

my brother ministers but also with his use of them. For instance: One of them wrote me and complained that the Dr's use of his words was "radically defective through incompleteness."

"Before this controversy began in the MESSENGER AND VISITOR Dr. Saunders as 'Reporter' wrote of our Sabbath school: 'The pastor's Bible class has averaged sixty-two. The report of the deacons made suitable reference to the pastor's work in this department.' Let me quote their 'suitable reference'—

"One of the chief aims of the pastor, second only to the proclamation of the gospel, has been to establish the faith of the people in the Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture; and to this end a series of studies has been conducted, in an adult Bible class at the close of morning service, setting forth the best methods of Bible study and aiming at an intelligent view of the inspiration of the Scriptures. This class has been well attended, and good interest secured which has outlasted the series of technical lessons, and is maintained up to the present in the study of the life of Christ as given in the gospel of Mark. This class has had a marked influence on our Sunday school, in which a renewed interest has been taken, and which has been eminently successful, as will appear from the Superintendent's report. For all this we are grateful to God."

We wish to emphasize the importance of the pastor's efforts to lead to a better understanding of the Bible. Said the Apostle Paul in his second letter to the Corinthians: "Our sufficiency is of God, who also hath made us able ministers of the New Testament; not of the letter but of the Spirit; for the letter killeth but the Spirit giveth life, and in this testimony we think we see the liberty and indeed the duty of taking sufficient advantage of the work of reverent historical and literary study to get as full a knowledge as we may of God's revealed will. 'Know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.'"

THE REAL QUESTION AT ISSUE.

It was not a question as to whether I believe in the Bible as the "Word of God." Again and again I have called it such in Dr. Saunders' presence. It is not a question concerning its "supernatural" revelation. I not only believed this but it is to be found in what I wrote in my summary and "Why we should study the Bible." I know that others find it there, I taught that the Bible was given by God the Father; that its authority was the authority of truth revealed especially through and in Jesus Christ the Son; and that holy men of old spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. I taught that the Bible as religious literature was inspired, inspiring and authoritative. So far Dr. Saunders and I agreed.

Roman Catholics believe that their Bible (determined and interpreted by the church) is infallibly authoritative in all its parts. Leo XIII in his encyclical on the "Study of Scripture" dictated that Roman Catholics were to go to the Bible with the assumption that it was inerrant. As a Baptist I want a sufficient reason. In our Bible Class Dr. Saunders wanted us to go to the Bible with the same assumption. As a Baptist I wanted a sufficient reason. The Dr. has not given and cannot give it. This is where we differ. Since this is the crux, to make "assurance doubly sure" let me quote these words that have been endorsed by deacons and other members of the class:

"In pastor Waring's Bible Class Dr. Saunders assumed and asserted his belief in, the absolute inerrancy of the Bible at least in the original text. It was this assumption that temporarily interfered with the pastor's method of Bible study which seeks the author's meaning without assuming that it is inerrant."

This then is the question at issue between us. This is the question that should be fairly faced at the threshold of Bible study. Until this question is settled between us it is useless for us to enter into any controversy concerning inspiration or any other question in the settlement of which the Bible is needed. The Dr. has not fairly faced this the real question at issue between us. He has evaded it by diverting and focussing attention upon inspiration and its definition and by subtly raising the cry of denominationalism.

EVASION.

The Dr. has evaded the issue in a number of other ways. We will notice two. He has evaded it by jests. The impression of the class and many others that he was "hitting" in opposing his pastor he evaded with a jest—and what a jest! The fact that by his assumption of inerrancy he interfered with our method of Bible study he evaded with a jest that was not only stale but irrelevant. Thoughtful readers of the MESSENGER AND VISITOR will distinguish between jests that enforce truth and jests that evade it.

The Dr. has evaded the issue by some analogies. This is one: If fallible man is by law held innocent until his guilt is proved, I feel bound to stand by the Bible—God's Word—as innocent until it is proved guilty. Note the Dr's subtle substitution of the word innocent for the word infallible. The question was not concerning the innocence of the Bible, but concerning its infallibility. Of course a man is assumed innocent until he is proved guilty. That however is a very different thing from saying that a man is assumed to be infallible until he is proved to be fallible. In his own sentence the Dr. assumes man to be "fallible." What right has he to assume the Bible is infallible? His own analogy is against him.

So also with his analogy about that naughty son who questioned as to whether his mother was "bad." Our question was not about the badness of the Bible (think of it!) but as to whether we had a right to assume that all the

Bible was absolutely infallible. If any of those sons in his great love for his mother would publicly assert that she was absolutely infallible in all that she said we would give him credit for his love but would question his judgment.

It is interesting in passing to recall the Dr's references to the "ingenious skill" and literary "dexterity" of the higher critics.

DENOMINATIONAL STANDING.

My view then differed from that of Dr. Saunders in that I did not assume that the Bible was inerrant. That however does not mean that the view I represent has not an increasingly important place in the Baptist denomination. As a matter of fact it is the view of an increasingly large number both of our leaders and of the rank and file in our churches. It is the view that was so strongly supported by the quotations I gave from Profs. Kirkpatrick and Genung and Drs. Davidson, Flint, Lorimer, Burton and Faunce. Significant for its future is the fact that this view is being taught in so many of our Baptist institutions of learning. In view of this let me ask a somewhat long question: "Is it not strange that among us Baptists who boast of our individual liberty, a single church member should presume not simply to dictate what his pastor's belief should be, but even to suggest the wording of his pastor's belief concerning this subject about which there is such a difference of opinion among the leaders of the denomination?"

The difference between Dr. Saunders and myself is the difference between a very conservative and a liberal-conservative Baptist. He represents those Baptists who like the Roman Catholics are hampered in their Bible study with the assumption of absolute inerrancy. I stand with the Baptists who in their Bible study are unhampered with this assumption. Since both these views are held by Baptists ought not the question at issue, to be settled on its own merits, without any demagogical appeal to denominational prejudices? "Defender of the Faith" or any such title won in that way is pinchbeck cheap.

Dr. Saunders has evaded the real question at issue between us. In doing so he has raised this false one of denominationalism. By means of general references and allusions he has left, with some, the false impression that I am not in harmony with the denomination. Yet he has not shown a single sentence of mine (taken in its context) to be untrue or that does not represent the views of many and leading Baptists to day. Why did he raise this false issue of denominationalism? Was it to evade the real issue concerning inerrancy? Why does not the Dr. tell us what right he had to assume the absolute inerrancy of the whole Bible? That is the question at issue.

H. F. WARING.

(To be concluded next week.)

St. John Letter.

St. John can boast of having a large number of business men possessed of a keen commercial sense, but who have not proven that they possess a correspondingly clear conscience. A number of citizens of hitherto unimpeachable character have formed themselves into a Horticultural Association to care for and beautify Rockwood Park. Here are delightful drives, walks and dells, a lake, cascades, a zoo, and much of nature's rugged beauty. Numbers of the city people go here to spend their spare hours, and in this way the Park is a great boon to many busy mothers and pleasure seekers. In the centre of all this a restaurant has been opened, where refreshments in the form of soft drinks, beer, lunches, etc., are served to the public. This has been provided for the convenience of a certain number who always avail themselves of such privileges wherever offered. Upon the lake boats are provided for those who wish to indulge in boating. These have always been available six days in the week only, but now the commissioners propose to open the restaurant on Sunday afternoon and evening, for the purpose of providing the general public with refreshments. There does not seem to have been a popular demand for this, and from an admission made by the President of the Commission before a Delegation the only request for this has come from the keeper in charge of the restaurant. The Christian and moral conscience of the City has been roused over this question, as it has not been over any other question for some time. The Evangelical Alliance has taken action, and has appointed two separate committees at different times to represent the Christian and moral sentiment of the city before the commission. They are opposed to the desecration of the Sabbath. Mr. Hanington, a member of the Committee, has resigned his position on the Commission as a protest against the attempt to open the restaurant on Sunday. The Christian Endeavor Union of the city has circulated mammoth petitions securing over 1200 names against it. It is beyond the ken of your writer, Mr. Editor, to understand the action of honorable men on a question like this. In principle they presume to believe in a day of rest, and as patriotic citizens they would declare themselves opposed to a Continental Sabbath in our Fair Canada. They claim that this is done from purely philanthropic motives, and not for gain. It certainly is the entering wedge for a wider and more general desecration of our day of rest, and if it is right to have an open restaurant in the Park on Sunday, it certainly must be right to have spectacular

shows, band concerts, boats to let, etc. Such is the history of every such movement in every city with which I am acquainted. Only last week I spent a number of days in the city of Worcester, Mass., and God forbid that the Sabbath in our park or our city, even under the name of philanthropy, or the comfort of the laboring man, should be turned into such a day of revelry as it has been in the beautiful park of Quinsigamond in that place. Its merry-go rounds, dance halls, boat races, toboggan slides, steamboat excursions, band concerts, open bars, with the devil and all his ministers in accompaniment there, turn this day of rest into a day of revelry.

We want no such day for St. John, but we want a clean Sabbath, so that the laboring man can rest; a quiet Sabbath, where earnest, toiling, tired people can get respite from all the hurly-burly and rush of this work-a-day age.

The Lord's Day Alliance has recently held its sessions in St. John west, and also on the east side a public meeting was held on Monday evening of last week, addressed by leading men from the Presbyterian General assembly. We are glad to know the wide and far reaching influence of this magnificent organization. We hope the people of Canada will be permitted to enact a law and to establish a principle, which will keep one day in seven, clean and clear of all mark of commercialism and materialism among the people in this young and rising nation.

We are now in the midst of the grand sessions of the Presbyterian General Assembly of Canada, which has been meeting for the week past in the St. Andrew's Presbyterian church on Germain St. Here is gathered one of the most magnificent bodies of men that has ever visited this city for any purpose. Scarcely do we see such an assembly of men representing so much brain and breadth of national Christian patriotism. The atmosphere of the assembly is strong and invigorating; the types of character are rich and rugged. There is no special display of oratory, as such, but there is a statesman-like grasp of national, religious and educational questions, such as we have never known to be surpassed in any of the councils of this country. We were glad to extend to them a welcome to our city, and gave them a loyalist's entertainment while they were with us.

But as we listen to their discussions and debates, one naturally draws a long breath and asks: Where are we at? The Millennium is surely coming! A strong resolution was passed recommending the appointment of a representative committee to consider with a similar committee of the Methodist, Congregationalists and other churches, the advisability and basis of union for all of Canada. A strong committee of sixty was later nominated by a special committee and appointed by the assembly. Only a few opposed such a union and of these the majority favored moderation and deliberation, and only a very few gave a definite and pronounced negative to it. These said the union with the Methodists and Congregationalists would obliterate the glorious history of the Presbyterian church, and would lower the salaries of the Presbyterian ministers from \$750 to \$600 and \$500 as was the case with some 1500 of the Methodist ministers of Canada. One speaker was so convinced of the undesirability of the union as to say that it would lower the literary standards of the Presbyterian church to unite with the other denominations. It was only fair to say that the proposer of these arguments were listened to with scant courtesy by the assembly. On the other hand it was hoped that union would solve the question of a multiplication of churches in many of the cities and towns of our land. It would liberate and set free a large number of earnest, faithful workers who could fill up our far west and man it with an efficient staff of missionaries ready to meet the coming swarms of emigration. It pointed out that no vital life would suffer, but that strength and economy and unity would bring together these separate denominations, and increase the efficiency of their work at home and abroad. Certainly if this is the feeling between denominations that were formerly champions of the two great opposing schools, of theology Calvinism, and Arminianism, the Baptist bodies of these provinces should no longer stand separated, but should bury their differences, and for the sake of the cause of Christ, unite themselves into one aggressive body.

By the way, Mr. Editor, what has become of our national Baptist convention? I for one have been waiting to hear announcements of such a meeting, which should take place this year. We certainly need a National convention meeting every two or three years, which will bring together all the Baptists, East and West. Federation is in the air, and with us it should begin at home. When we meet with our brethren of the far west, we realize that they bring to us new and vitalizing national ideas, and when the west meet men of the east certainly we have an element of conservative wisdom, that will benefit all. These provinces are awaiting the announcements of such a National convention for the next year, and surely we shall not wait in vain.

MAYNARD PARKER.

St. John, N. B., June 9, 1904.

Southern Baptist Convention.

This body held its recent session at Nashville, Tenn. It is the largest Baptist organization in the world, having in its connection nearly two millions of church members. We are told that it closed its business on Monday evening, May 16th, at 10 30 o'clock, and that at 2 a. m. on Tuesday complete copies of the minutes were in the hands of the President, J. P. Eagle, which the delegates of all the hotels in Nashville had them neatly bound and "served as side dishes at the breakfast table" on the same morning. A copy of the minutes has come to hand and shows no evidence of unseemly haste. It is printed on excellent paper in clear type, and is carefully proof read. The pages are continuous throughout, and in order, as if the utmost leisure had been afforded. The names of all the ministers are placed in alphabetic order, by their respective states. There are two hundred and sixty-four pages in the whole record. Well indeed may the southern papers congratulate secretaries Burrows and Gregory and their able staff of associates.

E. M.