, in any respect, be unfair. One has only to read the minutes of the Convention to be assured that the resolution which it is now claimed authorized the Executive to apply for this legislation, was passed on the last day of the Convention when comparatively few delegates were present.

Parliament Votes in Baptist Convention.

Dr. MacNeill quotes the Private Bills Committee, by implication, as an authority respecting the meaning of the resolution passed at the Convention. The fact is, the Private Bills Committee gave no fair consideration to the matter at all. Dr. MacNeill and his friends had lobbied the Committee in advance, because even he had wit enough to know that the Bill had no merit of its own on which to stand. We objected before the Private Bills Committee to the principle involved in the application, namely, asking Parliament to pronounce upon a measure which had never been discussed by the body the Bill was intended to govern. We insisted that this prejudiced the case in advance, by attaching to the Bill the prestige of a Parliamentary measure, and we objected to it on the ground that our opponents would be sure to

argue before the Convention that inasmuch as this had passed through the Committee stage of Parliament, and through the Commons and the Senate, it would be folly even to question a measure enjoying the approval of so august a body. A member of the Private Bills Committee asked us how we knew that any such argument would be employed, and insisted that inasmuch as the Bill could have no force until the Convention had approved it, Parliament was not prejudging the case at all. But after all it requires less intelligence to be a member of Parliament, it would seem, than almost anything else in the world—unless it be a defender of McMaster.

Recently we have read a letter in one of the Toronto papers which has no merit beyond affording proof of the intention of the proponents of the Bill to attempt to force it through the Convention on the ground that it has already passed Parliament. In the letter referred to, this passage occurs: "Surely the consensus of Parliamentary judgment given after a most careful consideration, and rendered without any political bias whatever, must carry weight and conviction to fair-minded folks, both within and beyond the Baptist Convention."

Let Us Hear Junius.

But we have said enough for one issue of *The Witness* on this subject. We yield our place to one of the greatest writers of all time. We print below a letter from the pen of the famous Junius. The letter was addressed, "To his Grace, the Duke of Grafton", and dated 8th of July, 1769; and, strangely enough, it was written on the principle of the very subject under discussion, the responsibility of the Duke of Grafton for the expulsion of Mr. Wilkes from Parliament. In the dedication to the English nation of the volume of his letters, Junius, whose identity was never disclosed, wrote: "When kings and ministers are forgotten, when the force and distinction of personal satire are no longer understood, and when measures are only felt in their remotest consequences, this book will, I believe, be found to contain principles, worthy to be transmitted to posterity."

Junius a True Prophet.

Even Junius was a truer prophet than he knew. He could not have more accurately dealt with our present denominational situation had he been living and serving as a minister in the Convention of Ontario and Quebec. The letter which follows, describing the Duke of Grafton's part in the measure against which Junius protests, might well have been written to Dr. John MacNeill. We ask our readers to substitute for the salutation, "To his Grace, the Duke of Grafton", some such words as these, "To Dr. John MacNeill of Walmer Road." The reference in the latter part of the letter to the Duke's possible retirement to a certain "seat of learning", refers to Cambridge University of which the Duke of Grafton later became Chancellor.

LETTER OF JUNIUS.

8 July, 1769.

To His Grace the Duke of Grafton:
My Lord:

If nature had given you an understanding qualified to keep pace with the wishes and principles of your heart, she would have made you, perhaps, the most formidable minister that ever was employed, under a limited monarch, to accomplish the ruin of a free people. When neither the feelings of shame, the reproaches of conscience, nor the dread of punishment, form any bar to the designs of a minister, the people would have too much reason to lament their condition, if they did not find some resource in the weakness of his understanding. We owe it to the bounty of Providence, that the completest depravity of the heart is sometimes strangely united with a confusion of the mind, which counteracts the most favourite principles, and makes the same man treacherous without art, and a hypocrite without deceiving. The measures, for instance, in which your Grace's activity has been chiefly exerted, as they were adopted without skill, should have been conducted with more than common dexterity. But truly, my Lord, the execution has been as gross as the design. By one decisive step, you have defeated all the arts of writing. You have fairly confounded the intrigues of opposition, and silenced the clamours of faction. A dark, ambiguous system, might require and furnish the materials of ingenious illus-

tration; and, in doubtful measures, the virulent exaggeration of party must be employed, to rouse and engage the passions of the people. You have now brought the merits of your administration to an issue, on which every Englishman, of the narrowest capacity, may determine for himself. It is not an alarm to the passions, but a calm appeal to the judgment of the people, upon their own most essential interests. A more experienced minister would not have hazarded a direct invasion of the first principles of the constitution, before he had made some progress in subduing the spirit of the people. With such a cause as yours, my Lord, it is not sufficient that you have the court at your devotion, unless you can find means to corrupt or intimidate the jury. The collective body of the people form that jury, and from their decision there is but one appeal.

Whether you have talents to support you, at a crisis of such difficulty and danger, should long since have been considered. Judging truly of your disposition, you have perhaps mistaken the extent of your capacity. Good faith and folly have so long been received for synonymous terms, that the reverse of the proposition has grown into credit, and every villain fancies himself a man of abilities. It is the apprehension of your friends, my Lord, that you have drawn some hasty conclusion of this sort, and that a partial reliance upon your moral character has betrayed you beyond the depth of your understanding. You have now carried things too far to retreat. You have plainly declared to the people what they are to expect from the continuance of your administration. It is time for your Grace to consider what you also may expect in return from their spirit and their resentment.

Since the accession of our most gracious sovereign to the throne, we have seen a system of government, which may well be called a reign of experiments. Parties of all denominations have been employed and dismissed. The advice of the ablest men in this country has been repeatedly called for and rejected; and when the Royal displeasure has been signified to a minister, the marks of it have usually been proportioned to his abilities and integrity. The spirit of the FAVOURITE had some apparent influence upon every administration; and every set of ministers preserved an appearance of duration, as long as they submitted to that influence. But there were certain services to be performed for the Favourite's security, or to gratify his resentments, which your predecessors in office had the wisdom or the virtue not to undertake. The moment this refractory spirit was discovered, their disgrace was determined. Lord Chatham, Mr. Grenville, and Lord Rockingham have successively had the honour to be dismissed for preferring their duty as servants of the public, to those compliances which were expected from their station. A submissive administration was at last gradually collected from the deserters of all parties, interests, and connexions: and nothing remained but to find a leader for these gallant, well-disciplined troops. Stand forth, my Lord, for thou art the man. Lord Bute found no resource of dependence or security in the proud imposing superiority of Lord Chatham's abilities, the shrewd inflexible judgment of Mr. Grenville, nor in the mild but determined integrity of Lord Rockingham. His views and situation required a creature void of all these properties; and he was forced to go through every division, resolution, composition, and refinement of political chemistry, before he happily arrived at the *caput mortuum* of vitriol in your Grace. Flat and insipid in your retired state, but brought into action, you become vitriol again. Such are the extremes of alternate indolence or fury, which have governed your whole administration. Your circumstances with regard to the people soon becoming desperate, like other honest servants, you determined to involve the best of masters in the same difficulties with yourself. We owe it to your Grace's well-directed labours, that your sovereign has been persuaded to doubt of the affections of his subjects, and the people to suspect the virtues of their sovereign, at a time when both were unquestionable. You have degraded the royal dignity into a base, dishonourable competition with Mr. Wilkes, nor had you abilities to carry even this last contemptible triumph over a private man, without the grossest violation of the fundamental laws of the constitution, and rights of the people. But these are rights, my Lord, which you can no more annihilate, than you can the soil to which they were annexed.

The question no longer turns upon points of national honour and security abroad, or on the degrees of expedience and propriety of measures at home. It was not inconsistent that you should abandon the cause of liberty in another country, which you had persecuted in your own; and in the common arts of domestic corruption, we miss no part of sir Robert Walpole's system except his abilities. In this humble imitative line, you might long have proceeded, safe and contemptible. You might, probably, never have risen to the dignity of being hated, and even have been despised with moderation. But it seems you meant to be distinguished, and, to a mind like yours, there was no other road to fame but by the destruction of a noble fabric, which you thought had been too long the admiration of mankind. The use you have made of the military force introduced an alarming change in the mode of executing the laws. The arbitrary appointment of Mr. Luttrell invades the foundation of the laws themselves, as it manifestly transfers the right of legislation from those whom the people have chosen, to whom they have rejected. With a succession of such appointments, we may soon see a House of Commons collected, in the choice of which the other towns and counties of England will have as little share as the devoted county of Middlesex.

Yet, I trust, your Grace will find that the people of this country are neither to be intimidated by violent measures, nor deceived by refinements. When they see Luttrell seated in the House of Commons by mere dint of power, and in direct opposition to the choice of a whole county, they will not listen to those subtleties, by which every arbitrary exertion of authority is explained into the law and privilege of parliament. It requires no persuasion of argument, but simply the evidence of the senses, to convince them, that to transfer the right of election from the collective to the representative body of the people, contradicts all those ideas of a House of Commons, which they have received from their forefathers, and which they have already, though vainly, perhaps, delivered to their children. The principles, on which this violent measure has been defended, have added scorn to injury, and forced us to feel that we are not only oppressed, but insulted.

With what force, my Lord, with what protection are you prepared to meet the united detestation of the people of England? The city of London has given a generous example to the kingdom, in what manner a king of this country ought to be addressed; and I fancy, my Lord, it is not yet in your courage to stand between your sovereign and the addresses of his subjects. The injuries you have done this country are such as demand not only redress, but vengeance. In vain shall you look for protection to that venal vote, which you have already paid for—another must be purchased; and to save a minister, (in this case a professor) the House of Commons must declare themselves not only independent of their constituents, but the determined enemies of the constitution. . . . It is not, indeed, the least of the thousand contradictions which attend you, that a man, marked to the world by the greatest violation of all ceremony and decorum, should be the first servant of a court, in which prayers are morality, and kneeling is religion. Trust not too far to appearances, by which your predecessors have been deceived, though they have not been injured. Even the best of princes may at last discover, that this is a contention, in which everything may be lost, but nothing can be gained; and as you became minister by accident, were adopted without choice, trusted without confidence, and continued without favour, be assured that, whenever an occasion presses, you will be discarded without even the forms of regret. You will then have reason to be thankful, if you are permitted to retire to that seat of learning, which in contemplation of the system of your life, the comparative purity of your manners with those of their high steward, and a thousand other recommending circumstances, has chosen you to encourage the growing virtue of their youth, and to preside over their education. Whenever the spirit of distributing prebends and bishoprics shall have departed from you, you will find that learned seminary perfectly recovered from the delirium of an installation, and, what in truth it ought to be, once more a peaceful scene of slumber and thoughtless meditation. The venerable tutors of the university will no longer distress your modesty, by proposing you for a pattern to their pupils. The learned dullness of declamation will be

silent; and even the venal muse, though happiest in fiction, will forget your virtues. Yet, for the benefit of the succeeding age, I could wish that your retreat might be deferred, until your morals shall happily be ripened to that maturity of corruption, at which the worst examples cease to be contagious.

JUNIUS.

THE VOICE IS THE VOICE OF MacNEILL, BUT THE SERMON IS THE SERMON OF FREEMAN.

We have before us a pamphlet of nine pages bearing on the front page a cut of the Walmer Road Baptist Church, above it the words, "The Walmer Road Pulpit," and underneath the cut of the church the words, "THE SHEPHERD PSALM," a Sermon by the Rev. John MacNeill, D.D., Minister of Walmer Road Baptist Church, Toronto, Canada." On the first and second pages of the sermon these words occur:

"For my own part I strongly incline to the belief shared by a great many that the figure of the Shepherd is carried through consistently from the beginning to the end. And so far as I am aware that belief is largely due to a beautiful little booklet called the 'Song of Our Syrian Guest,' written by W. A. Knight, who at one time entertained a Syrian in his home, from whom he received the idea of the interpretation. This idea has been splendidly elaborated in an exquisite exposition by Rev. J. D. Freeman, a little volume called 'Life on the Uplands.'"

The only reference in the entire sermon to Dr. Freeman's book, *Life on the Uplands*, is the above quotation. Below we print Dr. MacNeill's sermon with the exception of the last two paragraphs and a somewhat extended poem, which we have omitted only for want of space, and in parallel column passages taken from Dr. Freeman's book, *Life on the Uplands*. There are, we suppose, comparatively few men of originality; and even those who think they are original have probably unconsciously absorbed ideas from others—but it is not often you find two minds run so nearly in the same channels as the minds of Dr. Freeman and Dr. MacNeill.

Dr. Freeman's book first appeared in 1907; Dr. MacNeill's sermon on "The Shepherd Psalm," while bearing no date, was printed, we believe, within the last couple of years. The passages from Dr. Freeman's book incorporated in the sermon of Dr. MacNeill bear no quotation marks; the only reference to *Life on the Uplands* is, as we have said, the passage we have quoted from the opening of the sermon.

WALMER ROAD SERMONS?

We have been told of several occasions when people have heard preached from Walmer Road pulpit by the Pastor, as though they were his own, sermons found in printed volumes, and by other brains than his. Of course, any preacher will absorb much from his reading, nor could much objection be taken to one's gleaning in the fields of sermonic literature. When Dr. MacNeill had spoken at the first meeting of the Baptist World Alliance in London about 1904 or 1905, the late Dr. Alexander Maclaren, who was in the chair, turned to someone and remarked, "Mr. MacNeill is a good gleaner." But though gleaning may be permissible—especially to the poor, the gleaner would scarcely be called honest who would leave the wheat field with a whole waggon-load. We are glad to be informed that a few of our thousands of ministerial readers find even *The Gospel Witness* sermons suggestive. They prime their pump, as Spurgeon used to say, or they may find in the sermons a few bags of wheat which they turn into flour in their own mental mill, but we do not suppose any of them serve their hearers with meals exclusively composed of preserved tongue. Of course, no preacher objects to others making what use of his sermons they can, the chief objection to the practice of preaching other men's sermons is the reaction it has upon the man's own character. The man who habitually wears others' clothes, or accepts credit for another's mental labour, and travels under false colours, is likely to find his own mind affected thereby. This practice persisted in is likely to lead a man to regard truth lightly. We do not know how far the practice of a kind of gramaphonic ministry may account for Dr. MacNeill's loose statements and careless use of references. At all events, the parallel columns below will tell their own tale. Our readers must be the jury responsible for the verdict.

DR. JOHN MacNEILL.

(The italics in this column are ours and indicate the passages taken from Dr. Freeman's *Life on the Uplands*, either in exact verbal form or in substance.—Ed. G. W.)

Text: "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want." Ps. 23:1.

This is one of the portions of Scripture that a preacher always hesitates to touch. It is so simple, so beautiful, so deep, so sublime an expression of the goodness of God and the faith of the soul, that any comment would only spoil its beauty. It was written, I suppose, three thousand years ago, but it is just as fresh and true to life as though it were written to-day. Its words are among the first our childish lips have repeated from this old Book. Its promises are among the last we whisper into the ears of our loved ones as they pass through the darkening night of earth into the breaking day of Heaven. The sufferer in the sick chamber, the martyr at the stake, the soldier on the battle field, the traveller on the deep, the Covenanter, the Huguenot, the Puritan, the Missionary,—these and a multitude that no man can number, have found in these words the utterance of their faith and a new inspiration of life and hope. "The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want."

Though it has long been known as the Shepherd Psalm it was generally thought that the figure changed from the Flock and the Shepherd in the first part to the banqueting House and the gracious Host in the closing verses. For my own part I strongly incline to the belief shared by a great many that the figure of the Shepherd is carried through consistently from the beginning to the end. And so far as I am aware that belief is largely due to a beautiful little booklet called the "Song of Our Syrian Guest," written by W. A. Knight, who at one time entertained a Syrian in his home, from whom he received the idea of the interpretation. This idea has been splendidly elaborated in an exquisite exposition by Rev. J. D. Freeman, a little volume called "Life on the Uplands." According to our Syrian guest the Psalm represents the successive periods of the shepherd's day. *It reflects the whole round of his work from the morning to the evening hours, from the time his sheep leave the fold until they are safely folded again at night. Upon those changing experiences of the day is built up all this wonderful and comforting teaching about the care of God for His own, this Shepherd "that leadeth Joseph like a flock," the Shepherd who gave His life for the sheep and who will care for and defend them till they are safe within the eternal fold at last.*

1. *The Shepherd's Day.*

Now will you bear with me a moment while we note the history of the shepherd and his sheep throughout the hours of the day. *It is early morning to begin with. And very early in the morning he leads his flock out to the feeding ground. That is the ideal feeding time. The flock is fresh, their hunger is keen, the pasture is moist and sweet, and because of their hearty meal the sheep stretch themselves in contentment on the green. "He maketh me to lie down in green pastures."*

But as the noontide draws near it is hot and sultry; the sheep pant with heat and burn with thirst. And so the shepherd leads them—never drives them—away to the drinking place to slake their thirst. He dare not lead them to any of the roaring cataracts or hill torrents else they might be swept away in the flood. But all over the Judean hills are wells, deep and walled, whose waters never fail. He leads them to the "still waters" of these wells. Quickly with the bucket he fills the trough calling the sheep in groups to drink till all are satisfied. And though many shepherds gather with their separate flocks there is no confusion, for the sheep answer to their own shepherd. "And a stranger will they not follow but will flee from him for they know not the voice of a stranger." And so "He leadeth me beside the still waters."

DR. JOHN FREEMAN.

(The page numbers in this column indicate the place of the passage quoted in Dr. Freeman's book. "Life on the Uplands.")

They reflect the whole round of the shepherd's work from the morning to the evening hours. P. 24.

The shepherd is early astir. Waking with the dawn, he has his flock forth from the fold and out upon the grazing ground before the sun has risen, and while yet the grass is damp with dew. This is the most favourable feeding time of the day. The flock is fresh, its hunger is keen, the pasture is nutritious and sweet. P. 27.

* * *

It is in consequence of their fulness that the sheep "lie down." Not in weariness but in contentedness do they stretch themselves upon the sward. P. 28.

It draws toward midday. "Sunbeams like swords" are smiting the sheep. They pant with heat and burn with thirst. It is time for the shepherd to lead them to the drinking-place and cool them at the waters. He knows the way. All over these Judean hills, at frequent intervals, there are deep, walled wells, whose waters never fail. A good shepherd carries in his mind a chart of every well in his grazing area. P. 43.

For though there are many streams, the sheep cannot safely drink from them. Far different, remember, are these rough hill-torrents of the Bible lands from the gentle brooks that flow so softly between their banks of green through the meadows of the West. P. 44.

Swiftly the rope coils at his feet as the laden bucket rises responsive to the rhythmic movements of his sinewy arms. Into the trough he pours the sparkling contents. Again the bucket shoots into the darkness of the well; again, and yet again, and when the trough is filled he calls the thirsty sheep to come in groups and drink. P. 46.

Then from the well he must lead his flock into some new feeding ground for the afternoon meal or if it be late lead them back towards the fold. *And from well to well, or from well to fold, or from fold to feeding ground, there run the well-worn paths, trodden by generations of shepherds and myriads of sheep.* They are very intricate and a shepherd must know them well. Any path will not do. It is only the right path that leads to safety and supply. So "He leadeth me in right paths for His name's sake." It is sometimes on these journeys that the shepherd must lead his flock through some ravine or glen, *some deep, sharp valley in which the evening shadows gather in the late afternoon.* To lead the flock through one of these sunless canyons is always a perilous task. You can see the shepherd with his stout staff in one hand and his rod, or shepherd's crook, in the other. With his stout bludgeon he will beat off any wild beast, for there a panther may hide or a wolf may prowl for his prey; with this rod he will hold his sheep in line. I myself have seen a shepherd on the hills in Scotland where a lamb would dash away, catch him deftly with his crook beneath the chin and bring him back again. "Though I go down through the valley of the shadow I will fear no evil for Thou art with me, Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me."

Then there is the evening meal before the flock is folded for the night. "There is no higher task of the shepherd in my country," says our Syrian guest, "than to study the places, examine the grass and the ground and find a safe feeding place for the sheep. In some places there are poisonous plants. Some kinds of ground are infested with venomous serpents. *There are feeding grounds where the jackals, wolves, hyenas and panthers prowl along the hillsides and against these the shepherd must defend his sheep.* Of these feats of courage many tales are told. David, you remember, once slew a lion and a bear in defense of his flock at the feeding ground. And so our shepherd marks the circle of the pasture. He leads his flock upon it. He is steady about them as the shadows gather. Yonder are the glowing eyes of a panther, yonder the hiss of a serpent, yonder the skulking form of a wolf. But the sheep are safe. "Thou preparest a spread, a feast, before me in the presence of my foes."

And then home to the fold. The fold is only a rough, stone enclosure with no covering but high enough to keep out the wild beasts and to shelter from the wind. There is a low opening at one corner of the enclosure. There the shepherd stands. He is the door, "I am the door," says Jesus. "By me if any man enter in he shall be saved, and shall go in and out and find pasture." There at the entrance takes place the "rodding of the sheep." With his crook the shepherd holds the sheep while he inspects them one by one as they pass into the fold. He has his horn filled with olive oil; he has the brimming vessel of water at his feet. Here is a knee that is bruised, or a side scratched, and this he anoints with the healing tar of the cedar. Here is one sheep not only bruised but exhausted and worn, weary to drooping, and he bathes its head and face with oil and fills the large two-handled cup with water from the bucket and lets the weary sheep drink its fill. "Thou anointest my head with oil, my cup runneth over."

And so the day is done! Under the shepherd's care and by his presence the flock has had protection and goodness all through the day and they will rest safely in the fold of the shepherd until the new day shall dawn. "Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever."

2. The Day of Life.

This, then, is the story of the shepherd's day. Perhaps I ought to leave it there and let you make your own application. But there are some few facts that need special emphasis. The day in the life of the shepherd represents a life time in the experience of the saint. Life has its morning, its afternoon and evening, and what this Psalm sings is the good care of God, the safety, provision, the comfort, the joy of that life which is entrusted to the shepherding care of God.

Life's Morning With God.

Now there are two facts emphasized in the forenoon of the flock, viz.: the fresh morning meal with the contentment that follows and the quenching of the thirst at the well-side. And these two facts answer to the two outstanding elements in the early religious experience of the soul.

Generations of shepherds and myriads of flocks have trodden these old ways. They are the recognized highways, traversing the land from well to well and from fold to fold. To come upon one of these paths is to pick up a clue that leads out from the mazes of the wilderness to some familiar rendezvous. P. 79.

The land of Judea is pierced in every direction by deep and narrow glens. In these the shadows gather early in the afternoon. No sooner does the sun begin its westering than the glens begin to fill with gloom.

To lead a flock through one of these sunless canyons is always an adventure attended by grave peril. P. 97.

* * *

He keeps a keen lookout for wild beasts, since in these shades a wolf may lurk, or a panther make its lair. Should he hear a growl, or find himself confronted by a pair of blazing eyes, his shrill whistle sounds instant alarm to stay the flock. Bravely then he springs to battle, and with resounding blows of his mighty staff drives the brute before him until it slinks away bleeding in pain or foaming with baffled rage. P. 99.

There is but time for the evening meal before the sheep must be folded for the night. P. 117.

A robber out to snatch a sheep that should chance to stray. And what is that creature gliding darkly along the edge of the plain? A wolf, with fangs dripping in desire to crush the bones of a lamb and with throat thirsting to drink its blood. That stealthy movement in the thicket yonder? A lurking panther. That dark, silent form perched high up on the crag? A hungry eagle, awaiting opportunity to fall upon its prey and tear its throat asunder. That black menace slowly circling in the air? A vulture, making ready to drive its blinding beak into the eyes of an unwary victim. Others than the sheep are abroad and looking for their evening meal. The flock is menaced by powerful and pitiless foes. Yet the sheep are safe under the shepherd's care. Nothing escapes his watchful eye. He is constantly on guard. With long knife drawn, lest sudden need of it should arise, he walks around the feeding flock, describing a circle of safety within the rim of danger. P. 118.

Blessed are those who in the early morning of their life have tasted and seen that God is good. *It is in youth that the spiritual appetite is keen and the heart feeds on the fat pastures of God. Those are the days when life is nourished into a deep and full contentment. There are no lives that possess such profound peace or hold such reserve of spiritual power as those who can say, "Thou hast been my God from my youth." Let me speak especially to the young people who listen to me.*

There is no spiritual meal in after life that can ever compensate for a youth that has been spiritually starved. The world is full of lean and famished spirits, men and women whose souls are fainting in them, who might now be filled with content of soul and reserve power for trial if only they had followed the Shepherd in the early days. It is pathetic to see the multitudes who have wandered out without the Shepherd, driven by the wolves of passion, torn by the thorns of remorse, tramping the pathless sands of doubt, drinking at the dead salt sea of unbelief because they missed that meal with God in the early morning years of their life. "In life's morning march when my bosom was young," so sang Byron in deep regret in after years. And because the bosom is young and because the march has the glow of the morning youth is inclined to think that it does not need the Shepherd nor His satisfying portion. There never was a greater mistake. Youth cannot be content nor satisfied without God, and it is out of the experience of that need that men have learned to cry with the Psalmist, "O satisfy us early with thy mercy that we may rejoice and be glad all the days of our life."

There is another fact of life here. Near to the noonday of life there often falls upon us a burning thirst. In those wondrous years from twenty to thirty how often that comes—the thirst for knowledge, the thirst for righteousness, the thirst for power, the thirst for certainty, the thirst for love. There is no other way to satisfy that thirst except in Christ. He will give knowledge, for He is God's wisdom; righteousness, for He is God's Holy One and we are accepted in the beloved; power, for all power is given unto Him in heaven and on earth; certainty, for He is the way. He will satisfy love for He is the peerless Lover. The world is filled with strong young men and women thirsting in soul, longing, craving, seeking, hoping and turning everywhere but to Christ. They are,

"Sinking leaky buckets into empty wells,
And growing old in drawing nothing up."

To all such the Master of the well sends out the invitation, "Ask of me and I will give thee living water." "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters."

Life's Afternoon With God.

The Psalm also reflects the afternoon experience of the soul. In the shepherd's story the afternoon is the time of greatest danger. It is in the afternoon the flock climbs the paths often steep and stony. It is in the afternoon they walk through the valley of the shadow where the danger lurks on every hand. It is in the afternoon that the beasts prowl about the flock in the gathering shadows. So it is with men. The afternoon of life is a time of great danger. For one thing the afternoon brings us to the hard road of drudgery and toil. Life's responsibility increases. Life's glamor fades. Ideals droop; enthusiasms wither; the mirage disappears. It is easy to be cynical. The grade is steep, the miles are long, the burden is heavy, the sun is hot. It is the time of fullest energy and greatest achievement. It is a period that is peculiarly fatal to men and women of high genius. It is recognized by all as a time when something happens. And what happens? It is sometimes the period of great disaster in spiritual life. Men who were active become indifferent, men who never failed at a prayer meeting.

The psalm at this point reflects the comfort and peace of those happy souls who, in early life, have tasted and seen that God is good. P. 27.

* * *

To make the ideal beginning of life, we must go with the Good Shepherd early, and spend the dewy morn with Him upon the meadows of His Grace; for then the spiritual appetite is keen, and the heart feeds hungrily upon the fat pastures until it is nourished into deep content. Pp. 28, 29.

* * *

The most joyous souls, those which dwell in the profoundest peace, holding within them the largest reserve and resource of spiritual power, are those who can say, "Thou has been my God from my youth." Green pastures for the soul! They lie about us from our infancy. P. 29.

No after-feeding can ever quite compensate, in this life, for a spiritually impoverished youth. P. 34.

* * *

The world is full of lean and famished spirits, men and women whose souls are fainting in them, who might now be vital and virile, with vigor for righteousness and reserve power for trial, had they but responded to the Shepherd's call early in the morning. P. 33.

* * *

It is pathetic to witness the multitude of troubled lives that have slipped away from the Good Shepherd's care to be driven by the wolves of passion, to be torn by the thorns of remorse, to tramp the pathless sands of doubt and to drink from the dead, salt sea of unbelief, through the misfortune of having missed the satisfaction of the morning meal upon the meadows. P. 34.

It thirsts for Knowledge. P. 47.

And there is the thirst for righteousness. P. 47.

* * *

The thirst for love he answers with the gift of "Love divine, all love excelling." P. 49.

* * *

There is no other way to get at the heart of the well but to wait upon Christ and bid him draw for us. P. 55.

And I know other men whose accumulations of scholarship seems to have worn out their spiritual receptivity, and who present to-day the sad spectacle of thirsty spirits,

"Sinking leaky buckets into empty wells,
And growing old in drawing nothing up." P. 57.

It is suggestive of those enervating heats which so often make the years of middle life a perilous period for Christian men. P. 62.

These are the worrying years. Cares fret and fray the mind. Business anxieties, professional responsibilities, and domestic burdens press heavily. We feel that it is "now or never." We must make our reputation, build our fortune, and bring to harbour the ships of hope we launched in earlier life upon the seven seas of venture. P. 63.

Moreover, these are the years of disillusionment. Mirages fade. Disguises are detected. The cosmetic cracks. The veneer peels off.

We grow sceptical and cynical. Interests that once excited us appear puerile, frivolous, and vain. Thus the soul loses tone. Its strings lie slack and its music is hushed. P. 64.

who taught Bible classes, who were warm in evangelistic favour, fall by the way in the afternoon. It is the afternoon that some of the most fatal blunders occur. Abraham stumbled in the afternoon, Moses stumbled in his afternoon, David stumbled in his afternoon, Demas stumbled in his afternoon. Is there no preventive? Must we all come to that? No! "He restored my soul." "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength," and while we are content to put ourselves under the care of the great Shepherd and remain there, there is no fear of any declining spiritual strength and interest for "while the outward man may perish the inward man is renewed from day to day."

Life's Evening With God.

Here we come in the closing verse to the evening scene of life. "Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life, and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever." There is nothing more beautiful than a ripened old age that reveals the beauty and the care of God, and nothing more tragic than a life that grows old and hopeless without the comforts of His grace. *It will help us to understand this verse if we remember the Jewish feeling for old age. Not only had the pious Jew a tender reverence for the aged, but he hoped for himself that he might live to be old. He had an ambition to see his seed unto the third and fourth generation. Part of that feeling was due perhaps to the fact that the Jew had no clear outlook on the future life such as we have in Christ. He looked for his reward here. Old age and prosperity were the sign's of God's favour. That is not the prevailing word to-day. We speak now as though it were a misfortune to reach a great age. We hope to die in the harness. We have no desire to "lag superfluous" upon the stage. That change of view is partly due, no doubt, to our clear vision of the future life. "To me to live is Christ and to die is gain." "To die is gain" for a Christian. "The best is yet to be." But whether our life be long or short it will be a tragedy if the closing of the day does not find us rich in the things of God, content in the fellowship of Christ, happy and hopeful and looking forward to the safety and security of the Father's house.*

It will help us to a better appreciation of this strain of the song if we call to mind the characteristic Jewish feeling for old age. Not only had the pious Jew a tender reverence for the aged, but he hoped for himself that he might live to be old. He had an ambition to see his seed unto the third and fourth generation.

Then, too, we must remember that the Jew of David's time had no clear outlook in the future beyond the grave. P. 155.

All this, of course, is vastly different from the prevailing modern mood. We speak now as though it were a misfortune to live to a great age. We hope to die in the harness. We would "cease at once to labour and to live." We dread to "lag superfluous" on the stage. To outlive activity seems a curse.

The change in view is partly due, no doubt, to our brighter thought of what awaits us beyond the Great Divide. "Jesus Christ has brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." To the Christian "the best is yet to be" in the land beyond the flood. That is the Eldorado of his hopes. He knows that "to die is gain." Pp. 156-157.

(The last two paragraphs of Dr. MacNeill's sermon and a poem by Faber, are omitted only as an economy of space).

The New Convention of Ontario and Quebec

Known as "The Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec."

We have had not a few enquiries as to the progress of our new Convention. We must not boast, indeed we have nothing to boast about, but we are thankful for the blessing vouchsafed to our churches thus far. Of course, we have comparatively few churches and most of our churches are small, but if it be remembered that our Union is only eight months old, the figures will be found very impressive. A good number of the churches which have discontinued their support of all the funds of the old Convention have not as yet formally voted to join the Union. Most of them, we believe ultimately will join us. Nor, at this writing, have we statistics of all the churches which are now in the fellowship of the Union. We have before us, however, the statistics of sixty-six churches.

The total membership of these churches is 7,386, the number of baptisms for eight months is 465, the total number of scholars in the Bible Schools is 7,292 and the aggregate value of the church property is \$1,018,550. Had we complete statistics from all our churches, these figures would be considerably augmented. We would call attention to the fact that Jarvis St. Church occupies a much smaller part in these figures than her average work would have contributed. The Pastor has travelled within twelve months about forty-seven thousand miles—most of this during the last eight months. He has spent between two and three months of his time on railway trains. It followed inevitably that his own work suffered materially and, by his absence,

the number of baptisms were less than half the usual number. Therefore the work reported belongs chiefly to the other churches.

But over and above the membership of the churches, which, as churches, have joined the Union, thousands of members in the other churches remaining in the Convention are with us in sympathy. It must be remembered that a comparatively small proportion of the subscriptions obtained in the McMaster campaign have come from the churches. Several large amounts have been given by men who are notoriously destitute of any spiritual interest. McMaster's campaign for liberation from the bondage of belief in an infallible Bible and an expiatory atonement, was bound to make a strong appeal to the modernist and the worldling. But it would be interesting and informing if McMaster University would publish a list of the churches and prominent men who refused to contribute. McMaster is still sowing the wind and will reap the whirlwind.

Meanwhile our new Convention Churches go quietly and prosperously on their way, as the Lord gives testimony to the word of His grace.

But much money is needed to lay foundations, and support our new causes. Will not the thousands who are withholding their money from the funds of the old convention, turn their gift to the treasury of our new Union? And more, we ask all treasurers to send all monies in hand to the Treasurer, Rev. W. E. Atkinson, 337 Jarvis St., Toronto, at once! As yet, we have no capital—except God's promises, and they are all good and true. But God works through His people. Therefore send in every dollar that is in the church treasury for missions, at once.

Goals for the Altar Fire

By Rev. T. I. Stockley, D.D., Dean of the Toronto Baptist Seminary.

Sunday, July 8th.

I must be about My Father's business.— Luke ii:41-52.

The forty-ninth verse of the second chapter of Luke's Gospel should be printed in letters of gold a finger deep. For that absolutely priceless verse has preserved to us the very first recorded words that ever fell from the youthful lips of our Lord. He speaks only once till He is thirty years old, and this rich text tells us what He said. And our Lord's first recorded words are words of an immense significance and an immense importance.

"I must be about My Father's business," He said, dwelling on the word. And no wonder. For there had never been, and there never would be, another business of His Father's at all to compare with this business on which He now begins to be engaged. First and last, the Son of God will have His hand in many great businesses of His Father's, but there will never be another business like this. As the divine and eternal Son of His Father He had carried through many great undertakings already; and both on earth and in heaven He will carry through many more. But this present undertaking on which He is just entering is by far the greatest and grandest business of them all. Almighty, and full of all manner of resources, as the Son of God always was, He could not attempt this present business till He was first made flesh. No nor till He was first made sin. All the other businesses He had performed for His Father had cost Him nothing, but this new business burdened Him, and humbled Him, and straightened Him, and gave Him no rest, till it was accomplished. . . . Yes; it was your sin that was His Father's terrible business with His Son.

Alexander Whyte, D.D.

Monday, July 9th.

The Son of Man must be lifted up.— John iii:14-21.

"Even so must the Son of Man be lifted up."

And why must He go to the Cross? Not merely, as the other Evangelists put it, in order that "it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the prophets." It was not that Jesus must die because the prophets had said that Messiah should, but that the prophets had said that Messiah should because Jesus must. . . . The work of Jesus Christ could not be done unless He died. He could not be the Saviour of the world unless He was the sacrifice for the sins of the world.

We cannot see all the grounds of that solemn imperative, but this we can see, that it was because of the requirements of the divine righteousness, and because of the necessities of sinful men.

"Must" is a hard word. It may express an unwelcome necessity. Was this necessity unwelcome? When He said, "The Son of Man must be lifted up," was He shrinking, or reluctantly submitting? Ah, no! He must die because He would save, and He would save because He did love. His filial obedience to God coincided with His pity for men: and not merely in obedience to the requirements of the divine righteousness, but in compassion for the necessities of sinners, necessity was laid upon Him.

Oh, brethren! nothing held Christ to the Cross but His own desire to save us.

This sacrifice was bound to the altar by the cords of love.
Alexander Maclaren, D.D.

Tuesday, July 10th.

I must work.— John ix:1-14.

To Christ this man was an object who vividly reminded him of his mission on earth. As a mission of real and untiring activity. "I must work," etc. As a mission involving a great variety of activities. "The works." Not one or a few, but many and various—as various as the physical and spiritual wants of the human family. As a mission which is Divine and representative in its character. "The works of him," etc. He never forgot the Divine and representative character of his mission, involving special duties, obligations, and responsibilities in relation to him who sent him. As a mission which must be performed in due season. "While it is day," etc. He had only a day, and with regard to his

earthly life this was short. Even in this hour of his triumph and brilliancy, in giving sight to the blind man, he was reminded of its brevity. This very act hastened the approaching night. Those who shine brightly on the night of the wicked world cannot expect a long day. As a mission in which his disciples had to share. "We" (the proper reading) "must work," etc. The Master and the disciples were one, and their mission one. He came not only to work himself, but also to teach them to work. They were as yet apprentices, but now it was time to begin to break them in under the yoke and remind them of their duty, and all the more as day was drawing to a close. As a mission the necessity of its fulfilment was felt by him with increasing force. "We must," etc. This came from his Divine commission, from human woe, from the greatness and importance of the work, and the brevity of the time. From above, around, and from within came the inspiration of his work, which found appropriate expression in "We must work."

B. Thomas.

Wednesday, July 11th.

Them also I must bring.— John x:1-16.

"Other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and there shall be one flock and one Shepherd." Striking as these words are in themselves, they are still more striking when we notice their connection; for they follow immediately upon His utterance about laying down His life for the sheep. So, then, this was a work beyond the Cross, and whatever it was, it was to be done after He had died.

But what sort of a Man is this who considers that His widest work is to be done by Him after He is dead? "Them also I must bring." How? when? Surely such words as these, side by side with a clear prevision of the death that was so soon to come, are either meaningless . . . or they anticipate what an Evangelist declares did take place—that the Lord was "taken up into heaven and sat at the right hand of God," whilst His servants "went everywhere preaching the Word, the Lord also working with them and confirming the Word" with the signs He wrought.

"Them also I must bring." That is not merely a necessity rooted in the nature of God and the wants of men. It is not merely a necessity springing from Christ's filial obedience and sense of a mission; but it is a "must" of destiny, a "must" which recognizes the sure results of His passion; a "must" which implies the power of the Cross to be the reconciliation of the world. . . . It is written in the councils of Heaven more unchangeably than the heavens; it is guaranteed by the power of the Cross; it is certain, by the eternal life of the crucified Saviour, that He will one day be the King of humanity, and must bring his wandering sheep to couch in peace, one flock round one Shepherd.

Alexander Maclaren, D.D.

Thursday, July 12th.

Ye must be born again.— John iii:1-13.

The words of our Lord astonished Nicodemus, yet he might have been prepared for them; had he duly received all the statements of the Old Testament bearing on this, he would have found our Lord's words by no means incredible.

But this statement shocked His Jewish pride. What! a Jew, a Pharisee, a learned man, a leader and teacher of his nation, require in his old age of wisdom to begin again! As if the heathen and the publican were as good as he!

Begotten from above! how was that possible? Jesus applies to the men of Israel, and to Nicodemus, this great and humbling truth; "I said to thee—Ye must be begotten again."

That "ye" is emphatic, and very significant, as excluding the Saviour from the necessity of such a birth, while it includes all others. Christ needed no second birth, in order to become the Son of God. He says, not therefore, "We must be born again," but "ye". He had no fallen nature to put off.

When the Spirit came on Jesus at the Jordan it was not to renew Him, but to bestow power. The Father testifies to

Him in the past, as showing Him to be altogether approved in His sight, and needing no renewal, when He says, "This is My Beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

He, therefore, distinguishes between Himself and the sons of men, yea, even the sons of Abraham.

R. Govett.

Friday, July 13th.

Must worship Him in Spirit.—

John iv:14-26.

It is in worship that the Holy Spirit most completely attains the object for which He was given; it is in worship He can most fully prove what He is. If I would that the consciousness and the Power of the Spirit's Presence became strong within me, let me worship. The Spirit fits for worship: worship fits for the Spirit.

It is not only prayer that is worship. Worship is the prostrate adoration of the Holy Presence. Often without words: "They bowed their heads and worshipped," Exodus 4:21, 12:27; Nehemiah 8:6. "The elders fell down and worshipped," Revelations 5:14. Or only with an "Amen, Hallelujah," Revelations 19:4.

How much worship there is, even among believers, that is not in the Spirit! In private, family, and public worship, how much hasty entering into God's presence in the power of the flesh, with little or no waiting for the Spirit to lift us heavenward! It is only the Presence and Power of the Holy Spirit that fits for acceptable worship.

The great hindrance to the Spirit is the flesh. The secret of spiritual worship is the death of the flesh; a giving it up to the accursed death of the cross, and in great fear of its actings humbly and trustfully to wait for the Spirit's life and power to take the place of the life and strength of self.

As our life is, so will our worship be. The Spirit must lead and rule in daily life if He is to inspire our worship. A life in obedience to God's will and in His Presence fits for worship. May God give us to feel deeply the extent, the sinfulness, the impotence of worship not in Spirit and in truth.

Andrew Murray, D.D.

Saturday, July 14th.

Must through much tribulation.—

Acts xiv:19-28.

The afflictions of this present time are preparing us for service here and for glory hereafter.

Suffering benefits us because it enhances the glory that shall follow. The teaching of the passage is not merely in Romans 8:18, that present sufferings are not worthy to be compared with the future glory, but that the suffering of the present has a distinct bearing and influence on the glory of the future. In some way that we cannot fully comprehend the depth of our humiliation is the measure of our exaltation. The bitterness of the cross determines the brilliancy of the crown. Our trials become our triumphs. "Grant that these, my two sons," said the mother of Zebedee's children, "may sit, the one on Thy right hand and the other on the left, in Thy kingdom." But Jesus answered and said, "Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I drank of and be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with" (Matthew 20:21, 22). In other words, are you ready for the preparation that such an elevation must demand? In the heavenly kingdom position is in strict accordance with worth.

Rev. E. W. Moore, M.A.

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION LESSON LEAF

Vol. III. ALEX. THOMSON, Editor. No. 3.
Lesson 31. Third Quarter. July 29th, 1928.

STRONG IN CHRIST.

Lesson Text: II Corinthians, Chapter 13.

Golden Text: "For though he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God. For we also are weak in him, but we shall live with him by the power of God toward you." (II Cor. 13:4.)

I. PAUL'S WARNING CONCERNING THE EXERCISE OF HIS APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY (vs. 1-4.)

1. The apostle intimates his intention of visiting the Corinthians a third time. In the previous chapter he had referred to this and had stated what would be his general attitude while among them (12:14, 15). He now gives warning concerning a certain action which he was prepared to take if necessary (v. 2). The warning is given to those who before had sinned and to all offenders; and the action he contemplates is expressed in the statement "I will not spare". He was quite prepared to exercise his apostolic authority in disciplining the sinful members. 2. They were seeking a proof of Christ speaking in him and this they would receive when he arrived among them. No doubt he had his detractors in mind while writing these words. They counted him as nothing and referred to him as being weak in presence. He admits weakness yet claims supernatural strength through identity with Christ. His Lord was crucified through weakness yet He now lives through the power of God, and he adds, "we also are weak sharing his weakness, but with Him we shall be full of life to deal with you through the power of God" (v. 6). They would find a proof of the power of God in him in his dealings with them, though he would not be hasty in his judgment, from the mouth of two or three witnesses every charge would be sustained (v. 1). 3. Our once crucified Saviour is now alive by the power of God, no more to die, having been raised from the dead and seated at the right hand of the Father. He is there now for us, able to save to the uttermost all who come unto God by Him (Hebrews 7:25), and we are united with Him in a vital and living union (Ephesians 1:4, 2:6). The apostle realized this union and was conscious of its power. 4. He was also

fearless in the discharge of his duties and nothing would deter him from doing the will of his Master even though the duties were at times unpleasant. Well would it be, were all the Lord's servants equally as faithful. 5. Then also there are times when discipline is necessary within the church, though it should always be exercised carefully and prayerfully.

II. PAUL'S EXHORTATION TO SELF-EXAMINATION (vs. 5-10.)

1. The Corinthians were seeking proof of Christ's presence with Paul (v. 3), and he enjoins them to examine themselves, not him, and find out if they were truly in the faith; to put themselves to the proof concerning Christ's presence with them. By such examination they would find that Christ was within them unless they failed to stand the test (v. 5). Their first duty was self-examination, a thorough investigation of the life and profession to see if both were in accord and to make sure that God was in the life. 2. Professing Christians ought to make sure they are truly saved. There is the possibility of self-deception; some are trusting to their good works for salvation, to church membership, and even to baptism. None of these can save. There must be personal faith in Christ based on the atoning work of Calvary before the saving work is done. 3. If the Corinthians by this examination proved themselves to be in the faith, and found that Christ was within them; they would realize their condition was a proof that the apostle also was possessed by the Saviour (v. 6), for it was through his ministry they had been saved. He was not only their instructor, but their parent in Christ, and the Lord would not have used him had he not been possessed by Him. 4. He then prays for them that they do no evil. His desire is not simply that he might appear approved before them, but that they should do that which was right, even though they should doubt his sincerity (v. 7). This is a remarkable instance of selflessness wherein the apostle seeks the very highest for others even though they misunderstand him. Such an attitude does not come naturally to any of us. We would rather treat others as they treat us, but by God's grace we are enabled to put self in the background. Let us put God first, others second and self last. 5. The apostle proceeds to assure them the apostolic power which he had received was given to him not to be used against the truth but for its furtherance (v. 8). His chief purpose was the perfecting of their characters. He desired to see them in all things like their living Lord. Let

apostolic power which he had received was given to him not to be used against the truth but for its furtherance (v. 8). His chief purpose was the perfecting of their characters. He desired to see them in all things like their living Lord. Let us also seek to make progress in the Christian life, growing in grace day by day, not afraid of a real Biblical holiness while guarding against false teaching on the subject. 6. The purpose of writing in this manner is that he might not have to use sharpness when he comes to them (v. 10). He is prepared to do his duty but he would rather there was no occasion for any disciplinary measures.

III. CLOSING EXHORTATIONS (vs. 11-13.)

1. The apostle in concluding his epistles gives some important exhortations. He bids them "farewell" which also has the meaning of "rejoice". Surely a fitting conclusion to his teaching. It was not his purpose to rob them of joy but to increase it; but such real joy could only be theirs as they were in fellowship with the source of all happiness, the Lord Himself. 2. He then exhorts them to "be perfect" or "reform what was amiss in themselves", "to be perfect by filling up what was lacking in their Christian character". It is quite

evident there were several things lacking, those they were enjoined to supply. May it also be our purpose to supply the lack in our characters when such is observed. 3. He tells them to "be of good comfort", "to take courage". The Lord never discourages His people, even when He is correcting them he would not have them lose heart, but would stimulate them to greater zeal for His service and would encourage them to the overcoming of the difficulties of the way. 4. The Corinthians are next exhorted to "be of one mind" and to "live in peace", then the God of love and peace would be with them. Unity in the church is a real blessing and is necessary to progress; but it must be unity based on obedience to the will of God. There cannot be real peace or oneness of mind where sin is permitted. Sin is always a disturber of the peace and the apostle in this epistle is emphasizing the necessity of putting away all evil. Peace at any price, where sin is allowed, is disobedience to God. 5. "Salute one another with an holy kiss". This was the usual Eastern salutation, men saluting men, women saluting women in this manner. "All the saints here salute you". They wished to be remembered to them. As a final message he pronounces the benediction upon them, emphasizing the Trinity in the Godhead, and the blessings of grace, love and communion.

News in General

STUDENTS WANTED.

Des Moines University is an educational Oliver Twist, always wanting more—more money, and still more money, but more students also.

We believe Des Moines University will now enter upon a period of unprecedented prosperity. Every day she is making new friends. The news of the election of Dr. H. C. Wayman, ex-President of William Jewell College, as President of Des Moines, has been received with general enthusiasm. Dr. Wayman's magnificent record both as an educator and as a staunch conservator of the faith, has inspired new confidence in the institution's future among all who believe in distinctively Christian education. We expect also to be able to announce at an early date the addition to the Faculty of a number of professors who will bring new strength to the University. We are increasingly convinced day by day that God's hand was in the movement to make Des Moines University a genuinely Fundamentalist institution.

But we must have students. We are receiving enquiries daily, but we want hundreds of them. We speak to *you*—Will you make it your business to speak to every high school graduate you know about Des Moines University; urge its claims upon him, or her, and send the name of every one you interview to Des Moines that we may write direct?

The Advantages of Des Moines University.

Educationally it offers every advantage any other such school can offer. Its scholastic standards are as high as any, and its students will always have reason to be proud of the scholarship of D.M.U. *As a Christian University* it has no peer on the continent. There is no compromise with error here. Every professor is a scholar plus a Fundamentalist. Parents need have no fear that any professor will destroy a student's faith. No professor would be permitted to deliver another lecture who should be found guilty of teaching anything subversive of Christian faith. The Trustees accept full responsibility for seeing that no professor is engaged who is not pledged never to teach anything contrary to the truths of the Bible—because the Bible is itself true.

Geographically, Des Moines is almost at the very centre of the North American Continent. It may seem far from the Atlantic or the Pacific coasts to Des Moines. But it were better to send a student a long way, geographically, to a University whose teaching will bring him near to God, than to send him to an institution near at hand, and while thus saving a little money, by its false teaching send the student quickly to a far country.

Self Help. Most of Des Moines students work their way through college. The city has a population of nearly 150,000—with all the advantages and few of the disadvantages of larger cities. Students usually find it possible to secure employment which enables them to pay their way.

Des Moines University offers courses in Liberal Arts, Education, Engineering, Pharmacy, Commerce, and Music. There are the usual *pre medic* courses, and special short courses are provided for missionaries. The Bible is a required subject in all courses.

Write Miss Edith Rebman, Des Moines University, for Catalogue of any of the six colleges, and for general particulars.

JARVIS STREET CHURCH—AN EXPLANATION.

From many quarters we have received enquiries as to why *The Gospel Witness* reports so little about Jarvis Street Church. The answer is very simple. While this paper was originally launched as a Church paper, it has outgrown the limits of a local paper—and as another page of the issue shows, goes into all the world preaching the gospel. It has become the advocate of so many causes, that they all have to be given their share of space. Of course, poor old Jarvis Street bears the financial responsibility for its publication, and might be justified in claiming a liberal share in its announcements. But we thought our readers would grow weary of local news, and would be more interested in matters pertaining to the larger interests of the Churches of Christ. We confess our gratification, however, that so many people have manifested interest in the home base.

The work of Jarvis Street goes on. The Pastor's many and prolonged absences have had some slight effect upon the work, but all the prayer services are well sustained—three regular church prayer meetings during the week, one Sunday, and the School prayer conference Monday night—the Sunday congregation invariably fill, and frequently crowd, the auditorium; the Bible School averaged more than one thousand a Sunday last month, summer notwithstanding; the monthly Communion services usually number between 700 and 800 attendants; the giving of the people is sustained,—and, to quote a recent testimony—only last Sunday night,—a brother who had been a Deacon of another Church said something like this: "I have been a member of this Church now for two years. Outside they speak of Jarvis Street and its Pastor as though they were always fighting, but in the two years of my membership, I have never heard or seen anything to mar the perfect harmony of the Church's life." Jarvis Street people do dwell together in unity, and the fellowship of the saints is the sweetest experience this side of heaven.

The Pastor's absence has decreased the number of additions to the membership of the Church, as perhaps, might be expected. Our additions last year were something over 200 but less than 250. Notwithstanding, conversions are frequent and baptism takes place practically every Sunday when the Pastor is home.

The Sunday services in the summer time are rather heavy for the preacher. A large Bible class at 10 o'clock; preaching at 11.00; regular evening service at 7.00, (which lasts till 9.00) and then a great open-air service from the open-air platform at which perhaps never less than about 2,000 are reached. In addition to these services, there is an open-air service at 4.00 in the afternoon, prayer service at 6.00, and, except the first Sunday in the month, Communion at 6.30.

The week's public programme is as follows: Monday night, 7.45, Departmental Conference; 9.00, Pastor teaches lesson to about 200 Sunday School workers; Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday, Prayer meetings; Thursday, 9.00 p.m., Bible lecture by the Pastor.

The Church office has five secretaries always crowded with work, some of whom work twelve to fifteen hours a day not infrequently. Wednesday is *Witness* day. Wednesday night the Editor usually spends in the printing office till daylight. Friday, the only other night, the Editor usually tries to fill one of the many engagements always waiting for him—for instance, July 6th, Trenton, Ont. (102 miles away); July 13th, London (117 miles distant); July 20th or 27th, Guelph (60 or 70 miles off), and the other week (of 20th or 27th), going to and from Des Moines, Iowa—nearly 900 miles away.

Perhaps this is enough to let our readers know that Jarvis Street people have few leisure hours.

LETTERS FROM ENGLAND.

The two letters printed below came to hand this week, they are very significant and speak for themselves:

London, N.W., June 18th, 1928

Dear Dr. Shields:

The Gospel Witness has been passed on to me, during the last month or two, by my friend, and I would like to express my appreciation of your wholesome and stimulating sermons and articles in the defence and confirmation of the Gospel. May God sustain and encourage you in your great ministry.

When I read in your May 24th issue, p. 6, "The Pullman Sleeper 'Yorkminster'," it occurred to me that one of the "two distinguished gentlemen from England" must surely be Douglas Brown. Am I correct? That "room of quiet" seems so very akin to his mission methods on this side!

I have since received your issue of May 31st, with its timely and justified criticism of Dr. Douglas Brown. You are to be thanked for your "great plainness of speech". What a sad capitulation and compromise! But that D. B. should have joined the Modernists in Toronto, and apparently accommodated his message accordingly, is not surprising. He does so here. I enclose copy of a letter written to him some years ago by _____ whose name you will probably know, and I think you will gather from this the road he has been, travelling for some time.

I would that we had a Leader such as yourself among the Baptists over here. Even Tydeman Chilvers of Spurgeon's Tabernacle has recently expressed his pleasure at both hearing the speeches of others, and speaking himself, at the meetings of the Baptist Union. You have probably read the accounts of this in our *Baptist Times* and *British Weekly*. The President said, "We need him in our ranks, and all he has got; and he is with us heart and soul". And Mr. Chilvers responded: "I have been sitting under the shadow of my brethren with great delight, and their words have been sweet to my taste"! And F. C. Spurr reporting things in the "*B.W.*", speaks of "the exceptional welcome" accorded Mr. Chilvers as "more than a warm welcome" to him personally "It has opened arms to the Metropolitan Tabernacle, and the cheers of men who see in the gesture made by Mr. Chilvers the *mutual burial of a hatchet*, once bright and destructive, but now rusty, outworn and unnecessary". And more, "an indication that the long misunderstanding, due to the 'Down Grade' controversy, is at last ended". And so on.

It is a serious situation. While some, to whom we had looked to lead us in the battle against the enemy, seem to have surrendered, may God preserve us from his wiles.

Yours faithfully,

London S.W., December, 1928.

To the Rev. Douglas Brown.

Dear Mr. Brown,—

A quiet opportunity having been given me abroad of reading *Revival Addresses*, and *The Great Harvester*, I annotated the latter, which, if you care to do so, you may look over with me. *Revival Addresses*, however, in spite of the many laudatory and fulsome notices of it—is calculated to do such serious mischief to souls, that no gibe against 'criticism' or 'heresy-hunting' should deter those who love God's immutable truth from publishing their dissent.

My reason for writing you is—Jabez-like (vide II Chron. 4:9) to give you an opportunity of calling in every copy of *Revival Addresses*, as far as is possible, and save me the imperative necessity of publishing the enclosed brief review. Or, if that cannot be done, of adding your own retraction to my review.

Forgive an old man, who, living a quiet life of prayer and meditation, may see with a clearer vision the *raison d'être* of the conflicting factors struggling for the mastery in this strange and transitory infatuation of the popular religious crowd.

A further reason for troubling you is the certainty that there is no possibility of your hearing the truth from the men who will fawn and flatter you so long as you get the *crowd*. One has only to compare the nauseating flattery of the press notices with our own Blessed Apostle's experience and teaching in the Corinthian letters to be heartsick and ashamed. Only think of any one of those pentecostal Saints writing of Paul's "beautiful face", and "musical voice" and "charming personality", etc. It is a wicked caricature of divine service.

My poor suffering Brother:—When this advertisement stunt is played out—When the crowds are no longer there—When the "Quiet Room" is no longer a novelty—When the thousands of 'reconsecrated' people have gone back to their 'Saturday night concerts' and their card parties—as, indeed, most of them have already done—and the very men who have done their best to ruin you by gross flattery and insincerity, will give you a large berth and plenty of sea room and you shall come out of it all, as one emerges from a troubled dream, or a horrible nightmare—When that day comes, remember that you have a neighbour prepared to sympathize with you as one poor, unworthy, failing child of God may sympathize with another.

I beg to express the hope that your nervous system is recovering its vigour. I know what a nerve-destroying business this convert-making, and statistical newspaper evangelism is. I was in it for years, but not in such a wholesale way. The revelation of the Gospel of God's grace, and His eternal purpose in Christ Jesus, were at once reset to my soul and the grave of this nerve-racking emotionalism. Oh! for the Douglas Brown of pre-war days! How I used to love to hear you then! How you loved our Lord's good 'doctrine', and how mightily the Holy Ghost wrought through you! But you had no unholy alliance with Bible-wreckers and non-inspiration men in those days—no truckling with rationalists and modernists—no belauding of wicked old Jezebel—nothing in common with holy or unholy monks, friars, jesuits and other blasphemers and idolaters—

The baneful results of throwing overboard the essential ballast of wholesome doctrine was soon apparent, for, with startling rapidity there followed each other a preaching up of the monks of the Middle Ages—Did I not hear you?—Then a public renunciation of doctrine—Then the incorporation into your public utterances of gibes and diatribes against 'heresy-hunters', and fulminations against 'criticism'. You kicked aside the Laver to make room for a popular religious kind of rationalistic fox-trot to suit all comers. Plenty of sentimentality—floods of emotion—Heaps of consecration and no piety—no practical holiness—no separation from the world—religious and otherwise. How fatally easy the descent has been! I earnestly commend to you Hosea 14.

I have been, and am praying for you. Oh that you may return! Oh that we may hear the cry from your lips—touched once more with a live coal from off God's

Altar—"O how I love Thy Law", and "Rivers of water run down my face because they keep not Thy law".

May II Thess. 1:11-12—Eph. 1:15-23—3:14-20—be blessedly true of both you and me is my earnest prayer. Awaiting the favour of your reply. I remain,
Yours, for His dear Name's sake,

England, June 14th, 1928.

Dear Dr. Shields:

The *Gospel Witness* for May 31st has just come to hand. I am sadly interested in your criticism of Dr. A. Douglas Brown. You have said what those of us feel who are standing uncompromisingly for the truth. We cannot understand why Dr. Brown, with all his professed loyalty to Christ, will and does fellowship with avowed Modernists. Rev. H. Tydeman Chilvers is doing the same now, and Spurgeon's pulpit is thus being linked up with the Modernist leaders in the Baptist Union of Great Britain. It is enough to make Spurgeon and Archibald Brown "turn in their graves".

The Lord bless you in the brave stand you are making for "the Faith once delivered". We are hoping, and praying that Dr. Riley's visit will do something to stiffen the weak backs of English pacifists. With kindest regards.

Very truly yours in Him we love and serve.

Bethel Baptist Church, Orillia, Joins the New Convention.

We have been informed by the Secretary of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec that he has received a letter from the new Baptist Church, Orillia, as follows:

"I have been instructed to inform you that at a business meeting of the Bethel Baptist Church, May 30th, it was decided by a unanimous vote that this church would unite with the Convention of Regular Baptist Churches.

(Signed) Mable Wigg,
Clerk".

The application of the Bethel Church has been received by Mr. Atkinson, and Bethel Regular Baptist Church, Orillia, Ontario, has been formally welcomed into the fellowship of the Union. Mr. John Byers, of the Toronto Baptist Seminary, is acting pastor. We are sure that all the churches of the Union will welcome this addition to our fellowship, and pray that God's richest blessing may rest upon the Bethel Church.

Orangeville Regular Baptist Church (Pastor, W. G. Brown, B.A.; Student assisting, Mr. Gordon Searle, of the Toronto Baptist Seminary). Recently the young people of the Orangeville Baptist Church held services in the Orangeville jail where four Indians were numbered among the prisoners. The Indians were attracted by the singing, and three of them promised that when they were free they would come to church. Six weeks later one of the Indians was released, having been found innocent of the charge upon which he had been held, and, true to his promise, attended church service with his wife. Mr. Searle preached, and after the service the Indian's wife was spoken to about her soul's salvation. She yielded to Christ, as did also her husband later. The husband had been a very heavy drinker, and a heavy smoker too, but he had given up the drink before he came to church; and after his conversion the smoking was given up too. Some time later the Indian and his wife were baptized in the Orangeville Church. This was the beginning of blessing. Others have been converted in the meetings in the open air, and in such homes as opened up for gospel services in the surrounding country. In one place forty-five gathered in a kitchen to hear the Word.

Mr. Brown and his assistant are pushing forward the work of the Lord during the summer months, endeavouring to sow liberally in the expectation of a liberal harvest.

Pastors' and People's Conference: Churches in fellowship with the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec have formed conferences, and much blessing is the result. We report one recently held at Burtch.

During the conference held with the church at Burtch on Tuesday, June 12th, a council was formed for the purpose of recognizing the Burtch Church as a Regular Baptist Church, coming into the fellowship of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec. Representatives were present on the Council from the following churches and places: Brownsville; Oxford St., Woodstock; Stanley Ave., Hughson St., Immanuel, Hamilton; Scotland; Shensstone Memorial, Brantford, Otterville; Pastor Boomer of Simcoe, and Pastor Franklin of Port Dover. Rev. R. E. Jones of Woodstock was appointed Moderator, and Rev. H. S. Bennett of Otterville as Clerk. Rev. T. L. White, Pastor of Burtch Church, gave a history of the work, and stated the doctrinal basis upon which the church was organized, which proved to be the doctrinal statement set forth in the Tentative Constitution of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec. In the evening, to a congregation of some two hundred people, Rev. R. E. Jones gave a charge to the new church based on Paul's first letter to the Corinthians; and Rev. A. J. Loveday extended the hand of fellowship into the Union. Rev. H. W. Bower preached a gospel message, and a day of much blessing was brought to a happy close.

ASSOCIATION OF REGULAR BAPTISTS.

In response to invitations from the Sunderland Church, representatives from neighbouring and more distant churches of the faith met with the congregations of Sunderland and Cannington, on July 2nd, for fellowship and mutual encouragement. Representatives were present from the congregations in Fenelon Falls, Bobcaygeon, Scotch Line, Oshawa, Orillia, Lindsay, Alton and Orangeville.

In the afternoon, following a time of song and testimony, Rev. Gordon Brown, of Orangeville, addressed the meeting. Preceding the evening service an unofficial "business meeting" was held, with Rev. C. M. Carew, of Fenelon Falls, in the chair. The question of forming an Association of the Regular Baptist Churches in the Whitby-Lindsay district (and of churches outside that district as well) was discussed. All were unanimous as to the need for such an association, and Rev. C. M. Carew was instructed to place the matter definitely before the various Regular Baptist congregations in order that further steps might be taken.

Pastor James McGinlay, of Alton, preached a great sermon during the service which followed. Four decided to follow Christ in baptism.

The prayers of *Gospel Witness* readers are solicited for this new fellowship.

TORONTO BAPTIST SEMINARY

Offers Courses for Ministerial and Missionary Students.

FACULTY.

Dr. T. T. Shields, President.
Dr. T. I. Stockley, Dean.
Rev. Alex. Thomson, B.D.
Rev. W. Gordon Brown, B.A.
Rev. W. S. Whitcombe, B.A.
Rev. H. A. Ackland, B.Th.
E. Montgomery, M.D.
W. K. Fenton, M.D.
Miss Elizabeth Fuller.
Mrs. John Coghill.

Write for Catalogue to the Dean, Dr. T. I. Stockley, 337 Jarvis Street, Toronto.

NEW OFFICERS OF THE BAPTIST BIBLE UNION OF NORTH AMERICA.

We neglected to report last week that at the Annual Meeting of the Baptist Bible Union held in Jarvis Street Church, June 23rd, the following officers were elected to serve for 1928-29: President, T. T. Shields, Toronto; Vice-President, Maximilian Schimpf, New York; Secretary-Treasurer, Edith M. Rebman, Des Moines, Iowa; Executive Committee: E. A. Roberts, Cleveland, Ohio; O. W. Van Osdel, Grand Rapids, Mich.; Arthur B. Fowler, Buffalo, N.Y.; C. G. Griffith, Toledo, Ohio; H. O. Meyer, Pasadena, Cal.; C. J. Loney, Hamilton, Ont.; C. E. Tulga, North Platte, Neb.

To "Gospel Witness" Subscribers Throughout The World

The readers of this issue will see that an attempt is made to give the impression that "the Baptists of the World", as represented by the Baptist World Alliance in Toronto, have expressed disapproval of our stand for the faith by electing as its President one of the leading defenders of McMaster's Modernism. While we are confident no such significance can rightly be attached to Dr. MacNeill's election, we feel we owe it to the truth, and to our Baptist people throughout the world, to make every effort to inform them of the facts of the case. An especially large edition of this issue has been published, and we should like to send a copy to every Baptist minister throughout the entire world, and to as many Baptist deacons, and Sunday School Superintendents, and teachers, and missionaries, and Baptist workers, as possible. We therefore appeal to every reader of this paper to assist us in this gigantic task. 5c a copy will pay for both the printing and the mailing of a copy to any part of the world. We therefore ask our readers to sit down and think of as many pastors in their locality as possible, and send us the correct names and addresses, and a sum of money equal to 5c for each name. Some of our readers may be among the Lord's well-to-do stewards who could afford to help us circulate this paper by paying for those who can not afford to pay themselves. We should like to have tens of thousands of names of Baptists from all parts of the world, to each of whom we can send a copy of this issue of the paper. Our appeal therefore is first to

CANADIANS

In British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia. In every one of these provinces we have subscribers, and we earnestly appeal to everyone to send us names, with 5c each, to help us mail a copy of *The Witness*.

IN THE UNITED STATES AND UNITED STATES' POSSESSIONS

The Gospel Witness goes into every state in the Union, and even to far-off Alaska, and the Philippine Islands, and Cuba. Will every subscriber please send us names, and 5c per name.

IN MEXICO AND SOUTH AMERICA

We appeal also to our subscribers in Mexico, in Bolivia, in the Argentine, in Peru, in Chili, in Paraguay, in Central America, in Brazil, and in Costa Rico.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS IN THE WEST INDIES

In Jamaica, Trinidad, Bermuda, we appeal for aid in spreading this issue of *The Gospel Witness*. Send in names and addresses.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS IN THE ANTIPODES

Friends in New Zealand and in Australia, we appeal to help us stay the plague of Modernism by sending us hundreds of names of ministers and Baptist leaders to whom we can send the information contained in this issue of *The Witness*.

TO OUR READERS IN THE FAR EAST

We appeal to our subscribers in India, Burma, Ceylon, China, Japan, Persia. In all these countries we have interested readers, and we earnestly solicit their help in circulating this paper especially among missionaries.

IN GREECE, OR ANCIENT ACHAIA

To subscribers in this region where the gospel was preached with apostolic zeal in the first century we appeal to help us circulate this message, and to assist in stemming the tide of Modernism. Send us names and addresses.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS IN SYRIA AND EGYPT

To our friends in these ancient lands we call for help, for names of persons to whom this issue of *The Witness*, especially the names of ministers and Christian workers may be sent.

IN OLD ENGLAND

We have a great number of friends in Great Britain. Britain's exports, as represented by Professor Marshall and Professor Glover, have wrought untold injury by their influence to the Baptist life of Canada. We are being told that those who believe the Bible in England are regarded as "uneducated fools". We do not believe this to be true, and we are therefore especially anxious to flood Great Britain with copies of this paper. We ought to send at least ten or twenty thousand to Great Britain alone. We ask our British readers therefore to send us lists of names, with correct addresses, representing the ministers of England. We believe there are some friends of Fundamentalism in England who would be glad to contribute to a fund to make this possible. But the "Baptists of the world" ought to be, and must be, informed of what is said to be the significance of Dr. MacNeill's election to the Presidency.

IN SCOTLAND

And in the land north of the Tweed we have hosts of friends, some even in the Shetland Island. We appeal to everyone of them to send us names and addresses; send us money if possible, but if that should be impossible, send us names and addresses.

DEAR OLD IRELAND

From no part of the world have we received more encouragement from time to time than from Ireland. We therefore send this appeal to our Irish friends, both in the North and in the South. We should like to have the name of every Baptist minister,—and Presbyterian minister too, for that matter, and every other minister in Ireland. This appeal is our answer to Dr. MacNeill's declaration that "the Baptists of the world" have expressed approval of the infidelity of men like Marshall, Shailer Mathews, and Glover.

Subscribe to "The Gospel Witness" Now

The Gospel Witness contains weekly:

A SERMON BY THE EDITOR, preached from Jarvis Street pulpit. The stenographic report carries with it the atmosphere of a great service. About 3,000 ministers read the paper weekly.

AN EXPOSITION of the whole Bible Sunday School lesson.

EDITORIAL ARTICLES dealing with vital religious question of the day.

COALS FOR THE ALTAR FIRE, a devotional page edited by Dr. T. I. Stockley, Dean of Toronto Baptist Seminary.

GENERAL NEWS OF THE RELIGIOUS WORLD, and particularly of the Fundamentalist Modernist battle.

READ THE OPPOSITE PAGE to this and see in how many countries the Witness circulates.

READ THE FOLLOWING LETTER, and the letters from England in this issue, and see what some subscribers think of The Witness:

_____, Ga.
June 5, 1928

The Gospel Witness,
Toronto, Canada.

Dear Dr. Shields:

I am sending you herewith check for \$2.15 as a renewal for The Gospel Witness.

I have been reading your paper for about two years; and as a lawyer, I have found it to be absolutely invaluable to me. I have passed it on to a number of my friends throughout this section of the country and many of them have subscribed for it and say they couldn't get along in the world without it. My pastor comes to my office to read it every week. It is a blessing to know that there are still those who still stand for the TRUTH as it is in God. I believe, that, by the grace of God, you are making those quarters uncomfortable for the devil.

Heartily yours,

(Sgd.)

ORDER FORM

Fill this out, or copy, and mail to: The Gospel Witness, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2.

Find enclosed \$2.00 (if by cheque \$2.15), for which send The Gospel Witness for one year to the undersigned.

Name

Address