

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. 16.

TORONTO, AUGUST 30th, 1928.

Whole No. 330

TOO GOOD TO BE TRUE

We are being informed from various sources that there is still a very large element of thoroughly sound biblical Baptists in the Ontario and Quebec Convention. We have no doubt that this is true. In nearly all the churches there are individuals and families who know nothing about the denominational controversy beyond what they have learned from *The Canadian Baptist*, or from their Pastor, or from some denominational official.

In the membership of the churches there are great numbers of people who, while sound in their personal faith in Christ and in the Bible as His word, have never been instructed in the great doctrines of the gospel, and are really little more than babes in Christ. They are without spiritual discernment, and, like certain religious people to whom our Lord spoke in the days of His flesh, they are able to discern the face of the skies, but cannot discern the signs of the times.

There is another class of church members, who have had a genuine Christian experience, but who have not followed on to know the Lord, who know little of the Word of God, and who, while going to church on Sunday, have lived essentially worldly lives. They have not added to their faith virtue and the other graces which are potentially wrapped up in faith; they fulfil in their experience the scripture which says, "He that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins."

There is still another class, beyond doubt, consisting of men and women who are genuinely the Lord's, and who really have delight in spiritual things; but are without experience of the machinations of Modernists. It is natural that they should find it difficult to believe that a paper like *The Canadian Baptist* should, from week to week, publish some things in which there is not an infinitesimal element of truth, and other things in which there is the grossest misrepresentation. They were unable to believe that the late Dean Farmer had become so obsessed with McMaster University that he had ceased to measure anybody by his relation to Christ, but only by his relation to McMaster University. They were therefore deceived by the man whom they had trusted as a godly guide. Now that Dr. Farmer is gone we would not say anything about him that we did not say

when he was still living and able to answer for himself; but we repeat that the judgment seat of Christ will reveal that no man who ever had a place in the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, in the declining years of his life ever wrought such havoc to the cause of Christ as the late Dr. J. H. Farmer. He condemned everything and everybody who dared to criticize McMaster University, and he supported and credentialed anybody and everybody, irrespective of his religious views, who would speak well of that institution.

Having all these things in mind, we can well believe that there is a great multitude of people in the Baptist churches of Ontario and Quebec still affiliated with the Convention, whose hearts are really true, and who, if they but knew the facts, would clean house.

The Ministers of the Convention

But the ministers of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec are in an entirely different class. They ought to know the teachings of the times, and the awful perils of the day. They ought to be able to distinguish between truth and error, between that which is in accord with the truth of the Bible and that which is diametrically opposed to it. The pastors of the churches, and the officials of the Denomination, are looked upon as guides. It is their duty to know whither they are steering the ship.

Furthermore: practically all the pastors of the Convention have for years attended the meetings of the Convention. They have heard the discussions. They have heard Professor Marshall and others for themselves. It is useless therefore for any pastor or denominational official to plead ignorance of the true theological situation to-day. And yet among these ministers there are not a few who insist that they are loyal to the gospel. There are many, indeed, who privately acknowledge that they have no sympathy whatever with Professor Marshall's views, and that they strongly disapprove of the Convention's general attitude. But they are confident that there are better days in store! As yet they have reserved their fire! They are getting ready! They remind us there are vacancies in the Faculty of McMaster University, and they tell us that if the University should appoint another Professor

like Professor Marshall, "The University will hear from us"!

The Ontario and Quebec Seven Thousand

We are glad to be assured that even the Convention of Ontario and Quebec has its seven thousand who have not bowed the knee to the Baal of Modernism, and that many of these are to be found among the ministers. Be that as it may, the Elijahs of to-day should not be blamed too severely for assuming that they are alone in the fight; for it must frankly be admitted that the ministers at least among the seven thousand have succeeded in maintaining a most discreet silence, while, at the same time, concealing their whereabouts from the University of which Ahab is the manipulator although not the Chancellor.

The Rev. C. H. Schutt.

It is not our purpose to drag all the ministerial seven thousand from their hiding places just now, but we will venture in this article to deal with one denominational official, and that one is Rev. C. H. Schutt, Superintendent of Home Missions.

We have known Mr. Schutt for nearly twenty years, and were somewhat intimately associated with him in the work of the Home Mission Board long before he became Superintendent. Brother Schutt is a very likeable man; and if he has any enemies, his worst enemy would not be bold enough to charge Mr. Schutt with having the slightest sympathy with Modernism. Mr. Schutt is a thoroughly orthodox Baptist, and a premillennialist into the bargain—indeed, we are inclined to think he would go much farther in this latter particular than the Editor of this paper. In all the years of our acquaintance with Brother Schutt we have never heard that he ever uttered a word, privately or publicly, that could by any means be construed as favouring Modernism. We are glad therefore that the Home Mission Board of Ontario and Quebec has a thoroughly orthodox man for its Superintendent.

But information has come to us of late from several churches which have been visited by the Superintendent, to the effect that the Superintendent urges the churches to be loyal to the Home Mission Board, and to support the work of the Convention. In his contact with certain churches in the Norfolk Association, we are informed that Mr. Schutt did not insist that these churches should support McMaster University; but he did urge upon them a loyal support of the Home Mission Board. The Home Mission Superintendent's argument implied that the Convention situation was really not hopeless, and that if McMaster University went any further than it had gone, no doubt many would rise up in protest against its course!

Now this is what we call optimism gone mad. Is there any hope if another professor as extreme, or more extreme than Professor Marshall, should be appointed, that Mr. Schutt would heroically step into the breach and contend for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints? If there were hope of such a thing we would gladly cross a continent to hear Brother Schutt's speech.

But we must go into the past a little, and examine this great warrior's record to see what battles he has fought, and what victories he has won. Let our readers understand that we have a great affection for the Superintendent of Home Missions. We confess to a great weakness: this article ought to have been written months

ago. It would have been written had we not been restrained by the recollection of former fellowship with Brother Schutt, and by a real love for him as a man. But loyalty to the gospel, and to the cause of truth, compels us at last to speak; and we shall say nothing about Brother Schutt other than what his record of the years may say.

What Did Mr. Schutt Do in Dr. Harris' Day?

It was from the lips of the Superintendent of Home Missions we learned, on coming to Toronto, who the evil genius of the Baptist denomination really was. It was Brother Schutt who identified the arch-enemy of evangelical principles in the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec. But when Dr. Harris fought his heroic battle against McMaster on account of Professor I. G. Matthews, what did Mr. Schutt do in support of that heroic defender of the faith? So far as we are aware, Mr. Schutt did nothing at all.

But we would not blame him too strongly for that, because, being a novice in such matters, we confess to having failed Dr. Harris grievously in that fight. But we were not silent. We seconded Mr. MacNeill's resolution at the Bloor Street Convention in 1919 in good faith, but in the speech we made on that occasion, we specifically dissociated ourselves from Mr. MacNeill's compromising utterance, and declared that nothing could be settled until it was settled on a basis of truth and righteousness. Notwithstanding, our action in seconding Mr. MacNeill's resolution had the effect of granting the enemy a reprieve, and he did not fail to make good use of his time to dig himself in.

Did Mr. Schutt Ever Protest Against McMaster?

During the nine years of Professor Matthews' continuance in McMaster University we did our utmost in a quiet way, as Pastor of Jarvis Street Church, to make our opposition to Professor Matthews' teaching known. But what did Mr. Schutt do during the nine years? So far as we know, he did nothing at all.

What Did Mr. Schutt Do in 1919?

At the 1919 Convention in Ottawa, when the arch-enemy to which we have referred, either directly or indirectly, expressed himself in the editorial columns of *The Canadian Baptist*, when we challenged the position there taken, many voices were raised in support of our contention at the Ottawa Convention. We rejoiced at the splendid support which was given by many speakers, and by the delegates as a whole. But what had Mr. Schutt to say in opposition to Modernism on that historic occasion? Our hearing was fairly acute, and our sight was not dim, nor do we think our memory has become as yet specially defective; but we cannot remember that Superintendent Schutt had one word to say.

What Did Mr Schutt Do in 1924?

Once again a battle for the Book was fought in 1924 at the London Convention over the Faunce incident? On that occasion some new voices were heard in opposition to McMaster. The Convention for the first time in McMaster's history, less than four years ago, refused a vote of confidence in that institution, and at the end of the long debate, passed a resolution in condemnation of McMaster's action. We appeal to the memory of our Canadian readers, for we would not do Mr. Schutt an injustice. Does anybody remember hearing Mr. Schutt

on that occasion? What did the Superintendent of Home Missions do to help in the battle for the Book at London? With much regret we have to record that, so far as we are aware, he did absolutely nothing.

What Did Mr. Schutt Say at Hamilton?

The 1925 Convention was held in Stanley Avenue Church, Hamilton, and Professor Marshall there appeared for the first time, and his teaching was the question at issue. Our friends who quietly admit that Professor Marshall's teaching was unsound, heard him on that occasion, and many of them were greatly aroused because of his heterodox views. We did the best we could to expose Professor Marshall's errors, and we were ably and heroically supported by a fine array of speakers. But at Hamilton in 1925, what did Rev. C. H. Schutt do to stem the tide of unbelief? What help did he afford those who were fighting Modernism? Once again it must be admitted that the voice of Rev. C. H. Schutt was not even heard.

Some time in the spring of 1926 the Home Mission Board held a meeting at which a resolution, written in vitriol by Rev. Hugh McDiarmid, then of Stratford, was proposed. Its spirit, and the terms in which that spirit was expressed, were worthy of the Russian Soviet. We do not know whether Mr. McDiarmid was trying to earn a D.D. from McMaster by his proposal, but even the Home Mission Board balked at his bitterness.

The Muzzling Resolution.

Another resolution, however, was proposed, and it was proposed by Rev. C. R. Duncan, who represented the Oxford-Brant Association on the Home Mission Board, and who had accepted appointment as Educational Secretary of McMaster University. According to the invariable practice of the Board, when a man leaves the territory of the Association he represents, his membership in the Board becomes vacant and another is appointed; but Mr. Duncan occupied the dual position of representing an Association in which he did not live, while, at the same time, being a paid official of McMaster University.

That resolution explicitly forbade all missionaries of the Home Mission Board to have any part in the controversy. We have spoken of it as the "Muzzling Resolution", and by that name it became known.

Did Mr. Schutt Object to Muzzling the Missionaries?

What did Mr. Schutt, the Superintendent of Home Missions, do in the face of that proposal? What action did he take, either in defense of the faith, or in defense of the liberties of the Home Mission pastors? Did Mr. Schutt step forward and say, "Brethren, I am a Baptist. I believe in the time-honoured Baptist principle of soul-liberty. The money this Board grants these Home Mission pastors is not ours. We have not given it. We are merely trustees handling other people's money. We have no right to use the funds committed to our trust to muzzle the missionaries in respect to this great matter where the very fundamentals of the faith are at stake"? Did Mr. Schutt say that? Did he say anything like that? Did he say anything at all? So far as we are aware, Mr. Schutt was once again as dumb as the proverbial oyster. Nay, more, he afterwards wrote a letter on the subject to *The Canadian Baptist*, and our best information on the subject is that the letter was utterly untrue to fact. At all events, Mr. Schutt allowed the resolution to pass.

Did Mr. Schutt Wear the Muzzle?

But did Mr. Schutt allow himself to be bound by the resolution which bound the missionaries of the Board? By no means. Though Mr. Schutt had no word to utter in defense of the missionaries' liberties, or in defense of the faith, in two instances at least, at Glamis, Ontario, and at Tiverton, Ontario, Mr. Schutt went out of his way to plead McMaster's cause, and to say something to the effect that instead of finding fault with McMaster, we ought to be thankful that we had only one professor in McMaster who was under suspicion!

Only one? Whatever may have been true of McMaster University then, it appears now that there is not one solitary professor in McMaster who has not absolutely sold his soul to Modernism. Let no one name Professor A. L. McCrimmon. Professor McCrimmon's orthodoxy is of the type that would defend anyone who happened to be a professor of McMaster University.

What Did Mr Schutt Say at First Avenue?

The Convention of 1926 was held in First Avenue Church, Toronto. The Educational Session of that year marked the fiercest and hottest fight we have ever had. It lasted from the beginning of Professor McCrimmon's speech at about eleven in the morning—before the debate was opened—until past two o'clock the next morning. It was on that occasion Professor Marshall repudiated the idea of Christ's having endured the punishment of our sins. It was Professor Marshall's own utterances, on that occasion particularly, which, being published, opened the eyes of thousands and tens of thousands of Southern Baptists to see that in Professor Marshall the Ontario and Quebec Convention harboured a bitter enemy of evangelical truth.

Among those who spoke in defense of the faith on that occasion there were many splendid young men who won their spurs by making real contributions to the debate.

We know from what Mr. Schutt always preaches that Professor Marshall's position, as disclosed in his speech on that occasion, is as opposed to what Mr. Schutt believes as the night is to the day. But what did the Superintendent of Home Missions say in that great battle for the Book? Did anyone see him draw his shining sword and take his place in the forefront, and challenge the enemy in the name of the Lord? Again, so far as we are able to remember—and with deep sorrow we record it—Rev. C. H. Schutt was like the man who was found without a wedding garment—he was speechless.

What Did Mr. Schutt Say About "The Bill"?

We now come to the spring and summer of 1927. The Executive Committee of the Convention applied to Parliament for the passage of their iniquitous amending Bill. That, of course, came before the Executive Committee of the Convention. As Superintendent of Home Missions, Mr. Schutt was a member of that Committee. We do not know whether he was present at any meeting of the Committee when this Bill was under discussion. We should not be surprised to find that Mr. Schutt was out of the city when the Committee was held. It would not be altogether unlike Mr. Schutt, at least, to be absent when an important decision was to be taken. But certainly, no whisper has reached the

public ear that at the Executive Committee Mr. Schutt offered any opposition to the proposed amending Bill.

Throughout the summer of 1927 the Bill was under discussion. We should be glad to give front-page space and the boldest type to any word of protest Mr. Schutt uttered during those months, if any of our readers throughout Ontario and Quebec would be good enough to inform us of having heard such a word of protest. So far as we know, Mr. Schutt, in respect to the Bill, had nothing to say.

How Did Mr. Schutt Vote in 1927?

We come now to the Convention in Temple Baptist Church, Toronto. The great matter of the Convention was the Bill, the guillotine Bill. Everybody knew, who knew anything at all, that the power of Parliament had been invoked in order to deprive Jarvis Street Church of the right to send delegates to the Convention of Ontario and Quebec. When that Bill was before the House, did Mr. Schutt have anything to say? Nothing at all. On the contrary, when the vote was taken, Superintendent C. H. Schutt openly voted for the adoption of the Bill, for the setting up of the guillotine, in order that Jarvis Street might be excluded from the Convention. But when the next day the vote was taken on the resolution naming Jarvis Street Church as a church out of harmony with the Convention, and no longer entitled to send delegates, what had Mr. Schutt to say against that procedure? Mr. Schutt had nothing to say—for the very good and sufficient reason that he was absent from the Convention. He stayed away from the meeting. He helped to set up the scaffold, but he was too refined to be present at the execution!

Superintendent Has Never Once Protested.

So then, through all these years in which Modernism, like a cancer, has been wrapping its tentacles about the various Boards of the Convention, Superintendent Schutt has not once broken the silence, or had the courage to say one solitary word in defense of the faith once for all delivered to the saints. But we understand that in the event of McMaster University's going too far, Mr. Schutt, with some others, will be heard from! Did anybody ever hear of a man's acting heroically in defense of the faith of Christ, while he warned himself by the enemy's fire?

There was a time when the Convention had no constitutional power to exclude any church, or to silence any pastor. There was a time when the pastors of the Convention of Ontario and Quebec were absolutely free. There was a time they had sufficient courage to refuse to vote confidence in McMaster University. There was a time when Baptists of Ontario and Quebec could exercise their souls toward God without serious danger of being penalized therefor.

But in those days of liberty, when men were free to express their souls, what did Rev. C. H. Schutt, M.A., Superintendent of Home Missions, ever say, anywhere, at any time, in defense of the faith, or in opposition to Modernism? So far as is recorded, Rev. C. H. Schutt has yet to utter his first word on these matters. But now that the guillotine is erected; now

that the Home Mission Board is entirely dominated by McMaster's supporters; now that the Foreign Mission Board is under the Chairmanship of the defender of every kind of liberalism, Dr. John MacNeill; now that the columns of *The Canadian Baptist* are absolutely closed to every orthodox writer, and to every critic of Modernism; now that it is as much as a man's denominational life is worth to utter one word of criticism of McMaster University, can there be found anyone so bold as to hope that Rev. C. H. Schutt will at last break the long silence, and come out in defense of the faith?

According to the last Year Book the following constitute three members of the Home Mission Board: Messrs. Albert Matthews, G. W. Holmes, James Ryrie, C. J. Bodley, Arthur Jones, W. J. Kerr, C. Cook, F. R. Watson, A. D. Kitchener; Revs. J. R. Webb, O. U. Chapman, H. McDiarmid, H. B. Coumans, J. H. Boyd, H. C. Bryant, P. C. Cameron, D. W. Terry, C. W. King, R. R. McKay, J. A. Huntley, F. H. Wentworth, R. E. Nicholls, W. R. Telford, S. J. Farmer, W. H. Langton, L. H. Coles, P. C. Reed, W. E. Hodgson, F. C. Elliott.

It is worth while examining the membership of the Home Mission Board. With the possible exception of Mr. Arthur Jones, Rev. R. E. Nicholls, Rev. W. R. Telford, Rev. F. C. Elliott, and Rev. H. C. Bryant, there is not a man on the Home Mission Board who is not as definitely and irrevocably committed to McMaster's policy as is McMaster University itself. What folly it is to hope for any improvement unless God should stretch forth His hand and miraculously intervene, and strip the mask from the denominational deceivers who have sold out the interests of the Baptist Convention in Ontario and Quebec to Modernism!

We would spur, or even sting, Brother Schutt, and those who believe with him but who share his silence, into action if we could. But if the Convention's course, during the past three years particularly the endorsement of George Cross the infidel, and the laudation of men who are worse than infidels, even blatant blasphemers, like Shailer Mathews and T. R. Glover—if these things have failed to provoke Mr. Schutt and others to speech and action, it seems to us hopeless to expect that even the personal presence of Antichrist himself would move them to break their silence.

It seems to us that there is nothing for Bible-believing Baptists to do in respect to the Convention of Ontario and Quebec but absolutely to treat it as an enemy of the faith, and to refuse to give it support in any of its endeavours. It seems to us impossible that an organization which has held fellowship with such blasphemers as were given prominence at the recent Baptist World Alliance could have any part or lot with any really spiritual movement.

We have written the foregoing with deep sorrow. We repeat: we have refrained from writing it, hoping against hope that Superintendent Schutt would show his colours, and prove himself at last a hero of the faith. But we confess to having absolutely abandoned all hope that he will ever take a more heroic course than that which has marked his career for the past twenty years.

Moral Standard Necessary

The Bible Its Only Source

PROF. M. H. DUNCAN, Lubbock, Texas.

(This is the second article in a profoundly important series we are publishing from the pen of Professor Duncan, copied from the Western Recorder of Louisville, Kentucky).

It does not take much thinking to see that the loss of a standard in the financial world would mean almost instant chaos. Without the gold dollar as a measure of value; the banks of the country could not run for a single day. All business would be brought to a standstill and the business world to confusion.

We can all see that in the world of communication a standard is necessary and that, if men and women were to lose their sense of the meaning of words, there would be instant chaos in the social world. We live with our fellows in a social order and exchange ideas with one another because we have a standard of communication.

The word "orange", for example, has somewhat a common meaning to all English speaking people and, when the word is used, all know about what is meant, and thus communication is made possible. But suppose the word had one meaning for me, another for you, and still another for our neighbour? It is easy to see that there could be no communication and that each would be confined to his own world with no way of letting his neighbours know his thoughts. This is what actually happened at Babel, and all know what the consequences were.

I.

The arabic numerals—1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 0—seem to us very innocent symbols. We use them every day without thinking of their value, but the world of commerce could not get along without them for a single day. If you don't see the value of these simple symbols in the world of business, try to multiply in Roman numerals XXIV by XXV and see how you come out. Or try to divide XCIX by XXXIII.

The yard stick is a standard of length in America and the original yard stick is carefully kept in the national capitol at Washington. Men see the importance of its being something definite and its guardians seek to keep it under conditions such that it will not vary because of climatic or other conditions. We would not have much regard for the good sense of the man who would refuse to use this standard of length, saying that he was going to make a standard of his own, nor would we regard very highly the ethics of him who would secretly seek to get hold of the standard and make it longer or shorter. We would not think very highly of the intelligence of him who would claim that each one has the right to make a yard stick of his own and that no one has the right to force his opinion in the matter on another.

We can all see the necessity of accurate standards in the material world and the absurdity of any one or group's refusing to use the standards that have been provided common to all. We can see that chaos would reign in the material sphere of our lives to the degree that the common standard was not accepted by all.

II.

It should be equally evident to every thinking man or woman that a standard is as necessary in the moral sphere of our lives as it is in the material world. As chaos would follow the loss of the standard of measure, or the standard of length, so chaos is following the loss of the standard of morals, which is the Word of God. It would seem that this should be as evident to all as the noonday sun.

It should be clear that, in the moral world, there can be no more room for individual opinion or individual standards than in the material world; and, when men begin to claim the right to establish their own standards and to use their own judgment as to whether this or that is right or wrong, there will be as many standards of right and wrong as there are men and women, and we know that this means the moral chaos which is becoming more and more evident everywhere around us.

The greatest need of the world to-day is an accurate measure of right and wrong. We cannot long survive with a varying standard where each one claims the right to build his own moral ideals. If, as Professor McDougal says, the nations before us have passed away because of moral decline, moral decline will also be the cause of our passing if we do not provide ourselves with an accurate standard of conduct.

Boys and girls and men and women of to-day claim the right to think as they please and to be the judges of their conduct. In fact, one of the cardinal principles of present-day life is the right of every one to think as he pleases and there is much being said about the intolerance of the one who holds that a standard is not a matter of personal opinion. Much more is being said about the sin of intolerance than about other sin. Our viewpoint in this matter is causing us to lose sight of other sins and to sink lower and lower in our moral ideals.

III.

What right has any one to criticise the girl or woman who goes to the ball room half-dressed or who walks down the street in the broad daylight in a bathing suit? Who has the right to say that young men and women shall not sit two deep in a coupe without regard to sexual contact? Who shall say that young men and women shall not caress each other on the street corners or go in swimming together with little to hide their nakedness? The one who says that such is not right is accused of using an improper standard, and sometimes of being an old fogey because he uses a standard at all.

Mothers and fathers are being shocked every day at the conduct of their children because with them there is left a dim sense of a passing standard, but they helplessly look on with the feeling that they should not criticise, that perhaps they are behind the times

and belong to another age. A few days ago we heard a young lady tell her mother that she belonged to the 1492 crowd. We saw another mother witness her young flapper daughter half-dressed get into a car already crowded with young people and sit down into the lap of a young man.

"Well," she said, "it doesn't seem right, but I suppose I am too old-fashioned."

Thousands of fathers and mothers who deep down in their hearts know better, are afraid of the criticism of those who will accuse them of being behind the times and are adjusting themselves to lower and lower standards. In fact, this is true of the great mass of Americans. They are more and more tolerant of every form of evil. The standard of morals is gradually losing its meaning for them and causing them to sink to lower levels.

IV.

But how are we going to make the Bible the measuring rod of morals? If we accept the Book as our guide with the popular attitude towards it, we shall, it seems, not be much better off than we now are, for no two people put the same interpretation on it, as the more than five hundred different religious bodies witness.

It is true that men cannot agree as to the meaning of the Bible and, if God has not given along with its words a means of interpreting those words so that we may know accurately their meaning, we have in the Book no definite standard of morals and have no efficient guide to conduct. It is only as the Bible is a supernatural Book with a supernatural interpreter to guide those who go to it for light that it is an adequate measuring rod of morals. It loses its value as a standard and becomes as impotent to measure conduct as other books if it is reduced to human levels.

However, we are not to approach the Bible as we do other books. We must approach it in a spirit of humility and with a feeling of our need of its guidance if we are to learn its message for us. Jesus said: "He that wills to do his will shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God or whether I speak of myself" (John 7:17).

This is the key to Bible truth, and the only key. He that wills to do shall know. It is not the man who wants to know for the sake of knowing, but the one who wants to know in order that he may do, to whom God has promised to make known the meaning of His Word.

No man can sit in his cloister and expect the meaning of the Bible to come to him. He must pay the price of putting it into practice, and its meaning will come to him only as he puts it into practice. This is true not only of learning the Bible. It is a universal law of learning.

He who would learn anything must pay the price of putting it into practice in his everyday life. He who would know more of the Bible can do so only as he lives its truths, and the deeper things of the Book come only to him who lives the deeper life. People with shallow lives cannot have a very profound knowledge of its message.

V.

This is what Jesus meant when He said:

"And when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he

will convict the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment to come." (John 16:8).

The Holy Spirit of God is the only one in all the universe who can give men and women an accurate knowledge of the meaning of the Bible and a clear sense of right and wrong. Men and women are losing their sense of right and wrong and denying a judgment to come because they have shut the Spirit of God out of their lives. This is what Paul meant when he said:

"But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned (or understood)." (1 Cor. 2:14).

It is the very heart of the Christian message that the Holy Spirit enlightens the believer's heart and causes him to know God's will. The more the believer submits his life to the guidance of the Spirit, the more accurately he will know the meaning of the Bible message. The early Christians were able to live in perfect harmony because they were completely under the Spirit's guidance. "And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and one soul" (Acts 4:32).

A full acceptance of the Christian message is the only means of uniting men's hearts and of giving them an accurate standard of morals, and wherever Christianity has been fully accepted, it has enlightened men's minds and hearts and caused them to lay aside all forms of immorality and live on the very highest plane of morals. The one whose heart is filled with the Spirit of God never engages in that which is questionable. It is the one who has forgotten God who can see no harm in this or that and disregards the customary Christian standards.

A VINDICATION OR A CONVICTION?

(From "The Spokesman," Portland, Oregon, August, 1928)

Dr. John MacNeill of Toronto, Canada, thinks he was "vindicated" when he was elected president of the Baptist World Alliance. To the modest and humble believer comes the conclusion that if Dr. John MacNeill was "vindicated" then the Alliance was "convicted."

Dr. John MacNeill has followed Dr. Shailer Mathews and the Chicago University out of the Baptist fold. He finds sweet fellowship and alliance with Dr. T. R. Glover, who in his book, *The Pilgrim*, dares to say that our Lord Himself was "un-Christian." And now Dr. MacNeill has led McMaster University out to a non-sectarian position. Yes, we will have to conclude that the Baptist World Alliance no longer represents the Baptists. It is always thus. When we vindicate a man we are convicted by Christ.

Good-bye McMaster

In transferring McMaster University to Hamilton, Ontario, only the theological department will remain Baptist. Now we know what all the controversy about McMaster University in Canada was about. Satan and his world wanted to take this famous endowed stronghold of the Faith from the Baptists. Well, he did!

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

Why Men Would Rather Pay Their Way To Heaven Than Receive Salvation Free

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

Preached in Jarvis-Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, August 26th, 1928.

(Stenographically Reported.)

"If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain."—Galatians 2:21.

The preacher's one duty is to make plain the way of life, to tell men how to be saved; to tell men what salvation is, in all the length and breadth and height and depth and fulness of it, so far as God has revealed it. The preacher is not primarily a teacher, though that is involved in his preaching; his first duty is to proclaim the gospel of the grace of God. Every preacher ought to be a specialist, he ought to know one thing—he must know one thing, indeed, if his ministry is to be effective. If I were engaging a cook I should not examine him as to his knowledge of Shakespeare, I should not be particular about the grammatical construction of his sentences: the one thing I should demand of him would be that he know how to cook. That being his business, I could forgive him many things if only he could do that one thing well. When a man mounts the engine of a train on which I am to travel, I do not care about his colour, I shall not be particular about his social connections, nor care whether he is a Scotsman, an Englishman, or an Irishman: I want to know whether he understands the machine he is to control, whether he knows how to drive the engine. If he knows that, he may be excused for not being able to discuss many subjects foreign to his trade.

I remember a doctor's saying to my father once, "Ministers and doctors have many things in common. Many doctors owe their success—if they have any—to the attractiveness of their personality. Their patients say, 'I like Dr. So-and-So, he is such a fine man in the home.'" In many cases they will not trouble much about his skill unless the illness be a critical one. But the one thing I desire to know of a doctor is, Is he skilled as a physician? I have heard that a certain bishop, on recovering from an illness, was asked, "I understand you were troubled with— (naming a certain disease)?" "So the doctor says," the Bishop replied. "I hope he is right, because it would be too bad if I were to get well of the wrong disease!" There are people who get well of the wrong disease! They get well of another disease than that from which they supposed they were suffering. The physician's all-important qualification—if he will let me so speak of his work—is that he should know his trade.

So is it with the preacher. He is not sent to air his knowledge, but to tell men how to get to heaven, how to be saved. It is all to the good if he has learning. He may be able to interest more people if he has some measure of power with men; but the main thing is not even how he delivers his message, but that his message should be true, that it be the Word of God, so that men may know how to be saved. Of course the preacher ought to know how to tell it. I have heard of some men who are very

learned—so they say—but they are like the sealers of fruit the ladies put up: they are so tightly sealed that nobody can open them! The contents are presumably all good, but no one can get at it. It is the preacher's business so to speak that men may hear and understand.

There used to be a man in Cleveland, I suppose he is still there—he is far enough away for me to speak of him—a train announcer who has an excellent voice. Sometimes that is a great snare to a man. In any case, this man had a good voice, and the station gave him opportunity to show it off; he could make it ring like a bell. He was there to announce the trains—but strangers had not the remotest idea what he said. He would shout at the top of his voice, and occasionally one could catch the name of a city whose name was familiar, like New York or Chicago—but it did not sound like New York or Chicago. The man exercised his voice, but few people learned from his announcements how to get to their destinations. I had to go to the man and say, "I want to go to such a place. I have heard you announcing the trains, but do not know whether mine was announced or not. Will you please tell me from what track my train will leave?"

Preaching of that sort is not very profitable; and the longer I live the more disposed I am to simplify my message and make it so plain that the boys and girls can understand it. I shall try to do that to-night. I sent some sermons to my father when I was about twenty in my first pastorate. I was proud of them. I thought they were very good! I asked for his criticism, and I got them back marked all over on every page. My father drew a line under word after word, and in the margin wrote, "Why not so-and-so?" I found he had substituted the shortest and simplest words, almost invariably words of one syllable, for the long words which I had found in the dictionary—of which I knew the meaning, but which were as an unknown tongue to many of my hearers. I learned my lesson, that the preacher's language should be so simple that no one can fail to understand him. I want to-night to tell you how to get to heaven, how to be saved. If you are not interested in that, I fear I shall not be able to entertain you.

My text says that if righteousness could have come by the law, then the death of Christ would have been in vain. By implication it tells us that the death of Christ was absolutely essential to the salvation of the soul, that if there had been any other way God would have found it for us.

I.

To begin, then, in order to be saved, WE MUST MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DIVINE RIGHTEOUSNESS. Righteousness is an element in salvation. We must be

righteous or we cannot be saved. So let me remind you that *salvation, fundamentally, consists in a right relationship to God*. I know there is an element of human relationship in it, for the law has to do with a man's duty to his neighbour as well as to his duty to God; but the first and great commandment is that we should love God. Our supreme necessity therefore is, that we should each be brought into right relationship to God.

In much modern preaching little or nothing is said about the soul's relation to God. Christianity is reduced to mere humanitarianism. If a man pays his debts, is a good husband and father, faithful in his duty as an employer or employee, if he is a good citizen, if his character is outwardly respectable, then why should he not join the church? But nothing is said about the upward look, about the relationship of the human soul to God. Yet the teaching of Scripture is that the soul's relationship to God is of primary importance. If we need to be saved, it is because, first of all, we are lost; and our lost condition depends, primarily, not upon our relationship to our neighbour, but upon our relationship to God. Our neighbour may be our creditor, but He is the chief Creditor to Whom we owe most of all, and Whose requirements must therefore be met.

Therefore I bring you that very simple statement which a few years ago would have been commonplace, but is now almost new, that it does matter whether you and I are properly related to God. I remind you that God is, and "that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him"; that it is imperative that we consider whether we are according God His proper place in our lives, whether we worship God—whether, indeed, we have come into harmony with His law, and whether the righteousness of His holy law is fulfilled in us.

I do not ask, for my present purpose, what your relationship to your fellows may be, however excellent it is, however exemplary your character, or stainless your record, or unblemished your reputation among men: the main thing, the first thing, is, How do you stand with God? Is there before you an open path to Heaven? Is the fear of God before your eyes? Is there any response in your heart to God? Is there any communion with God? Do you know Him at all, or is He a stranger? Is the Spirit of God the atmosphere you breathe? Have you any commerce with the Skies? Or are you separated from Him, without any conscious fellowship with Him, without any recognition of His claims upon you? I say, salvation consists primarily in a right relationship to God.

So we must consider that. It means, logically, inevitably, that we must somehow meet the divine requirements. If that is the first requirement, it is a matter of relatively little importance what men may think of us, or what our own opinions may be. Human philosophies have no weight here at all. If salvation involves a proper relationship to God, then His standards and His requirements must be met, whatever they may be.

I met a friend in Old London once. He was a Torontonian who had plenty of money. And he was highly indignant when I saw him. He said, "I went to a certain hotel and paid the price of being a guest there. I knew it was a very expensive place to stay, but I was prepared to pay the price. When I went down to dinner, and was about to pass into the dining-room, the head waiter stood across the door and said, "Excuse me, sir, but you cannot come in here." "But why not?—I am a guest of this hotel. I pay my bills." "But you are not properly dressed,

sir." "Not properly dressed! I am respectably dressed, am I not?" "Yes, sir, but it is a rule of the house that nobody is admitted to the dining-room without evening dress." "But we do not set up such absurd requirements in my country. One goes into a first-class hotel, and if he can pay his way, and is respectably dressed, he is welcome." The head waiter smiled and said, "I am sorry, but that is the rule of this house." "But I want to go into the dining room." "I have my instructions, sir, and I cannot allow you to enter." "And do you mean to say that no matter how much money I have in my pocket, I shall not be allowed to go into the dining-room, simply because I have not a dress suit on?" He was highly indignant, and went and packed up his bag and left the hotel. Perhaps you sympathize with him, but it was the rule of the house, and all his money could not buy his way in.

If you were summoned to court, you would probably enquire how you ought to dress. "But," you say, "surely that is an unimportant matter." No, it is not—ask your wife! It is not unimportant; it has its place. I have had invitations myself—when away from home, and have been important!—telling me exactly how to dress. One can please himself whether he accepts, but if he does, he must comply with the conditions.

Now *the Lord has the right to lay down the terms of entrance into His presence*, and whether you like it or not, you will have to abide by His clearly specified terms. It is of no use to plead the customs of your country, it is of no use for us to set up earthly standards by which to judge the things of heaven: when we come there, we come into the presence of God; and if we are to come to Him it must be on His terms; otherwise we shall not be permitted to come at all. He is the Lord of the house, and no church council can change the terms.

You say, "I will not go to hear that man preach again. I would not belong to a church like that." We are sorry if you have so little sense as to be angry with a man who tells you the truth, but the question is not whether you belong to this or some other church; the question is, what does God require? You will have to find out. And when you find out, you will have to meet that requirement or you will not be allowed to come where He is.

How shall we know? How shall we know what the terms of admission to His presence are? *I do not know how we can know unless God tells us*. "My minister says so-and-so"—I do not care what your minister says. Nor do I want you to pay any attention to what I say unless it is supported by a, "Thus saith the Lord." In these matters the opinion of a minister is of little consequence. But you say, "What do we send our young men to theological colleges for?" Well, really, sometimes I do not know! We have a theological college of our own so I must not say too much! But all such training is vain unless it be supported by the Word of God. Someone says, "What if we have no word from God? What if the Bible be not true?" Then we may as well dismiss this service. If the Bible is not true, then I have no message for you. Neither has any other minister. Every church is a temple of hypocrisy if it has no Bible. What right has a preacher to gather a congregation and talk about another world if he has no Bible? If this Bible be not true, the preacher knows nothing about any other life than this. We are shut up to a divine revelation in the matter of the soul's salvation. We must hear from

God, or we know nothing. Therefore we must abide by the teaching of the Book.

In a sentence, *what are the divine requirements?* What do you mean by the "righteousness of the law," for example? How good must a man be in order to be saved? Saul of Tarsus said that touching the righteousness of the law, he had been blameless. In his outward life he had kept the law perfectly; there was no flaw whatever in his record. The Pharisees, generally, lived outwardly righteous lives. I think sometimes they are misunderstood and misrepresented. Not all Pharisees were hypocrites. Many of them were profoundly sincere, as was Saul of Tarsus. He believed the law, and he kept the law. He did all he possibly could to make himself right with God, and he thought for a while that he had succeeded. He said, "I owe nothing. So far as that standard is concerned, I am blameless." I question whether there is a man or woman here who can say that, but Saul of Tarsus could. It was perfectly true so far as his outward life was concerned. Our Lord recognized the external righteousness of Pharisaical living and said, "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." The righteousness of the Pharisees was inadequate; the righteousness which must obtain favor with God is a righteousness that exceeds that of the Scribes and Pharisees.

To what extent must it exceed it? Is there any standard by which we may measure a man as to what God requires of him? Yes, there is one. As our Lord emerged from the waters of baptism a Voice from heaven said, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." There is a pattern Man, there is One Man Who succeeded in pleasing God. I shall not argue with the man who says he is just as good as a church member. I hope you are—and I hope you are better than most of us. But that is not the question at issue. The principle upon which I would insist, with the authority of God's Word for my foundation, is that *you and I must somehow or another equal the absolute righteousness of Jesus Christ*. Nothing less than that standard will ever pass muster with Heaven. You may be better than the best man that ever lived, but you must be as good as Jesus Christ in order to be saved. He is the Standard. He is Incarnate Righteousness. In Him every requirement of God's holy law was fulfilled, in His relationship to God and in His relationship to His neighbour, in its letter and in its spirit. In all the length and breadth and depth and height of its meaning, Jesus Christ kept the law and fulfilled it to the uttermost. God said, "He is My Son. I am well pleased with Him."

Can you measure up to that? You say, "Of course I cannot." Did you ever know a man who did attain to it? Did you ever know a man who could even approximate the perfection of Jesus Christ? You say, "No." Then you never saw a man in your life who, in his own right, on the ground of his own merit, ever did have or ever could have any standing with God.

II.

That being so, I take my next point to say that notwithstanding the exactions of the law, its inexorable qualities, its high standards, yet **MEN WILL PERSIST IN TRYING TO WORK OUT A RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THEIR OWN**. That is really an extraordinary thing, but it is a fact, that men in respect to their relationship to God insist upon trying to pay their own way; and any kind of

religion that will offer a man a chance of getting right with God by his own efforts is sure to be a popular religion.

I call your attention to this fact that *outside of the realm of religion, in all other matters, it is common for men to want to get something for nothing*. Men have no special objection to the principle of grace. They are always after something for nothing. There is some woman here to-night who will be boasting to her husband during the week that she found a great bargain downtown; she saved two cents—and paid two car fares to do it! Every store-keeper knows that human tendency, and that is why he marks things up to ninety-nine cents, or a dollar ninety-nine, just a little short of two dollars! Every merchant knows that people want something for nothing—and I fear that that human tendency is a terrible temptation for some of them; I fear their advertisements do not always tell the truth. They mark things down to so much—but they do not tell you that they first marked them up! That is true of a housewife whose income is limited. She wants to make her income go as far as she can by getting bargains. But she is not a bit worse than her husband, because most business men do the same thing. If he can get a thing a little bit below the usual price, he is as proud of that five cents as though somebody had given him a dollar or more.

Why is it, I wonder, that in religion, when salvation is offered without money and without price, as the free gift of God's boundless grace—why is it that men should be unwilling to accept a bargain? Can you tell me? You know that is true, do you not? You know that is the stumbling stone with a great many people. They cannot understand, and will not believe, that salvation can be had without money and without price, that it is the free gift of God's sovereign grace. And yet in all other matters they will look for that very thing.

I wonder *if we can analyze that, and discover why men want to pay their way with God?* What is there about this religion of grace that is so obnoxious, so objectionable, to the human mind?

One thing is that *grace humbles pride*. Grace treats us as bankrupts. Grace says that with all our learning—if we have any; with all our self-righteousness—if we think we possess any; with all our wealth—if we have any; and with all our standing among men, it amounts to nothing: at all with God.

You cannot offend a man more than by admitting that you never heard of him. When he comes to introduce himself to you, he does not like to be so insignificant as to have passed through life without your knowing anything about it. If he is a sensible man, and has lived at a distance, he will make allowance for that. We are all of us proud. Yes, you are. Do not tell me you are not. You are all proud. "No", someone says, "it is not pride; it is self-respect"! Yes! Disguise it as you may, the fact is, you are proud. Human nature is proud. It always has been. Whatever it has to be proud of, nobody knows! And what you have to be proud of, nobody knows! If we could see ourselves as we really are, we should discover that we have much to be ashamed of and nothing of which to be proud. Divine revelation tells us the truth. God says to us, "You have nothing that I want. You have nothing of value to Me at all. I love you in spite of your unworthiness, and I will save you by grace alone; but your currency is debased, your righteous-

ness is as filthy rags." That is one reason men do not like the gospel of grace, because it humbles human pride.

Another reason is that *it exposes human sin*, it really does. When you come to the revelation of God in Christ, you see that sin, your sin, my sin, everybody's sin, little sins, big sins, every kind of sin, was so obnoxious in the sight of God that He had to pass judgment of death upon it. It puts you and me in the criminal class, my friends. "What, I a criminal! A respectable man like I am!" Yes, you are under the law, and under the condemnation of the law. In the judgment of the law of God you are not fit to live, and the only thing to do with your sin is to send it to hell. You say, "You do not believe in that in our day, do you?" It is in the Book, and I know nothing respecting these matters outside the Book. Professor Glover may be very wise about the future; but I do not know anything about it apart from God's Word. I know that is in the Book, and that is God's judgment upon your sin and my sin, that a holy God so hates it that He has prepared a place called hell. I do not know what hell is—I do not want to know, and I hope none of you may ever know—but it is both a place, and a state; and grace consigns our sin to that, and tells us the only possible way of escape from it is through the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ Who endured in His own Person the equivalent of our punishment.

That is one reason people do not like the gospel of grace: it exposes their sins, it exposes their utter impotence. Grace says, "There is nothing you have that is of any value to God. There is absolutely nothing you can do that can obtain merit before God. You are so utterly, hopelessly, everlastingly, bankrupt of everything which God esteems, that you cannot pay an infinitesimal fraction of a cent on the dollar. There is nothing you have that is of use." That is not complimentary, is it? My friend Professor Marshall—if I may call him such, I am his friend anyway—does not believe that, but that is in the Book; that, in part, is why grace is so obnoxious to the carnal mind.

But there is another thing I must not forget, and that is that *grace in the nature of the case, belongs to a realm to which we are strangers, and therefore we cannot understand it*. I suppose one of the richest men in the world is Henry Ford, but it would not be difficult for Henry Ford to give every penny away—and then he would not make many men rich. A tramp came to the Iron Duke, the Duke of Wellington, one day and asked him for help. The Duke enquired on what ground he expected help from him. "Because", said the beggar, "I am your brother, sir." "Ah", said the Duke, putting his hand in his pocket and giving the beggar a penny, "go and get all your other brothers to give you as much as I have given you, and you will be a richer man than I."

I suppose when people go to the bargain counters they like to deceive themselves, but if they have any sense they will know that no merchant in the world can give things away. When the prodigal was in the far country he became accustomed to the ways of the far country. He went there a rich man, and spent all he had. "When he had spent all"—talk about inspiration, you get it in that parable! Every human life is written there. Independence! When he had wasted all, when he had spent all, when he had not a penny left, what happened? "No man gave unto him." Did you hear it? It was the rule of the far country that nobody gave anything. They lived to buy and sell and get gain. The prodigal lived so

long in the far country that he had forgotten the idiom of the language of his father's house. He did not know the language of grace, and could not understand it. When he came to his father he said, "Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee. And am no more worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants. Give me a job, and let me earn my way. I should like to pay for what I receive. Put me out there with the servants." But scarcely had he got the words out than grace overwhelmed him, and the father said, "Bring forth the best robe, and put it on him." That is grace!

Do you know why you and I cannot understand grace? Because if you had all the wealth of Ford, and Rockefeller, and the Vanderbilts, and the Rothschilds, and all the other rich folks—and all the poor folks beside—if you had it all, while it would take you a long time to count it, it would be possible to exhaust it. Mark this well: *grace argues infinity always*; grace is a divine quality; it never can be exhausted. *Only God can give, and keep on giving, and still be as rich in the end as at the beginning*. So you see it is not until the Spirit of God teaches us that any of us can understand that great principle of grace.

III.

Now then, my text says that *THE DEATH OF CHRIST IS REALLY THE DEATH OF ALL SELF-RIGHTEOUSNESS AND SELF-SUFFICIENCY*. "If righteousness come by the law, Christ is dead in vain." If you could save yourself, it was not necessary for Christ to die; if there be any possibility anywhere, under any conditions, under any circumstances; for a human sinner so to relate himself to the law of God as to pay up his back debts, and meet its present requirements, and guarantee his good behaviour for the future—if any man can do that of his himself, then it was not necessary for Christ to die. Of course the implication of it is that nobody can do it, and therefore, blessed be God, Jesus Christ died.

My friend, when you reject the free gift of God's grace, and substitute your own righteousness, you are really repudiating the death of Christ, you are declaring that the cross of Christ is not the wisdom of God, nor the power of God; you are declaring that you are going to find a way to God yourself, and therefore it was not necessary for Christ to die. Oh, the wisdom of the Cross! Who of us does not know the truth I have been discussing, that there is no possibility of salvation by human effort? It is all from above, and Christ did not die in vain.

Then if He did not die in vain, *His death was an adequate payment of your obligation*. If He did not die in vain, then He died to some purpose; and He died for the very purpose He came to die for: "The Lord hath made to meet upon him the iniquity of us all." Are you not glad He died? Are you not glad it is true that "he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed"? Shall we cease from our own efforts then, acknowledge our bankruptcy, and say again to-night, "Nothing"—not little, but—

"Nothing in my hand I bring;
Simply to Thy cross I cling;
Naked, come to Thee for dress;
Helpless, look to Thee for grace;
Foul, I to the fountain fly;
Wash me, Saviour, or I die."

I wanted to leave you without excuse for the judgment day, I wanted once again to make the way of life so simple that I could stand before God at last and say, "I told them that salvation was Thy free gift."

A little girl whom I baptized a while ago came to see me. I said, "How were you saved?" She told me that she went to a meeting where a man was talking to a group of boys and girls, telling them what to do to be saved. He put his hand in his pocket and took out a twenty-five cent piece and said, "I will give any boy or girl this quarter who will come up and take it." They looked at each other for a while, not knowing what to do. At last a little fellow went up; and the man put the quarter into his hand; then said to the rest of them, "Anyone of you could have had it if you would have come up for it. Now just as that boy believed what I said, and came up and took the quarter from me, so you can have salvation from God." This little girl said, "And I took it." ("Praise the Lord!")

That is salvation. God does it. It is the free gift of His sovereign grace. How many of you will receive it to-night? I want you all to hear Mr. Savage in the open air service, but we will take time for our invitation, so that you may have an opportunity to acknowledge Christ.

(Several responded to the invitation and came forward confessing Christ.)

BAPTIST BIBLE UNION LESSON LEAF

Vol. III. Rev. Alex. Thompson, Editor. No. 11.

Lesson 39. Third Quarter, Sept. 23rd, 1928.

MADE ONE IN CHRIST.

Lesson Text: Ephesians, chapter 2.

Golden Text: "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." (Eph. 2:19-20).

1. The Apostle reminds the Ephesians of the wonderful change wrought in them by God; he institutes a contrast between their past and their present, and in doing so portrays the condition of the sinner and the saint. 2. In the past they were dead in trespasses and in sins, (v. 1), entirely separated from the spiritual life and without experience of its blessedness. They lived in an entirely different sphere, walking according to the course of this world, (v. 2), whose ways are contrary to God's ways, and according to the "prince of the power of the air" who is none other than Satan. This being is also termed the "ruler of this world", (John xiv:30), the god of this age, (2 Cor. iv:4), and the one in whose power the whole world now lieth, (1 John v:19, R.V.). Surely such information ought to stir our hearts to pray more for the unsaved, and to warn them to flee to the Lord for safety, especially when in such a condition they abide under the wrath of God. 3. In such a plight sinners need help. They are not able to give themselves life, or to escape from Satan's power by their own strength, so the apostle informs them God did something: He made life possible through Christ, causing those Ephesians, and also all other saints, to live with Christ, and this purely through His grace and because of His great love, (vs. 4, 5), referring to the new birth which has become a reality through the death of Christ. He therefore gives to the dead person that which is most essential to him, even life. 4. This is only the beginning of blessing, however, for thereafter the child of God is identified with His Lord in all things, He is raised with Him and made to sit together in heavenly places with Him, (v. 6). He has become part of the body of which Christ is the Head, (1:23), and as the head and body cannot be separated he is where the Head is. The children of God are therefore a heavenly people, drawing their sustenance from above. 5. The design of such exaltation is that in the ages to come God might manifest the exceeding riches of grace, (v. 7). We have but a faint

conception now of His goodness to us in Christ Jesus, but in that glorious time yet future, the wonders of His grace will be revealed, and we shall better understand His loving attitude towards us, and we shall know more fully the meaning of grace. For by grace are we saved through faith and not of works, (vs. 8, 9). Salvation is all of God. Man can neither work for it nor buy it; he must receive it as a gift from a gracious Saviour who knowing his sinfulness yet deigns to richly bless him. 6. The saints then are God's own handiwork, "created in Christ Jesus unto good works which God has prepared that they should walk therein", (v. 10). They are saved to live for and to serve God.

II. ONE IN CHRIST, (vs. 11-18).

1. The apostle in this section institutes another contrast between past and present. In the past those saints who were Gentiles in the flesh called uncircumcision by the Jews (v. 11), were at that time without Christ, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, due to their position outside of Israel, and were without God and without hope in the world. (v. 12). To be hopeless and without God describes a condition which could not be worse; the future all dark, with no expectancy for eternity, no comfort from God's presence and no knowledge of His will, just a groping in the dark. This was the condition of those Ephesians before conversion. They were worshippers of gods, being idolaters, but they did not know the true God. 2. A change, however, has taken place in their condition. In the past they had been far off, now they had been made nigh by the blood of Christ, (v. 13). What they could not do for themselves God did for them through the atoning work of Christ. Note again the prominence of the blood of Christ, and the importance of the work of Calvary. 3. Christ is our peace, (v. 14). He has wrought the work of reconciliation, breaking down the wall of separation between Jew and Gentile, a reference possibly to the wall separating the court of the Gentiles from the other parts of the temple, symbolical of the barrier between these two divisions of the human race. The enmity between them has also been taken away, (v. 15), in the setting aside of the law contained in ordinances. The law was the dividing line, but now that has served its purpose, and has been taken away; the type being fulfilled in the antitype, Christ. The result has been a union of Jew and Gentile (v. 15). They have both been reconciled unto God by the death of Christ, and their mutual enmity has been slain thereby, (v. 16). Christ came and preached peace to the Gentiles which were afar off, and to the Jews who were nigh. (v. 17), and through Him both have access by one Spirit unto the Father, (v. 18). Jewish and Gentile believers are therefore one in Christ, and have direct access into God's presence, and require no human mediator.

III. FELLOW CITIZENS IN CHRIST, (vs. 19-22).

1. Having such oneness in Christ these Gentile saints were admitted into all the privileges of the children of God. They were no longer strangers and foreigners but fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God, (v. 19). They were now inside the family instead of outside and all that the Father had was theirs. Christians have a heavenly citizenship, their names are written in the Lamb's book of life, and they are meant to live a heavenly life. They are built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone, (v. 20). The apostles and prophets were sent of God and inspired of the Spirit to give the formative teaching concerning the work of God, and so to lay the foundation, but they themselves built upon the foundation of Christ, (1 Cor. III:2). He was the chief corner stone upon Whom the whole building rested, and in Whom the apostle adds the "whole building fitly framed together groweth into an holy temple in the Lord", (v. 21). There is continuous building proceeding, Christians are being built into the structure, (v. 22), and the final result will be a sanctuary for God in which He through the Spirit will dwell. To both Jews and Gentiles a religious sanctuary was familiar. There was the temple at Jerusalem in which the Jews worshipped and the Gentiles of Ephesus had the temple of Diana, but Paul reminds them of another temple, not of stone, but of human beings, living stones, (1 Peter II:5), which is being erected by God for His own dwelling place. May we not hinder Him in His great work but gladly may we take our place in this great spiritual structure and be content to fill the niche wherein He has placed us, to the glory of His name.

Goals for the Altar Fire

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

Sunday, September 2nd.

The call to be alone with God.—

Psalm xlii:1-11

What we need above all things in these crowded days is the setting apart of many *listening* times; times of quiet in which we can hear the heavenly voices that call to us unregarded in the busy day. The great clock-bell of St. Paul's is not heard even a few streets off in the roar of traffic all day long; but it can be heard over half the metropolis in the silence of the night. One reason why God so often spoke to His servants in the night was that all was quiet then. That, too, was one reason why so many of them were sent away into desert solitudes that they might hear what He had to say. It may be one reason why sickness and sorrow are sent so frequently into our careless lives. God has something to say to us which, in the whirl of our earthly ambitions, we cannot hear: and He makes the noises of the outer world to cease that He may speak to the soul. Sometimes He "*tries us in the night,*" sometimes He "*giveth songs in the night,*" sometimes He "*instructs us in the night,*" sometimes He gives us "*a vision in the night*"; but all of these we shall utterly miss if there is no quiet time in which He can come very near to us, and we can come very near to Him.

Monday, September 3rd.

The need of being alone with God.—

Matthew vi:1-15

"The doors being shut." There is more in this simple phrase than meets the eye. It tells how the Risen One suddenly stood in the midst of His disciples in the fast-closed upper room on the evening of the Resurrection day, and, in so far, it is the record of a miracle. But it also contains a fine suggestion of a great spiritual truth; and it is noteworthy that it is to John, the most spiritual of the Evangelists, that we are indebted for our knowledge of the fact. They were not merely a secluded but a trembling company. Do what they could, try to believe as they might, they could not rise into the joy of the resurrection. But the Risen One Himself came noiselessly and mysteriously into their midst with His words of peace. The same divine Lord who had come out of the grave in spite of the sealed stone, came into the upper room in spite of the closed doors, for no earthly barriers could hinder the perfect freedom of His glorified resurrection life; and His greeting to them brought a gladness with it they had never known before. But do not *all* His best visits to the soul take place only when, in a true, deep sense, the doors are shut? We need shut doors for our holiest intercourse with Him. He needs shut doors for His most comforting messages to us.

Tuesday, September 4th.

The vision when alone with God.—

Luke ix:28-36

From the mountain-top of secret prayer we get a "God's-eye view" of everything; and it is marvellous how that makes many great things look small, and small things great; how all mere worldly ambitions look surprisingly poor, and heavenly ambitions the only ones worth having. There is a wonderful reversal of estimates there; but to gain it is worth the climb; for, descending the hill, we can carry away with us the vision of the mountain-top to sanctify all our feelings when busy with things below. It is only by going

daily in this way above the world, and looking down upon it, that we can become really superior to its false attractions, and meet them with nobler ambitions stirring in the breast, and the light of heaven shining on the face. We must go upward as well as onward in our acquaintance with God, and linger long amid the glories of the mountain vision, if we are to come forth radiant from the secret place, and be shining witnesses to a shining Lord.

Wednesday, September 5th.

Lowliness through being alone with God. I Timothy 1:1-15

The saintliest are always the humblest. Growth in holiness can be measured by the acuteness of the consciousness of remaining sinfulness. The more our prayers for enlightenment are answered, the more our deep sinfulness comes into view. Was not this exemplified in the experience of that saintly man, the Apostle Paul? In the year 59, writing to the Corinthians, he calls himself, "the least of the Apostles." Five years later, in the year 64, writing to the Ephesians, he calls himself "less than the least of all saints;" and in the year 65, when just finishing his course and ready to enter into his Master's joy he writes to Timothy and calls himself "the chief of sinners." His sins seem to grow behind him as the love and glory of Christ grow before him. Christ's grace seems larger for his enlarging view of his sins, and his sins seem greater for his increasing sense of the love that has washed these sins away. The road of self-humbling is the only road that leads to peace and honour at last. "Stoop! stoop!" said Samuel Rutherford writing to a most pious and godly friend—"stoop! stoop! it is a low, low door by which we enter the kingdom of God."

Thursday, September 6th.

Heart-healing when alone with God.— Genesis xxxii:24-32

Why has God such delight in the broken heart? First, because He gets His right place within it, the only place He will ever consent to fill. Secondly, because Christ is adequately valued only by the broken heart. What a glory weeping eyes can see in Jesus of Nazareth and Calvary! The poor broken-hearted thief upon the Cross saw more in Him than all the self-satisfied scribes and Pharisees could do. "He came," says Pascal, "to heal the sick and let the healthy die." Thirdly, because the Word of Life is so precious to the broken heart. "I have learned more within these curtains than from all the books I ever read," said Richard Cecil on his bed of suffering: and why? Just because he read the Bible there, not as a critic, nor a controversialist, nor even as a minister for the sake of others, but simply as a sinner, a broken-hearted man. And fourthly, because as the Hearer of prayer "the Lord is nigh to them that are of a broken heart." There are no prayers like the prayers of the broken heart. No "princes" have such "power with God" as broken-hearted men. Jacob, in one night of broken-hearted wrestling with God, gained more than he had gained by the feebler prayers of half a century.

Friday, September 7th.

Peace of conscience when alone with God.—

Zechariah xii:4-14

Zechariah xiii:1

The only answer to a guilty conscience is, "Christ has died"; and the simplicity of the Gospel message is its point-

ing to that one glorious fact, and telling us that if we want peace with God we must think not of some righteousness of our own but of the already perfect righteousness of God's dear Son which may be ours for the taking, if only we stretch out for it an empty hand. John Bunyan tells how, walking alone in the fields, crushed by the misery of an accusing conscience, he seemed to hear a voice above him that said, "The Lord our Righteousness"—and how, immediately, the thought flashed into his troubled soul, "It is righteousness God wants in me to take me into heaven; well, if Christ is my righteousness, then my righteousness has been in heaven, and God has been looking at it for sixteen hundred years"; and so Bunyan came out of the darkness into the light of a perfect peace. It is only so that peace can come to any man: for what God gives us through His Son is not *salvability* merely, but *actual salvation*; not just the hope of acquittal hereafter, but full acquittal here and now, *immediate* peace through "the one sacrifice for sins for ever" offered on the Cross.

Saturday, September 8th.

The soul takes wing when alone with God. Isaiah xl:18-31

Christian men of an earnestly spiritual type are sometimes accused of too much "other-worldliness"; of living too much among unseen and eternal things, despising things seen and temporal. The truer charge against most Christians would be that they have too much of "present worldliness," that they do not think half enough of the eternal that so far transcends the temporal. One of the ancient philosophers divided men into "earthly" and "winged" souls. Alas! the "earthly" souls are many, and the "winged" souls few. Accused of soaring! God pity us that we so seldom soar at all, and never high enough. Even Paul could not *always* soar. Even he could not always feel his sufferings to be "light, and only for a moment." He could do that only "while he looked to the things unseen and eternal." God's all-suffering peace can come into us in no other way.

Readings by Rev. G. H. Knight.

Next Sunday in Jarvis Street

Next Sunday there will be the usual services, but we expect that on account of the Exhibition, large numbers of visitors will be with us. Many Sunday School workers will come, interested in our Bible School. We send this message to every member of Jarvis Street Church with a very urgent request that every member endeavour to be present at all the services on Sunday. We appeal to the adults who are not teaching in the Sunday School, to be present in the Pastor's Class Sunday morning. Let us show our visitors what a real Sunday morning Bible class is like.

Again: we ask all members of the church who belong to other departments, not only to be present themselves, but endeavour to have the full complement of every class at School. This can be done by a little extra visitation. And we shall be glad if parents and others will make every effort to assist in securing a record attendance in all departments of the School on Sunday. In addition, we suggest that everyone try to get all the scholars to remain to service. Above all things, let there be earnest prayer that the presence and power of the Holy Spirit may be mightily manifested both in the Bible School and at all services.

And further: let every member of the church come on Sunday prepared to participate in the services. When the

invitation is given, the climax of the service is reached; and sometimes members of the church, thoughtlessly, almost ruin the service by leaving before the invitation is completed, and sometimes take some unconverted people with them. Find out whether the person beside you, if he is a stranger, is a Christian, and when the invitation is given, give him or her an invitation to come to Christ. Some of our personal workers remain in their seats until the last verse of the hymn is being sung. The proper time to move is at the beginning of the hymn, not at the end. Furthermore, do not ask someone else to do what you ought to do yourself. If the Lord gives you an interest in a particular person, speak to that person yourself. It is probable that He intended you should do so, and that He will bless the invitation which you give. Let this apply to both morning and evening services.

We are planning that Sunday shall be a day of great spiritual uplift to everyone, and an occasion when many shall be saved. We appeal to every member of the church to do his or her utmost toward this end. Subjects for Sunday will be announced in the daily papers. When you see them, call up all the friends you know, call their attention to the subjects, and invite them to come to the services.

Once more: the Pastor will preach out-of-doors at the close of the evening service. Four services make a heavy day's programme for the preacher in Jarvis Street, and it is scarcely possible that any member of the church can be more tired than the preacher. We are certain that thousands of people hear the gospel every Sunday as it is preached from the open-air pulpit. Let us issue this special appeal to the members of the church, that on Sunday when the evening service is over, instead of sitting down and visiting with each other, come out to the open-air service and take your place, and do what personal work you can; and especially pray earnestly while the gospel is being preached that souls may be saved.

Remember the Saturday evening prayer meeting. If you have Exhibition visitors, bring them along with you. Some of them perhaps were never in such a prayer meeting as we shall have in Jarvis Street next Saturday evening. Give them a taste of it, and perhaps it will send them back to start such a prayer meeting of their own in the place from which they come.

We would remind our members also of the other prayer meetings, Tuesday and Thursday. Let us come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty.

Because of the out-of-door service we shall have to postpone the evening Communion Service to September 16th.

DES MOINES UNIVERSITY

Urgently Needs

YOUR CONSTANT PRAYERS

YOUR GENEROUS GIFTS

YOUR SONS AND DAUGHTERS

Address the Secretary-Treasurer,

Des Moines University,

Des Moines, Iowa.

A MISSIONARY ON GLOVERISM

A missionary from India has sent us a copy of *The Statesman*, of Calcutta, for Sunday, July 15th, with a covering letter in which he says:

"I thought your eye might not fall on this explosion of our so-called Baptist Dr. Glover; so I am sending it to you. This is the way their pernicious doctrines are peddled by the press, and we have quasi-Christianity to fight along with the other works of the devil."

Little comment is needed on that which follows, except to say that those who foolishly, and in opposition to the plain teaching of Scripture, attempt to fix a date of the Lord's return, do great injury to the cause of biblical Christianity, and give occasion to such infidels as Glover to blaspheme. It is instructive, however, to observe with what avidity the public press lays hold of such infidel outpourings. *The Toronto Star*, for example, has no space for articles which would magnify the Bible as the word of God, but any amount of room for the wild imaginings of such unbelievers as Salem Bland.

Only the judgment day will reveal the awful havoc wrought in human lives by such false teachers as Glover. Baptists who have held fellowship with him, and have supported him, ought to bend their heads in shame.

Following is the article:

THE SECOND ADVENT.

It was on a P. & O. steamer, Eastward bound in the war time. The regulation Sunday morning service, as one knows it on shipboard, had been held; this was an evening one, less formal, and 200 people were in the saloon. So many, one felt, would not have gathered, but from the wish to hear something serious on central issues.

A pleasant, earnest layman from Palestine spoke to us. Many things portended a speedy Second Coming of Christ, but he would concentrate on one or two happenings in Palestine which were very significant. The frontier of Palestine had at last been extended to the Euphrates—or perhaps was to be; but look at the return of the Jews to Palestine, which, all agreed, was the certain prelude of the Second Advent. In the previous year 5,000 Jewish immigrants had settled in Palestine!

Next morning, on deck, a young American showed me a paragraph in the *American Outlook*, (writes T. R. Glover, in the *Daily News*). In the year when those 5,000 Jewish immigrants, a certain prelude of the Second Advent, settled in Palestine, there had been 125,000 Jewish immigrants to the United States. Perhaps—

Loose Thinking.

Quite recently a friend of mine from India, deeply interested in the Depressed Classes (the fifty millions of "Untouchables") told me that things are so bad out there that he saw no help for it but the Second Coming. Miss Christabel Pankhurst is saying the same. Another friend raised another point. Twice over in the Revelation emphasis is laid on "1,260 days"; and between the declaration of war and Allenby's entry into Jerusalem there were 1,260 days. This, she felt, must prove something.

It is all such loose and helpless thinking; but the Second

Adventists are ever with us. I note that the Second Advent has constantly been proclaimed as imminent, and as regularly it has proved tardy in realization. The Early Christians in the first century (we are told till we are tired) lived on the basis of a speedy coming of Christ. All through the nineteenth century people kept predicting it. Napoleon was "just Apollyon with an N in front of him"; and Dr. Cumming, Mr. Baxter, Dr. Grattan Guinness, and many more worked Daniel's indications of dates for all they are worth, and a great deal more. The interpreters all differ; they have to differ as each "Last Day" goes by.

Three Theories.

But the gravamen is elsewhere, and must be treated seriously. Did not Christ, people ask, predict His Second Coming, and are you going to reject what He says? Every reader of the New Testament knows that in three of the Gospels we have the "eschatological discourse." What are we to make of it? Well, first get it disentangled; some of it seems to refer to the future fall of Jerusalem; some to a return of Christ. We need not trouble about Jerusalem here; what of the return of Christ?

Three theories are open to us, perhaps equally open, whether we are verbal inspirationists or higher critics. The discourse may be (1) genuine, literally giving the actual words of Christ or (2) genuine but misconstrued by its reporters or by the authors of the Gospels; or (3) not Christ's at all, but wrongly attributed to Him. For the third view, we have to remember that even in an age of printing, wrong attributions are made, and that in a day of floating manuscripts, they were much easier to make and much harder to correct; and that the early church was not a body of much literary culture or critical insight.

Against it we have to set the widespread belief that Christ would soon return, which it is clear from Thessalonians, St. Paul at one time shared. To rebut this, and in favour of the second theory, it can be urged that, quite apart from anything Christ said, Jewish apocalyptic literature shows that many Jews believed in a speedy end of the age, brought about by a Messiah.

Slow Discipline.

Such Jews, accepting the Messiahship of Christ, would naturally lay hold of anything that He said which recalled the familiar idea. As to the first theory, it also offers alternatives, such as that (a) Jesus was really ignorant of the future and thought of it exactly like his least reflective contemporaries; (b) much the same but that this limitation was part of his "emptying Himself"; (c) that He had to use the language employed by men, but always gave it His own meanings, as in the case of the name Messiah.

It may be noted that the apocalyptic passage in the gospels has a family likeness to much Jewish writing of the kind, viz., everything is going wrong; the world is reeling with apostasy and disaster; the end will be dreadfully sudden; God will by arbitrary fiat undo it all and start again. To some minds invariably "the world is very evil, the times are growing late." Things are always worse than ever and as bad as they can be, yet there seems really little point in the change being sudden, for God has always preferred the slow ways of discipline and natural growth. "God's ways with men are mostly commonplace." What is gained by preaching a sudden Advent? Will it warrant you in dropping endeavour, or urge you to do more, when Christ in the twinkling of an eye is about to do all? Is the preaching of the Second Advent either helpful or relevant?

The Mind of Christ.

But look more broadly and deeply at the mind of Christ, which our Second Adventists (I think) neglect in their passion for surprise. His emphasis was not on their sort of surprise. He looked deeply into God's mind and was as quiet and rational as Zeno the Stoic; he refused to give dates and hours for the end; he would have it that God alone knew the future or need know it. He always seems to imply that God's ordinary ways will serve-growth, work, faith suffice; and it is interesting to note that the real developments of the world on Christian lines have been made by people who accepted Christ's way of it, and left Second Advents to God, content to serve their Redeemer here and now.

LAST SUNDAY IN JARVIS STREET.

Last Sunday proved a spiritual refreshment to many in Jarvis Street. The congregations were large, practically filling the church at both services. Strangers were present from nearly every state in the Union, it seemed to us; and from every province in Canada. At both services a number came forward, who were soundly converted. Rev. H. H. Savage, of Pontiac, preached a fine gospel sermon from our out-of-doors pulpit to a great congregation. The Pastor preached indoors morning and evening.

THE TORONTO BAPTIST SEMINARY.

The Seminary will open for classes October 1st. We are expecting a considerably increased enrolment. Courses are provided in English, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Biblical Introduction, Church History, Systematic Theology, Biblical Exegesis, and other subjects. The Seminary can do for its students all that any Bible-training school or institution can do, and, we believe, much more. Special arrangements are being made for evening classes this coming year, in order to extend the privileges of the Seminary to many whose daily occupation prevents their attending day classes. The Seminary offers a very thorough training for students who have the ministry or missionary service in view; and at the same time, in its evening classes will afford opportunity for those who have no intention of undertaking any sort of official work to become more thoroughly grounded in the great truths of the gospel, in order that they may be better fitted for lay service as teachers or Sunday School superintendents or Christian workers.

There is no charge for tuition, but a registration fee of \$8.00 for day classes, and \$5.00 for evening classes is charged. The Seminary has a fine men's dormitory across the street from the Seminary building, in which there are magnificent sleeping rooms, with running water in nearly every room; and excellent board is provided. The cost for room and board in the dormitory is \$8.00 per week.

SEMINARY FINANCES.

The Gospel Witness has not said very much about the financial aspect of the Seminary work; we have been so busily engaged pleading the interests of other causes. But it is necessary to call the attention of our friends to the fact that the Seminary does need funds. We were greatly delighted recently at the receipt of a cheque of \$1,000.00 from a dear saint who is a Baptist of the old school. She was, we

believe, baptized by Dr. Fyfe. She knows what Baptists used to stand for, and after examining the work being done by the Jarvis Street Church and the Toronto Baptist Seminary, she concluded we were standing just where Dr. Fyfe stood in the long ago. We hope many others will follow her example.

The cost of operating the Seminary is, in round figures, about \$1,000.00 per month. We have no regular income: we are wholly dependent upon what the Lord's people may send us. We trust some of our readers may be moved to remember this worthy cause.

DES MOINES UNIVERSITY FACULTY.

The following new members have been added to the Faculty of Des Moines University. Every one of them is as sound in the faith as in academic training, and we feel the Faculty has been greatly strengthened by their election.

Dr. N. L. T. Nelson, Ph.D., Chicago, formerly professor in Mississippi Baptist College—Biology.

Dr. Herbert Schiefer, Ph.D., University of Michigan, formerly associate professor in University of Michigan—Head of Mathematics and Physics Department.

Dr. Fred B. Pearson, Th.M., Th.D., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary; A.B. graduate of Howard College, Birmingham, Alabama; missionary to Jerusalem; four years professor in William Jewell College—Bible.

Professor Grant McDonald, Mus.B., American Conservatory, Chicago; graduate in Piano, Organ and Theory of Drury College; formerly Head of the Department of Fine Arts at McKendree College—Professor of Piano and Chairman of Faculty of Music.

Miss Ada B. Carroll, Mus.B., American Conservatory, Chicago; graduate study with David Bishpam and Oscar Saenger of New York; formerly professor of Voice at McKendree College—Voice.

May Bittinger Underwood, Graduate in Public School Music, DePauw University; student of John Williamson, Westminster Choir, Dayton—Public School Music.

Miss Helen M. Hunt, B.S., Des Moines University; M. S. Ames—Home Economics.

Rev. W. J. Jones, A.B., Wheaton College; A.M. and B.Th. Princeton University—English.

Mr. E. F. Wolf, B.S., John Fletcher College; sixty hours graduate work; fourteen years' experience in high school and college—Assistant in Chemistry.

Mr. Ray Montgomery, A.B., Western Kentucky Teachers' College, and Bowling Green Business University; six years' experience—Commerce.

Miss Carolyn Forgrave, Instructor in Education—Dean of Women.

DES MOINES UNIVERSITY CONTRIBUTIONS.

This hungry institution always needs money, and more and more money. When distributing the Lord's money, remember this worthy and needy institution.

SUBSCRIBE TO-DAY

for "The Gospel Witness." Sent postpaid for 52 weeks to any place in the world for \$2.00. Address: 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2. Telephone: Elgin 3531.

A Greater "Gospel Witness"

Of all the activities in which the Editor of this paper has some part, he is convinced there is nothing more important or more far-reaching in its influence than the work of THE GOSPEL WITNESS itself. We will venture even to blow our own trumpet a little.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS started from a church calendar, without a cent of capital. We had no money to advertise it. We started it as an act of faith, and God has wonderfully blessed its ministry.

What would be said of anyone who was known to have an audience of THREE THOUSAND MINISTERS PER WEEK? And yet THE GOSPEL WITNESS reaches about that number of gospel preachers. Without advertising, it has spread itself through THIRTY-EIGHT DIFFERENT COUNTRIES OF THE EARTH.

Its sermons and other messages have been re-printed in numerous periodicals, so that its weekly testimony is sometimes multiplied ten or one hundredfold.

We have reason to believe that not a few ministers in difficult and isolated places have been given new heart by its messages, and enabled to take hold of their sword afresh as they realized they were not alone in the fight.

We were informed by one brother that he had subscribed for THE GOSPEL WITNESS for all the elders of a certain Presbyterian church. These men had not made a special study of the ravages of Modernism, and did not see the dangers of the day. But this brother told us that through reading THE GOSPEL WITNESS that Presbyterian church had been converted into an out-and-out Fundamentalist church, and the elders stand together as a body for the great truths of the gospel.

We had a letter from A PASTOR IN ITALY explaining that one dollar in American or Canadian money was equal to five dollars in Italian money, but he said he could not do without the paper even if he had to pay the equivalent of ten dollars for it.

We have had the testimony of scores of ministers that they have found the paper more helpful to them in their ministry than any other paper coming to their desk. We have had kind words spoken also by missionaries from the far corners of the earth of the blessing THE GOSPEL WITNESS has been to them.

In addition to that, the paper has endeavoured to serve the interests of many good causes, and through its appeals thousands of dollars have come into the Lord's treasury in different places.

All this has come about almost without any sustained endeavour to press the claims of the paper. The paper, however, has been so wonderfully blessed of God that we feel led to inaugurate a new movement for A GREATER GOSPEL WITNESS. We need, first of all, a greater circulation. We believe it ought to be possible to add 10,000 subscribers between now and the end of the year, or an average rate of twenty-five hundred per month.

All this will cost money, and we invite the Lord's stewards to help us spread the messages of THE GOSPEL WITNESS in this way. We have a new Circulation Manager, who is full of enthusiasm for the possibilities of the paper. Plans are being made which, it seems to us, must almost certainly result in an increased circulation of ten thousand in the next four months.

HOW EVERY "GOSPEL WITNESS" READER CAN HELP.

1. Send us a substantial contribution for THE GREATER GOSPEL WITNESS fund. Every dollar will help, but we appeal for large, as well as small contributions. Had we the money ourselves, we would gladly put tens of thousands of dollars into THE GOSPEL WITNESS enterprise.

2. Solicit your friends to subscribe to THE GOSPEL WITNESS, and see if you cannot send us anywhere from one to ten or twenty subscriptions.

3. If you cannot secure the subscriptions yourself, send us the names and addresses of persons whom you know to believe in the great principles for which THE GOSPEL WITNESS stands, and we will write them direct soliciting their subscriptions.

4. Pray daily that the efforts being put forth to extend the influence of the paper may be blessed of God.