

The Gospel Witness and Protestant Advocate

Authorized as Second Class Mail, Post Office Department, Ottawa

Vol. 32, No. 13

130 Gerrard St. E., TORONTO, JULY 16, 1953

Whole Number 1625

The Many-Splendoured Ministries of Old Age

By Rev. Robert Barr, Minister of Knox Presbyterian Church, Toronto

(Printed by permission of the Author)

"And when the sun was going down, a deep sleep fell upon Abram; and, lo an horror of great darkness fell upon him, and he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance. And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age."

—(Genesis 15:12-15).

IN THIS chapter we have the story of how God appeared to Abraham in a dream, and after telling him of the great future that awaited his race, went on to promise the patriarch that he would be "buried in a good age". What a wonderful promise that was, "a good old age!" This has been the prayer of men and women all down the centuries, that, if God spared them to grow old, it would be a truly good old age. So often men and women dread the approach of old age. They think of it as a season of life when they shall no longer be able to do the things that have made life worth living. They picture it as a time of increasing physical, and, it may be, mental weakness. They are distressed because they know, or have known, old people who are a burden to themselves and to others.

Now all of this may be quite true, but whatever the world may say or think, the Bible declares that God means old age to be good — a thing of honour. He has promised to make it so. It was the promise He gave in Isa. 46:4: "Even to your old age I am he; and even to hoar hairs will I carry you: I have made, and I will bear; even I will carry, and will deliver you." Mark well these words, "Even to your old age I am he." Jesus is the Good Shepherd, who takes care of His sheep right to the end. God never pensions off any of His children. He never places them on a retired list. There is no question of their having nothing to do. The tasks He assigns us may differ with the years, but He still has ministries for us if we have eyes to see, ears to hear, hands to do, hearts to love, and wills ready to obey. We must remember that God's ministries are never limited

to the young, the fit, and the strong. His standards of fitness are not those of the world. What He said in 1 Samuel 1:7 is forever true. "The Lord seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart."

Paul would have us remember that "God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty" (1 Cor. 1:27). In Psalm 92:14 we are told quite plainly that God has a special fruit for old age. Take out of the Bible the stories in which old people play a central part, and how much poorer the Bible would be! It would be like taking many of the masterpieces from the walls of an art gallery. Think of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Moses, Joshua, Naomi, Barzillai, Anna, Simeon, Paul and John — all of them grew old, and in their old age had their finest moments. They proved that God has for old age a many-splendoured ministry.

What then are some of the ministries that God has reserved for old age? In the first place, old age can make a unique contribution to the beautiful things of our common life. We see this, of course, in many other walks of life. There is music. Is it not strange that great composers reserve the greatness of their genius for the closing movements of their theme? We see it in nature. Does not the sun bring its most colourful pageants into the evening hours, and does not nature wear her loveliest garments in the Fall? We see it in the work that the great Sculptor of human faces does for the aged. One of the loveliest faces in the Old Testa-

ment is that of Barzillai, whose portrait is given in 2 Samuel 19:31-40. What a gracious person Barzillai was! We can see the light of the glory of God in his face as he stoops to kiss King David. So too with the aged Anna and Simeon, to whom Joseph and Mary brought the Child Jesus.

Then there was "Paul the aged." Picture him in the Roman prison dictating that wonderful letter to Philemon. We may be sure his face had a grace and a beauty that it had not known in the days when he was a fiery young evangelist, contending earnestly for the faith. And how can we forget the aged John on the Isle of Patmos, closer to God and radiating the glory of God in a far more wonderful way than he had done as a young disciple? It is still true. What a poor world this would be without the beauty that is given to it by God's aged saints. It is in the faces of Christian old folk that you find a serenity eloquent of mountain lakes, gentle winds and far horizons — the hair white as the driven snow, the brow furrowed by the wheels of time, the hands gnarled with toil, the face made gentle with sorrow, the eyes that are "pools of silent prayer", through these there shines the glory of God. How poor life would be without them! This is a ministry open to all aged folk — a ministry denied to youth.

But while God grants old age this ministry of the beautiful, He also makes possible a very practical ministry. It is not so much that old age can do things, although of course, there are many things it can do; but rather that old age provides opportunities for others to do lovely things. The very helplessness of the aged keeps alive in others the virtue of unselfish service. To create an opportunity for someone to do a lovely thing is oftentimes a greater ministry than to do that lovely thing ourselves. When God gave the commandment, "Honour thy father and thy mother," it is true He was thinking of the needs of the aged, but He was thinking of far more than that. He was thinking of the needs of the young and middle-aged. As a matter of fact the promise attached to the commandment is not for the aged but for the young. When and where this commandment is obeyed, the returns and the dividends are precious. Think of Ruth. How much she owed to age because of the opportunities for service and loyalty provided by Naomi! There was Timothy. He would never have been the young man he was had it not been for the opportunities of service and loyalty provided for him by Paul, the aged. This is always true. Think of the young men and women in your circle who are the finest characters. Are they not the young men and women who are giving willingly of their time, their talents and their love, to the caring for the aged? What a hard world this would be without those beautiful virtues that age calls for in youth! In thus providing us with a field for service, the aged folk perform, in their very helplessness, a far greater ministry than they realize. But, of course, if the aged perform this ministry, the aged must have the patience of Jesus, for it is often harder to be served than to serve.

Last but not least, God opens up for the aged the gracious ministry of intercession. Read the story of Moses praying for his people on the hill-top. We are told that when his "hands were heavy; they took a stone, and put it under him, and he sat thereon; and Aaron and Hur stayed up his hands, the one on the one side, and the other on the other side; and his hands were steady until the going down of the sun" (Ex. 17:12).

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 RAandolph 7415

Registered Cable Address: Järwitsem, Canada

Never was Moses of greater value to his people than in that hour, and he was a very old man. There was Eli, the aged. He had been a priest for a long time, but the richest period of his priesthood was when, as an old man, he taught the boy Samuel, the secret of prayer. There was Samuel himself. He never did a finer thing for Saul, than when in the sunset years of his life, he said to him, "God forbid that I should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you" (1 Sam. 12:23).

The richest period of Paul's life was not when he was rushing about from place to place, but when, as an old man in prison, he turned to the ministry of intercession. Jesus did not say that man ought always to be running about, but He did say that man "ought always to pray, and not to faint" (Luke 18:1). Surely He was thinking of the ministry of old age when He said this; and it is still true. More than ever the world needs this ministry. That the aged can perform in a unique way. Remember, my friend, the key people in the kingdom of God, the shock troops, are the praying men and women. Where is the place of power in the Kingdom of God today? It is not in the offices of financial magnates, it is not the jet-propelled planes breaking the speed of sound — the place of power and miracle is in the prayer room. Who are more fitted, and who have more time for this ministry than the aged? To you old folk is given this wonderful task of keeping the angels going up and down the ladder of prayer. But you say to me, "How can I enter this ministry?" There is but one way — the way of the new birth, the work of the Spirit through the shed blood of Jesus Christ. It means complete death and being born again.

It is sad to reflect that so many old folk have never had this experience. Have you had it? When we have had this experience, then "growing old" takes on a new meaning, for what does "growing" mean? Surely it does not mean decay. No, growing means life and development. So it is after we are born again of the Spirit, while the outward man may perish, the inward

man is renewed day by day. We really do grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, as Peter reminds us in 2 Peter 3:18. What are you doing with, and in, your old age? The Bible calls upon you to redeem the time. The fields are white unto harvest. You be one of the labourers,

They tell me I am growing old.
Praise be to God for GROWING!
It never indicates decay.
But some new fulness every day,
New reaching up towards the sun —
If growing, then I am not done!
My hidden roots are hale and strong.
I know to where those roots belong.

Im growing old, but GROWING still,
And one day — how my soul shall thrill!
I'll pierce the clouds of time and sense,
I'll pass old earth's circumference,
And in Heaven of Love and Light,
Ill go on growing in His sight.

—Robert Barr.

JARVIS STREET MEMBER RECEIVES MILITARY CROSS

The official citation is as follows:

AWARD OF
THE MILITARY CROSS
TO

ZB 10022

2ND LIEUTENANT EDGAR HERBERT HOLLYER
3RD BATTALION, THE ROYAL CANADIAN
REGIMENT

ON THE NIGHT OF 2/3 MAY, 1953, "C" COMPANY, 3RD BATTALION, THE ROYAL CANADIAN REGIMENT, SUSTAINED A HEAVY ATTACK BY SUPERIOR ENEMY WHICH WAS ACCOMPANIED BY AN INTENSE PRELIMINARY BOMBARDMENT. THE BRUNT OF THIS ATTACK WAS BORNE BY NO. 7 PLATOON OF "C" COMPANY OCCUPYING A FEATURE KNOWN AS HILL 97 COMMANDED BY 2ND LIEUTENANT HOLLYER. THE PLATOON HAD OCCUPIED THIS POSITION FOR THIRTEEN DAYS PRIOR TO THE ATTACK DURING WHICH TIME THE POSITION WAS SUBJECTED TO CONSISTENT SHELLING AND MORTARING WITH DEVASTATING EFFECTS ON THE DEFENCES. DURING THIS PERIOD THIS OFFICER PRESERVED A CALM AND CHEERFUL MANNER WITH HIS TROOPS. INSPIRING THEM TO GREAT EFFORT IN REPAIRING AND IMPROVING THEIR POSITIONS. ON THE NIGHT OF THE ATTACK WARNING OF THE ENEMY'S PRESENCE WAS RECEIVED FROM A FIGHTING PATROL WHICH ENCOUNTERED THE ENEMY ON THE RIGHT FRONT OF NO. 3 PLATOON. LIEUTENANT HOLLYER PLACED HIMSELF IN A POSITION TO OBSERVE THIS ACTION AND A SUBSEQUENT ACTION WHICH RESULTED WHEN A SECOND FIGHTING PATROL

WAS SENT OUT TO ASSIST THE FIRST AND BECAME ENGAGED IN THIS BATTLE. HE PASSED BACK RAPID AND ACCURATE INFORMATION ON THE PROGRESS OF THIS ACTION, WHICH FOREWARNED HIS COMMANDING OFFICER OF THE IMPENDING ENEMY ATTACK AND PERMITTED HIM TO MAKE PREPARATIONS FOR THE ENSUING BATTLE. DURING THIS STAGE IN SPITE OF HEAVY SHELLING HE CONTINUED TO VISIT HIS SECTION POSTS, TO ENCOURAGE AND INSPIRE HIS MEN TO MAN THEIR POSITIONS AND DIRECTED THEIR FIRE UPON THE ENEMY WITH DEVASTATING EFFECT. AS THE BATTLE PROGRESSED HE RETURNED TO HIS COMMAND POST PERIODICALLY TO REPORT DEVELOPMENTS TO HIS COMMANDING OFFICER IN A COOL AND CONFIDENT MANNER. HE CALLED FOR ARTILLERY FIRE ON THE ENEMY WITHIN A FEW YARDS OF AND ON ALL SIDES OF HIS POSITIONS WITH SKILL AND ACCURACY, LEAVING HIS BUNKER AS NECESSARY AND WITH COMPLETE DISREGARD FOR HIS PERSONAL SAFETY TO OBSERVE AND REPORT THE RESULTS. ON ONE SUCH OCCASION HE WAS BLOWN BACK INTO HIS BUNKER AND ON ANOTHER WAS PERSONALLY ENGAGED BY THE ENEMY WHICH HE DROVE OFF. EVENTUALLY, AS A RESULT OF THE WEIGHT OF THE ATTACK HIS POSITION WAS OVERRUN. LIEUTENANT HOLLYER REMAINED AT HIS POST DRIVING OFF THE ENEMY WITH GRENADES, AT THE SAME TIME CALLING FOR FIRE ON HIS OWN POSITION. DURING THIS BOMBARDMENT HIS COMMUNICATIONS WERE DISRUPTED BUT HE REMAINED ON THE POST UNTIL THE ENEMY WERE DRIVEN OFF. HE THEN TOURED HIS POSITION TO ASSESS THE SITUATION AND WAS AGAIN ATTACKED BY SEVERAL ENEMY. HE REESTABLISHED COMMUNICATIONS WITH HIS BATTALION HEADQUARTERS AND REQUESTED AND WAS GRANTED PERMISSION TO RETIRE WITH HIS SURVIVORS TO NO. 8 PLATOON FROM WHERE HE DIRECTED RESCUE PARTIES GOING FORWARD. THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT THIS OFFICER'S INITIATIVE, DETERMINATION AND SKILL IN FIGHTING COUPLED WITH HIS INSPIRING LEADERSHIP AND COMPLETE DISREGARD FOR HIS OWN PERSONAL SAFETY CONTRIBUTED BEYOND MEASURE TO THE DEFEAT OF THE ENEMY AND THE SUCCESS OF THE ENTIRE DEFENSIVE BATTLE

**SUBSCRIBE TO
THE GOSPEL WITNESS**

WERE WE IN POLITICS SEEKING AN ISSUE!

WE WONDER that no political Party has trained its guns on the Postal Department at Ottawa.

During the first war, while in London, we were invited to have luncheon at a certain college, and to address the students and faculty after luncheon. On the day of the appointment we were amazed to receive, about the middle of the forenoon, a post card written by the Principal of the college at nine o'clock on the morning of the same day, giving us direction as to how to reach the college at twelve o'clock; and the post card was received in plenty of time to direct us — in the largest city in the world a post card reached its destination in about an hour and a half! In this country it might require perhaps in some cases a week and a half. A parcel addressed to us, and put in the Post Office in the city of Toronto on July 2nd, was delivered at our office on July 8th. It took six days to pass from one Toronto address to another.

We are given one delivery a day; but it would appear that if the mail is at all heavy, the Post Office leaves it to the next day, or the day after: apparently any time will do. We really believe that the Dominion of Canada has the most inefficient postal service of any civilized country in the world. The population of Metropolitan Toronto is about one and one quarter millions, and we have one mail delivery a day!

The Postal Department is not designed, in itself, to be a money-making agency. There is a sense in which it is the very heart of a country's economic life. A thoroughly efficient mail service, a service of letters and parcels, is indispensable to rapid business communications. And yet the opposing Parties in this election are spending their time blowing bubbles, and hitting nothing and have not said a word about our crippling Postal service.

We respectfully suggest to Mr. Drew, and Mr. Diefenbaker, and Mr. Fleming, and others, that they give attention to the scandalous inefficiency of the Canadian Postal Service. The real-scapegoat of the Levitical economy was not a scapegoat in the sense in which that word is used today. In a figure the scapegoat actually bore away the iniquities of the people. The Postmaster-General deserves to be selected as a scapegoat, to bear not a little of the responsibility for the errors of the Liberal Government. And with that in view, we suggest that the Postmaster-General might well be treated like the scapegoat, and led away to "a land not inhabited", — and left there.

THE STRENGTH OF PIETY

We have wondered at the lowliness of a man, who stood among his compeers like Saul among the people—to find him simple, gentle, generous, docile, humble as a little child — till we found that it is with great men as with great trees. What giant tree has not giant roots! When the tempest has blown over some such monarch of the forest, and he lies in death stretched out at his full length upon the ground, on seeing the mighty roots that fed him — the strong cables that moored him to the soil — we cease to wonder at his noble stem, and the broad, leafy, lofty head he raised to heaven, defiant of storms. Let us not forget that humility is the root and strength of lofty piety.

—GUTHRIE.

THE REVISED STANDARD VERSION OF THE BIBLE AND FOREIGN MISSIONS

By Rev. William A. Mahlow, General Secretary of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions

MANY Christian scholars such as Drs. Allan MacRae, J. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., Oswald T. Allis, G. Douglas Young, etc., and many periodicals including the *Christian Beacon* and the *Sunday School Times* have pointed out that the new version of the Bible is in reality a liberal interpretation of the text; and any serious minded student of the Word who has examined the new translation has been appalled at the liberties taken by the translators especially in passages dealing with the Person of our Lord. The purpose of this note is not to press this point but to call the attention of missionary-minded Christians to the serious consequences this will have on foreign missionary work.

Few people realize the importance of English versions of the Bible on the mission field. Wherever English colonialism has gone the English language has also gone. In addition to this, World War II has carried the English language to many other portions of the globe and popularized it. Educated people in almost all parts of the world now know at least something of the English language, and English is often the official court language of the land or at least one of the official languages. This means that when a native pastor knows a language other than his own it is usually English. Since the King James and other English versions of the Bible have often been more accurate than the translations into the mission field languages, the native pastor or teacher, not unwisely, turns to the English versions for help in exegesis of the Word. The help he received from the King James, English Revised and American Revised Versions strengthened his faith and trust in the integrity of God's Word, but should the Revised Standard Version of the Bible become the "official" English Bible and find its way into the native pastors' studies around the world, what a gradual but sure undermining of the faith of the missionary church would result! The fundamental American pastor with his theological training and with the advice and counsel of fundamental scholars as close at hand as his telephone is not easily deceived by every wind of doctrine. The national pastor, however, has come to trust the English-speaking world as the present-day source of his faith. What is written or said by English and American churchmen is often accepted per se "as of the Lord." What an insidious danger thus lurks in a widely publicized and widely spread defective translation such as the Revised Standard Version. Let us do all we can to see that our brethren beyond the sea get the Word of God in as pure form as possible. One way we can do this is to join the crusade being led by the American Council of Christian Churches in opposing the use and acceptance of the Revised Standard Version as an "official" Bible.

—Biblical Missions.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

We should be greatly helped if our GOSPEL WITNESS readers would advise us, not less than a week in advance, of their change of address, when they anticipate moving. Also please give us the old address, so that we may quickly locate your name.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

A Great While to Come

An Address by the Pastor, Dr. T. T. Shields

Delivered in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Thursday Evening, July 9th, 1953

"And this was yet a small thing in thy sight, O Lord God; but thou hast spoken also of thy servant's house for a great while to come. And is this the manner of man, O Lord God?"—2 Sam. 7:19.

THERE is a very interesting bit of history attending this text. King David was enjoying a period of unusual tranquility, for he had been a man of war from his youth. But at this time God had given him rest from all his enemies round about. And he reflected upon his own comfortable and even luxurious condition; he said, "I dwell in an house of cedar, but the ark of God dwelleth within curtains." This was what he said to Nathan the prophet. "I have been looking after my own interests, I have built my own house, and here I am comfortably established while the ark of God, representative of the cause of God, still dwelleth within curtains;" the implication being that the ark of God should have an house, and that the people of God should have a temple wherein to worship.

It is not surprising that Nathan should have responded very heartily to the implied suggestion, and should have said to David, "Go, do all that is in thine heart." But even the loftiest ideals, or those which seem to be lofty to us, and the noblest purposes, may not always lie within the will of God. And even the godliest of men may be mistaken counsellors. We had better go to a higher Authority if we would know what we ought and ought not to do. For that night the Lord spoke to Nathan, and in effect He said, "Nathan you have given my servant David the wrong counsel. In all the years that are past in which I have led my people did I ever say to anybody, 'Why build ye not me an house of cedar?'" We must learn from what God has said, and we may sometimes learn from what He has not said. Had He desired certain things He would have revealed His will to His servants. He said in effect, "Go and tell David that he is all wrong. It is well that he had it in his heart to build me an house, but that is not my plan. You go and tell David I will build thee an house." That is the surprise of grace!

We are all of us prone to think that God wants us to do something for Him. I venture to say that nowhere within the pages of this Book can you find explicitly or implicitly a command given to any one of His human creatures to do something for God. He is sovereignly independent; He does not need you to do anything for Him. "If I were hungry," saith He, "I would not tell thee: for the world is mine, and the fulness thereof." Well does He know that we are so bankrupt in the moral conception of things, and in abilities — "skills", as we use the word in the plural now — to render Him any service, that He has not asked us to do anything. As well might you ask a lame man to win the marathon. He cannot run it. Now the attitude of God is that He wants to do something for us, and in our folly we rebel against the reception of His grace. "Tell David I do not want

him to build me an house. Tell him I will build him an house. That is what I want to do." That is true of every one of us. He is waiting to be gracious. Did you ever think of that? Grace abounds with Him, but He waits to bestow His grace. "I will build thee an house." And every day we live God stands ready to do something for us, and to do something in us; and we do something for Him only as we are yielded to the operations of His grace that He may do something in us and for us.

Jesus said to the Samaritan woman, "Give me to drink," and she was amazed at His condescension, He being a Jew asking a drink of her that was a Samaritan. But He really did not need the drink, for He said later, "If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give me to drink; thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water." He is always desiring to give. It is not within the capacity of human nature so to live. Mr. Rockefeller Senior, though counting his wealth by hundreds of millions, was wont to give the friends who called upon him a new ten cent piece that had never been in circulation. You might be a pauper or a millionaire, it did not make any difference; he would always bestow a shining dime right from the mint, never more and never less. But even a man of countless millions could not without restraint continue to give, give, give, liberally and lavishly. The ability to give, and to be always giving, argues infinity, and only God is infinite. But He is the Giver of every good and perfect gift.

Then God reminded David through Nathan of what He had done for his people, what He had done for his house, taking him from the sheep-cotes, and making him ruler over Israel. And David was amazed, and he said, "Who am I, O Lord God? and what is my house; that thou hast brought me hitherto?" The past was a record of abounding mercy and ever-multiplying grace. "I do not understand why Thou hast brought me hitherto," and yet when he had heard what God had to say through Nathan he said, "All that is as nothing at all — And this was yet a small thing in thy sight, O Lord God." — the multi-millionaire's ten cent piece, the small thing, great as it was by human measurement, — "but thou hast spoken also of thy servant's house for a great while to come. And is this the manner of man, O Lord God? Thou hast exceeded the utmost bounds of human liberality in the past, but now Thou hast drawn the curtain and enabled me to look down into the future, not through centuries merely, but through millennia. Thou hast spoken of thy servant's house for a great while to come."

Mr. Slade read to us this evening that the Lord has given to us exceeding great and precious promises, that

by these we might become partakers of the Divine nature, who have escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust. I wonder if we properly appreciate the reservoir of supplies, the real resources of faith, the promises that are ours, that are given to us, for the purpose that we might become partakers of the Divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust, or through coveting. That is in the past, what we have escaped from, but these are given to us that we may become Christ-like, that we may become God-like, that we may be partakers of the Divine nature. And yet how few there are who rightly utilize these exceeding great and precious promises! And remember, when the Lord uses superlatives He has a superlative of some sort to describe. When He says that His promises are not a dollar bill, but million dollar bills, He does not exaggerate. They are "exceeding great and precious" because they will procure for us so much. Your dollar is not worth a dollar; it is not worth more than fifty cents. We are in the midst of an inflationary period where the value of money has declined and the price of goods has correspondingly increased. But within the realm of the Kingdom of God there is no inflation or deflation. His promises are like Himself, the same yesterday, and today, and forever.

I do not know whether you have ever heard the story — I have told it I think, and I do not know where I picked it up. But it was said to be a true story of a Scottish mother whose son had gone away to Canada. She received his letters at regular periods, but she was very poor, and a neighbour calling on her asked her if her son did nothing for her. "Yes," she said, "he writes me, and he says a lot of kind things in his letters." "But doesn't he send you any money?" She said, "No, he never sends me any money." Perhaps you know that in the old days in England there were no notes short of a five-pound note. I remember when one was paid in gold if he had a sovereign or a pound, or if you had a ten-shilling piece you were paid in a gold ten-shilling piece, a half a sovereign. But if one ever had a five-pound note he was getting in the upper classes, and he had to sign for the thing, and have the number taken, and all the rest of it. Well this dear soul had never had any money. And she said, "No, he never sends me any money, but he sends me some very pretty pictures sometimes; some of them are alike." Her friend said, "What do you do with them?" "I store them all up with his letters." She said, "Let me see them." So she brought them out, and here they were bills, Canadian currency of a large denomination. And she had hundreds of dollars stored away and she did not know it; she continued to be poor.

That is just like many professing Christians. We store up the promises of God, and we quote them occasionally, but how many of us do really take them to the bank and cash them, and say, "I am promised that and I want it, and I want it now."

Yes, they are "exceeding great and precious promises." We are like the poor man who had not travelled very much, and on his first trans-Atlantic voyage he provided himself with food for the journey, and never appeared at the dining table. On the last day he went to the steward to make some inquiry, who said, "Why Mr. So and So, I haven't seen you in the saloon, I haven't seen you at the table?" He said, "Well, the fact of the matter is, when I bought my ticket I hadn't enough left over to pay for meals; and so I provided myself with some things

that would not perish, and I have just been doing the best I could in my cabin." "But," said the steward, "all your meals were paid for in your ticket. You had a right to come to the table every time the meal was called, and a right to everything on the table." But he had been half starving himself on soda biscuits! There are thousands of soda-biscuit Christians who shut themselves up with a cardboard box and live like a mouse when they ought to be living like princes. The fact is it is all paid for, and let me tell you there is no *a la carte* in the King's dining room, it is all *table d'hote*; it is all paid for.

I remember one day when I was a little boy hurrying from the train to the counter of a restaurant somewhere in England with my father. We had only a few minutes, and we just had a cup of tea and a bun, or something of that sort. I could scarcely drink the tea, it was so hot, but I managed to get it down. Right beside me there was a good big jug of cream, not one of these little things they serve in our restaurants and which ought to be prohibited by act of Parliament, but a real jug of real cream. When we got back into the railway carriage I said to my father, "I wish I could have had that cream." He said, "Why didn't you take it?" I said, "I thought you would have had to pay for it." "Why no, my boy," he said, "it was all paid for." I have been making up for missing that cream ever since! I do not propose to go without things that are already paid for.

Now here is David. If I were announcing a subject I think I should say I was going to speak to you on "The Surprises of Grace". David said, "Is this the manner of man, O Lord God?" "Men do not treat me like that." No, of course they do not. When the prodigal came home he had forgotten the idiom of his father's speech, he had been so long away. He had nothing to pay, and nobody gave to him, so he said, "When I go home I will ask for a job with the servants." "Make me as one of thy hired servants." We always say that, as though the Lord God would be beholden to us, and were in need of our poor service! We serve, yes, as that son served after he had put on the best robe, shoes on his feet, and a ring on his hand, and was recognized as a prince of the house. I have no doubt that he was as diligent in his father's business as anybody could be, but not for reward, but because he was a son, and he belonged there. All that his father had was his. That is true of us, and David had to find it out.

God Has Spoken

Let me just emphasize two or three words, because you can take the principles of it and apply it all through the Book. "Thou hast spoken." Do you believe that? The Modernists say God has not spoken. I remember when we were in the midst of our controversy years ago a certain college President wrote a letter in *The Canadian Baptist* and said, "I wonder if these men who contend so lustily for the inspiration of the Scripture have considered the difficulty involved in God's speaking?" A college President that ought to have had long ears and four legs to fit him! You recall Dr. McIntire spoke of Moses' hesitation because he was not eloquent, and the Lord answered him and said, "Who hath made man's mouth? have not I, the Lord?" The Lord made man's mouth; do you not think the Lord can speak? He can make an ass to speak, as He did for Balaam's instruction. That is a good thing for a good many people. "Thou hast spoken." "Blessed is the people that know the joy-

ful sound." "My sheep hear my voice." There is something distinctive about the word of God. Said the spouse, "I sleep, but my heart waketh." She listened, and she said, "It is the voice of my beloved that knocketh, saying, Open to me, my sister, my love, . . . for my head is filled with dew, and my locks with the drops of the night." Ah yes, the true Christian never forgets the Shepherd's voice.

We went off the radio nineteen years ago, when they suddenly put the price of our service up to two hundred or two hundred and fifty dollars — I forget just what it was. But even now sometimes I go into a store, and I meet somebody, and tell him what I want, and he addresses me by name. I have had that experience scores of time. I say, "How do you know me?" And they have said, "I used to hear you over the radio, and I have never forgotten your voice." I do not know why, but that is what they say after nineteen years. But one thing I know, that when the Lord's sheep have once heard the voice of the Good Shepherd they never forget it. It is different, it is distinctive. That is what it is when a Christian comes to read the Word of God; he can say like David, "Thou hast spoken".

In the British Navy, or on any other ship for that matter, there is no such thing as a rope; it is always a line. And what we should call a rope, or a line if you like, in her Majesty's Navy is all woven or spun, or whatever they call it, for the Navy itself, and every inch of it, whether it be large or small, has running through it, woven in with it, a little crimson cord. You could not steal a bit of Her Majesty's rope, because when you cut it there it is. That is true of the Bible. There is a red cord running through it all. There is something about the Word of God that distinguishes it from every other word. Turn the pages of the Book of Exodus, for instance: "And the Lord spake unto Moses," "And the Lord spake unto Moses," "And the Lord spake unto Moses." But these Modernists say He did not speak. Why either He did or the writer of the Book of Exodus was an egregious liar. But God did speak.

Thus, by Nathan, the word of God came to David, and David said, "Thou hast spoken." What a different Book this would be to us all if we could all accept that! If you are expecting some good news from somewhere, a letter from someone, very important, and it at last arrives bearing your name, perhaps by special delivery or airmail, what do you do? You tear it open, and say, "I wonder what he has said?" There is the signature, and above is what he has said. Well we ought as Christians to be expecting some good word from Heaven every day, for He never forgets His children, and then as we get it say, as David said, "Thou hast spoken."

An Addressed Letter

It is a happy thing too to find our address on the envelope, is it not? David was under no misapprehension; that word was directed especially to him. "Thou hast spoken also of thy servant." Can you find yourself named in the Bible? Not everybody is as fortunate as I am. You see my name is written there: "The shields of the earth belong unto God." I am sorry for those of you who are called Smith because there is a Scripture which says, "There was no smith in Israel!" They had to go to the land of the Philistines to sharpen their weapons.

But facetiousness aside, the truth is, every believer's name is in the Book. They came to Jesus saying, "Even

the devils are subject unto us through thy name." He said, "Do not be specially glad about that, but rather rejoice, because your names are written in heaven." There is a passage in the Revelation I am very fond of where the Head of the Church speaks to the church at Sardis, and He said, "And unto the angel of the church in Sardis write . . . thou hast a few names even in Sardis which have not defiled their garments; and they shall walk with me in white: for they are worthy." As though the great Head of the Church had taken the church roll of Sardis, and had put it down beside the Lamb's Book of Life, and said, "There are a few names in that book down there that I have in my book up here." Is that not great blessing?

Miss Lindsay found me two books I had forgotten I had. When I went to England in 1915 I took two books with me with carbon paper interleaving all the pages. I wrote one sheet for a letter home, and the rest I had in my book, so when I got through I had all my correspondence in the book. But in the book there was an invitation from the Corporation of the City of London addressed to me. That, of course, was before I lost my reputation! I used to have lots of special things then. But here was an engraved invitation addressed to the Rev. Dr. T. T. Shields, inviting him to be among the guests of the Corporation of the City of London on the occasion of the presentation of the freedom of that city to the Right Honourable Sir Robert Borden, with a long string of degrees after his name, Prime Minister of Canada. I looked at it and I said, "Was I ever invited to such occasions? Of course I was, and told how to dress, and all the rest of it, on many occasions. I was foolishly rather proud of that at that time, but I do not worry about it now. But I am proud when I find that in this Book of books there is a word that identifies me. There isn't any doubt about it. Thou hast spoken to me.

I remember as a little boy in one of my father's scrap books — they are stored away now, and I do not know where they are, alas — there was a story of a little old lady who watched the procession as it passed by when Her Majesty Queen Victoria rode by in state. And her impressions were written in verse, and the one thing that impressed her above all was not the splendour of Her Majesty's accompaniments, but that "She smiled and she nodded to me." That dear old lady was quite sure that the Queen had smiled and nodded to her. I haven't thought of it until this minute since I was a boy. But I know that the King of kings has done more than smile and nod to me; He has put me in His Book, and I can say as certainly, and from as profound conviction as David did, "Thou hast spoken to thy servant." And that is a great honour.

A man came into my office one day some years ago. He had written me a letter tearing one of the deacons to pieces because the deacon had committed this great offence, that somewhere at some time he had passed him without speaking to him or recognizing him. I knew the deacon, and I knew he was just the soul of courtesy and Christian affection. I did not answer the letter, but the writer came in to get his own answer. His letter was on my desk, and I said, "This is your letter?" He said, "Yes." I said, "Well you do not mean that; you must have been a little bit off shade or something when you wrote that. That is not you." I said, "I do not think that deacon intentionally passed you by. You will agree that we forget it won't you?" So I took up the letter and said, "Shall I tear it up?" He said, "Tear

it up Pastor." So I tore it up and put it in the waste basket, and I said, "Is it all right?" "Yes," he said, "it is all right." He was a good man, but he just imagined that somebody had slighted him. We have all felt like that sometimes.

I think I will pause to tell you a story a minister told me when I was going to my first church. He said, "Do not be supersensitive." I said, "What do you mean?" He said, "I went as a student to a little church, and there was one man in the church more prominent than the others. He had a large store, and a great many interests, and he was perhaps the most influential man in the church. He had a fine family, and he invited me to have dinner with them. I went, and I had a lovely evening. Then when I was coming away he put his arm around me, and said, "Now Pastor count this your home. You will have a place to board, but do not wait for an invitation. Whenever you feel like it you come here; the door is always home, and we shall be always happy to see you." He said, "I came away saying, 'I shall be often there.'" But he found himself there again one evening, whether he had taken the invitation for granted or not I forget, but anyway he was there. The head of the house served the meal, and sat at the head of the table and never said a word; he seemed preoccupied. He said, "I never felt so uncomfortable. I said, 'What have I done? I have offended him in some way. What have I done?' Time passed, and I did not go there again, and one day this man met me with his old cordiality. He said, 'Pastor, you haven't been in to see us for a long while,' and remembering I said, 'No, I haven't.' He saw there was something wrong, and he said, 'Is there anything wrong?' Then I told him, and he said, 'Let me see? I remember. That day in business from morning till night everything I touched had gone awry. I wasn't out of sorts with you, and never have been, but I was so preoccupied with all these problems that had crowded in upon me that I couldn't talk to my wife, I couldn't talk to anybody. And you thought that you had offended me? Never think that again. Come often, we want to see you.'" And this man said to me, "If people pass you by, and sometimes seem a little bit stiff, and not as cordial as their wont, pay no attention to it; maybe they have their troubles. Wait till tomorrow or the next day, and they will be all right again."

The Lord Never Neglects Us

What a blessing it is that the Lord never passes us by, that He is never so preoccupied that He cannot listen to our prattle! And we do prattle a lot, do we not? We talk a lot about nothing. But there it is. "But thou hast spoken also of thy servant's house." Do you know it is your privilege to get a word for your house? You men, heads of families, what do you earn money for? To keep your family. When you receive money what is it for? It is not all your yourself, it is for your family, for your house. What are the exceeding great and precious promises for? They are for your house. And to children's children the blessing of the Lord descends if we ask for it. And David said, "Thou hast spoken also of thy servant's house." What a mercy that is! My dear friends, whatever belongs to you, whatever concerns your house, your business, your household affairs, the health of your children and your family — it is all part of it. And God has something to say about your house, and is interested in your house and everything that belongs to you.

I have read of a little girl who had broken her dolly and the sawdust was coming out, and she did not know what to do with it. She took it to her father, and he was sitting reading his paper. He said, "Go and show it to your mother." So she came crying to her mother. She said, "Daddy doesn't care about my broken dolly." "O yes he does," mother said, "you know Daddy is reading, and he is occupied." "I know," she said, "but he might have said 'Oh!'" Tell God all your troubles. And He will welcome you: "Call upon me in the day of trouble: I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me." And if it is only a broken dolly, just a plaything that we have made a lot of, and that does not amount to anything at all, you can be sure of His sympathy. He will not pass you by. "Thou hast spoken also of thy servant's house."

"A Great While to Come"

Ah, but here is the emphatic word of the text. That is the thing that struck David. "Thou hast spoken also of thy servant's house for a great while to come. And is this the manner of man?" No man knows about what is going to happen in the "great while to come." There is no contract into which any man or woman can enter that is more binding than the marriage tie. But what do people promise when they are married? — that they will cleave to each other "until death shall us part". You cannot promise anything beyond that. I think all the time of Jarvis Street Church, and sometimes in moments of weakness and weariness I could almost wish that I could speak of Jarvis Street for "a great while to come". But I say, "I cannot do that; I shall have to leave that to the Lord. That is His province, not mine. I cannot look into a great while in the future, but the Lord can. Maybe I will try to speak to you of it Sunday night — I do not know whether I shall or not, but it has just been coursing through my mind: "Will ye also go away?" "To whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." That is here. David said, "Nobody else can speak about eternal life; nobody else can speak about the unfolding centuries, the millennia, and see right on to the last syllable of recorded time, but Thou canst." And so the Lord promised him that Solomon should build His house, but beyond that he would establish his throne, and his seed should occupy it forever. And you remember how on the day of Pentecost Peter declared that that promise was fulfilled. Christ came of the seed of David according to the flesh, and when David spoke of the future he was not speaking of himself because he is dead, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. He was speaking of great David's greater Son, and the establishment of His throne forever. So David was assured that he should never want for someone to sit upon his throne, and he never will, for He Who is the Son of God is the Son of man. "What think ye of Christ? whose son is He?" They say, "The Son of David." "How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying . . . Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstools?" Christ was in this promise, and when God promises grace to us for a great while to come you can be sure that He promises it to us through Jesus Christ our Lord;

What promises we have! How rich this Book is! Spurgeon has a little book entitled "A Cheque Book on the Bank of Faith." I rather think it is just full of these exceeding precious promises, although I have never read it. There are lots of books on my shelves that I have never read. People ask me sometimes, "Have you read everything on your shelves?" I say, "No; I haven't

read everything in the dictionary either." My library is my dictionary. A Cheque Book on the Bank of Faith. That is what this is. The Lord has given us exceeding great and precious promises, and I do believe dear friends that if you look for it you will find a cheque just exactly suited to your requirements. Sometimes when I go travelling I carry what little money I have in Travellers' Cheques, ten dollars, some five dollars, maybe one or two twenties, and maybe a fifty or so if I am going far. When I go to cash a cheque I say, "What do I want now?" And I do not cash a fifty dollar cheque for a dollar meal, or two dollars either. I just choose the smallest denomination. But if it is some big thing, if I have to buy a ticket, or something of that sort, I look for something in my cheque book that will fit my requirements, and then I take out my fifty dollar cheque, or whatever it is. You will find cheques of all denominations in this Book for your faith. Whatever you need tonight take out the one you need, sign it, and cash it.

I heard the late Dr. Charles Eaton, when he was Pastor of Bloor Street Church, later Yorkminster, and who was later Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in the United States, tell of a country man having a cheque, and he did not know what to do with it. He was not used to dealing with cheques. So he asked a friend, and he said, "Take it to the bank and they will cash it." He took it to the bank, and the teller looked on the back and said, "It isn't endorsed?" "What do you mean?" "Why you will have to endorse it; you will have to write your name on the back of the cheque. That is what we call endorsing." "Oh! lend me a pen." So he gave him a pen, and he wrote, "I heartily endorse this cheque." I like to sign cheques on the back. I am not so fond of those we must sign on the front. But if I sign on the back that means something is coming to me. When you go to Heaven's bank you always sign on the back. You heartily endorse this cheque, this promise, and the Lord will cash it. May He make us all rich in faith, giving glory to God, for His Name's sake. Let us pray.

We thank Thee, O Lord, that Thou art always giving, that Thou art a God of grace, and that Thou didst make Thyself known to us in One Who was full of grace and truth. That is our only hope. Nothing but grace can save us, and nothing but grace can keep us. The Lord bless us every one. Amen.

FOR YOUNGER READERS

HOPPY AND THE SNAKE

A True Story by Rev. Harold Fuller

ARUSTLE in the weeds at my feet disturbed me as I sat reading on my little African stool outside my mud-walled house. At first I could not tell what was jumping around, but finally I noticed a little frog. In the early morning light his green skin, spotted with black, looked just like the coloring of the earth and the weeds.

Hoppy — I thought that must have been his name — did not know that I was watching. He had been hopping around all night looking for food. On the floor of the missionary's house he had found all kinds of bugs that had dropped dead from the kerosene lantern, and outside he had licked up lots of ants. Now he was tired and needed a good long rest through the day.

Hoppy knew, though, that if he lay down out on the open ground, some big bird would swoop down and eat him, or a slimy snake hiding in the grass would gulp him down. So Hoppy looked for a safe place to take his nice

long nap. At last he spied a dark hole under the mud wall of the missionary's house.

"I'll be safe in there," thought Hoppy, as he scratched away some of the earth to make more room. "No one will ever catch me in that dark hole."

Just as Hoppy was beginning to wriggle in, a shiny green head shot out of the hole. Hoppy was terrified. He was looking right into the tiny, flashing eyes of an ugly snake! He tried to jump back, but the snake's jaws snapped open and clamped tight over his head. The little frog scuffled and twisted, and kicked his feet in the air, but the snake's grip held firmly.

As all this was quickly happening, I couldn't help but think about the boys and girls I knew who thought they could play with sin and not get caught. Yes, there were some who did not even know that God was watching them, and they didn't think that Satan — whom the Bible calls the serpent — would ever hurt them. But after they were caught in sin, it was too late; they could not save themselves — they were just like the little frog.

As Hoppy's struggling died down, the snake began to swallow him. First one jaw stretched, and then another, and Hoppy slid farther and farther down. Finally just his hind feet were sticking out of the snake's mouth.

Was it too late to help Hoppy? I picked up a stick. The snake was darting his hooked tongue in and out past the little frog's legs, but he didn't like the looks of the stick. I struck at his head, and he drew back into the hole. The snake knew he couldn't run away quickly with such a big mouthful, so he gave up the frog and disappeared.

I thought Hoppy was finished, as he lay there on the ground limp and quiet. But he sighed a couple of times and breathed deeply. Then I was surprised to see him shake himself and take a little hop. He fell over, but after a rest he took another hop. Sure enough, after a while Hoppy was back on his legs and able to hop far away from the snake.

I couldn't help thinking that I had done about the same thing for Hoppy that the Lord Jesus can do for every boy and girl: When they get into sin they cannot free themselves from Satan. Jesus has to do that for them, because only He is strong enough. Then when Jesus sets boys and girls free from sin, He gives them new life so that they can keep away from sin.

If sin has hold of you, won't you pray to God to set you free?

—Written in North Nigeria for
The Sunday School Times.

BOOKS AND BOOKLETS

By DR. T. T. SHIELDS

"Other Little Ships" _____	\$2.00
"The Plot That Failed" _____	2.00
Special Illustrated Number of Sept. 28 _____	.25
"Russellism or Rutherfordism", 71 pages _____	.25
"The Papacy in the Light of Scripture", 26 pages _____	.25
"The Oxford Group Analyzed" _____	.66
"Does Killed in Action Mean Gone to Heaven?" _____	.66
"The Christian Attitude Toward Amusements" _____	.66
"The God of All Comfort" _____	.66

The Gospel Witness

130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2, Canada

THE GREAT CONTENTION

Chapter XXXIV in the History of the Battle for the Bible Among
Baptists of Ontario and Quebec

By Dr. T. T. Shields

MY READERS will remember that this discussion was provoked by an article by Dr. T. B. McDormand, Secretary of The Convention of Ontario and Quebec, in *The Maritime Baptist*, entitled "The Tragedy of Schism". In that article, by implication at least, he blamed me for splitting the Baptist Convention. My readers will have followed with interest the official documents published in this series, and will be able to form their own opinion as to where the responsibility lies for the schism, to which Dr. McDormand refers.

What ought we to have done? Jarvis Street Baptist Church, doctrinally, stands in exactly the same position it occupied when it was founded, a position which was maintained during the ministries of men like Dr. Fyfe and Dr. Castle. Jarvis Street stands, as it has always stood, for the divine inspiration, the integrity, infallibility, and supreme and final authority, of Holy Scripture, with all that that position involves. From every quarter that fundamental truth was being assailed. It was being denied in McMaster University. Its denial was being propagated by certain of the professors, and by students who had imbibed their false teaching.

What was our duty in the premises? To fold our arms and sit idly by? To witness the distortion, perversion, and utter denial of the truth of the gospel, and say nothing? If a burglar breaks into a house and proposes to steal everything of value in it, and take it away, is the man of the house to be blamed for rising in the small hours of the morning, and hurling the burglar downstairs? He may be hurt in the fall. He may cry so loudly that the neighbours will be awakened. But what of it? *Who started it? That is the question.*

What has happened to the denominations in which no protest has been made, the United Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Baptist Conventions in Canada, and in the United States, north and south? Where Modernism has been allowed to have its way it has strangled Evangelical orthodoxy. But in all these denominations "a remnant according to the election of grace" of the blessed people who "know the joyful sound", have rebelled against the poisoning of the springs of spiritual life. In all the larger denominations of the continent, there have been divisions; and Bible believers, for their own sake have had to separate from the infidelities of varying degrees propagated by Modernistic institutions, professors, and preachers. But always the enemy has been the aggressor, and Bible believers have had to fight a defensive warfare. We do not generalize. We do not include everybody. Because we had no desire to incriminate those who were free from blame, we dared to name the Modernistic culprits. No doubt there are many in The Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, who have come to the Convention from Great Britain, or from the United States, who are perfectly sound in the faith; but knowing nothing of the history of *The Great Contention*, they listened to such men as Dr. McDormand, who, blamed those who refused to surrender the Citadel

of Truth, called the Bible, for wrecking the denomination.

Our only regret, after these thirty years of continuous warfare, is that we have been unable to wage the war with greater force. No doubt people are still being told; after this long lapse of time that there is no Modernism among Baptists. Any such statement, however, is far from the facts of the case.

We Were Not Alone in Our Contention

Many valiant soldiers of the cross stood with us. But we never made the slightest effort to enlist anyone, or to seek a following. Among those who stood nobly with the Pastor in Jarvis Street Church, were the late Dr. C. J. Holman, K.C., and his wife. Both Dr. and Mrs. Holman were people of intellectual force. Mrs. Holman had been for twenty-five or thirty years President of The Women's Missionary Society (West) in what we now call The Old Convention. Before her marriage she was vice-Principal of Moulton Ladies' College. Dr. Holman, as he stated in the letter we published last week, addressed to The Private Bills Committee in Ottawa, was the last surviving Executor of the Will of the late Senator McMaster. He knew the Baptist Denomination, and its history, as few men did.

A letter written to the members of Jarvis Street Baptist Church by Dr. Holman in connection with this controversy, and kindly sent to us with other of Dr. Holman's pamphlets, by his widow, happily still surviving, while it is extremely complimentary to myself, I think will bear reprinting. Perhaps I ought to apologize for printing it. But when a man has been treated to repeated mud baths by the enemy, it may not be amiss to show something of the pattern of the original cloth before it was covered with mud.

Here is what Dr. Charles J. Holman, K.C., L.L.D., wrote to the members of Jarvis Street Baptist Church. While the letter is undated, it must have been written some time between April 21st, and September 21st, 1921:

Dear Fellow-member of Jarvis St. Baptist Church:

As a member of Jarvis St. Church for 45 years, and a Trustee, I venture to express my views on the present situation.

In the pulpit is a gifted man—unexcelled among all Canada's preachers. Never have the Scriptures been expounded more faithfully and ably. The Year Books for the last twenty-three years (which is as far back as Year Books give records) show the highest average of baptisms during that period has been during the present pastorate. Yet to drive him from the pulpit is the avowed aim of the present opposition. And why? Personally I have yet to hear one valid reason.

I know that the Pastor has aroused opposition because—
1. In his preaching he has unflinchingly stood for the inspiration and authority of the Bible from Genesis to Revelation. This has offended the Higher Critics.

2. He has *dared* to protest against the craze for amusements, and has appealed to the office-holders and members for consecration of life, and to surrender to the Holy Spirit.

3. He has had trouble with the organist, but the Pastor has not been alone in his objections. Many have been sore at heart because persons making no profession of religion are put forward to lead the singing, and they regard the

\$3,600 cost as not well expended. They desire to see a spiritual choir, spiritually conducted.

4. He dared to stop vaudeville stunts at Sunday School entertainments.

5. He gave a clear deliverance on the relation of the ordinances, and of the Baptist position. This met with hot criticism in some quarters, though Jarvis St. is a Regular Baptist Church and the Trusts in the Title Deed are strictly in accord with the Pastor's preaching.

And all the disaffected on the above or any ground are making common cause in opposition.

Fellow member, is the Pastor to be "crucified" for the stand he has taken in these matters? Paul said truly, "The time will come when they will not bear sound teaching."

It is said that he does not hold "the young people". This cannot mean the many young people who attend the services delighted with his ministry, but evidently *other* "young people". How about the parents? Have the parents no responsibility? Some talk about lack of sympathy with Young people's federations, but these organizations were under the particular charge — not of the Pastor — but of the Associate Pastor. Mistakes have been made. We all, even deacons and ministers, make them. That prince of preachers, Dr. Lorimer, declared it to be a mistake ever to appoint an associate pastor. He said it always worked trouble. Jarvis St. appointed one to have special charge of the Young People's and Sunday School work, and to do the visiting. This worked happily for a time, but it finally made trouble, for we now find the opposition declaring of the Pastor that "he did not visit", was "out of touch" with Young People's Societies, etc., all of which was in the province of the Associate Pastor. Is this fair? Surely some of the objections *now raised* are not worthy of serious consideration.

Disguise it as you may, the *original* and *underlying* ground of opposition is the Pastor's position as to Higher Criticism. At the Ottawa Convention he moved a protest against an article in the denominational paper. Those who had been friendly to the teaching of Prof. Mathews at McMaster went to Ottawa to oppose the action of the Pastor. Mr. Ryrle (as he was entitled to do) moved an amendment to *side-track* the motion of the Pastor. The Convention would have none of it, and the amendment was withdrawn. Dr. Shields swept the Convention. The delegates stood for the Bible, excepting a small minority. The opposition came back and made no secret of their resolve to "get Shields out of Jarvis St." Their sympathizers in the Church were too weak for an open fight *until* the Pastor *dared* to preach against the craze for amusements, and besought the members "to put Christ first." *Then* suddenly scores were added to the opposition, and to the grief of many, it became known that certain deacons failed to support the Pastor on the amusement question. *Then* — mark it well — *after that sermon* — certain members, 15 in number, banded themselves together and with a shocking disregard for the honour of the Church they professed to serve, they dragged Jarvis St. affairs before the public, and published a manifesto in *The Toronto Star* charging the Pastor with introducing "religious controversy" into the pulpit. They put one *real* issue *then*, how-much-so-ever they later sought other excuses. That "religious controversy" consisted in Dr. Shields' answering from the pulpit the attacks of the Higher Critics. The weakness of the churches to-day is that too many pulpits stand mute on this question, though the fight is on the world over.

Across the border Dr. A. H. Strong — that great Baptist and great theologian — has said: "The unbelief in our seminary teaching is like a blinding mist settling down upon our churches", and our churches are "being honeycombed with doubt and indifference". Already this is creeping into our Canadian churches. Talk of deprecating "religious controversy"! Why, Jude thundered out that "ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints."

Some good people do not realize the gravity of the issue, but certain it is that if by any chance this opposition succeeded, every Higher Critic would throw his hat in the air with joy — joy that their ablest opponent had been silenced in the Jarvis St. pulpit.

As to amusements. Whatever may be the right of the individual member as to amusements, I stand with the Pastor for the principle (deacons or no deacons to the contrary) that in the best interests of the Church those who

indulge in or favour theatre-going, dancing and card-playing ought not to accept the honourable position of deacon.

Are the members of this Church to stand with those who combatted the Pastor on this question? If so, it would be a humiliating day for Jarvis St., and what think you would be the effect upon the young people — the denomination — the Christian public?

It is suggested that because Mr. So-and-So is not *pleased* with the minister, the latter *must* go, and that if he went it would make for peace. Utter nonsense! And it is to be hoped that no member will be influenced by any such suggestion. It will not make for peace. It will make for *the ruin of Jarvis St. as a spiritual force*. Further, it is idle for members to talk of "being put out of" Jarvis St. If they go out, they put themselves out.

This is no ordinary case. Here is a great denominational leader, against whom is arrayed every Higher Critic of the Bible in the country. The denomination stood by him at Ottawa. They know the *real* issue. The Christian public knows the real issue, and they stand watching to-day to see if Jarvis St. will ring true. If Dr. Shields left Jarvis St. he is lost to Canada, as there is no suitable pulpit for him here, and to lose him now, when there are grave questions involving Baptist principles facing the denomination, would be nothing short of a calamity. He is already coveted by our denomination in the South. One of the widely circulated papers of the U.S.A. characterizes his speech at Des Moines as one "of the greatest ever delivered" . . . It adds: "The subject was Christ, the defence of His truth against all comers", and then says, "We covet this man for Southern Baptists. If some great pulpit does not capture him, it at least ought to be trying; if some theological seminary had him, happy that seminary. What a college President he would make!" And this man recognized the continent over as one of the most powerful of Bible expositors, they would drive from Jarvis St. and from Canada. Where, oh where, would we find his equal?

Some deacons and others have withdrawn their weekly offering and have absented themselves from Jarvis St. services and the "Table of the Lord". It has been intimated that the Church could not go on without *them*. An effectual answer has been given by the congregations that have greeted the Pastor, and the very liberal plate collections. The members who have been carrying on the spiritual work in the face of this opposition are the real strength of the Church; and further, during the summer, never in the history of Jarvis St. has there been such a high tide of spirituality, never such beautiful inspiring testimonies, never such heavenly prayer meetings, never such remarkable conversions, never such heartening experiences, and when the new members were welcomed into the fellowship of the Church at the last largely attended communion service, it was a scene that brought tears of joy to one's eyes. Does not this work of grace joy your heart? Shall it be stopped?

Fellow-member, do not permit yourself to be side-tracked by small issues. Take high ground. This is a great issue.

The message of Jarvis St. pulpit has been Evangelical and Evangelistic, and pronouncedly in defence of the Word of God. If you are in agreement with that message do not fail to be at the meeting of the Church on Wednesday, the 21st of September, and be prepared to *stay it through*, and see that the message is not only supported, but that the Pastor is supplied with officers who are loyal.

CHARLES J. HOLMAN.

The meeting to which Dr. Holman's letter summoned the members of Jarvis Street Church, proved to be the enemy's Waterloo. The Pastor was sustained in a glorious victory and immediately thereafter began the great blessing which has never left Jarvis Street Church unto this day.

We have already described the great victory which was achieved at the Convention in London, in 1924. Rev. L. H. Marshall was undoubtedly imported by Dr. J. H. Farmer in 1925 in a determination to reverse that decision.

At the time of Professor Marshall's appointment I was a member of the Board of Governors of McMaster Uni-

versity. I did everything in my power to clean house within, without inflicting the noise of the housecleaning upon the ears of our neighbours. Yet I am represented by many as some sort of "bear in a china shop", who was always spoiling for a fight. The fact is, before this controversy began I was regarded as the champion conciliator of the Denomination. If there was trouble anywhere I was sent for that I might endeavour to bring the disputants together. But never was I charged with disturbing the peace. As a matter of fact, as I look back, I cannot recall a single instance when I had the slightest disturbance in my own church caused by any trouble in the church itself. All my troubles have come from the outside, from my extra-church affiliations. I will not attempt to name the motives which actuated the enemy. Certainly it was not always because of this particular controversy; but it always came from my extra-church relationships.

Whether in moments of weakness, or of clearer apprehension of facts and principles, I cannot say, but I have sometimes been led to feel that had I my life to live over again I would be Pastor of an independent, unaffiliated, Baptist Church, and I would give myself to the ministry of that church alone. And yet, taking a wider view, I am constrained to say that I fear such a position would have been, and would now be, a mistake: "We then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves." I quote this as a suggestion that the stronger churches ought to unite and co-operate with a view, first of all, to helping the weaker churches, by which I mean numerically weaker, thus promoting mission work at home and abroad.

Jarvis Street Church asks no help from anyone, but God. We have never needed any Convention. Conventions have ever been a burden and a perpetual headache. But any father of a family will acknowledge that bringing up a family is a strenuous business. And yet, notwithstanding its burdensomeness, there is not one member of the family with whom he would part company. So we have loved, and do love, churches which are, circumstantially, unable to support the work of the gospel in their neighbourhood, and who need help. We have rejoiced in these relationships just as a father rejoices in his family, notwithstanding, some of the children have turned out to be ungrateful and faithless rebels.

But I think, however, it may be well for me to say that before I uttered one word in public, I did everything possible, behind closed doors, to stop the Modernistic trend of McMaster's teaching. I was Pastor of the most influential Baptist Church in Canada. The church I served gave more to denominational objects at that time than any other two churches in the Denomination. I had absolutely nothing to gain, and everything to lose, so far as my personal affairs were concerned. I had been approached by many of the leading churches of this continent. I was solicited by the Deacons of Spurgeon's Tabernacle, London, and had only to say the word and I could have crossed the Atlantic and relieved myself of all this trouble. I stood because there was a principle at stake, and I felt that it would be utterly cowardly to retire from the field before the victory was won.

There was nothing within the gift of The Old Convention, I dare now to say, that could not have been mine had I been willing to keep step with the Modernists, or, indeed, even without that. I will not name the offices that were named to me. It is enough to say that I wanted no office from the Presidency down: I desired

only that "the truth of the gospel might abide" with the Denomination I loved.

I said at the time that I believed ninety per cent of the churches were evangelically orthodox, and almost the same percentage of the ministers. Dr. Farmer disputed my estimate. I still believe that if men, who professed Evangelical principles, like the late Mr. Albert Matthews, Mr. James Ryrie, Mr. S. J. Moore, and others, had had the courage to stand, Evangelically-minded ministers, too numerous to mention, would have stood with them, and the Denomination could have been saved. And, as I had intimated to Chancellor McCrimmon at the time, Church Union was immediately in prospect and multitudes of people, from the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches, dissatisfied with the merger, would have flocked to Baptist Churches, if only the Convention of Ontario and Quebec had nailed the Evangelical flag to the mast, declaring, "We will never surrender".

I must have in mind the termination of this narrative, for were I to publish all that is even now in print and is germane to this question, "of the making of many books there would be no end."

The rock upon which the Denomination at last split was the appointment, and teaching, of Professor L. H. Marshall. I shall deal with that in my next chapter.

(To be continued)

DISHONOURING THE BIBLE

It is indeed pitiable, something quite absurdly vain to hear a certain kind of people making out by lame violence, which they mistake for forcible reasoning, that the Bible is an old-world book, a rag out of fashion, not a garment fit for this day's wearing. Some knavish preachers are not ashamed to do this: They have lived on the dear old book, it has kept them and their families in food and lodging these last thirty years, and yet they have nothing good to say about it; they like better the last book which they do not understand, or the last novel which is as hemlock or strychnine to the soul. Thieves they be, knaves with pulpit robes reluctantly thrown over their thievish breasts. Beware of them. They are clever liars, swindlers who look too innocent to be quite guiltless, hirelings who hunger for the pelf. I could respect, in some grim way, the vulgar infidel who blasphemés openly and on purpose, and rejoices in his pitiful bellowing, mistaking the very blatancy for courage; but the man in the pulpit who insults the Bible on which he lives, and wriggles out of the profession by which he climbed to the pulpit he dishonors, I charge with worse crimes than those which blackened Barabbas or damned Iscariot.

—PARKER.

TORONTO BAPTIST SEMINARY

Training is Sound, Thorough, Evangelical,
Scriptural

Courses of Two, Three and Four Years

Degrees

Tuition Free

Write for Information:

The Secretary,

337 Jarvis Street,

Toronto 2, Canada.

DANGERS INVOLVED IN THE CULT OF THE QUEEN OF HEAVEN

(A paper read at the Wycliffe Preachers' Conference in England by Mr. G. F. Brown)

The primary object of this paper is not to trace "The Cult of the Queen of Heaven" to its source, but to expose it for what it is, a diabolical substitution, by which Christ the "King of Kings" is dethroned, and a fallen human creature, is enthroned in His stead, a substitution that is so complete in the eyes of the Romanists, that all and everything that Scripture attributes to our Risen Lord and King has been assigned to the "Queen of Heaven."

Suffice it to say that the origin of this cult has no foundation whatever in the "Word of God," neither is it in any sense Christian. In fact, this cult, though practised by a Christian (?) church, is the very antithesis of Biblical Christianity. The dangers or consequences involved in the practice of this cult are too numerous to delineate, and in many instances too revolting to contemplate. The main dangers, as will readily be seen, are of our intellectual, moral and spiritual character; intellectual dishonesty in the inauguration of the cult, moral degeneracy in the practice of the cult, and spiritual bankruptcy in the fruits of the cult, to say nothing of the corruption and betrayal of all that Christianity means and is.

The Enthronement via the Immaculate Conception

IT WILL be instantly realized that this cult of the "Queen of Heaven" as practised in the Roman Church revolves around the person of the Virgin Mary. To the Roman Catholic, the Virgin Mary IS the "Queen of Heaven", and is the object of praise and worship. And I think it would be true also to say, that she is the object of adulation as nauseous and revolting to her as it is to the Word of God. This being so, the question now arises, "By what figment of the imagination or intellectual ingenuity has the Virgin Mary been honoured, or should I say dishonoured, with the title and office of 'Queen of Heaven'?" This figment of imagination, or hallucination is provided, in the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. This doctrine is the "chariot" by which the Queen has ascended to her throne.

Despite the error and paganism associated with this cult, the Church of Rome seems to have grasped the Biblical Truth, that "Nothing that defileth shall ever enter Heaven." Ignoring however the "Cleansing Fountain" which God has provided for us in the "Blood of Jesus Christ," the Church of Rome assigns her devotees to "Purgatory" to be cleansed, whilst to the Virgin Mary she assigns a special dispensation enabling her to be born without contracting the stain of "Original Sin". This anomaly she designates "The Immaculate Conception."

In connection with this doctrine, the historian Gibbon says, "The Latin church has not disdained to borrow from the Koran, the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin" (Dec. and Fall, vol. 5, p. 340). In Chapter three of the same volume, Gibbon, in giving an account of the birth of the Virgin Mary, speaks of "Driving away Satan with stones", and in these words, according to the Jesuit Maracci, the Immaculate Conception is hinted at (Alcoran. tom. 2, p. 341).

Being unable to find evidence or support for this doctrine in the Word of God, the Church of Rome had of necessity to look elsewhere for it. So with the help of the Koran and a more fertile imagination, the doctrine was conceived.

The position is summed up by Di-Bruno thus, "The soul of the Blessed Virgin was of itself liable to contract

the stain of Original Sin like any other child of Adam, and therefore needed Redemption, but in view of and through the merits of Jesus Christ, whose Virgin Mother she was to be, she was preserved and protected from contracting this stain" (Cath. Belief, ch. 42). So on Dec. 8th, 1854, Pope Pius IX proclaimed the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, to be from henceforth and forever an Article of the "Catholic" Faith.

When we ask for Biblical proof to support this doctrine, it is of course never produced, and many of Rome's theologians are candid enough, or brazen enough to admit that there is no Biblical warrant for the doctrine. One Roman Catholic, Dr. Raphael Melia (Mary the Object of Veneration) said, "In the Holy Scriptures, the Immaculate Conception is not expressly mentioned." Cardinal Bellarmine seemed somewhat annoyed that Biblical support for the doctrine should be deemed necessary. "People cannot expect," he said, "that we can bring forward any express text of Scripture on the subject." Not only do we expect Biblical support, we demand it if the doctrine is to be regarded as an article of the Christian Faith.

Rome has, of course, a second string to her bow, on which many a discordant and mythical tune has been played, "The Unanimous Consent of the Fathers." When we consult these "Fathers" we find that this unanimity is at discount, and strange as it may seem, many of them disagree entirely with this doctrine. Augustine disagreed with it, "Mary, derived from Adam, died because of sin — and the flesh of our Lord died to take away sin" (on Psa. 34, tom. iv, col. 240).

Aquinas also disagreed with it saying, "Though the parents of the Blessed Virgin were cleansed from Original Sin, nevertheless she contracted Original Sin" (Summa, pt. 3, Art. 2, p. 7).

Cardinal Cajetan spent no little time searching the "Fathers" in connection with this doctrine, and he enumerates fifteen "Fathers" whose teachings were definitely opposed to this doctrine. Included in this list of "Fathers" whom Cajetan terms irrefragable are, St. Augustine, Ambrose, John Chrysostom, Anselm, Eusebius and Aquinas. (Others, Eusissenus, Remigus, Maximus, Beda, Bernard, Erardus, Anthony of Padua, Bonaventura and Peter Lombard). Whilst Salmeron the Jesuit counts two hundred who were of the opinion that the Virgin Mary was conceived in sin.

In the 1818 edition of his book, "End of Religious Controversy," p. 160, the Roman Catholic Bishop Milner says, "The church does not decide the controversy concerning the Conception of the Blessed Virgin, because it sees nothing absolutely clear and certain concerning it either in the written or the unwritten word, and therefore leaves her children to form their own opinions concerning it." Despite this fact that the controversy was unsettled when Milner published his book in 1818, thirty-six years later Pope Pius IX in his "Letter Apostolic" announcing the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, declared that the Church had always held the same doctrine. "It was therefore," says Tablet Dec. 23, 1854, "at a moment of complete internal freedom and repose, when dispute was long dead, and disputation silent—that a Pope—Pius IX, chose to gratify the long cherished wishes of the children of the church, by the issue of a solemn, judicial and definitive sentence proclaiming that the Virgin Mary had never contracted the stain of Original Sin, and the Immaculate Conception is therefore from henceforth and for ever an Article of Catholic

Belief." The second article of the Creed of Pope Pius IX reads, "Neither will I ever take the Scriptures and interpret them otherwise than according to the Unanimous Consent of the Fathers." To which they should have appended, "Neither will I ever take the 'Fathers' and interpret them other than according to the present opinion of the Roman Catholic Church."

The "Reign" of the Queen of Heaven

Having been endowed with the necessary qualifications to reign, Mary is now enthroned far above all principalities and powers. Her domain knows no limits, it is Universal, and includes all things and everything, whilst her power is unsurpassed even by that of God Himself, and before her even Christ must "Bend the knee".

To the Romanist, the promulgation of the Immaculate Conception became an absolute necessity. Whether deliberately or otherwise, Rome had changed her religion and her God. Christ Jesus was no longer the object of worship, but was compelled to abdicate His throne in favour of His mother. There was not and could not be room for two on the same throne.

When on Dec. 8th, 1854, this new doctrine was decreed an article of belief, it in no way enhanced the status of the Queen of Heaven. She was already reigning supreme. The decree merely confirmed her qualifications to reign, endorsed her credentials, and legalised her position. It put, as it were, a seal upon their choice of sovereign, and silenced forever further opposition within the Church of Rome's own ranks.

The writings of Alphonsus Ligouri, written long before the decree, testify that not only was Mary reigning in Heaven, but that she had already been invested with "deity". It must have occurred to the Church of Rome that Deity cannot in the slightest degree be contaminated with sin. Thus it became imperative that the new "god" should be so far removed, as to avoid even the possibility of the taint of sin.

We go a step further, and in 1950 when the doctrine of the "Bodily Assumption" was decreed an article of faith, it was but the logical outcome of all that had gone before, when first the idea of Mary reigning in Heaven was conceived. In the nature of the case, the promulgation of these two doctrines could not have been prevented. Delayed, yes, prevented, no. They had to be. You simply cannot impose limitations upon that which you invest with "deity". Consequently, whatever the Word of God attributes to Christ, the Church of Rome attributes to their new "god", the Queen of Heaven.

Is Christ the Saviour of the World? So is the Queen of Heaven. An indulgenced prayer of Gregory XVI contains the following, "O Immaculate Queen of Heaven and of angels, I adore thee. It is thou who hast delivered me from Hell. It is thou from whom I look for all my salvation" (Extract from a private letter, in Archives du Christianisme, No. 15, p. 122).

Is Christ the Mediator and Advocate? So is the Queen. "O lady in Heaven," says Ligouri, "we have one advocate and that is thyself" (Glories of Mary, p. 168). "By her we may receive all the assistance necessary for us. She is most powerful with God to obtain from Him all that she shall ask of Him. He cannot refuse her request" (Catholic School Book, p. 158).

Does Christ bestow gifts and grace? So does the Queen of Heaven. "All the gifts, graces and virtues of the Holy Ghost are by her hands administered to whom she pleaseth, when she pleaseth, how she pleaseth

and as much as she pleaseth, and this because she is the mother of the Son from Whom the Spirit proceedeth" (From Dr. G. Osborn's "A Reply to Mr. McSwinnney's Remarks" in "Modern Romanism Illustrated," p. 69). In other words, the work of the Holy Spirit is subject to the veto of the Queen of Heaven.

Mary, says St. Lawrence, is the Mistress of Heaven, for there she commands as she wills, and admits whom she wills (Glories of Mary, p. 215). Is Christ Omnipotent? Is God Almighty? How much more so the Queen of Heaven. Bernard Senensis says, "All things even God are servants of the empire of the Virgin" (Ser. V, p. 118). Of the monarchy of the Universe, Christ made no testamentary bequest, because that never could be done without prejudice to His mother. Moreover, He knew that a mother *can annul the will of her son* if made to the prejudice of herself (Ser. V, p. 118). "Therefore, setting each individual thing one against the other, what things God has done for man, and what things the Blessed Virgin has done for God, you will see that *Mary has done more for God than God has done for man*, so that thus on account of the Blessed Virgin, God is in a certain manner under a greater obligation to us than we are to Him" (Ser. VI, p. 120). We trust that He is sincerely grateful to us.

And Bernardinus de Bustis adds his support by asserting that "The Blessed Virgin is herself superior to God and God Himself is her subject by reason of the humanity derived from her" (Mariale, p. 605).

Time will not permit of the further elaboration of this subject, but mention might here be made of the Queen's husband, Joseph. It is hardly fitting that he should be regarded altogether as a nonentity. It is only natural that some consideration should be given to the husband of so high and exalted a personage as the Queen of Heaven. To say the least, he would be expected to radiate a measure of that glory reflected from his exalted wife. So we read in the "Glories of Joseph", p. 16, "If therefore she (Mary) be a princess, he (Joseph) is a prince, and where she is Queen he is King." And as though the height of blasphemy had not already been attained, on the same page we read, "O rich Joseph to whom God himself becomes a beggar."

They say the Devil is an adept at finding work for idle hands, so like father like son, the Church of Rome has seen to it that Joseph is provided with an occupation worthy of the husband of their Queen. Consequently, the Catechism ordered by the national synod of Maynooth in 1885 contains the following, "O God who in thine ineffable providence didst vouchsafe to choose Blessed Joseph to be the spouse of thy most Holy Mother, grant we beseech thee that we may be made worthy to receive him (Joseph) for our intercessor in Heaven, whom we venerate as our holy and most powerful protector."

It will be seen from all this that the dangers involved in the "Cult of the Queen of Heaven" are identical with the dangers involved in relying upon the human intellect and reason when divorced from the Word of God and deprived of the Holy Spirit's guidance. Professing themselves to be wise they became fools and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like unto the Queen of Heaven. Changing the Truth of God into a lie they worship and serve the creature more than the Creator, wherefore God shall send them a strong delusion that they should believe a lie.

—The Churchman's Magazine.

THE CANADIAN GENERAL ELECTION

THE GOSPEL WITNESS is not a political journal. Its Editor has never belonged to any political party. Liberalism, under Mackenzie King was an abominable thing which I learned to hate. In our judgment William Lyon Mackenzie King proved to be the worst blight that has ever afflicted Canadian public life. He was never loyal to Britain: we do not believe he was ever loyal to anybody, but himself; and so far as we are concerned, he departed, "Unwept, unhonoured, and unsung."

We confess to being conservatively inclined, and we do not intend that that should be understood exclusively in the political sense. We believe in the scriptural admonition, "Cleave to that which is good". We have no liking for change for the sake of change. If a thing is good, we should like to retain it. But the terms "Liberal" and "Conservative" are misnomers. We can see nothing liberal in Canadian political Liberalism. And the name "Conservative" is no worthier trade mark.

A good friend writes us assuming that we approved of Sir Charles Tupper, and the crew that Sir Mackenzie Bowell called "a nest of traitors". Nothing could be farther from the truth. We abhorred the action of the Conservative Party at the turn of the century in endeavouring to make political capital of the Manitoba School Question, and we have been fighting against what the Conservatives then proposed ever since.

Sir Robert Borden was a statesman of the first order. Premier R. B. Bennett, later Lord Bennett, might have done well if he had stood up and fought the reactionaries in his own Party, instead of effecting a change of domicile by going to England.

The fact is, we have no confidence whatever in the moral integrity of either Party. The last election was not a vote for Mr. St. Laurent so much as it was a vote against Mr. George Drew. We agreed at the time with a certain prominent Conservative when he said that every time Mr. George Drew opened his mouth he threw away ten thousand votes. His superlative egoism and egotism and the vacuity of his policies were enough to ruin any Party.

The present Prime Minister is a Roman Catholic, but we believe he is a good man — that is, as good as a Roman Catholic can be. As a man he is greatly to be preferred before his predecessor. C.C.F.ism is a not-too-distant relation of Communism, and we abhor both of them.

It was the habit of most people outside of Alberta to laugh at Premier Aberhart's Social Credit policies, and his promise of twenty-five dollars a month dividend. We were of the number who believed the Social Credit theory to be impracticable. Alberta never had Social Credit. It was a theory that proved to be utterly impracticable. But Mr. Aberhart was an honest man, and he gave Alberta a clean honest government; and that, above all things, is what every province, and the Dominion of Canada, needs and wants.

We went to Vancouver a year ago to speak, really, against the new Party which was formed in the hope of foisting Separate Schools upon British Columbia. We were asked by many, "How would you vote?" and we replied, in Vancouver first before the election, that with the example of Alberta before us, had we the opportunity we would vote Social Credit. We do not care what the Party is called, but since Social Credit has practically abandoned its monetary theory and has become synonymous with political honesty, if we had the opportunity in

the forthcoming election, we would vote Social Credit.

We believe Mr. Diefenbaker is the ablest man in the Conservative Party, and were he the Leader there might be a ray of hope in that direction. But we can see no hope whatever of the Conservative Party's improving conditions under Mr. George Drew. He sold out the Province of Ontario to the Roman Catholic Church. He outdid even Mitchell F. Hepburn in flooding Ontario with liquor. Frankly, we do not know of any one good thing he has to his credit, politically. He is a handsome, political nobody, for whom we should suppose no sensible person would vote.

We can offer no direction to anyone except to say if there is a good Social Credit candidate in your riding, vote for him. We could wish that Premier Manning of Alberta could become the national Leader of a Party, who would give the country merely an honest Government. If we were seeking a man for a position of trust, and we had to choose between a brilliant scoundrel and an ordinary average man of good moral character, we would choose the man of good character first. That is why we could not vote for Liberal, Conservative, or C.C.F. That is why we would cast a Social Credit vote if we had the opportunity of doing so.

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 17 Third Quarter Lesson 4 July 26, 1953

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

THE SIGN OF SEPARATION

Lesson Text: Johshua 5:1-15.

Golden Text: "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you."—2 Cor. 6:17.

I. The Act of Separation: verses 1-9.

Gilgal was about two miles from Jericho (Josh. 4:19), the first citadel in the land of Canaan to be stormed by the children of Israel. Hence, the experiences of the people at Gilgal were preparatory to the victories which would be granted to them in the new land. They were entering into Canaan, into an enlarged, more abundant life.

The first act required after they had crossed into the Promised Land was a renewal of the rite of circumcision, a custom which had lapsed during the wilderness journey. God had exacted this ceremony as a sign that each male child, as an individual and as the representative of his future family, was thereby entering into that covenant which God had made with Abraham (Gen. 17:7-14).

By inspiration the writers of the New Testament contrast this human ordinance of circumcision of the flesh with the Divine circumcision of the Spirit, which is the sign that we are ready to enter into fellowship with our Lord (Rom. 3:28, 29; 4:11; Eph. 2:11-13; Phil. 3:3; Col. 2:11).

For the purpose of the Sunday School teacher, the emphasis should be placed upon the significance of this act at Gilgal, the name of this place meaning "Rolling" (Josh. 4:19). In symbol this ceremony marked the rolling away of the reproach of Egypt. What was the reproach of Egypt? It was the luxury of life and the indulgence of the flesh (Exod. 16:3), which brought reproach upon the name of the Israelites and accordingly, upon the name of Jehovah (Gen. 34:14). Circumcision stands for death to the flesh.

The Christian who would be victorious over sin, self, the world and Satan must die to the flesh with its carnal lusts and desires (Rom. 13:14; Col. 3:1-5). We must separate ourselves from all that would bring reproach to the name of the Saviour, whose we are and whom we serve. The Spirit of God must be allowed full control, that He may mould us according to the will of the Lord, and that we may daily be transformed into the likeness of our Saviour (Rom. 8:1-13, 29; 12:1, 2; 2 Cor. 3:18).

