THE STORY OF THE PLOT THAT FAILED-Page 9



PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF EVANGELICAL PRINCIPLES AND IN DEFENCE OF THE FAITH ONCE FOR ALL DELIVERED TO THE SAINTS. \$2.00 Per Year, Postpaid, to any address. 5c Per Single Copy.

Editor: T. T. SHIELDS

"I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ."-Romans 1:16.

Address Correspondence: THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2, Canada. Registered Cable Address: Jarwitsem, Canada.

Vol. 15, No. 39

TORONTO, FEBRUARY 4, 1937

Whole Number 768

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

WHOLE-HEARTED VOLUNTEERS

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, January 31st, 1937

(Stenographically Reported)

Broadcast over Station CKOC-1120 Kilocycles

"Then the spirit came upon Amasai, who was chief of the captains, and he said, Thine are we, David, and on thy side, thou son of Jesse: peace, peace be unto thee, and peace be to thine helpers; for thy God helpeth thee. Then David received them, and made them captains of the band."

-I. Chronicles 12:18.

Saul was Israel's first king. Early in his reign, because of his disobedience, the Lord took His Spirit from him. On the other hand, David, the son of Jesse, was anointed by divine direction to succeed Saul in the throne of Israel. The verse which I have read to you relates to that period of history during which Saul was yet upon the throne, but David was gaining an influence with the people. He was without in desert places, and there were people who forsook the standard of Saul, and joined themselves to David.

Our text records that, under the leadership of one of the captains, named Amasai, a company of men came to David and announced, "Thine are we, David, and on thy side, thou son of Jesse: peace, peace be unto thee, and peace be to thine helpers; for thy God helpeth thee. Then David received them, and made them captains of the band."

Saul, I think, is a very eminent illustration of another prince, described in Scripture as "the god of this world", and as "the prince of the power of the air", to whom a great many give their allegiance, and whose will and spirit they obey. On the other hand, we have abundant scriptural ground for looking upon David as a type of the Lord Jesus Christ, "great David's greater Son", Whom God hath anointed to be King, not only over Israel, but over all the earth, for "the kingdoms of this world (shall) become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever." It is with the choice between these two princes, and their spiritual parallels, that we are concerned this evening.

I.

I shall begin by asking you to examine with me THE OCCASION WHICH CALLED FORTH THIS DECLARATION OF LOYALTY. It was an occasion in Israel's history when the respective merits of two princes were under consideration, and in some quarters, in dispute. Saul was Israel's king. He was a man of magnificent appearance, and forceful personality, and of many and varied gifts of character. When first he was brought forth to the people, and the people observed him, he made a most favourable impression upon the multitude, who had petitioned God, through Samuel, to provide them a king like all other nations. When they saw Saul, "There was not among the children of Israel a goodlier person than he: from his shoulders and upward he was higher than any of the people"; and spontaneously and unanimously they cried, "God save the king." Samuel had warned them, saying, "This will be the manner of the king that shall reign over you: He will take your sons, and appoint them for himself, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen; and some shall run before his chariots. And he will appoint him captains over thousands, and captains over fifties; and will set them to ear his ground, and to reap his harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and instruments of his chariots. And he will take your daughters to be confectionaries, and to be

cooks, and to be bakers. And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your oliveyards, even the best of them, and give them to his servants. And he will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his officers, and to his servants. And he will take your menservants, and your maidservants, and your goodliest young men, and your asses, and put them to his work. He will take the tenth of your sheep: and ye shall be his servants."

Thus Saul had fulfilled the prophecy and proved to be a very selfish king. He used his high office for his own ends, and the people little by little were alienated from him. He lost the affection of a great host. In addition to that, by his deliberate rejection of the divine counsel, and the doing of his own will, he had incurred the divine displeasure; and it had been announced by the Lord Himself that He would take the kingdom from Saul, and give it to one who was worthier than he.

David, "ruddy, and of a fair countenance", a man of excellent character—and we rather think a man of peculiarly winsome personality—who seemed to melt the hearts of all who came in personal contact with him, had been anointed as Saul's successor; and now the people were forced to make choice between Saul and David.

It is so still. There are contrary forces at work in the world. One does not need to be a theologian to recognize that there is a malignant power that dominates the hearts and lives of the majority of people. I can conceive of no explanation of such evils as we have been speaking of this evening apart from the hypothesis of the existence of an evil personality, an adversary, an enemy of the souls of men, who seeks their destruction. Surely, nothing is easier to believe than the existence of a personality who is described in the Word of God as the "devil", the "god of this world", "the prince of the power of the air", "the wicked one" in whose lap the whole world lieth.

There is a trinity of evil on the one side: the world, the flesh, and, back of both, the devil, who seek the allegiance of men, and endeavour to secure their devotion to their service. There is also One Who is fairer than the children of men, but Whose visage was marred more than any man's, and His form more than the sons of men. There is One Who, in the days of His flesh, went about doing good. He never did anyone evil, but He did good to all the multitudes who came into vital touch with Him. Wherever He went, virtue flowed from Him. . He went to the cross and died, and they buried Him. A symbol of that you have seen this evening in the ordinance of baptism. But He rose again, and has ascended into heaven, "from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool."

The choice every man and woman must make is between these two dominant personalities: whether we shall yield ourselves to the control of evil, and take the course prepared for the unwary, the broad road that leadeth to destruction; or whether, rather, we shall listen to the call of Him Who is anointed at once to be our Saviour and our King, and give ourselves wholly to His service.

It was a time of war, and it was not possible for those who would choose the service of David, to choose at the same time a life of ease and luxury. Those who would follow him, had to go into the wilderness; they sought him in desert places; they came to him in the hold where he was hiding from Saul, the son of Kish, for he still kept himself close and did not manifest himself to all, as he did to some. But it was a day of conflict, and any man who came to David with such a word as this, "Thine are we, David, and on thy side, thou son of Jesse" knew that he was enlisting in the army, that he was volunteering for the war. David offered them no emolument; he offered them no easy life: notwithstanding, they sought him in the hard places, and gave themselves to his service.

I have never sought to increase the number of religious professors, whose religion consists solely in membership in an agreeable church, which gives no trouble to anyone, but provides a fine sleeping-car in which people may sleep and take their rest. I would not try to augment the number of those who are at ease in Zion. The Lord Jesus never did. When the multitudes came to Him, and would have become His disciples. He said, "Do not enlist without understanding what is before you. You had better count the cost, and remember what is involved in discipleship." In effect He said, "You will have to put Me before your father and mother, before your wife and children, before all ease and comfort-before life itself. Unless you are ready to volunteer for the war, ready to go with Me all the way, putting on the whole armour of God, you had better not come at all."

There was a time when the people thronged Him, tens of thousands of them, and would have made Him King; but He said, "Ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled—you wanted someone to feed you, to minister to your physical welfare—labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you." When He expounded the spiritual character of His mission, the multitudes left Him. Many even of His professed disciples, turned their backs upon Him, until, instead of tens of thousands, He was left with only twelve—and one of them was a devil.

That is the attitude of Scripture toward all those who would profess and call themselves Christians: it bids us count the cost. It never has been easy to "follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth". And perhaps it never has been more difficult than it is to-day. There is so much of the form of godliness without the power thereof; there is so much religion which has no effect upon character and life, there is so much churchianity that has no Christianity at the heart of it, that people have turned away from religion. There are thousands of people called Christian who are scarcely distinguishable from the mass who make no religious profession. I do not ask you to join that number. We represent One Who is still despised and rejected, a "man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief."

It is not popular to follow the Lord Jesus, whether in the pew or in the pulpit. We are expected to administer sedatives, to lull men's consciences to sleep if indeed there are any consciences left to be lulled. We are not expected to stimulate people, to awaken them to a sense of their obligation to God and their neighbour, but to sing softly as though all were well and let the world go to the devil. God preserve us from adding so much as one to the number of these vain professors who are but stumbling-blocks in the way of those who would really come to God.

If you would be a Christian in the biblical sense, trusting God for the blotting out of sin, for cleansing away of iniquity, and thereafter faithfully following Christ, you will find yourself engaged in war, and will need, not a comfortable summer dress for a picnic, but the whole armour of God, that you may be able to stand in the evil day.

There is nothing peculiar about this church, or the testimony of this pulpit. I know there are those who are not friendly to us—"As concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against." But we preach from this pulpit nothing more than the gospel which was preached from all pulpits but a few years ago. We offer for men's acceptance the same Saviour, upon the same terms, as was offered by all evangelical churches but a few years ago. We preach the same gospel which Spurgeon and Moody preached. There are some just now who are exploiting Moody's name, singing Moody's hymns, while they pour contempt upon Moody's gospel, and set aside Moody's Bible. We have not changed: others have changed. We simply abide by the old landmarks, by the old standards, declaring, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation." I would rather enlist one soldier of the cross who will surrender himself wholly, and without reserve, to the Saviourhood and Lordship of Jesus Christ, than I would promote an orgy of religious emotion, and get a procession of people to walk down the aisle, and forget all about it next morning. If you do not want a hard life, if you want still to keep company with the world, the flesh, and the devil, do not profess and call yourself a Christian. "Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people."

You cannot serve Saul and David at the same time. It must be one or the other. If you enlist in the service of David, you enlist to be a soldier; you will be a marked man from the beginning; you will join, not that you may be a soldier on parade, wearing gold braid and buttons, and following a brass band, but to wear khaki. It is hard work, and short commons; suffering, and all kinds of disabilities, must men and women endure if they would be faithful to Jesus Christ. That is the service we offer you.

Once more: on this occasion, neutrality was impossible. It was useless for anybody to say, "I am for both Saul and David"; and equally absurd for anyone to say, "I belong to neither of them." They had to be for one, and against the other. It was not possible to be neutral.

It is never possible for men of conscience to be neutral in respect to good and evil. We cannot be neutral where moral issues are concerned. The great issue is, whether we shall continue in sin, and serve this trinity of evil to which I have referred, or enlist in the service of Christ, and fight for righteousness. If I ask you this evening which side you take, and you reply, "I would rather not say"—by so saying you have answered me. You are a soldier of Saul in disguise. You are not on the side of God. A man or woman who is out-and-out for Christ, wears the uniform; everybody knows where he stands. It is no compliment to any professing Christian to say that he can pass in any company, week-day or Sunday, without people's discovering there is something different about them, something that distinguishes and differentiates him from unbelievers. That difference is the presence of God in his life; he has sworn allegiance to the Prince of Glory.

II.

Let us look for a minute or two at THE DECLARATION OF LOYALTY ITSELF. What did these men promise? They declared for the war, but *their declaration was a vow of personal allegiance to David*. Amasai came to David and said, "Thine are we, David." I would remind you that Christianity is an intensely personal matter. It requires individual decision. Moreover a true Christian is one who is devoted to a Person. If only we could recognize that institutions—churches of any name, howsoever true in their testimony to the Word of God—are not in themselves arks of salvation, we should be saved from much error. Salvation is in the person of Jesus Christ, and whoever would be a true Christian must swear allegiance to a new King, even to our glorious Lord Jesus Christ.

Many people are ready to discuss almost anything religious; but if one should mention their personal relationship to a living Saviour, to a risen Lord, to a coming King, with Whom they hold daily converse, and from whom hour by hour, by His Spirit, they receive heavenly direction, they do not know anything about it. Theirs is a Sunday religion; an institutional religion; or perhaps a credal religion; or a religion which consists in devotion to a programme-but all divorced from the vital, challenging personality of the Son of God. "The hope of glory" is "Christ in you"; when a soul is really converted, he comes into a new personal relationship to Jesus Christ; and unless that has been effected you are not a Christian at all. You may have been, in turn, a member of every church in Toronto; but that is no proof that you are a member of Christ.

When Saul of Tarsus, of whom we spoke this morning, recognized that the voice he heard from heaven was the voice of the Jesus Who had been crucified at the place called Calvary, he cried, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" He vowed allegiance to a new King, to a new Master.

Have you done so? Is Jesus Christ, let me ask you, a reality to you? Have you come to Him? And if you have, how have you come?

There is a very human touch in our story. When David saw the men coming, he went out to meet them, saying, "If ye be come peaceably unto me to help me, mine heart shall be knit unto you: but if ye be come to betray me to mine enemies, seeing there is no wrong in mine hands, the God of our fathers look thereon, and rebuke it." In effect he said, "Why do you come to me? Are you sincere? Have you come to be my friends? Have you come to enlist in my army—tell me frankly." David had so often been betrayed that he wanted to be sure. Amasai, spokesman for the company, said, "Thine are we, David. We have come to be thine, to be devoted to thy service."

I wonder what we go to church for? What we pray for? Why do we sing the hymns of Zion? Is there at the heart of all our devotion a real personal affection for the Lord Jesus, the Son of God? Do we know Him? Is the story of His resurrection nothing more than a story in a book? Or are we sure of it from the fact that we have had personal contact with Him,

4 (364)

THE GOSPEL WITNESS

February 4, 1937

and have engaged in personal converse with Him? I challenge you men and women who profess and call yourselves Christian, to answer to your own conscience and to God, are you wholly Christ's? Is He your Lord and Master? Can you say to Him, in response to His searching enquiry as to why you come, "Thine am I, Lord Jesus. I put Thee first—before all churches, before all creeds, before all ordinances, before my family, before all my worldly interests, before life itself. I belong to Thee. That is my supreme devotion"?

This declaration of loyalty involved also *their dedication to a cause*. David was not an idler. He was not waiting for admirers; he was not soliciting the friendship of people for friendship's sake. He had espoused a cause; he had work to do; he was going somewhere and he was looking for helpers, for men who would come to him with a purpose. When he asked them, "Why do you come, to betray me to mine enemies, or to be real helpers", Amasai said, "Thine are we, David, *and on thy side*, thou son of Jesse—under thy banners we fight; for the principles of thy kingdom we shall contend."

Every Christian is enlisted in a cause. For example, it ought to be known that everyone who calls himself a Christian is against every kind of evil. It ought to be possible for the workers of iniquity in this city, could they obtain the roll of all churches, numbering tens of thousands of members, to say, "That is the nucleus of the army of opposition; we can be sure they will be unanimously opposed to this plan of ours." I would not boast-we have much reason to be humbleand yet I do rejoice that the God Who has led us through the fire, and through the flood, has purged us as a church from cowardice, from people who are afraid to take a stand for righteousness. Every church ought to be a unit in opposition to evils such as we have dealt with this evening. I should be ashamed to be Pastor of a church that had anyone in its membership who would be reluctant to draw sword against these damnable institutions that are roundabout us. ought to be on the side of righteousness.

I know-and I try to make it clear-that the fundamental, cardinal thing is our personal relationship to Christ, and the personal salvation that comes in consequence thereof; but as the issue of that relationship, we are enlisted in a cause, and we ought to be able to say, "Thine are we, O Christ, and on Thy side, against the world, the flesh, and the devil, wherever they show themselves." I do not conceive of religion as qualifying me only to sing the songs of Zion-"Jerusalem, the golden". I wish I were there! I hope it will be a better place than "Toronto the good". But until I get there, no matter what it costs, I conceive it to be my duty as a Christian, and if I may so say, as a Christian minister, always to lift my voice against every evil-individual, social; and national. We are here to set up a standard for the people.

If you come to Christ, to make Him your Saviour and Lord, enlist on His side, on His side. I want it known that I am on the side of Jesus Christ in every issue. When a man, for example, plays fast and loose with the Bible, and tells us it is not true, I shall oppose him with all my strength. I am weary of the assumed intellectual superiority of the enemies of the Book. I have battled with hundreds of them, and I have often

said I could eat a dozen of them for breakfast—and not know I had had breakfast. When any man of that school takes up an attitude of opposition to the Bible, I tell him frankly, I am on Christ's side; and therefore I will fight him as long as I have breath in this body, because Christ approved of the Bible.

Are you enlisted on His side, ready for the call, whatever it may mean?

Their declaration was an act of consecration to the service of peace. "Here we are", said Amasai, "we are thine. We are on thy side, and we are here to seek peace—peace be unto thee, and peace be to thine helpers."

That is the programme of the kingdom of God. We are not pessimists, but we recognize that you cannot cure a cancer with a sedative. It is no use trying to be a Christian Scientist—and succeeding in being neither a scientist nor a Christian.

There cannot be peace with sin. After the family physician has given a gloomy verdict, preparing the family for death, he is dismissed, and some youngster, just from the university, because he does not know what else to do administers an opiate. The family telephones all the neighbours to say that father is ever so much better. "We have changed doctors, and there is real improvement." But the undertaker comes just the same, when the disease has done its work.

Certain preachers went up and down the country in England, preaching peace, while Germany was arming to the teeth to destroy us. What is the greatest agency for peace to-day? Still Britain. But she will maintain that peace only as behind her word there is the might of a united—and armed—Empire.

Religiously, you cannot have peace while ignoring sin. You cannot say to a man who is in rebellion against God, Peace be unto thee. "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." The only way to make peace is the way the Lord Jesus has made it. Christ's way of getting peace is by dealing with the fact of sin, and removing it. Those who are enlisted in the cause of Christ are engaged in a peace programme; but the only way by which peace can be effected is by the conquest of evil, not by its conciliation. As for example, Stalin, and Mussolini, and Hitler represent principles with which rightcousness can never be at peace. And that our statesmen will sooner or later discover.

These men enlisted in the service of David, and their enlistment was a confession of faith: "Peace be unto thee, and peace be to thine helpers; for thy God helpeth thee." To be on the side of Jesus Christ is to be on God's side, as to be on the side of David was to be on God's side. It is the winning side. It may not pay here. You may have to go without in desert places, as did the servants of David—but what of it? We shall reach the palace and the throne by and by.

III.

A very brief word concerning THE DECLARANTS.

Who were these men?. The first was Amasai, captain of the band. Amasai, was not a little man: he was a big man, a man of great qualities of mind. God has plenty of room for big men—if there are any. We come as poor sinners, but, having come, there are people who are variously gifted. When Saul of Tarsus enlisted in the service of Jesus Christ, he brought all his gifts. He came with all his powers, and laid them at the feet of Jesus Christ. He had one of the most colossal minds the world has ever known. He would have been a leader of men had he never been saved, but, illuminated and augmented by the indwelling of the Spirit of God, he became the greatest of all preachers.

I wonder if there are any here who think they are too big to be Christians. Perhaps you are, in your own estimation. But are there any who are really gifted? I do not know what your powers are, but whatever your capabilities they should be laid at the feet of Christ. Amasai was a gifted man, and saw the profit of enlisting on the side of David. And there were many others: "The least was over a hundred, and the greatest over a thousand." But they counted it no derogation of their honour to be numbered with David's helpers in the war.

We are all captains. We all have influence—some captains of hundreds, and some captains of thousands. There are many people within the circle of your influence who will be largely influenced by what you do. It may be only the children in the home, and a few others who are comparatively obscure, or some in high places, but certain people are subject to your influence. It is imperative therefore that we should recognize the responsibility of living, and of leading other people in the right way—or the wrong way.

Some of those who came to David were *highly skilled*: they were ambidextrous, skillful warriors, afraid of nothing. Brave spirits were they who made this declaration, and some of them men of achievement.

Have you heard the broadcasts from Louisvillewhere the poor broadcaster's throat was harsh and hoarse, until by and by he could scarcely speak at all? But he kept on giving his messages of appeal: "Send a power boat to corner of such a street, fourteen people in a room; lives in danger-very urgent." Or, again, "Gasoline and oil floating down such a street-please do not strike matches, or smoke in that neighbourhood. I repeat: gasoline floating on the water. Do not smoke." "Baby in such a district only three weeks old-no milk for several days. Urgent." "Take serum to such a number"-and on and on through the night.

What a terrible calamity it is! I have been living it through because I know the country so well. The Mayor of Louisville, scarcely able to speak, but still staying on duty, appealing for police and help of all sorts from other cities—exhausted, but still carrying on in his effort to save life, battling with the flood.

That was the spirit of the persons who came to David. "These are they that went over Jordan in the first month, when it had overflown all its banks; and they put to flight all them of the valleys, both toward the east, and toward the west." They were men of might, all of them. In relation to our sins, we are poor sinners and nothing at all; we must come as little children. But there are people whom God has gifted in various directions. Let us bring all our talents and dedicate them to the service of our glorious Lord, saying, "Thine are we, O Christ, and on thy side, thou Son of God."

WHAT WAS THE RESULT? David received them. He always received them. Many of them had been rebels. They had been on the other side. But they had seen the light, and had changed their allegiance—and he received them all. He turned no one away. So also our gracious Lord receives all who come.

I remember during the Great War, there was one young fellow who tried seven times to get into the army, but was "turned down". His eyes were defective, or his feet were not right—I do not know what was wrong with him. But at last he came to me one day and said, "Pastor, I am in." "You are!" "Yes, sir. I said I would try once more—and this time I made it. I may not get to the front, but I am in." I found him later in the north of Scotland cutting the trees in the forest—but he was doing his best; he was enlisted in the war.

It may be that some of you feel you are not good for much, but Christ will never "turn you down" because you have imperfect vision. You may come with all your defects, as well as with all your capabilities, and our Lord will receive you. He has a way of making soldiers of people who are not naturally heroic. On the other side of the line they have a phrase that is not very elegant, but is most expressive. When speaking of a certain type of person they call them "fourflushers". How some men boast of what they are going to do!

Peter was like that: "Though all men deny thee, yet will not I." When a servant girl said, "I have seen you before; you were with Jesus of Nazareth", he said. "No; I was not." Brave man! Three times this heroic soldier denied, but the great Commander turned and looked at him as though to say, "I heard you, Peter. You did exactly as I said you would. But I will make something of you yet. I called you a rock, and I will make a rock of you." After His resurrection He had an interview with Peter, and three times Peter confessed his love for the Lord. And on the Day of Pentecost, looking into the faces of the very men who had crucified Jesus Christ, he said, "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel, and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands, have crucified and slain." And again: "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." When they tried to put a muzzle on the disciples, it was Peter who stood up and, I think, with a smile on his countenance, and a tone of defiance in his voice-I love to quote his saying, because he had been such a coward, as we all are by nature-said, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye, but we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard". Peter had become a soldier, because the Lord received him, and made him a captain of the band.

He can make you heroic, for David "received them, and made them captains of the band". Captains! Perhaps' you have heard a story, which will bear repeating, of Napoleon: when reviewing his troops, his horse galloped away. A private stepped from the line and caught the horse's bridle, and brought him back to the Emperor, who said, "Thank you, captain." "Of what regiment, your majesty?" the soldier enquired. Napoleon, pleased by being taken at his word, said, "Of my guards." When the Lord Jesus calls a man captain, he is a captain; for He makes him a captain, fit for any kind of service.

The people followed Amasai's example: "At that time day by day there came to David to help him, until it was

a great host, like the host of God." Amasai started the procession. "Thine are we, David, and on thy side, thou son of Jesse." Then the men of Manasseh, Adnah, and Jozabad, and all the rest of them, came, until at last they made him king, turning the kingdom of Saul unto David, according to the word of the Lord. The day came when the crown was put upon his brow.

I wish the Lord Jesus were now universally recognized as King. He is in the purpose of God, but I wish His were the supreme authority in Toronto, in Ontario, in Canada, in the British Empire, in the United States, and in all the nations of the earth. I wish the day might speedily come when He shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the rivers to the end of the earth. I should like to go to the coronation of our new King and Queen next May, but I shall not be there. But I am going to a still greater coronation. I shall be there when God shall make the enemies of my Lord to become His footstool. I covet a position in the King's army. You may call me anything you like here, but I shall be glad if, receiving me. He will make me a captain. I should like to be a helper in the war. I confess to one supreme ambition, I should like to feel, when the day's work is done, that, by the grace of God, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge shall give me at that day."

Are you going to be at the coronation? Are you enlisted in His service? It may be that someone here tonight has it in his power to start a procession toward Christ. If you would openly avow your faith in Christ, perhaps someone else would say, "There goes Amasai; I am going with him." And who knows where/it would end? May God make us all true soldiers of the Cross, ready to endure hardness for His sake.

> The Son of God goes forth to war, A kingly crown to gain;
> His blood-red banner streams afar, Who follows in His train?
> Who best can drink His cup of woe, Triumphant over pain,
> Who patient, bears His cross below, He follows in His train.

"A noble army, men and boys, The matron and the maid— Around the Saviour's Throne rejoice, In robes of light arrayed. They climbed the steep ascent of heaven Through peril, toil, and pain: O God, to us may grace be given To follow in their train."

SEMINARY SUPPLIES

When the tide was turning in favour of David in Israel, and all Israel were "of one heart to make David king", we read that certain people who were "nigh them"—that is, people who were not too far away to make transportation of their gifts possible—"brought bread on asses, and on camels, and on mules, and on oxen, and meat, meal, cakes of figs and bunches of raisins, and wine, and oil, and oxen, and sheep abundantly: for there was joy in Israel."

The people of that day were intensely practical. Their supreme desire was to see David king, and while doubtless they depended upon God to bless their efforts, they actually used their asses, and camels, and mules, and oxen, to carry certain food-stuffs, to minister to the physical needs of David and his army.

The one and only reason for the existence of Toronto Baptist Seminary is the making of the Lord Jesus, King, not in the sense that He is dependent upon human suffrage, but in the sense that the purpose of God respecting the Kingdom of God should be proclaimed to men through the gospel, in order that they may recognize the Lord Jesus Christ as their King.

The Seminary exists to train men and women to preach and teach that great truth at home and abroad. But none of them are angels! They are men and women in the flesh, and therefore they need food to maintain the body while their minds are being trained for the discharge of this high ministry. One good solid meal is supplied to the students of Toronto Baptist Seminary each day at noon in the B. D. Thomas Hall. We have no dormitory, and the students find rooms wherever they can. We do not know one of them who is not poor. They manage as well as they can themselves for the beginning and the end of the day, and they all live very frugally. But years ago we saw that it would be impossible to maintain a company of students in health unless we could be sure of their having at least one good, wholesome, plentiful, hot meal a day. If they get that, they may be able to manage quite comfortably with lighter meals of a simple order morning and evening.

Friends of the Seminary from time to time have sent us in supplies. Through the kindness of Mr. Charles Feaver, who has but recently come into our membership, and who is the General Manager of the firm who are the Toronto distributors of Frigidaire, we have now a large Frigidaire sufficient to take care of supplies of meat, butter, eggs, milk and other things which require a cold temperature. We greatly appreciate Mr. Feaver's generosity, and only wonder how the Seminary kitchen managed to get along without.

Since receiving this gift of a Frigidaire equipment, friends have sent in large roasts of beef and other meat, which, at one time, we could not have taken care of except as we received supplies for one or two days. Now we can take care of all such gifts.

So, to begin with, anyone who would like to provide the meat for the Seminary for a day could send us a good roast of beef, about fifteen pounds. Other things the Seminary can always use are: eggs, butter, potatoes—in fact, all kinds of vegetables, raw or canned—apples, tomatoes, pickles of all sorts, every kind of preserved fruit—in short, any housewife will know what a company of young men and women, with fairly good appetites, can enjoy. It may be a little early to méntion it, but we do so in order that our friends in the country may have it in mind. The Seminary could make use of any quantity of maple syrup; so please remember us when the sap begins to run.

We have been told by some people that they like to "put down'd their fruit and pickles every year, and do not like to carry any over. If you were rather prodigal in your provision last Fall, and it looks as though you are going to have a surplus at the end of the season, do not wait until the season ends and the Seminary closes, but make an estimate of what you could spare, and send it on to the Seminary now.

We read of the early church that they "did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favour with all the people." Friends who send us in such contributions of food as we have suggested may be sure that a company of students will "eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God", and, in addition, will be grateful to those who have thus remembered them.

Did you say you were going to do that? Thank you! But please, please, PLEASE, do it now.

THE PURGATORY "RACKET"

Some months ago we described the Roman Catholic Church as the most colossal racketeering organization in the world. We have never found any occasion to withdraw that statement. There are many who have regarded Roman Catholics as a deluded people, and Roman Catholicism as an unscriptural but rather harmless delusion. The more we see of Roman Catholicism, and the more carefully we analyze it, the more clearly does its malignancy appear. It is a vicious system which must owe its origin and inspiration to the adversary of the souls of men. February 4, 1937

THE GOSPEL WITNESS

A couple of months ago, a fine, upstanding man, father of a family, was converted through the instrumentality of Deacon O. L. Raymer, teacher of the Senior Men's Class. This brother had been bereaved of his wife, and the Lord used that deep sorrow to bring to him his greatest joy. He and his son were later baptized, and became members of Jarvis Street Church.

Last week this man brought us a communication which he had received through the mail, from a Roman Catholic source. He was not a Romanist, and had never had any connection with the Roman Catholic Church. But an account of his wife's death had appeared in the death notices of the newspapers, and apparently these goulish Roman Catholic societies prey upon the susceptibilities of grief-stricken people while still the wound of bereavement is open. This diabolical proposal from "The Purgatorial Society, Crosier Monastery, Onamia, Minnesota", was received. We print it in full below:

THE PURGATORIAL SOCIETY

Conducted by the Crossier Fathers CROSIER MONASTERY, ONAMIA, MINN. Rev. Richard Klaver, O.S.C., Director

My Dear Friend:

The very depressing news of the demise of your beloved deceased has just been sent to us by a mutual friend. With a sincere feeling of sympathy and condolence we join with you in your recent bereavement. The ways of God, indeed, are inscrutable, yet in your extreme sorrow you have the consolation that your friends grieve with you.

As you undoubtedly know the Crosier Fathers are in the position to remember the dear deceased in their Holy Masses, Prayers and Novenas. Meanwhile it does not seem out of place, to call your attention to the Purgatorial Society which exists at our Monastery.

A person enrolled in this Society receives a Perpetual Remembrance in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. We think it a beautiful and consoling thought to know that in this way your dear deceased will never be forgotten,—not even after your own death.

We suggest that you give the deceased an Enrolment in The Purgatorial Society, and assure this Soul a daily Remembrance in Holy Mass for all time. The fee for this Enrolment is five dollars, indeed a small amount considering the inestimable value of this everlasting memorial.

A more beautiful lasting tribute of love cannot be found; no truer expression of your love and affection can be shown.

That this soul may be given the immediate benefit of this Most Holy Remembrance we suggest that you do not postpone your reply. Assuring you once more of our sincere sympathy and our prayers for God's blessing, we are

Faithfully yours in Christ,

THE CROSIER FATHERS. Rev. Richard Klaver, O.S.C., Director.

This was already in type when, only to-day, Deacon J. G. Hyde, of Jarvis Street, brought us another of the same sort. Mrs. Hyde's sister, Mrs. Sutherland, died January 11th. In this case also the death notice, as a matter of course, appeared in the daily press. Apparently these purgatorial societies of various names receive lists of death notices from Toronto papers, and immediately send their literature. Brother Hyde received a communication from "The Franciscan Monastery, Hollidaysburg, Pa.", enclosing seventeen mourning pictures, having various pictures on one side, and on the other side the following: "'We have loved her during life; let us not abandon her, until we have conducted her by our prayers into the house of the Lord.'—St. Ambrose.

IN YOUR CHARITY

Pray for the Report of the soul of Margaret Sutherland

Who Died On January 11, 1937

Prayer

"O Gentlest Heart of Jesus, ever present in the Blessed Sacrament, ever consumed with burning love for the poor captive souls in Purgatory, have mercy on the soul of Thy servant, bring her far from the shadow of exile to the bright home of Heaven, where, we trust, Thou and Thy Blessed Mother, have woven for her a crown of unending bliss. Amen: May She Rest in Peace, Amen."

If, as is taught by the Roman Catholic Church, submission to the Pontiff is necessary to salvation, then those who die without the pale of the Roman Church are deprived of the doubtful privileges of purgatory, but must needs go straight to perdition. If the Roman Catholic Church so believes, why does it propose to say Masses and offer prayers for the relief of souls in purgatory when they profess to believe they are not there? The first of these epistles from the Purgatorial Society explains that bit of illogic on the ground of: "The fee for this enrolment is \$5.00"; and in the other: "Any offering that your kindness prompts you to send to our Monastery", will provide the explanation.

Following is the communication received from the Franciscan Monastery:

REV. BENIGNUS GALLAGHER The Franciscan Monastery HOLLIDAYSBURG, PA.

Dear Friends:

P.O. BOX 138

With feelings of sorrow we have learned that death has visited your family, and therefore to encourage you to bear patiently with this trial, we join with your relatives and friends in offering you our sympathy in your sorrow.

patiently with this trial, we join with your relatives and friends in offering you our sympathy in your sorrow. At the same time, we take the liberty to mail you the enclosed Mourning Pictures. They have the name of your departed one, the date of death, together with a beautiful prayer that God may grant to the deceased Eternal Rest. May we suggest that you distribute these tokens of sacred remembrance among your relatives and friends. You may rest assured they will be the means of having many a prayer offered for the happy repose of your loved one's soul. In case you need more of these Mourning Pictures, we will gladly send them to you upon receiving your request. And if the printer has erred in spelling the name, or has given the wrong date of death, we will have the correction made to your satisfaction in the new supply of Pictures.

Any offering that your kindness prompts you to send to our Monastery, in appreciation for receiving these holy Pictures will be used in educating young men to become priests of Our Order. No doubt these young men will daily remember you and your dead in their prayers, and later in their Masses. However, if you are unable at present to make even a little offering, we wish you to retain these prayer Pictures just the same and use them, and we desire you to ask for additional ones if you need them.

A perpetual Novena in honour of Saint Anthony of Padua, and another in honour of Our Lady of Perpetual Help, and a daily Mass are offered for our living and deceased benefactors and for all those recommended to us.

Begging God to console you in your sorrow and to grant to your departed one Eternal Rest.

Yours in sympathy,

THE FRANCISCAN FATHERS, Father Benignus Gallagher. 8 (368)

THE GOSPEL WITNESS

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 1 First Quarter Lesson 7 February 14th, 1937

DR. T. T. SHIELDS, EDITOR

THERE IS ONLY ONE BAPTISM

Golden Text: "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."—Romans 6:4.

The Scripture emphatically declares there is but one baptism (Eph. 4:5). The promise of the baptism of the Holy Spirit was fulfilled once and for all on the Day of Pentecost, and when the gospel was first preached to the Gentiles as recorded in Acts 10:44-48; 11:15-18; and when the New Testament speaks of baptism subsequently to these events, it signifies baptism by water. The question to be considered in this lesson is, What is baptism?

We must keep in mind that many of our children, if they have any thought of baptism at all, think of it as merely the sprinkling of babies. It is important that, in setting forth the way of salvation, we should teach at the same time what duties will devolve upon those who believe; so that when Christ is received, there will be no question in the minds of converts thus instructed, that their first step thereafter must be an open confession of Christ in baptism.

It is always well, in discussing these matters, to use the Word of God as our exclusive authority. We may therefore ask our scholars to turn to the Bible, and let us see what the Bible has to say about baptism, that we may learn what the word "baptized" means as used in the Scripture.

The first instance in which Scripture describes baptism is found in Matthew 3:13-17, which records the baptism of the Lord Jesus. Suppose we knew nothing of baptism, and were to read the third chapter of Matthew, and other scriptures, what should we think baptism to be? Of John the Baptist it is said, "Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judæa, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." Should we not conclude that John had selected the region roundabout Jordan for his preaching because of the convenience of the Jordan? And when it is said that people "were baptized of him in Jordan", would anyone suppose that a great company of people went out to the river Jordan to be sprinkled?

Again it is said of the baptism of Christ, "Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water". Surely He could not go up "out of the water!" if He had not first of all gone down into the water. Somewhere we have seen rather a ridiculous picture representing the baptism of Christ, in which He is standing waist-deep with John in Jordan, and John is pouring water upon His head. Could anything more absurd be imagined than to go down into the midst of Jordan to have water poured upon one's head?

We may look now at John 3:23: "And John also was baptizing in Ænon near to Salim, because there was much water there." Here the Scripture expressly states that John selected the place, "Ænon near to Salim" because there was "much" water. Surely paedo-Baptists, who require less than a finger-bowl of water to "baptize", as they call it, a couple of dozen children, can do it without "much water". Much water is needed, however, if baptism be administered.

Again, we have the record in Acts 8:38, 39, where it is said of Philip and the Ethiopian eunuch, "They went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip", etc. One could scarcely imagine a small amount of water, say a little pool beside the road as being described as "a certain water". Obviously, the Ethiopian recognized that a good deal of water was necessary.

Then in Romans 6:3, 4, and Colossians 2:12, baptism is expressly said to symbolize a burial. Baptism is typified as being planted in the likeness of Christ's death, and being also in the likeness of His-resurrection.

It should also be said that the word "baptism" means immersion, and nothing less. It may be remarked that there are passages in the New Testament which tell us of the administration of baptism, but which are silent as to where the water was obtained. For example in Acts 2, when three thousand were baptized, nothing is said about the water necessary to their baptism. The same is true of the baptism of Saul of Tarsus, and of Lydia and her household, and of the jailor and his household as recorded in the sixteenth chapter of Acts. But if nothing is said about a large quantity of water, such as would be necessary for immersion, neither is there anything said about a smaller quantity. Baptism being generally understood as being the immersion of the person in water, when the Scripture says that so many people were baptized, we can only conclude that they were immersed.

For example, should we report that a certain number of people were baptized in Jarvis Street Church, it would not be necessary to explain that in the church building is a baptistery so many feet wide, so many feet deep, and so many feet long; and that the baptistery at a certain time was filled with water to a certain depth, and that when baptism was administered, Deacon Greenway and the Pastor went down into the water, and then the candidates one after another went down into the water, then one after another came up out of the water. If we report that so many were baptized, people of ordinary intelligence would know that when that report went out from a Baptist church, they were immersed in water, even though nothing is said about water. The same is true of the record of the New Testament. When the New Testament was written, sprinkling had never been substituted for immersion. Baptism meant immersion, and nothing else. Therefore it was enough to state that so many people were baptized.

Once more: scriptural baptism is immersion in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. We know that from the fact that the Lord Jesus specifically so stated in the Great Commission (Matt. 28: 18-20). In the Second of Acts it is said they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, which does not mean that they were not baptized in the name of the Trinity, for Peter has just been speaking of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, saying that the coming of the Holy Ghost was proof that Jesus of Nazareth was made "both Lord and Christ". Then they said, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" The fact that they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus can mean nothing less nor more than that His name was linked with those of the Father and of the Holy Ghost, in recognition of the fact that He was Lord.

Again in Acts 19, where it is said certain people of Ephesus "were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus", the context distinctly teaches that that included the name of the Father and of the Holy Ghost; for Paul asked these disciples, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" And they answered, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost"—"Unto what then were ye baptized?" Paul could not understand how baptism could have been administered without their hearing of the Holy Ghost because New Testament baptism required that the candidate be baptized in the name of the Trinity. When they explained that they had been baptized unto John's baptism, Paul told them, that the One of Whom John prophesied had actually come, and so, in contradistinction to John's baptism, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus—but in the name of the Father and the Holy Ghost too.

Inasmuch as salvation is all of grace, and is the work of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and inasmuch as baptism is a confession of salvation, then baptism in the name of the Trinity is not only scriptural, but logical as well. THE GOSPEL WITNESS

THE STORY OF THE PLOT THAT FAILED

The History of a Church's Struggle to Maintain an Evangelical Ministry in a Free Pulpit

By T. T. SHIELDS

CHAPTER XIII.

Mr. Ryrie introduced his motion in a speech which had nothing in it sufficiently striking to rivet it upon one's memory, except that it was the usual plea to get on with the work instead of discussing beliefs. He did the best he could, and perhaps as well as anyone could have done with such an absurd proposal. I know that Mr. Ryrie did not frame the resolution, and I am not reflecting upon him when I say that nothing more inane could be imagined than for anyone to come before a deliberative body and ask them to vote that they believed certain things, but that "the interpretation in detail of our distinctive beliefs (is) uncalled for, and sure to minister to heart-burnings and divisions in our body".

Surely if the interpretation in detail of our distinctive beliefs were certain to lead to "heart-burnings and divisions", whoever framed that amendment must have known that there were many who were drifting away from these distinctive beliefs, and that to expose their true character and the direction they were travelling, would make for divisions and heart-burnings. We shall have something to say about the framing of this amendment a little later. It is enough at this moment to point out that if anything were needed to show the necessity for a clear-cut stand on the question, the amendment supplied it.

The amendment was seconded by Rev. W. A. Cameron, Pastor of what was then Bloor Street, but is now Yorkminster Baptist Church, Toronto. Mr. Cameron's speech, I distinctly recall; but before analyzing it, I should like to write a word or two about Mr. Cameron himself.

At the outset, I must confess to a strong personal liking for the Pastor of Yorkminster Church. Mr. Cameron knows well that we have absolutely nothing in common theologically. Our opinions are about as far from each other as the east is from the west. But I like Mr. Cameron as a man, even though we disagree. I have never known him to be nasty. He has always behaved like a gentleman so far as I have observed him.

Further, I gladly recognize his ability, particularly his qualities of leadership. Few men could do what he has done in leading the Bloor Street organization to the erection of their present magnificent pile. That Mr. Cameron has ability, and is able to attract and interest large congregations, the record of his long incumbency of Yorkminster demonstrates. Indeed, I have often coveted Mr. Cameron for evangelicalism. Some may smile cynically, and even sarcastically, at that remark; but it is sincerely. written, for I believe Mr. Cameron could be a mighty power for good were he a New Testament gospel preacher. But my personal liking for Mr. Cameron cannot be allowed to prevent my strongly dissenting from his theological views. Mr. Cameron is not a theologian-he never was, and perhaps never will be. He has not the philosophical mind; never troubles himself about careful analyses. That he preaches much truth is very probable, but his truths are pebbles gathered on the surface. He knows nothing of real digging for gold, finding a vein and following it through to the depths.

Busy preachers have few opportunities of hearing others. I have not heard Mr. Cameron often: I have read more than I have heard. Mr. Cameron has a habit of occasionally caricaturing evangelical orthodoxy. A caricature usually exaggerates some prominent feature, retaining sufficient resemblance for purposes of identification; but everything else in the portrait is usually sacrificed to that one feature, and even that is always exaggerated. Such are Mr. Cameron's usual representations of orthodoxy. Sometimes he inveighs against beliefs which no sane man ever held.

Mr. Cameron should always restrict his forensic utterances to places and occasions which permit no answer. He should never engage in a public debate with equals—still less with those who may be more thoroughly informed than he.

Having said all this, we are still of the opinion that Mr. Cameron has a delightful personality—hail, fellow, well met—who looks upon life as a game to be lived in the spirit of clean sportsmanship. Life, to us, is far more than that. But Mr. Cameron, at the Ottawa Convention, galloped to the rescue of his hard-pressed comrades—metaphorically, of course—and appeared as one mounted upon a prancing charger, while he brandished an ornamental sword, made for appearance rather than use. He presented a fine figure on that memorable occasion.

He laid some emphasis, not by repetition but by tone, on the fact that the mover of the amendment was a Deacon of Jarvis Street Church. He followed Mr. Ryrie's lead in magnifying the work. The important thing was that all should get together, and pull together. What we were to get together for, or pull together for, neither he nor Mr. Ryrie informed us, save vaguely to get on with the work of the Convention. He kept to the text of the amendment thus far, that he deprecated controversy, and made the extraordinary assertion that the Christian church had prospered in time past in the measure in which it had avoided religious controversy—and he appealed to the professors of church history present for support of his contention.

Mr. Cameron's speech was not a very long one. It was listened to by the great assembly with interest and respect, but without audible response. Mr. Cameron evidently supposed he was doing very well, for when he thought he had made his point, and I should presume he must also have thought he had won his audience, he said, "And now, there is nothing left for Dr. Shields but to withdraw"-he did not complete his sentence; for that great assembly exploded like a British mine, and roared in reply, "Never! Never! Never!" And then, apparently with measured speech, and as one person, that great crowd proceeded from their cries of "Never", to, "Sit down! Sit down! Sit down!" This ultimately was accompanied with a rythmic stamping of the feet. In utter astonishment, Mr. Cameron raised his hand and said. "You need not shout: I can hear you", and stepped from the platform.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS

February 4, 1937

Often since that hour I have thought of that spontaneous outburst, and sought some explanation of it. If that whole company had been under training for weeks, directed by a leader's baton, and taught to say the same thing at the same instant of time, it would have been impossible for anyone to train such a crowd to speak with such precision of time and tone as did that great company. My only explanation is that it was under leadership, and that the shout of a King was in the camp, that the Spirit of God Himself inspired that protest.

The resolution and the amendment, being now before the house, many speeches were made, some of the speakers proposing amendments. According to the Year Book, speeches were made by the following: Rev. J. R. Webb, Rev. A. E. St. Dalmas, Rev. J. R. Turnbull, Rev. E. T. Newton, Rev. A. P. Wilson, Mr. A. A. Ayer, Rev. Robt. White, Rev. J. Currie, Rev. S. J. Farmer, Rev. J. McIntosh, Rev. J. Linton, Dr. A. L. McCrimmon, Dr. L. S. Hughson, Dr. J. H. Farmer, Dr. E. M. Keirstead, Rev. M. C. MacLean, Rev. W. B. Tighe. They were about equally divided in their support between the original motion and the amendment.

Rev. John Linton gave us a peep through the key-hole of the door of a theological classroom, and recounted his experience as a student in Brandon College under Professor Harry MacNeill, now a professor in McMaster University. Dr. J. H. Farmer made his usual appeal for compromise. The most heroic speech of all was that by the late Dr. E. M. Keirstead, himself a professor of McMaster University. He, of all the speakers, was the only one who carefully analyzed the terms of the amendment. He pointed out that there was scarcely a doctrine of the gospel-naming the new birth and the atonement-about which there might not be differences of opinion; and showed that if the spirit and letter of the amendment were observed, every preacher and teacher would have to avoid the discussion of every subject with which others might not agree. It was an able speech, delivered with real spiritual power.

Some of my readers will be disposed to object perhaps that I so appraise the speech because it happened to be in support of my motion. Perhaps it is difficult to rid one's mind entirely of its predilections; notwithstanding, I distinctly recall that I felt at the time that Dr. Keirstead had struck a note which had escaped the observation of all others, as he showed that the amendment, if actually acted upon, would become a muzzle restraining every preacher and teacher in the Denomination.

There was very much about that never-to-be-forgotten session which cannot be defined, much less described, in words. There was an atmosphere about the place that was unusual, an atmosphere which must have made some uncomfortable, but which was breathed with delight by others. My own explanation of that session is that it was an experience of the heavenly places. The Spirit of God was there, and God's angels were there. Of course there was opposition; but it is in the heavenly places we meet real opposition. It is there "we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

Numerous amendments were proposed throughout the discussion. Some timorous souls who were with us had not rightly estimated the tide that was running, and were prepared to compromise. The gentleman to whom I have before referred, and whom I had taken into my confidence by showing him my resolution in advance, came up to the platform to me with an amendment which he had carefully framed, and confided in me that he had referred it to the opposition, and that they were willing to vote for it. I let him know that I had discerned his treachery, and told him I would fight the amendment to the last ditch. It was never seriously set before the meeting, and though many suggestions were made, no amendment to the amendment was formally submitted.

As a mover of the motion, it was my privilege to speak a second time, and I had reserved my fire throughout the afternoon, and, by what Bunyon would call "the goings of God on my spirit", I felt distinctly at a certain juncture that I ought to speak; and I so intimated to the Chair, who replied, "You are aware that that would be your last chance?" "Yes; and I am now prepared to take it."

The hour was getting late, and the Chair announced that he had been advised of my desire to speak, and that my speech would close the debate. He paused a few moments to give others an opportunity if they desired to speak. At length I rose and discussed quite briefly the amendment, pointing out that it was a proposal to put our principles in our pockets, to hide our light under a bushel, to hold fast to our convictions—but not to let anyone know we had them; that anything more absurd than the amendment could scarcely have been suggested, for it intimated that if a company of Baptists declared the reason for their being Baptists, it would be "sure to minister to heart-burnings and divisions in our body".

My good friend, Mr. Cameron, must try to forgive me for saying that my speech was especially directed toward his speech delivered as seconder of the amendment; for there was really very little in what Mr. Ryrie had said calling for a reply. He had done very little more than move the amendment. I called attention to the fact that Mr. Cameron had particularly emphasized the matter of the mover of the amendment being a Deacon of Jarvis Street Church. Of course it had been planned as an adroit move to discredit me before the people by setting up one of my Deacons as the mover. In dealing with that, I recall that I stated I'had always entertained the highest respect for Mr. Ryrie, but that if every member of Jarvis Street Church were equal in standing and influence to Mr. James Ryrie, and if I knew they were prepared unanimously to support Mr. Ryrie's extraordinary position, it would not deter me for a moment in the course I felt in conscience bound to take.

I told them that I was a Baptist from conviction, that I had found no reason to change my position, and that my one desire was to learn the Canadian-or, rather, the Ontario and Quebec-content of the term, Baptist. I declared that if the Convention should find it possible to support The Canadian Baptist editorial, I could only conclude that I had no theological kinship with Canadian Baptists. I said that, to me, the term, Baptist, had a certain historical content, that it represented certain biblical principles, and that if they emptied the word of its significance, leaving only what Theodore Roosevelt would have called a "weasle-word", they might have the name, and I would retain the principles, for, I said, if the editorial at issue represented what Baptists stand for, I should have to declare that I was no longer a Baptist.

I called attention to Mr. Cameron's extraordinary statement to the effect that history would attest the truth February 4, 1937

THE GOSPEL WITNESS

of his contention that the Christian church in time past had prospered in the measure in which it had avoided religious controversy, and that he had appealed to the professors of history to say whether or not this were so; and that I commended the discretion of the professors to whom Mr. Cameron appealed in that they had remained silent! I then proceeded something in this vein: "As I heard my friend, the Pastor of Bloor Street Church, propose progress without controversy, and decry controversy as a sure hindrance to progress, I could not help wondering if he had ever heard of such a person as Martin Luther, or John Knox, or John Calvin, or Wyclif"—and called the roll of the fathers.

I went farther and said I could not help asking myself whether the seconder of the amendment, in the course of his reading, had by any chance stumbled upon the name of Paul; that if he had done so, it must surely have appeared to him, as to all others, that nearly every one of the epistles of Paul is controversial, and was written for the purpose of setting someone right who was going wrong. I pointed out also that even the Master Himself, in His discourses, was controversial; and that it was as a controversialist He was crucified at the place called Calvary-that, indeed, it would not be an exaggeration to say that the Bible from beginning to end was born in controversy, that it was the word of truth given us to correct error, the word of light given us to dispel darkness. And I said, "After hearing the Pastor of Bloor Street in this discussion, I would earnestly recommend that he seriously consider the advisability of taking a post-graduate course in Church History, for he has shown us this afternoon that he badly needs it.

In the course of the discussion it had been evident that personal considerations were entering into the debate, and that a great many people were chiefly anxious to avoid saying anything that might hurt the Editor of *The Canadian Baptist*. The Year Book of 1919, on page twenty-seven, says:

"Dr. W. J. McKay addressed the delegates, and in the course of his remarks stated that while he had not written the articles, he accepted full responsibility for them."

That was, of course, a very proper attitude for Dr. McKay to assume. Personally, I had nothing against Dr. McKay, or against anyone else. I had no desire to "hit" anybody, and certainly had every reason to refrain from hurting anyone's susceptibilities. All I desired was that the Convention should repudiate the teaching of the editorial in question, and put itself on record as standing squarely for the old faith. I felt that any minor compromise in the verbal form of the resolution, which would divert the thought of the people from personalities to principles, and help to secure a clear declaration on the principles at stake, would not only be legitimate but eminently wise. In my final speech therefore I proposed that the last clause of the motion containing the resolution proper should be amended, by general consent, by inserting the following words:

"while expressing our affectionate regard for and implicit confidence in, the Editor of *The Canadian Baptist.*"

That was accepted by everyone, and without formal amendment, and at my own suggestion and initiative, the words I have just written were inserted, so that the last clause of the motion was made to read as follows:

"Therefore this Convention, while expressing our affectionate regard for, and implicit confidence in, the Editor of The Canadian Baptist, hereby declares its dis-

approval of the editorial in *The Canadian Baptist* of October 2nd, entitled, "The Inspiration and Authority of Scripture', on the ground that in its representative character as the organ of the Convention, *The Canadian Baptist*, in the said editorial, commends to its readers some new, vague view of the Scriptures different from that to which the Convention declared its adherence in 1910, and upon which the denominational University is declared to be founded."

The added words are here printed in italics for the sake of clarity.

When the President put the motion as changed, the Year Book says, "The resolution was carried, only a few voting in the negative." When the contrary vote was called, the house being still packed in every part, aisles and all in the gallery and on the floor, it was difficult to see. But so far as I was able to discern and count, only thirteen out of that great assembly voted against the resolution. But that thirteen included certain influential men of the Modernist group, and when I saw them standing against that almost unanimous expression of the Convention's doctrinal position, I saw clearly that they were not anxious for agreement, but were determined rather to force their views upon the people.

The session which had convened at two o'clock in the afternoon, adjourned at seven-forty-five, with crowds standing outside waiting for admission to the evening session of the Convention. The session closed, there was a veritable stampede up the aisles for the platform. Literally hundreds of hands were raised, almost like a Nazi salute, as they swarmed up to the platform to shake hands, and to offer congratulations. Many of them were evidently deeply stirred, and I distinctly recall that Dr. S. S. Bates, then Secretary of McMaster University, gripped me warmly by the hand, as, with tears on his cheeks, he said, "Thank God for your leadership to-day. I never thought so much of you as I do now."

There were others by the score whom I could name, but I refrain from doing so. In fact, while still the crowds were coming, I slipped out of the back door to the school-room, and out of the building; for the reason that I did not wish to prolong the demonstration, nor to rub salt into the wounds of those who had been so utterly routed.

I learned later that I was credited with great political astuteness, which I utterly disclaim. I should feel, guilty of a sin against God if I did not declare that throughout that afternoon I was but a humble servant under authority, and had no consciousness whatever of being particularly astute, or of resorting to any tactical move to gain a victory. Indeed, I had gone there prepared, if need be, to be defeated. I had told the Convention that all I desired was a clear, unfettered, unmistakable, expression of the Convention's convictions, that I might know where my fellowship ought properly to be found.

But one, whose name is clearly in my mind, but whom I shall not name, stopped me ere I could leave the building, and said, "I have been wondering, Dr. Shields, what would happen to your opponents if you were to decide to go into politics. They would have no chance at all." The mover of the amendment at dinner that night is reported to have said to someone—and it was some indication, I suppose, of the fact that he was only playing a part that he had been asked to play, and not one in which he had taken the initiative. Again I say that the management of the meeting had been in the hands of the Spirit of God—that if the Pastor of Jarvis Street wished to be

February 4, 1937

so, he could easily make himself Prime Minister of Canada!

These were gross exaggerations of any ability I had displayed that afternoon, and I fear there was a tendency to attribute to human wisdom that credit which was exclusively due to the Spirit of God.

It was a great victory, beyond all doubt. I remember meeting the late Rev. P. A. McEwen at the close of the meeting, when he said, "This has been the greatest victory for Evangelical Christianity ever recorded in the history of this Dominion." But I was under no delusion whatever. I knew that though a victory had been won, the war was not ended; but had only begun; for before I slept that night I was advised that a little group had met, and had declared that that verdict would have to be reversed; that they had said, "He has beaten us in the Convention: we will beat him in his own church."

Since that time all sorts of fantastic tales have been told about my subtlety and my unfairness, which were absolutely without foundation in fact. I will relate only one of them, and that had to do with the authorship of the amendment moved by Mr. James Ryrie.

Someone came into Jarvis Street Church, sat in the back seat, and, greeting one of our men, said that he had come merely to see what was going on, but that he had no respect whatever for Dr. Shields. When asked why, he said that before the Ottawa Convention, Dr. Shields had attended a Board meeting, and had surreptitiously extracted a document from another man's coat in the cloak-room, which proved to be a copy of the amendment to be proposed at Ottawa, and that, having thus virtually stolen something from another man's pocket, he had based his whole resolution upon that amendment.

This report was very amusing to me, although I dare say, by those who had no knowledge of the facts to offset it, the report may have been received, to the damage of my reputation in the estimation of those who received it. But here are the facts. Mr. W. C. Senior was then Secretary of what was called the Convention Plan of Finance. It was Mr. Senior who told me that he had attended a denominational meeting of some sort, where the coats of all the brethren attending had been hung together in a cloakroom, or on a rack, and that he had been detained in conversation with some others, and was the last to leave the room. When he went to get his coat there was only one hanging there, so he put it on. He immediately discovered that it did not fit him, that it was not his coat. He did what anybody would have done under the circumstances: he put his hands in the pockets to see if he could find any mark of identification.

In one of the pockets he found a paper, and that paper was a copy of the amendment, typed on the stationery of the legal firm of which Dr. D. E. Thomson, K.C., was the head. Mr. Senior said that, beyond doubt, the amendment had been framed by Dr. Thomson. It will be seen therefore that it was someone else who got the wrong overcoat, and that I was not informed of the incident until later in the Convention, between sessions, when I met -Mr. Senior who, at that time, was rather jubilant over the Convention's decision.

But what can anyone do to defend himself from the tongue of slander? Anyone who is forced to engage in religious controversy may well appropriate the Psalmist's confident expression, "Thou shalt hide (me) in the secret of thy presence from the pride of man: thou shalt keep (me) secretly in a pavilion from the strife of tongues."

In my next chapter I shall refer to certain other incidents of the Ottawa Convention as they relate to the war, which was thereafter transferred from the Ottawa to the Toronto sector.

Subscribe to The Gospel Witness Now

For only \$2.00 it will visit you every week of the year, carrying the atmosphere of the services of a great church, and a verbatim report of a sermon, and for eight months, a Bible lecture too. Subscribe for yourself and for a friend. The paper is now in its fifteenth year, and circulates in over fifty different countries.

The 52 Sermons and 30 Lectures on Biblical Theology appearing in one year's issues of "The Gospel Witness," if published in book form would make about eight volumes of 150 pages each. Would not this be a good all-year-round gift for a preacher, teacher, or student? And all for \$2.00. A paper-covered book of sermons "The Most Famous Trial of History", is sent with each year's subscription.

SPECIAL OFFER

In order to introduce "The Gospel Witness" to new subscribers, for \$3.00 we will send the paper for one year and a copy of "OTHER LITTLE SHIPS."

Order Blank

"The Gospel Witness,"

130 Gerrard St. E., Toronto 2.

Please find enclosed \$3.00 for which send "The Gospel Witness" for one year, with a copy of "Other Little Ships"; or \$2.00 for one year's subscription to "The Gospel Witness", to the undersigned.

Name Address

"The Oxford Group Movement Analyzed," by Dr. Shields, a 38-page booklet, 10c postpaid.

12 (372)