

The Gospel Witness and Protestant Advocate

Authorized as Second Class Mail, Post Office Department, Ottawa

Vol. 29, No. 7

130 Gerrard St. E., TORONTO, JUNE 8, 1950

Whole Number 1463

REJOICE!

"Rejoice in the Lord alway: and again I say, Rejoice." —Philippians 4:4.

THE words of our text are easy to say and are often, too often alas, easily and lightly said. "Cheer up," says some one who has not felt the chilling blast of sorrow and suffering, and hence his well-meant words are void of meaning or of power to bless the one who labours under the burdens of life. There is much truth in the jest that a pessimist is one who has had to live too long with an optimist. The Pollyanas who are determined to look upon the bright side of life are certainly a virtuous race, but if they fail to remember that there is also a dark side to life their cheerfulness is too forced to be pure and in the end produces bitterness. Not of this kind was the rejoicing of the Apostle Paul. He was not among those who paid his debts with empty words and fond wishes; he was a realist, who dared to look upon the most sombre aspects of life and yet, seeing greater good beyond, to rejoice and to bid others drink from the same fountainhead of joy that he had found.

We do not need to remind our readers that the Epistle to the Philippians, well named the Epistle of Joy, was written in prison, where Paul lay in imminent danger of violent death at the hands of a Roman executioner. His beloved churches were under the insidious attack of subtle enemies of the Gospel who sought to bring to naught the labours of a lifetime. Some of those whom he had trusted had forsaken him, and he must have felt keenly a sense of loneliness in the great pagan city at the crossroads of a wicked world where he waited, helplessly in chains, the sentence of his imperial judge. We might have excused him for indulging himself in at least a little self pity, but there is no hint of it in the entire epistle. Like a highly trained athlete who strains every nerve as he disregards everything else in his one great endeavour of pressing toward the goal, so the Apostle presses toward the mark for the prize of the upward calling of God in Christ Jesus.

What is the source from which this poor prisoner has drawn his abounding joy? Is it open to us also? The Apostle assures us with his whole soul that the same wells of salvation are opened to us also and that they

are to be found in the fountainhead of all grace and peace: "Rejoice in the Lord," he writes. And where else could mortal men find true and lasting joy? Those who have most reason to know the pleasures of earth can but say with the Preacher of old: "Vanity of vanities; all is vanity. What profit hath a man of all his labour which he taketh under the sun? . . . I have seen all the works that are done under the sun; and, behold, all is vanity and vexation of spirit." We have all been brought to the place where we sang the words of the great hymn with a deeper sense of their meaning than we had known hitherto:

When other helpers fail, and comforts flee,
Help of the helpless, oh, abide with me!

There is a philosophy of life that makes pleasure the yardstick to measure the worth of all things: whatever conduces to one's pleasure is good and right and true, it is affirmed. But in practice the pleasures sought after invariably descend to those of the senses, until an Epicurean has come to mean one who cares for nothing except satisfying the appetites of the body, like a brute beast. Those who live for such things are not long in finding that it is all vanity and vexation of spirit, and they are compelled to confess that their way of life is fallen into the sear, the yellow leaf. Paul's joy is in the Lord and is therefore eternal and may be present "alway", as even in the depths of a Roman dungeon it does not desert him. It is founded on the grace and peace of which he writes in the first chapter of this letter, and it issues not in a passive resignation to the inevitable but in joyful acceptance of the Father's will and in the strenuous activity of victor in the race. It is natural to rejoice in abounding health, in great wealth, in multitudes of friends, in what the world calls success and influence; but to rejoice in tribulations and afflictions, this is nothing less than supernatural. To do this a man must have more than a philosophy, he must have an all-powerful, all-gracious God, who is able to supply all his needs according to His riches in glory by Christ Jesus. Anyone can rejoice in the outward

circumstances of life for a time; but only the genuine believer can rejoice at all times in the Lord.

But unhappily, not all believers have reached the secret of Paul's constant joy in Christ, sometimes their tears flow for themselves and they are cast down and their souls disquieted within them. How may such poor tried and troubled mortals as we rejoice in the Lord alway? It must be first, last, and always "in the Lord". We must follow Paul's example in suffering the loss of all things: There can be no satisfaction in Christ until we have given up every vestige of self-righteousness and satisfaction in our own works. Christian joy is founded on peace, on peace with God, which has been made by the blood of Christ's cross. Continual joy in the Lord will be ours only in the measure in which we can say in truth with Paul: "So now also Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life, or by death." Our joy will never be full while our minds are distracted with the many things of life rather than the "one thing" to which God has called us in Christ. As we come to recognize in thought and to translate into everyday living that our citizenship is in heaven, that the way to the throne of grace is ever open to us and that therefore we must be careful for nothing but prayerful in everything, as we fix our thoughts on whatsoever things are true, honest, just, pure, lovely and of good report; when we not only learn and hear and see the truth but do it, then shall the peace of God be with us and garrison our hearts and minds through Christ Jesus. We have but alluded in these few words to the manner in which the epistle describes in some detail how Paul rejoiced in the Lord in order to remind ourselves that his joy in Christ was not a superficial, sentimental feeling but a vital union with the Saviour which enabled him to walk in newness of life. His joy was in the Lord because his whole life was hidden with God in Christ, and every part and department of all his thought and activity were in the Lord. "Rejoice in the Lord alway: and again I say, Rejoice."

—W.S.W.

JARVIS STREET CHURCH

From *The Christian Beacon*.

THERE are very few ministries of forty years in one pulpit. We salute Dr. T. T. Shields, pastor of the Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Canada, and we congratulate the congregation on forty years of fellowship and testimony with its leader. For more than 20 years a sermon, delivered from the Jarvis Street pulpit, has been published each week in THE GOSPEL WITNESS AND PROTESTANT ADVOCATE. These sermons have circled the world.

This pulpit and the testimony of this forty-year ministry belong not to Jarvis Street but to the church universal. We have photographically reproduced the pulpit of the Jarvis Street Church from which the Word of the Lord has sounded forth. Here is a pulpit that has been in the vanguard of the great battle against apostasy, that has challenged Rome in true Protestant freedom and has stood uncompromisingly against all forces which would cast any shadow over the Gospel or minimize the independence and sovereign doctrines of the Baptist congregation. Only eternity will reveal the abundant fruit of such a blessed and effective ministry.

The Gospel Witness and Protestant Advocate

Published every Thursday for the propagation of the Evangelical principles of the Protestant Reformation and in defence of the faith once delivered to the Saints.
\$3.00 Per Year. Postpaid to any address. 10c Per Single Copy.

Editor

T. T. SHIELDS

Associate Editors

W. S. WHITCOMBE, M.A. (Tor.)

OLIVE L. CLARK, Ph.D. (Tor.)

S. S. Lesson and Exchanges

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

Address Correspondence:

THE GOSPEL WITNESS

130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2, Canada

Telephone RAndolph 7415

Registered Cable Address: Jarwitsem, Canada

DO YOUR BOOKS BALANCE?

Was there ever a successful merchant who did not balance his books year by year? I have noticed in reading the details of courts of bankruptcy, that fortunes are as surely wrecked by indolence or carelessness, as by wild speculations, indolence or carelessness, or boundless extravagance. Here is a trader, bankrupt. Sober, honest, industrious, anxious to pay everyone their own, not living in splendour at other men's expense, he should have thriven. Yet this honest man has to take a place beside rogues—he, and others throwing all the blame upon fortune; imputing his misfortunes to the blind goddess, her capricious temper and unsteady wheel. But the examination comes, like that day of a greater judgment which shall reveal the true and unsuspected causes that have wrought the ruin of many souls. The debtor's books are produced; and now it appears that last year, and the year before, and for many years there has been no balance struck. Fancying that all was right, too careless to think of it, too busy to spare time for taking stock, or too indolent to go through its irksome labour, from year to year he has put off striking a balance, till now he strikes on the rick ahead. The crash comes. He opens his eyes on ruin; and finds, too late, that for years he has been driving a losing trade. He is a bankrupt for want of a balance. And the general practice of men of business, their custom of year by year taking stock, examining their books and of striking a balance to know how they stand, is a lesson of highest value. Our everlasting salvation may turn on it. People go on dreaming that all is right when all is wrong; nor wake to the dreadful truth till they open their eyes in torment. What pains ought we to take to avoid the remotest chance of such a calamity! If men take such care of their earthly fortunes, how much greater our need to see how we stand with God; and do with our spiritual what all wise merchants do with their earthly interests—review the transactions of every year! Let us judge ourselves that we be not judged; and, holding a court of conscience, in the words of the text, "Look on all the things that my hands have wrought, and on the labours that I have laboured to do." —DR. THOMAS GUTHRIE

THE GROWING EVIL OF GAMBLING

THE Toronto Chief of Police last week made public a report on gambling. Mayor McCallum has also informed us through the press that there are in this city more than six professional gambling syndicates with at least 2,000 outlets. Their turnover, we are told, amounts to millions of dollars a year and the mayor informs us that most crime, even murder, stems from gambling joints. Premier Frost feels somewhat aggrieved that his government was not informed of the intention of the city fathers to attack this evil and offers the co-operation of the Provincial Police Force, which, he assures the Mayor, is very efficient.

While we are happy to observe the anxiety of all these officials to express their horror of the present evil conditions in Toronto's underworld, and of their earnest desire to remedy the situation, we may be pardoned for remarking that the above-mentioned public servants already have both legislative authority and police forces at their disposal to put an end to the evils they are now talking about. We cannot help but wish that they had acted first and then told us afterwards of what they had already accomplished. We recognize the importance of arousing public opinion on these matters, but when the laws against gambling are already on the statute books, it seems to us that the best way to appeal to public opinion would be by enforcing the law. The Chief has given an excellent report informing us of the evils of gambling and all the ramifications it has in the underworld, but we believe that numerous books in the public library could be found on the same subject in much greater detail. If not, a former civic official of Montreal has recently issued a book giving a very detailed account of how the gambling rings of Montreal are tied up with all kinds of vice and have corrupted and polluted not only morals but also administration and law enforcement in that city. But again, we are constrained to ask why has not the Chief of Police reported to the people of this city what he has done, not merely what ought to be done? It is almost incredible that he should dare to suggest, however, indirectly and discreetly he does so, that there is a possibility of bribery and corruption among the members of the force of which he heads. Yet when we read his following assertion, in *The Daily Star*, this would seem to be his meaning:

Are Toronto Police Open to Corruption?

Dealing with attempts on the part of gamblers to corrupt police, Chief Chisholm said corruption on the part of the gambling element is difficult to detect. He quoted an English solicitor as saying:

"It is not surprising that corruption so seldom comes to light. How can it be expected that it should do so? Both parties to the transaction have the strongest possible reason for preserving secrecy, and, except by chance, detection is almost impossible."

Whatever this may mean, it is very curious language for a Chief of Police to use, and most of all for the Chief of Police of a city that is known, or at least used to be known as "Toronto the Good". Is our fair municipality losing its reputation since it voted on the wide open Sunday?

According to the papers of recent date, a lady from Montreal, if indeed she was a lady, drove her car on downtown streets at the rate of sixty miles an hour and when stopped by a police officer, offered him a bribe, saying that all Toronto policemen had their price. The

magistrate before whom this foolish woman was arraigned rightly waxed angry and sent her down to the cells for seven days, without the option of a fine. He was justly indignant over this wanton affront made against the good name of our police force, and the prisoner well deserved the sentence meted out to her. But what will she think since Chief Chisholm has spoken, and what will the magistrate do should another such case come before him?

Again we say that we wish these officials would talk a little less and do much more. And this opinion we shall continue to hold until they redeem themselves by dealing effectively with the evil of gambling.

The Mayor's Bad Example in Gambling

Why do the responsible heads of the City of Toronto and of the Province of Ontario candidly admit the present activity of huge gambling syndicates whose existence they ought to have prevented and have been empowered by law to do so? We do not venture to recur to the suggestion of the chief of police that they are corrupted by bribes from the wealthy gambling rings, for there is another and simpler explanation, one that is suggested by another news item on the same page of the newspaper that reports Premier Frost's indignant and somewhat ingenuous letter to Mayor McCallum. Lower down on the same page (*Toronto Star* of June 1) there is found another news item under the following heading: "Expect Raffle to Raise \$50,000 for Flood Fund". There we are informed that the biggest raffle ever to be held in Toronto has been planned by a group of "sportsmen" and that it has the blessing of Mayor McCallum, who is to print the tickets free of charge in his own shop and has also donated one of the prizes. We are aware that Mayor McCallum and the fifteen Lions Clubs of Toronto who are organizing this raffle are not committing an illegal act since the law permits occasional gambling for charitable purposes. But has the Mayor reflected on the morals of the raffle? If gambling is wrong, then a good and laudable object that may profit by it does not sanctify its evil. If it did, the Mayor and his "sportsmen" and Lion-like associates would be justified in holding up a bank on condition that they directed the proceeds to a charitable object. Mayors and other politicians are very busy persons and have little time for logic and, alas, sometimes almost as little time for concern regarding moral affairs, but we think if our good printer-mayor would put on his Western hat in the solitudes of his office and reflect seriously for a moment or two he would see the truth of what we say.

The Heart of the Problem

Is not the heart of the problem here? The law forbids gambling, all decent and thoughtful persons recognize the evil that stems from it, but in small amounts, occasionally and for charitable purposes they thoughtlessly condone it and even indulge their own appetite a little. What we need is an awakened conscience in this matter and in all other moral questions. We recognize that the statements of the Mayor and the Chief of Police were doubtless designed to arouse the public conscience, and in this laudable purpose we heartily concur. But unless there is an awareness of right and wrong, public opinion cannot be expected to respond. We wish that the Mayor himself would set a better example and eschew gambling of all sorts.

"Bingomania"

We exceedingly regret that a service club such as the Lions, which certainly does much good work, should soil its good name by being associated with a huge raffle, however worthy the object in view. In another Toronto paper of last week there appeared an account of "Bingomania", as it was called. It told of wives of hard-working miners squandering their husbands' earnings at weekly bingos held under the auspices of labour unions, service clubs and churches. Knowing the North and Quebec, we do not need to be informed that the churches were Roman Catholic, and *The Toronto Globe and Mail* of course did not so inform us, out of tenderness for that church. Such bingos, held weekly—that is one each night, by seven different organizations—are but schools of gambling for women and children. Is organized labour so impoverished that it has to resort to this method of raising funds? Are service clubs so obtuse in morals that they invoke the jesuitical dictum that the end justifies the means?

As for the Roman Church it is no longer any surprise to us that it is willing to batten fat on the proceeds of gambling. We have seen too many "Bingos", lotteries and raffles announced in the press of Quebec and openly advertised from the notice board of Roman Catholic Churches in Quebec to be surprised at this. Scarcely a week passes but some subscriber sends us the announcement of a raffle or a bingo held in connection with a Roman Catholic Church. We have consulted several official Roman Catholic works on the subject and what they say on the matter is summed up by *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, which, after admitting that in earlier days the church strictly forbade games of chance, states that the Council of Trent left it to the judgment of bishops as to what games should be regarded as lawful. It then says:

"Modern ecclesiastical law is less exacting in this matter. Nowadays it is commonly held that positive ecclesiastical law only forbids games of chance, even to the clergy, when in themselves or for some extrinsic reason, such as loss of time or scandal, they are forbidden by the natural law." (Vol. VI, p. 376.)

Rome's Laxity

Those who are looking for some moral impetus to awaken and uplift public opinion in the matter of gambling will look in vain to the Roman Catholic Church. According to its precepts and practices, the Roman Church would welcome Mayor McCallum's gifts to raffles, and would offer no rebuke to the Lions' proclivities for gambling as noted above, and alas it offers no objection to wholesale legalized gambling as seen in the Irish Sweepstakes and in the Quebec act empowering the holding of provincial lotteries. Both those states are predominantly Roman Catholic and exemplify Roman Catholic teaching. Running true to form, the Roman Catholic Church offers a religious short-cut, it permits its followers to make the best of two worlds. As an old professor of mine used to say: "It is the natural man's religion."

When we read the reports of the Chief of Police and the Mayor on moral or immoral conditions in our city, it calls to our mind a biblical phrase that the Apostle used to describe the wickedness of the ancient world of his time: "This present evil world". Truly, the "whole world lieth in the wicked one". But that does not excuse us for failing to play our part as Christians in protesting against the wickedness of our city and

our land. The moral reawakening that we need can come only by a genuine revival of religion, born of the Holy Ghost and resulting in the regeneration of hosts of men and women. This was the source of the moral revival in Eighteenth Century England, when under the simple, evangelical preaching of Whitefield and the Wesleys, England was aroused from the moral slough into which she had fallen. Our day and generation need another such revival!

—W.S.W.

NUNS TOLD TO BACK BINGO

THE following clipping which is illustrative of the above discussion, was sent to us only the other day by an interested subscriber, and though it is somewhat late, we venture to reprint it here to show the real attitude of Rome to gambling.

From *The Toronto Daily Star*, Monday, October 17, 1949

Newark, N.J., Oct. 17—(AP)—Leaflets backing Democrat Elmer H. Wene for governor "because he favours bingo legislation" were handed out to parochial (separate) school principals and teachers for distribution among their parishes, the Newark Sunday News said.

The newspaper said support of other democratic legislative candidates also was urged in the circulars handed out to 400 nuns at a meeting in St. Patrick's cathedral school hall Saturday.

Auxiliary Bishop James A. McNulty of the Newark Roman Catholic archdiocese, who presided at the meeting, and Rev. John J. Dougherty of Immaculate Conception seminary, Darlington, outlined plans for the circular campaign, the Newark News added.

"Dr. Dougherty," the newspaper said, "told the nuns that an issue such as bingo is important to the church because of the financial obligations involved in operation of schools and school buses."

He was further listed as saying "the church desired to campaign for bingo legislation as a matter of principle" and the nuns were to carry the campaign on behalf of candidates supporting bingo legalization back to their parishes.

Bingo has been one of the big issues in the New Jersey campaign in which Wene is opposing Republican Governor Alfred E. Driscoll, who seeks re-election.

HOW TO READ THE BIBLE

Read the Bible, not as a newspaper, but as a home letter. If a cluster of heavenly fruit hangs within reach, gather it.

If a promise lies upon the page as a blank cheque, cash it. If a prayer is recorded, appropriate it and launch it as a feathered arrow from the bow of your desire.

If an example of holiness gleams before you, ask God to do as much for you. If the truth is revealed in all its intrinsic splendour, entreat that its brilliance may ever irradiate the hemisphere of your life.

—F. B. MEYER.

GOSPEL WITNESS PUBLICATIONS

(Reprints)

"The Antichrist—His Portrait and History", By Baron Porcelli50
"The Greatest Fight in the World", by C. H. Spurgeon, 64 pages25
"Blakeney's Popery in Its Social Aspect", 312 pages	1.00

The Gospel Witness

130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2 - Canada

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

Even if Infant Baptism as Practised by Protestants And Roman Catholics Be Unscriptural, Is There Any Harm In It?

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, May 28th, 1950
(Stenographically Reported)

"And as he journeyed, he came near Damascus; and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven, and he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he, trembling and astonished, said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?"—Acts 9:3-6.

"Then the Pharisees and scribes asked him, Why walk not the disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread with unwashen hands? He answered and said unto them, Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. For, laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups; and many other such like things ye do. And he said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition. For Moses said, Honour thy father, and thy mother; and, Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death; But ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, It is Corban, (that is to say, a gift,) by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; he shall be free. And ye suffer him no more to do ought for his father or his mother; Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered; and many such like things do ye."—Mark 7:5-13.

I THINK we have in the verses I first read to you the secret, the psychology of the great career of Saul of Tarsus, who later became Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles. Knowing no better, he persecuted the church of Christ. Then, as we have read, he was arrested on the Damascus Road by a light which shone upon him from Heaven. He heard a voice calling "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" Now, you will note, Saul of Tarsus said, "Who art Thou Lord?" His first task was to identify the Speaker; to find out who He was, and whence this voice came. The Lord said, "I am Jesus Whom thou persecutest; it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks." And just as soon as Saul was assured of the identity of the Speaker, he asked another question: "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" That is the function of faith; first, to identify Jesus Christ as the Saviour, the Lamb of God, the Lord of all, and next to inquire, "What wilt Thou have me to do?"

The other verses describe another class of religious people—people who had substituted the traditions of men for the Word of God. And the Lord said, "In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men,—as the washing of pots and cups, and many other such like things ye do. You have made a religious ordinance of things which are nothing more than a human tradition."

Is Jesus Christ Lord? Is His Word
Supremely Authoritative?

Little that I shall say this evening can be of profit to anybody unless he first takes the position of the Apostle

Paul. Our first enquiry must be: "Who is Jesus?" Is He just an Insurance Agent signing a policy to give you eternal life? Is He only an Example, whose walk you are to try to emulate? Or a mere Character in history to whom you must pay due respect? Or is He the living Son of God? Is He Saviour and Lord?

On the Day of Pentecost the multitude supposed that Jesus of Nazareth was dead; they knew He had been crucified, and they supposed that He was dead. Peter argued that "having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear—therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." It was when they were convinced of the sovereign Lordship of Jesus Christ, the multitude were "pricked in their heart," and cried, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?"

Therefore, that is my question to everyone this evening: "Is Jesus Lord? Are His commandments binding upon you? Have you any concern whatever to know what the will of God is? Many who profess and call themselves Christian open their Bibles but infrequently to discover what the Lord's will is. They go on, drifting along, doing their own will, quite careless of the Divine requirement that they should be asking all the time: "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?"

Inevitably, if you put the traditions of your church, your own convenience, your business interests, your social position, or any other thing, before the supreme

authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, I cannot do anything with you; because, indeed, if I were to prove to a demonstration a certain proposition, it would have no effect upon you. You would say, "Well, that may be all true, but I do not care. I am under no obligation to obey." Now that is a very serious consideration, but it is a fact, notwithstanding. I think I should be well within the mark if I were to say that the vast majority of people who profess and call themselves Christian drift along through life doing their own will, and caring but little what the will of the Lord is concerning them.

And so in this matter, of which I have announced that I will speak this evening, it will be of no consequence to you if I prove that infant baptism, as I think I did in my last address, is utterly unscriptural; nor if I were to prove too, that it is quite injurious, unless you believe and receive the Word of God and are determined to do just what God commands you, my arguments will be of no avail. Those who belong in that category described in the seventh chapter of Mark are by no means passed away, for there are numberless people who bear the Christian name, who do "after the traditions of men"; and are more concerned about the practices of their Church; what their minister has to say; what their grandfather was, and what he did, than they are to discover exactly what is the teaching of Scripture, and then to do precisely what the Scripture teaches.

There was an article by Dr. Stanley Russell, in *The Toronto Star*, and he is perfectly frank, and is to be commended for his frankness. He said "It is perfectly true that neither in its teaching, nor by its example, does Holy Scripture give any authority for the baptism of infants. Jesus did not practise it, nor is there any record of such a ceremony in the New Testament. If the question is to be decided on the basis of these authorities then we should all join the Baptist Church, which conforms to scriptural precedent." This is an exceedingly frank and fair statement of the case I think. But then he goes on to say, and spoils it all, saying, in effect: "After all, baptism is a little affair, why worry about it. Why bother about these little things—pay no attention to them. Go on; if your church practises infant baptism then fall in line with it; if they practise something else, fall in line with that; do not make yourself odd and peculiar. Perhaps we are odd, and peculiar in this place; we are, indeed, peculiar enough to believe that what the Scriptures teach is an all important consideration to every believer."

An Erroneous Conception of the Function of Baptism

The baptism of infants obviously grew out of an erroneous conception of the function of baptism. Baptism is nothing more than a confession of faith; a divinely ordained means for those who believe in the Lord Jesus, to confess their identification with Him in His death, in His burial, in His resurrection, as you saw these young men do this evening. They believe that when Christ died, they died; when He was buried, they were buried; when He arose from the dead, they arose from the dead; and so they obey His commandment just to tell the world that henceforth they would be looked upon as identified with Jesus Christ.

The Error of Baptismal Regeneration

But, baptism has been assumed to be an instrument of regeneration, and there is the difficulty. That is true

of the Roman Catholic Church. If I believed that people could be saved by baptism I think I would go out and try to baptize everybody I could get my hands on, if they would consent, that they might be baptized and saved. But I know perfectly well it will not; I know there is absolutely not one word in Scripture to justify the assumption that baptism confers any grace upon anybody, save such grace as comes to him who consciously and deliberately and voluntarily does the will of God because it is the will of God. Then he has the answer of a good conscience because he has obeyed the Lord. But there is no magic quality in the waters of baptism that really regenerates the soul, and yet my dear friends that is exactly what Roman Catholicism teaches.

Rome Substitutes Baptism for Faith

As a matter of fact, the Roman Catholic Church has substituted baptism for faith in Christ. Rome explicitly teaches that it is utterly impossible for anyone to be saved without baptism, whether an adult or an infant. Children must be baptized in order to be saved. They do not say that if a child is not baptized it will go to Hell, but they have created a convenient place for it. And so they tell us that if a child is unbaptized, through no fault of its own, it will be denied, the word is, "the beautiful vision", it will never see the face of God, and its spirit will be consigned to a convenient place called "Limbo". It will not go to Hell, and it will not go to Heaven, but it will never see the face of God unless it is baptized. I have told you this more than once, and what a libel that is upon God! What an atrocious doctrine that is! How it misrepresents Him who said: "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven." Not baptize them, but "let them come unto me". And they brought infants to Him and He took them up in His arms and blessed them, and the mothers went away rejoicing because the Lord had blessed them, but He didn't baptize them, for Jesus baptized no one. "Jesus Himself baptized not, but His disciples."

Infant baptism is called by the Roman Catholic church "The Sacrament of Regeneration", and everywhere repeats that when the sign of the cross is made upon a child, or the child is in some way baptized, it is made a new creature in Christ, regenerated, it has a new nature. Surely, dear friends, we all know that there isn't a word of support of that doctrine in the Word of God, is there? And it is a terrible thing to practise in the name of the Lord that which He has not commanded.

How Did Infant Baptism Originate?

But where did infant baptism come from? It is not easy always to trace these things to their origin, but I think I know. History comes to our help, and I quote from an article on Baptism in the *Edinburgh Encyclopaedia*, by Sir David Brewster. This is what Sir David Brewster says:

"The first law for sprinkling was obtained in the following manner: Pope Stephen II, being driven from Rome by Astolphus, King of Lombards, in 753, fled to Pepin, who a short time before had usurped the crown of France. While he remained there, the Monks of Cressy, in Brittany, consulted him whether, in case of necessity, baptism performed by pouring water on the head of the infant would be lawful. Stephen replied that it would. But though the truth of this fact should be allowed, which, however, some Catholics deny, yet pouring or sprinkling was admitted only in cases of ne-

cessity. It was not till the year 1311, that the Legislature, in a council held at Ravenna, declared immersion or sprinkling to be indifferent. In this country (Scotland), however, sprinkling was never practised in ordinary cases, till after the Reformation; and in England, even in the reign of Edward VI., immersion was commonly observed. But during the persecution of Mary many persons, most of whom were Scotchmen, fled from England to Geneva, and there greedily imbibed the opinions of that church. In 1556 a book was published at that place containing the form of prayers and ministration of sacraments, approved by the famous and godly learned man, John Calvin, in which the administrator is enjoined to take water in his hand and lay it on the child's forehead. These Scottish exiles, who had renounced the authority of the Pope, implicitly acknowledged the authority of Calvin; and returning to their own country with John Knox at their head, in 1559, established sprinkling in Scotland. From Scotland, this practice made its way into England in the reign of Elizabeth, but was not authorized by the established church."

There is no reasonable doubt that the practice of infant baptism is a Roman Catholic invention, as it has no warrant whatever in the Word of God; and it is practised because, as I say, of the erroneous conception that baptism does really regenerate the soul. Now that is particularly taught by the church of Rome as a sacrament of regeneration. Saint Augustine says:

"If immediately after baptism there follows departure from this life, there will be absolutely nothing that a man can answer for, for he will have been freed from everything that bound him."

Baptism does everything, though the child doesn't know anything at all about it. It regenerates his soul and fits him for the presence of God. Could anything be more absurd than that? What sort of a God have we, that little children should be penalized forever, (even if it were true that children should be baptized) because their elders neglected to get them baptized at the proper time? And, as I have told you, Rome is so insistent upon this matter of baptism as absolutely indispensable to the salvation of every soul that it has provided for pre-natal baptism, the baptism of children before they are born. I will not offend you by the obscene descriptions of these regulations made by the church of Rome for the pre-natal baptism of children.

The Greek Orthodox Church

Now the same is true of the Greek Orthodox Church. The Greek Orthodox Church does not sprinkle, it immerses, but it does immerse infants; it practises infant baptism, but it adheres to the original practice of immersion. But you are neither Romanists or Greek Orthodox.

Anglican Prayer Book Teaches Baptismal Regeneration

I must tell you therefore that the Anglican Church is not one bit better. I do not want to offend any Anglicans, and I can well believe that many Anglicans do not believe in baptismal regeneration. At the same time we are bound to recognize what is taught in the book of Common Prayer, and I am going to give you some quotations this evening, so that you may see. And this is the book of Common Prayer for Canada. Now I have the deepest respect for my Anglican friends, and some of the noblest saints I have ever known have been Anglicans; some of the truest men of God I have ever met are Anglican clergymen; but they seem to have a

"black spot" somewhere, and I find it difficult to understand how men, so instructed in and who otherwise are so obedient to the Word of God, can set it at naught at this point, where the Scripture speaks so explicitly.

It is here insisted that baptism must be administered only once. Standing there the Priest shall ask whether any of the persons now presented have before been baptized or no. If they shall answer "No," then shall the Priest say thus:

"Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, and that our Saviour Christ saith, none can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and born anew of Water and of the Holy Ghost: I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous mercy he will grant to these persons that thing which by nature they cannot have; that they may be baptized with Water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy Church, and be made living members of the same."

I cannot quote all that is said here, because I should keep you too long, but — "here all the congregation shall kneel." Now listen to this — before the child is baptized:

"Almighty and everlasting God, who of thy great mercy didst save Noah and his family in the ark from perishing by water; and also didst safely lead the children of Israel thy people through the Red Sea, figuring thereby thy holy Baptism; and by the Baptism of thy well-beloved Son Jesus Christ, in the river Jordan, didst sanctify Water to the mystical washing away of sin: We beseech thee, for thine infinite mercies, that thou wilt mercifully look upon this Child; wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost; that he, being delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's Church; and being steadfast in faith, joyful through hope; and rooted in charity, may so pass the waves of this troublesome world, that finally he may come to the land of everlasting life, there to reign with thee world without end; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Godfathers and Godmothers

He reads passages from the Gospel, and then the minister addresses the Godfathers and Godmothers on this wise: Now I do not know where they got the idea of sponsors, one thing I am absolutely certain of is that the Holy Scripture knows absolutely nothing about Godfathers or Godmothers. They are purely a human invention. This is salvation by proxy,—it is in the Prayer Book but it isn't in the Bible. It is an institution of the church. Now the Priest addresses the Godfathers and Godmothers after this fashion:

"Dearly beloved, ye have brought this Child here, to be baptized; ye have prayed that our Lord Jesus Christ would vouchsafe to receive him, to release him of his sin, to sanctify him with the Holy Ghost, to give him the kingdom of heaven and everlasting life. Ye have heard also that our Lord Jesus Christ hath promised in his Gospel, to grant all these things that ye have prayed for: which promise he, for his part, will most surely keep and perform. Wherefore, after this promise made by Christ, this Infant must also faithfully, for his part, promise by you that are his sureties, (until he come of age to take it upon himself) that he will renounce the devil and all his works, and constantly believe God's holy Word, and obediently keep his commandments."

Now who of you would become surety for an infant child and solemnly promise in that child's behalf that when he grows up he will renounce the Devil and all

his works? In many cases the Godfathers and Godmothers are not even Christians themselves. They haven't renounced the Devil and all his works for themselves, to say nothing of renouncing them for a child. Now listen:

"I demand therefore, Dost thou, in the name of this Child, renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the carnal desires of the flesh, so that thou wilt not follow nor be led by them?"

The child is supposed to answer through its sureties, the Godfathers and Godmothers:

"I renounce them all."

A pretty bold statement, I think.

Faith by Proxy

Then they go farther. They are to believe by proxy.

"Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth?"—

here is the infant child, who doesn't even know its own father and mother—

—"and in Jesus Christ his only-begotten Son our Lord? And that he was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; that he suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; that he went down into hell, and also did rise again the third day; that he ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; and from thence shall come again at the end of the world, to judge the quick and the dead?"

"And dost thou believe in the Holy Ghost; the Holy Catholick Church; the Communion of Saints; the Remission of sins; the Resurrection of the flesh; and everlasting life after death?"

That is supposed to be asked of the child. But its sureties answer:

"All this I stedfastly believe."

I do not want to hurt anybody's susceptibilities, but, really I cannot conceive of anything more utterly absurd than that. No parents dare promise that for their own children. Have I not known the most godly parents who have been broken-hearted because of the waywardness of their children, through no fault of the parents? Then the minister further asks the child through its sponsors:

"Wilt thou be baptized in this faith?"

The child doesn't know anything about it, but his sureties answer in his behalf:

"That is my desire."

It may be the child is crying lustily and protesting against the whole performance, but the Godfathers and Godmothers say: "That is my desire."

Once more:

"Wilt thou obediently keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of thy life?"

And again they answer:

"I will, God being my helper."

Then there follows a prayer that "the old Adam in this Child may be so buried, that the new man may be raised up in him."

Then this prayer follows:

"Almighty everliving God, whose most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ, for the forgiveness of our sins, did shed out of his most precious side both water and blood; and gave commandment to his disciples, that they should go teach all nations, and baptize them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Regard we beseech thee the supplications of thy congregation; sanctify this Water to the mystical washing away of sin; and grant that this Child, now to be baptized therein, may receive the fulness of thy grace, and ever remain in the number of thy faithful and elect children; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

We come now to the naming of the child.

"Then the Priest shall take the Child into his hands, and shall say to the Godfathers and Godmothers,

"Name this Child."

"And then, naming it after them (if they shall certify him that the Child may well endure it) he shall dip it in the Water discreetly and warily, saying,

"I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

"But if they certify that the Child is weak, it shall suffice to pour Water upon it, saying the foresaid words."

I should not like to imply that all Anglicans are so weak that they "could not well endure" to be dipped in the water discreetly and warily. And yet one is almost forced to assume that they must be a generation of weaklings, because there is not one in ten thousand of them that is immersed. And yet the Prayer Book says that unless someone shall certify they cannot well endure it, they shall be dipped; they shall be immersed. We have no quarrel therefore with our Anglican friends as to the form or mode of baptism. They admit that immersion is the primitive form.

—But I am dealing this evening with the fact that faith is a prerequisite to baptism. And here provision is made for the baptism of children on the ground of the promise of their Godfathers and Godmothers.

Now let us go farther:

"Then the Priest shall say,

"We receive this Child into the Congregation of Christ's flock, and do sign him with the sign of the Cross, in token that hereafter he shall not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified, and manfully to fight under his banner against sin, the world, and the devil, and to continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto his life's end."

"Then shall the Priest say,

"Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this Child is regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's Church, let us give thanks unto Almighty God for these benefits, and with one accord make our prayers unto him, that this Child may lead the rest of his life according to this beginning."

After the recitation of the Lord's prayer, this extraordinary prayer follows:

"We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this Infant with thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for thine own Child by adoption and to incorporate him into thy holy Church, and humbly we beseech thee to grant that he being dead unto sin, and living unto righteousness, and being buried with Christ in his death, may crucify the old man, and utterly abolish the whole body of sin; and that as he is made partaker of the death of thy Son, he may also be partaker of his resurrection; so that finally, with all thy holy Church, he may be an inheritor of thine everlasting kingdom: through Christ our Lord. Amen."

I have read these excerpts to you merely to show that the Anglican Church—the Anglican Church in Canada—teaches the dogma of baptismal regeneration; that people are saved—children are saved—by baptism; whereas, the Scripture teaches that no one can be saved unless he believes in the Lord Jesus Christ; and to substitute the promise of proxies for the personal faith of the child or the older person (one who is old enough, at least to believe) is surely indefensible.

I venture also to ask, Wherein does the Anglican doctrine of baptismal regeneration differ in principle from the teaching and practice of the Roman Catholic Church?

Now, baptismal regeneration is certainly contrary to the teaching of Scripture. There is no warrant for such belief or practice in Holy Scripture. That can be proved in a thousand ways.

I do not know whether I have any Roman Catholic friends here tonight; if they are they are no worse and no better than their fellow Protestants by nature, for "we have all sinned and come short of the glory of God." And there is only one way of salvation for every one of us, and the one way of salvation is through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and the cleansing by His precious blood, and regeneration by the Holy Spirit.

Thousands of Baptized Persons in Penitentiaries

According to Government statistics, over fifty percent of the prison and penitentiary population of this Dominion are Roman Catholics. They number about forty-three percent of the population, but over fifty percent (fifty-one or two percent of the prison population) according to Government statistics, are Roman Catholics. Now, if so, every one of them has been baptized. But baptism did not keep them out of the penitentiary, even though they were baptized. Hitler was a Roman Catholic; Hitler was baptized when he was a child; so was Mussolini; so was Stalin. Stalin began to study for the Priesthood of the Greek Orthodox Church; and they were all baptized as infants. Were they regenerated? Were they made children of God and received into Christ's Church? Can you think of a Christian church made up of Hitlers, or Mussolinis, or Stalins? How utterly impossible that conception is!

Well, for the sake of argument, let us admit then, as many will, just like Dr. Russell—that it is not Scriptural; we admit that there is no warrant for infant baptism in the Scripture. But some will say, It is a nice ordinance anyhow — and it is a lovely thing to see young parents bringing their little children to the font, and dedicating them to God, and being baptized, or "christened". (That word "Christened" dates back to the early part of the seventeenth century, and it signifies being "made Christian".) They were supposed to be made Christians by baptism.

What Harm Is There in It?

So our friends say it is a lovely thing to see parents bringing their little children to the font, dedicating them to Him and having them baptized. What harm is there in it, even supposing it is not taught in the Scriptures, is there any harm in practising it? Dr. Russell says there isn't. We may accept the traditions of the church; we may follow the practices of the church to which we belong, and it will be all right. What harm is there?

I submit, in the first place, that we have no right to

practise in the name of the Trinity that which the Lord has not commanded. We had, many years ago, rather an eccentric Baptist minister whose name was Davidson—Dr. Thomas L. Davidson. He was once asked to sprinkle, or baptize a child. He went to the home and they provided him with a basin of water, and he took the infant in his arms, and he asked the father and mother its name. We will call it John Thomas. And so Dr. Davidson said: "In the name of the father and of the mother and of Thomas L. Davidson I sprinkle you John Thomas." They were horrified and said, "Dr. Davidson, that isn't baptism." "Why isn't it?" "Why," they said, "baptism must be administered in the name of the Father, and the Son and the Holy Ghost." "Yes, have you a Bible?" "Yes." "Will you show me within the pages of that Book my authority, as a Christian minister, for sprinkling water on the forehead of this child, calling it baptism, and doing it in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost?" "Well, we do not know where to look for it." "It wouldn't make any difference if you did, because it isn't there. It isn't in the Book at all." "But," he said, "the father has no objection, the mother has no objection, and I have no particular objection, and so in the name of the father, the mother, and Thomas L. Davidson I can sprinkle the baby if you want me to. But I cannot baptize it in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, without Scriptural warrant, for it is written, 'Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God in vain, for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh His Name in vain.'" It is a terrible thing to practise as an ordinance a tradition of men, and to do it in the name of the Holy Trinity.

Assumption of Regeneration by Baptism Utterly False

Then, there is this further harm in it. It assumes that regeneration takes place at baptism, and thus substitutes a mere ceremony for vital faith. And children grow up with that idea—"I was baptised into the church. My father and mother tell me so. What else do I need? I affirm that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is a grievous error, and ought to be exposed and condemned. I read to you from the Book of Common Prayer, "This child is now received into Christ's Church," by baptism. The Anglican Church certainly teaches that; notwithstanding history attests that baptism does not regenerate, for the vilest of men have been baptized. You will all admit that. You know a great many people who have foul tongues and evil hearts, and yet they were baptized in infancy. They were made no better for it; they were not regenerated.

Another Deadly Error

But I have another very serious objection to it, and that is because it counterfeits Christianity. It is the Devil's master counterfeiting ordinance. It puts the name of Christian upon millions who do not know Christ. That cannot be denied. I sent an advertisement once to Toronto newspapers for help here in the church. In my advertisement I said, "Must be definitely Christian, total abstainer, and non-smoker". One paper objected to publishing the advertisement. I said, "What is the matter?" "Why that is discriminating against the Jews!" The poor silly girl thought that everybody who wasn't a Jew was a Christian. Why did she think so? Because this horrible dogma for centuries has been telling the world that very thing. Infant baptism puts

the name of "Christian" upon people who have never known the Lord.

Still Another Evil in the Dogma

Then in the next place it establishes churches made up of unregenerate people. The teaching of the word of God is that the New Testament Church should be composed exclusively of people who have believed in Christ, and have been born again. There is no place in the membership of the Christian Church for one who makes no profession of regeneration, of having been born again.

We cannot agree that no harm can come from doing in the Name of the Trinity what the Scripture neither commands nor permits. But that will become the rule of Pulpit and Pew if you make churches to consist of people who do not know the Lord. What of your elders, and your wardens, deacons, if you have them? What if they are not saved? They are in official positions in the church. What can you expect of the pulpit? How can you expect any minister of Christ to be a free man, to declare the whole counsel of God, if he has a church made up of people who care nothing for the authority of God's word, but who give precedence to the traditions of their church.

Some years ago before the Depression in the days of our great Sunday School a lady came here one Sunday morning to look over the school. She went from department to department, and she said, "I don't know how you do it." I said, "What is mysterious about it?" There were some fifteen to eighteen hundred present. "Well," she said, "I don't know how you do it." I said, "The teachers, of course, regularly visit and look after the shepherding of all their children. If any are absent, before the next Sunday they are visited." "But how can they find time?" she said. "These young men and young women have got to have time for recreation. They must have a night at the theatre, and perhaps a night for dancing. When they have had that, what time is there for them to visit?" I said, "That does not obtain in this school. Our teachers don't take a night at the theatre, and they don't go dancing. They are separated unto the gospel of Christ." She said, "Do you mean to say that you would not have anyone teach in your school who was an habitual attendant at the theatre?" I said, "Not for a moment, if we knew it." "And you would not have anyone in your school who danced?" I said, "Not at all." "They would be excluded?" "Absolutely!" "Well," she said, "that would exclude me, and I am the wife of a Presbyterian minister." I said, "I can't help that, Mrs. So-and-So, but you would be excluded, notwithstanding your husband's position, and profession. We believe in a regenerated church membership, and we believe the work of the church should be done by regenerated people who have in truth and fact 'renounced the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world,' and are factually separated unto the gospel of Christ."

I don't want you to think that I have any special reason for naming any particular Church. I hold in my hand the Westminster Confession of Faith, of the Presbyterian Church. It is published in Edinburgh, containing the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, scripture proofs at large, together with the sum of saving knowledge.

Now this church practises infant baptism. Let us look briefly into its teaching on this matter.

Chapter 28, Sections V. and VI.

"V. Although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated."

"VI. The efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered; yet notwithstanding, by the right use of this ordinance, the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own will, in his appointed time."

You will observe the Westminster Confession of Faith does not say that all who are baptized are necessarily regenerated, but that "baptism is not so inseparably connected with salvation, that salvation is dependent upon it. Well, so far, so good. But they baptize infants notwithstanding. As to the Church, it has this to say:

Chapter 25: II. and VI.

"II. The visible church, which is also catholick or universal under the gospel, (not confined to one nation, as before under the law) consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children."

"VI. There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ: nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ, and all that is called God."

Now that is the Presbyterian doctrine of Baptism and the Church that the children of godly parents are members of the church, and are included in the church. They are included in the covenant, and in due time they must take their place in the church. But even before so doing they are included in the membership of the church. The Westminster Confession of Faith says so.

And so this practice of infant baptism makes it necessary for some of us to protest against substituting the traditions of men for the commandments of God. I insist that the word of God should be followed in all these matters.

A False Testimony

Then I object to it because it gives a false testimony; it misrepresents Christianity to an ungodly world. You go and ask anyone to-morrow, "Are you a Christian?" "No, sir, I am not." "Why are you not a Christian?" "Because I am just as good as those who profess to be. There are many church members of whose lives I should be ashamed." See if you don't get that before the day is out. You will get it from the majority of people. Why? Because the name of "Christian" has been put upon the mass of ungodly people who misrepresent the gospel of the grace of God.

The Origin of Communism

One other thing: where did Communism come from? In its most dangerous form, it came out of Russia. What was it? It was a protest against the tyranny of Czarism and of the Greek Orthodox Church. It is not too much to say that Communism is very largely the child of infant baptism. The only Christianity the masses of Russian people knew was that which was exemplified by the Greek Orthodox Church, and its tyrannous rule over the people had nothing Christian in it.

What About Europe?

What about France? Our young friends told us last Sunday morning that of the forty-two or forty-three millions of people in France, thirty-eight million profess no religion at all. Why? Because the only religion they know is Roman Catholicism, and they hate that with perfect hatred. And I don't blame them.

Look at the darkness of Europe to-day! It is not as dark as it was in the Middle Ages. But Roman Catholicism has stamped all these multitudes with the name of "Christian", without changing their hearts, or reforming their lives. As a matter of fact, I object to this practice of infant baptism because of its damaging influence throughout the whole world. I believe it is the most prolific mother of errors the world has ever known. Had we time for the necessary research, I am sure I could convincingly show that most of the political and economic ills of the world have a very direct relation as effect and cause to this infant-sprinkled Christianity which arrogantly claims dominion over the whole world.

It is not enough to say "I know it is not scriptural, but I think it is a lovely ordinance, and therefore I don't object to it." Abide by the teaching of God's word. The teaching of God's word is that "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures." And we are to come as poor sinners, repenting of our sins, and seeking mercy at His hand, believing on the Lord Jesus Christ, having believed, we are then, before all the world, to proclaim our identity with Him in the ordinance of baptism which you witnessed this evening.

Be assured of this, my dear friends, that if we depart deliberately from the clear, unmistakable, teaching of the word of God, by a hair's breadth, we court trouble for ourselves, and we make trouble for everybody else.

What I have said will have no value to you whatever, if first of all you have not identified Jesus as Lord: if you have not asked, like the Apostle Paul, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" Not the church, not the minister, not your wife, not your children, not your neighbours—never mind what they say; come as an individual soul, regenerated by the grace of God through faith in Christ Jesus, and by the power of the Holy Ghost, and say, "Now, Lord, here I am! What is next? What wilt thou have me to do?"

HOW THE BIBLE IS OFTEN TREATED

A bright little boy once took the Bible from the centre table of his father's home and turned its dusty pages and said: "Mother, is this God's Book?" "Certainly," was the mother's reply. "Well, I think we had better send it back to God, for we don't use it here," said the little fellow.

This is a fair picture of many a home and the way the Bible is treated. The centre-table Bible is a catch-all. It is a place for relics, letters, poetry and pressed flowers. He has revealed to us words of truth and grace, and like David we should meditate upon His word by day and by night. The Scriptures are sufficient to make us wise unto salvation. Christ says, we are sanctified by them. Paul says, we are begotten by them. Peter says, we are born again by them.

A UNITED CHURCH CLERGYMAN LOOKS AT INFANT BAPTISM

By Rev. G. Stanley Russell in *The Toronto Daily Star*

IT IS perfectly true that, neither in its teaching nor by its example, does Holy Scripture give any authority for the baptism of infants. Jesus did not practise it, nor is there any record of such a ceremony in the New Testament. If the question is to be decided on the basis of these authorities, then we should all join the Baptist Church, which conforms to scriptural precedent, and the attitude of which compels respect even from those who do not share it. It might also be mentioned that there are, in other denominations, those who have some misgivings in this matter, and that a number of young people are baptized only when they enter into membership of the Church.

Now and then there are those, in the late teens and early twenties, who ask to be baptized largely because they feel different from others of their age, whose parents followed the usual practice. It is almost as if vaccination had been omitted, and the absence of scars on their arms made them feel conspicuous.

Cases Are Exceptional

These, however, are exceptional. In most families the baptism of infants comes only second to the burial of the dead as a religious obligation which has survived the abandonment of almost every other. People who no longer go to church have some lingering awe—one hates to call it superstition—which makes them reluctant, if not afraid, to bury their dead without religious rites, or to let their children grow up unbaptized. It is an entirely illogical attitude, for, if religion is unnecessary at other times, it is difficult to see why it suddenly becomes essential in these connections. However, there it is, and there is no accounting for it.

Of course, a good deal is due to the lingering power of the Church's ancient attitude. One of the early fathers drew a lurid picture of unbaptized children crawling on the floor of hell! Within our own recollection clergy were summoned in the small hours of the morning to baptize dying infants, for the very practical reason that they might not, unless that was done, be given proper burial.

There are still those who believe most firmly that, with the sprinkling of water on the forehead, a definite change takes place in the nature of the infant and its relationship to God. While no longer prepared to accept the darker destinies which the Church once believed inevitable for the unbaptized child, these people firmly hold that the sacramental act makes a real difference to the infant. Born in sin and under the wrath of God, by the laver of holy baptism the child becomes regenerate. How or why we are not told.

When all this has been said, however, much more remains. Those who believe that at the Reformation too many sacraments were retained, are nevertheless aware that one of them was holy baptism. What is more, we are not prepared to admit that the guidance of the Holy Ghost ended with the New Testament, or that, while the baptism of infants has no warrant in Scripture, it may not have abundant authority since. That is not to unchurch the Baptists, to whom, apparently, that guidance has not come and who are walking by a light sufficient for them, but it is to refuse to unchurch

the rest of us, who feel that the baptism of infants is permissible, if not authoritative.

Follows Great Precedent

Perhaps the nearest the New Testament comes to authorizing it is where Joseph and Mary take the infant Jesus to the temple "to present him to the Lord." Whatever else holy baptism means, it means that, and follows that great precedent. It recognizes, with awe and wonder that every little child sent into a home and hearts of love and reverence, is the gift of God, Who Himself came in a little child for our salvation. The presentation of the babe in church has, therefore, in itself an immense significance. There is also, of course, thanksgiving for the safe arrival of the little one, and for the joys and opportunities that this new life makes possible. Who shall predict or number them? Who shall dare to contemplate what the growth of this tiny soul to Christian maturity may mean to the parents, or to the world?

In the year 1809, all eyes were on the Napoleonic war, and the fortunes of our armies in the Peninsula. Yet the most significant thing about that year was the babies that were born, and, presumably, baptized. Did they not include Tennyson, Gladstone, Darwin and Lincoln? Did not some clergyman say one day, "Florence, I baptize thee in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," and neither he nor Mr. and Mrs. Nightingale had any conception of what was to come of it.

At the Council of Whitby, where the Celtic and Roman Churches so nearly came together, one of the dividing factors was whether a child be under the water once or three times. The other two were the date of Easter and the shape of the priest's tonsure—by such trifles are Christians held apart and the world left unevangelized!

It is high time the Church recognized itself as a unity of diversities, as a "general assembly of the Firstborn," as "one family in heaven and on earth," to which all who have the spirit of Christ belong, whether they go to mass or play in a Salvation Army band, whether they sprinkle infants or immerse adults. The idea that the Church is some specific form of organization, in which a particular order of government or a special procedure in ritual, or even a rigid system of theology constitutes its divine character, will not hold. The water of life is the essential, and the shape of the bottle that contains it is not a subject for grave concern, and most certainly not a matter which justifies Christians in either excluding each other or quarrelling with each other.

Therefore, this matter of baptism is too small for the fuss that is made about it. Whether we sprinkle infants or immerse adults, if we do all to the glory of God, honestly and with reverence, we may be very sure that the result is acceptable in His sight.

EVER SEEKING, NEVER FINDING

Let each one examine his thoughts, and he will find them all occupied with the past and the future. We scarcely ever think of the present; and if we think of it, it is only to take light from it to arrange the future. The present is never our end. The past and the present are our means; the future alone is our end. So we never live, but we hope to live; and, as we are always preparing to be happy, it is inevitable we should never be so.

—BLAISE PASCAL

POOR CITIZENSHIP IN SOME SCHOOLS

From *The Ottawa Citizen*

HAVING prevented the Dean of Canterbury from completing a speech in Hamilton, high school students are apparently well pleased with themselves. They boast that most of them went to the meeting to create a row and that all city schools were represented. But creating a row is the tactic of rowdies, whose conduct is no credit to any cause or country. Similarly, inciting children to the ceremonial burning of the pamphlets of a religious sect, as has been done in more than one Quebec municipality, is encouraging them to act like vandals. Such incidents should cause parents and teachers to wonder how well the schools are training students in good citizenship.

It would be remarkable if class room influence were not behind the concerted effort of the Hamilton students. A few community leaders in education and religion have been quoted as approving the Quebec pamphlet burnings. Yet calm thought should convince any adult of the folly of these reactions to unpopular doctrines. In principle, such conduct shows intolerance of freedom of expression, as well as refusal to think. On a widespread scale, it could set majorities against minorities without the gloves that must be worn in a democracy. In the extreme, it was the conduct of young Nazis burning books in Berlin and young Fascists bludgeoning their opponents in Mussolini's Italy.

From the point of view of citizenship, the real evidence of the success of education is to be seen not in examination results but in the ability of students to think for themselves, and in their willingness to respect the rights of others. Hamilton young people who did not want to hear the Dean could have stayed home. Having attended, they could have stood up to question or disagree. But they went to make trouble, and their conduct is a bad reflection on themselves and their elders.

The Gospel Witness Comments on the Above Editorial

The above editorial from *The Ottawa Citizen* expresses a conviction that we have had since first reading of the stupid exhibition of mob rule given in Hamilton when the Dean of Canterbury spoke there. The young hoodlums, apparently as well organized as the mob that wrecked the Christian Brethren's Hall in Shawinigan Falls, Quebec, succeeded in demonstrating their own inability to meet the arguments of the Dean in favour of Communism, and second, in giving him and his opinions a much wider publicity than he would otherwise have enjoyed. In this country there are many people who are disposed to sympathize with anyone who is the victim of such undemocratic and un-British tactics as was this English visitor. We suspect that at home the Dean of Canterbury is a somewhat obscure person who has been given the right to wear a title that carries little importance with it. His superior, the Archbishop of Canterbury, has assured the world that the Dean does not speak for the Church of England. As an individual he has a right to speak for himself, however ill-advised and ill-founded his assertions may be. The organized opposition that has followed this communist sympathizer wherever he has been in Canada seems determined to force upon him an importance that does not belong to him either by reason of his office or the arguments he sets forth.

The Ottawa Citizen well remarks: "It would be re-

markable if class room influence were not behind the concerted effort of the Hamilton students." We agree, and would be willing to go farther and venture our guess that the same power was behind this Fascist organization of young terrorists as directed the raid at Shawinigan Falls, Quebec. In that Province it is French-speaking Protestants who are the target, in this province it is the Communists. Both refuse obedience to the Church of Rome; on the other side of the Ottawa it is safe to use French Protestants thus, here it is apparently almost as safe to deal with Communists in this fashion. Such a principle of action is not democratic, it is papal, and Canadian citizens ought to recognize it as such and treat it with the scorn it deserves.—W.S.W.

"CATHOLIC ACTION" AT GOVERNMENT EXPENSE

THE following advertisement taken from the Roman Catholic publication, *The Ensign* of May 20, is an illustration of the way in which Rome delights to have the civil government pay for its religious work. We reprint in full this amazing Catholic Action advertisement:

TEACHERS NEEDED FOR INDIAN SCHOOLS

We are in urgent need of English-speaking Catholic school teachers for the Indian day-schools in Northwestern Ontario, Southern Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

You may earn as high as \$3,060 a year teaching in Indian Day Schools! Free teacherage, fuel.—Salaries by the Indian Affairs Branch of the Federal Dept. of Mines and Resources.

Here is your opportunity for practicing Catholic Action in the Mission field!

For further particulars and salary schedule, write to:

Very Rev. Philip Scheffer, O.M.I., Provincial of the Oblates,
340 Provencher Avenue, St. Boniface, Man.

The salary mentioned is a somewhat generous one for a profession that is not overpaid. Teachers in Separate Roman Catholic Schools are on the average paid less than teachers in the Public Schools. Even in Quebec, the teachers in the Roman Catholic Schools receive a noticeably smaller stipend than do the teachers in the Protestant Schools. But when it is the Federal Government that foots the bill, the Church of Rome shows itself more generous with public funds. It offers more than \$3,000 a year plus house and fuel: the equivalent of at least the better part of another \$1,000. Perhaps the priest who offers this position would also expect successful candidates to give a "cut" to the Church as do the teaching priests and nuns. In their case the religious order pockets the salary and gives the teachers room and board and "pin" money, and on none of the salary is Income Tax paid.

Roman priests are most vehement in their protestations of opposition to the incursion of the Federal Government into the field of Education. Their real sympathies in the matter are better shown by the above advertisement: it is apparent that Federal government funds or provincial funds are equally welcome in Roman Catholic education or missions project on condition that no questions be asked when the grant is made. The Indian Affairs Branch would bear some investigation, it would seem, if this advertisement is a fair sample of the way it works.—W.S.W.

CATHOLIC INFORMATION vs. WHAT THE BIBLE TEACHES

A VERY interesting dialogue in print has been carried on for some time past in the advertising columns of a Grand Rapids, Michigan, newspaper. We do not know how it began, though we can divine how it will end, but for some time past a friend in Grand Rapids has been sending us clippings from the paper containing the series of advertisements sponsored by "The Redemptorist Fathers" in that city, accompanied by advertisements of approximately the same length paid for by The Trinity Baptist Church of that city which answers from the Scriptures the traditional dogmas of Rome as set forth in this modern garb. Apparently the publisher of the paper knows what freedom of the press means and is willing to see that it is extended to his readers and advertisers. The result is most interesting to see: on the one hand the strange twistings of Romanist reasoning founded on the vain traditions of men, and on the other side, the clear and simple teaching of Scripture on the fulness and finality of Christ's sacrifice for sin and the freeness of salvation by grace.

We reprint two advertisements of this series: the Romanist argument for the mediation of the Virgin and the saints, and the reply to it based on the Word of God. The contrast strikes the eye at once: the Romanist priests claim that their dogmas are "reasonable", though they do not even so much as refer to Scripture in seeking to establish them, and entirely pass by the multitude of superstitions invariably connected with Mariolatry. They also appeal to "democracy" and "mutual understanding". How strange that would seem in Shawinigan Falls, Quebec. But Rome ever changes its manners with the climate of the country. In "Catholic" Quebec it is rabidly, violently, intolerant; in Michigan it pleads for "mutual understanding". We congratulate the pastor and people of the Trinity Baptist Church in Grand Rapids for their excellent work in answering the Romanist propaganda by setting forth the teaching of Scripture.

Our Canadian readers will ask, why do we not do likewise in our papers. The answer is simple: the Canadian publications that accept the advertisements of Roman Catholic propagandists will not permit any answer that they regard as controversial. The Toronto daily papers even censor the Jarvis Street Church announcements that mention the Roman Catholic Church by name. So sensitive are they when Protestants state their faith in contrast to Romanism. How is it possible to deal with a controversial subject without controversy? One must come to the conclusion that some publishers think that controversy is evil, though how they fancy a democracy can be made to work without it, is impossible to say.

We are sure that our readers will ask themselves, as we do, how any intelligent person could be won by the sort of reasoning exemplified in the Catholic information advertisement we reprint. The natural man, however, is always happy when he is presented with some specious, ready-made argument for continuing in his way of pride and self-righteousness. We remember that the multitudes at the judgment hall where Jesus was tried chose Barabbas the robber and passed by the Holy One. The Apostle Paul speaks of those whose minds are blinded by the god of this world so that they believe a lie. We can think of no other explanation of the type

of mind that could frame such advertisements or be persuaded by them.—W.S.W.

"CATHOLIC INFORMATION"

We All Have Pull In Heaven

I KNEW the Governor, so I wrote him direct for a legitimate personal favour.

I knew the Governor's mother. I knew he loved her. I knew she therefore had honorable influence with him. So I wrote her to plead my cause with her son.

I knew, too, an old family servant whom the Governor had pensioned for life for services worthily rendered. So I wrote him to say a word in my behalf.

Now the Governor alone could grant my request and perhaps my plea to him would have been all-sufficient. But it couldn't hurt to use all legitimate "pull" in his mansion. It seemed wise. I did it.

God alone can provide for the needs of His creatures, so every Catholic prays to Him first, in adoration and supplication. But in our Father's house there is Mary whom He honored above all His creatures by inviting her to become the mother of His Divine Son, and at whose request Christ performed His first earthly miracle in Cana of Galilee. In our Father's house there are the saints—servants of God who are pensioned for eternity for services worthily rendered. Mary, His Mother and ours! The saints, His brothers and sisters, and ours.

Pull in Heaven? Why it's tremendous! It's there waiting for us, if we but ask. To us Catholics it would seem wasteful; it would seem unreasonable; it would seem downright nonsense not to use all possible heavenly pull to back up our requests to God Almighty.

"Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us!" "All ye holy Saints of God, pray for us!"

There is equally sound logic behind every Catholic belief and practice. Our purpose in publishing these articles here each week is not necessarily to persuade our readers that our beliefs are right, but rather to persuade you that they are not unreasonable, not superstitious, not evil. It is only by creating such mutual understanding and trust that democracy can be made to work in our community, our country, our world.

This space is paid for by
REDEMPTORIST FATHERS,
ST. ALPHONSUS CHURCH
Grand Rapids, 5, Mich.

This article appeared as a paid advertisement in the press of Grand Rapids, Michigan.

WHAT THE BIBLE TEACHES

WHAT a travesty of the Character of God to teach that He can be swayed in His Judgments and purposes by the same kind of "pull" that is employed in human politics! What a complete ignoring of the Word of God to create Mary and "the saints" as mediators!

Beloved readers of this column, read the Bible and be satisfied with what God has said. Remember Solomon's word in Proverbs 30:5-6 "Every word of God is pure . . . Add thou not unto His words, lest He reprove thee, and thou be found a LIAR." If the readers of these articles will read, search and meditate upon the Scriptures, our purpose will be fulfilled. We are not interested in foisting human opinions upon you, but in driving you to the Book. Our slogan is "Back to the Bible! Away from the traditions of men!"

There is no mystery as to how one may come to God. There are not many ways: there is only ONE. Jesus said, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by Me" (John 14:6). He also said, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, He will give it you. Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name: ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full" (John 16:23-24). Paul said, "There is one God, and ONE MEDIATOR BETWEEN GOD AND MEN, THE MAN CHRIST JESUS" (1 Tim. 2:5). The writer of Hebrews said, "Seeing then that we have a great high priest that is passed into the heavens, Jesus, the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession. For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need" (4:14-16).

Access unto God through Jesus Christ is the privilege of every believer. All who have received Jesus as Lord and Saviour are saints (Romans 1:7), and as such "have been brought nigh unto God by the blood of Christ. And through Him we have access by one Spirit unto the Father. Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God" (Eph. 2:13, 18, 19). This is God's Word: believe Him!

"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after THE TRADITION OF MEN, after the rudiments of the world, and NOT AFTER CHRIST" (Col. 2:8).

This space is paid for by the
TRINITY BAPTIST CHURCH
Rev. W. Herbert Scott, Pastor

This article appeared as a paid advertisement in the press of Grand Rapids, Michigan.

HARDSHIP

Dr. Cane, finding a flower under the Humboldt glacier, was more affected by it because it grew beneath the lip and cold bosom of the ice, than he would have been by the most gorgeous garden bloom. So some single struggling grace in the heart of one far removed from Divine influences may be dearer to God than a whole catalogue of virtues in the life of the one more favoured of Heaven.

As in nature, as in art, so in grace; it is rough treatment that gives souls, as well as stones, their lustre. The more the diamond is cut, the brighter it sparkles; and in what seems hard dealing, there God has no end in view but to perfect His people.—DR. T. GUTHRIE.

GOD GIVE US MEN!

God give us men. A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands.
Men whom the lust of office does not kill,
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy,
Men who possess opinion and a will,
Men who have honor, men who cannot lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking!
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty, and in private thinking;
For while the rabble, with their thumb-worn creeds,
Their large professions and their little deeds,
Mingle in selfish strife, lo! Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land, and waiting Justice sleeps!

—Josiah Gilbert Holland.

WILLIAM FLOWER

WILLIAM FLOWER, otherwise Branch, was born at Snow-hill, in the county of Cambridge, where he went to school some years, and then came to abby of Ely. After he remained awhile he became a professed monk, was made a priest in the same house, and there celebrated and sang Mass. After that, by reason of a visitation, and certain injunctions by the authority of Henry VIII he took upon him the habit of a secular priest, and returned to Snow-hill, where he was born, and taught children about half a year.

He then went to Ludgate, in Suffolk, and served as a secular priest about a quarter of a year; from thence to Stoniland; at length to Tewksbury, where he married a wife, with whom he ever after faithfully and honestly continued. After marriage he resided at Tewksbury about two years, and thence went to Brosley, where he practised physic and surgery; but departing from those parts he came to London, and finally settled at Lambeth, where he and his wife dwelt together. However, he was generally abroad, excepting once or twice in a month, to visit and see his wife. Being at home on Easter Sunday morning, he came over the water from Lambeth into St. Margaret's church at Westminster; when seeing a priest, named John Celtham, administering and giving the Sacrament of the altar to the people, and being greatly offended in his conscience with the priest for the same, he struck and wounded him upon the head, and also upon the arm and hand, with his wood knife, the priest having at the same time in his hand a chalice with the consecrated host therein, which became sprinkled with blood.

Mr. Flower, for this injudicious zeal, was heavily ironed, and put into the gatestone at Westminster; and afterwards summoned before bishop Bonner and his ordinary, where the bishop, after he had sworn him upon a Book, ministered articles and interrogatories to him.

After examination the bishop began to exhort him again to return to the unity of his mother the Catholic church, with many fair promises. These Mr. Flower stedfastly rejecting, the bishop ordered him to appear in the same place in the afternoon, and in the meantime to consider well his former answer; but he neither apologizing for having struck the priest, nor swerving from his faith, the bishop assigned him the next day, April 20th, to receive sentence if he would not recant. The next morning the bishop accordingly proceeded to the sentence, condemning and excommunicating him for a heretic, and after pronouncing him to be degraded, committed him to the secular power.

On April 24, St. Mark's eve, he was brought to the place of martyrdom, in St. Margaret's churchyard, Westminster, where the fact was committed: and there coming to the stake, he prayed to Almighty God, made a confession of his faith, and forgave all the world.

This done, his hand was held up against the stake, and struck off, his left hand being fastened behind him. Fire was then set to him, and he burning therein, cried with a loud voice, "O Thou Son of God receive my soul!" three times. His speech now being taken from him, he spoke no more, but notwithstanding he lifted up the stump with his other arm as long as he could.

Thus he endured the extremity of the fire, and was cruelly tortured, for the few fagots that were brought being insufficient to burn him they were compelled to strike him down into the fire, where lying along upon

the ground, his lower part was consumed in the fire, while his upper part was little injured, his tongue moving in his mouth for a considerable time.

—Foxe's Book of Martyrs.

Bible School Lesson Outline

Volume 15 Second Quarter Lesson 12 June 18, 1950

OLIVE L. CLARK, Ph.D. (Tor.)

UNION WITH CHRIST

Lesson Text: Colossians 3:1-17.

Golden Text: "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God."—Col. 3:1.

I. New Life in the Saviour: verses 1-11.

This chapter describes the believer's union with Christ, Who is pre-eminent in His person (chap. 1) and in His ministry of reconciliation (chap. 2).

Our Saviour, being God from all eternity, took upon Himself the form of sinful flesh, that He might die on our behalf (Phil. 2:6-8). Raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, He was exalted to the Father's right hand (Phil. 2:9-11). The believers, to whom the Lord reckons the work of Christ, are counted as having died with Him, having risen with Him, having ascended on high with Him (Rom. 6:2-5; Eph. 2:4-6; Col. 2:12, 20); and sharing His exaltation as well as His suffering, they will one day appear with Him in majesty, power and great glory (Rom. 8:17-19; Phil. 3:20, 21; 1 John 2:28).

This high standing with Christ, which is the position of the believer in the reckoning of God, involves a solemn responsibility to live in a manner worthy of that Divine calling (Eph. 4:1). If we are regarded as having risen with Christ in newness of life, our interests, thoughts and desires should be directed to things that are heavenly and spiritual, rather than to those which are material and worldly. If we have died with Christ to the world, let us put away all that belongs to the old, unregenerate nature (Rom. 6:5-14; 8:13; Gal. 6:14; Eph. 4:17-25). These things characterize unbelievers (Eph. 2:2, 3; 5:1-7). As we have been made new creatures in Christ (2 Cor. 5:17), we are to take off, as it were, the garments of sin (2 Cor. 7:1); any sin of thought, such as anger, wrath or malice (Eph. 4:31), and any sin of speech, such as blasphemy, impurity or untruth (Gal. 5:19-21; Eph. 4:25, 29).

We who belong to Christ have put on Christ (Gal. 3:27), receiving by faith His righteousness, which has been imputed to us (Rom. 3:20-28; 8:3, 4; 2 Cor. 5:21; Phil. 3:9). We have been renewed by the Holy Spirit (John 3:5; Eph. 4:23; Tit. 3:5), and the process of sanctification has commenced (Heb. 10:10, 13), whereby we who were originally made in His likeness, which sin to a certain extent has marred (Gen. 1:26, 27), shall be ultimately entirely like Him (Rom. 8:29; 1 Cor. 15:49; 1 John 3:1, 2). One might illustrate this truth by reference to a photograph. The likeness of the subject is stamped upon the sensitive paper in a moment of time, but development in a dark room is needed before the likeness is made manifest. Sanctification as a crisis takes place the moment we believe on Christ, but sanctification as a process may take years to be complete. Whatever our condition as regards things national (Greek or Jew, verse 11), religious (circumcision or uncircumcision), cultural (Barbarian or Scythian), or social (bond or free), we shall be found in the image of Christ, the Pre-eminent One, our All in all (1 Cor. 1:26-31; Eph. 4:10).

II. New Love for the Saints: verses 12-17.

If in the purpose of God we are His chosen ones, destined to be made perfect, like unto Christ, let us aim to have His mind in all things (Phil. 2:5); let us practise the virtues which are appropriate to those who are clothed in the holy garments of His righteousness (Rev. 19:8).

Since Christ has loved us and saved us, regardless of our national, religious, educational or social standing (Gal. 3:28), we are to remember that He is All in all, and that in spiritual matters human distinctions do not count (Gal. 6:15). We are to love others, even as Christ loved us (1 John 3:16; 4:21). We are to follow Him in being merciful (Lk. 6:36), kind (Psa. 117:2; Joel 2:13; 2 Pet. 1:7), humble (Matt. 11:29), meek (Matt. 5:5; 21:5; Eph. 4:2; 1 Tim. 6:11) and long-suffering (Col. 1:11; 2 Tim. 3:10). Like Him, we are to be patient and forgiving, one toward another (Matt. 6:12-15; 18:21-35; Eph. 4:32). If the love of Christ is allowed full sway in our hearts, it will knit us together, as we all strive toward maturity of character and the perfection which is promised (Rom. 5:5; Eph. 4:13-16).

Our relationships one toward another will be free from jealousy and angry strife, if in each heart the peace of God is allowed to rule, "to sit as umpire" (literal meaning of Greek word translated "rule" in v. 15). As peace is the gift of God to each member of the body of Christ (John 14:27; Phil. 4:7), so righteous and holy unity, a harmony based upon conviction, should prevail among those members (Rom. 12:18; Eph. 4:2-4). But peace which is gained at the expense of righteousness, is not true peace (Jas. 3:18).

Thanksgiving to God for His mercy, for His grace in calling us to Himself, will also tend to promote unity among His children (2 Cor. 1:11).

How are the Christian virtues of love, peace and thanksgiving to be fostered? How shall we be made like unto our Master? By beholding Him in His word (Psa. 119:9, 18; 2 Cor. 3:18), and by letting His word find a lodgement in our hearts (Psa. 119:11). Then heavenly wisdom shall be our portion (1 Cor. 2:5; Eph. 1:8; Col. 1:9).

Another means of grace is Christian fellowship (1 John 1:3). We may teach and admonish one another (Eph. 5:19; Heb. 10:25), praising God together for His manifold grace (Psa. 34:3; Heb. 13:15).

The Apostle sums up the practical duties of a Christian in verse 17 (compare v. 23). These words may also be used as a test: whatever we may say or do with thanksgiving to God is approved (Eph. 5:20); but if any word or action cannot be for His glory or be the subject of prayer and praise to Him, it is not lawful or expedient (Rom. 14:22, 23).

For Younger Scholars:

Even little children know that they must keep their good clothes clean, and fresh dresses or suits are often necessary. Only God can give us clean hearts (Psa. 23:3, 4; 51:7, 10; Matt. 5:8), but He will remove from us all the stains and

soilure of sin, if we but come to Him, trusting in the Saviour, Who died for us (Isa. 1:18; Rev. 1:5). Explain the necessity of keeping away from sin, which blackens our hearts.

Girls would be interested in the illustration of the beautiful garments of the bride. She would not want to come to her beloved with old or soiled garments. Tennyson tells of a noble lady Enid, beloved by the knight named Geraint. The queen had expressed the desire to clothe his bride in rich attire, sparkling with royal jewels. Enid, whose parents had lost their fortune at an enemy's hand, was taken to the queen wearing a faded silk dress, but this was soon exchanged for glorious apparel. We must go just as we are to our Lord (Isa. 64:6; Zech. 3:3-5), but He will give us a spotless robe when we are made one with our heavenly Bridegroom (Matt. 22:11-14; 25:1-13). By the time of the marriage feast, we shall be clad in perfectly sinless dress (Matt. 22:1-10; Rev. 19:7-9). In the meantime let us be careful not to soil our garments through contact with sin, but let us constantly apply to the Lord for the application of His cleansing blood (2 Cor. 6:14-7:1; Rev. 7:14).

Boys will be interested in a talk on army inspection. The soldier's uniform is provided for him; his own suit, no matter how well made, how expensive or becoming, will not do (Eph. 2:8; 6:13; Tit. 3:5). We must put on Christ (Rom. 13:14; Gal. 3:27). When inspection day approaches, each soldier presses his uniform, removes all stains, polishes his buttons, shines his medals, and does everything in his power to look well when the general reviews his troops. We must prepare to meet our God (Amos 4:12). His eye will detect every flaw, so we must be born again, that our sins may be washed away (Isa. 1:18; John 3:7). Then we must go to the Saviour constantly, confessing our sins, that He may day by day cleanse us from sin (1 John 1:9).

DAILY BIBLE READINGS

- June 12—The Fruits of Union with Christ John 15:1-19.
- June 13—The Certainty of Union with Christ .. John 14:1-20.
- June 14—Union with Christ Through Spirit's Baptism
1 Cor. 12:1-13.
- June 15—Life Through Union with Christ Gal. 2:15-20.
- June 16—Walking in Union with Christ I John 2:1-6.
- June 17—Christ's Prayer for Unity John 17:13-23.
- June 18—Unity of the Brethren Through Christ
1 Cor. 1:10-17.

SUGGESTED HYMNS

Behold, what love! The church's one foundation. Blessed be the fountain of blood. There is a fountain filled with blood. Once I was dead in sin. Dying with Jesus.

**THE GOSPEL WITNESS,
130 Gerrard Street East,
Toronto 2, Ontario, Canada**

ORDER FORM

Enclosed find \$..... to be applied as follows:—

- A subscription to *The Gospel Witness* \$3.00
- The Plot That Failed* \$2.00
- Renewal of subscription to *The Gospel Witness* .. \$3.00
- Other Little Ships* \$2.00
- The Priest, The Woman and The Confessional* \$1.00

NAME

STREET

CITY OR TOWN PROVINCE

The following books are offered as premiums to subscribers to *THE GOSPEL WITNESS*. Check the one you wish to receive:

- 1. *The Papacy, in the Light of Scripture*, by Dr. T. T. Shields.
- 2. *The Greatest Fight in the World*, by Rev. Chas. H. Spurgeon.
- 3. *Russellism, or Rutherfordism (Jehovah's Witnesses)*, by Dr. T. T. Shields.

NOTE:—If cheque is used other than drawn on a Toronto Bank, 15c exchange should be added.
U.S.A. subscribers kindly do not use Postal Notes.