

in *Zachariah*, 11 and 12, instead of *Jere-miah*. Again, in *Hebrews*, 11 and 21 we have these words, "By faith Jacob when dying worshipped, leaning on the top of his staff." In *Genesis*, 47 and 31 the words read "Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head." How is it that "bed's head" in the Old Testament is made to read "top of his staff" in the New? Is there any sign of "mixing" here? Then again *Luke* in *Acts* 7 and 6 calls "400 years" what *Paul* in *Galatians* 3 and 17 calls "430 years." *Luke* records in *Acts* 7 and 16 that *Stephen* said that *Jacob* and our fathers were buried in "Shechem." In *Genesis* 25 and 10 we are told that *Abraham* was buried in the "Cave of Machpelah." In *Genesis* 49 and 31, that *Jacob* buried *Isaac* there also. In *Joshua* 24 and 32 it is recorded that *Joseph* was buried in "Shechem," but it is not stated in this passage or elsewhere in the Old Testament that *Joseph's* brethren were buried there as *Stephen* states. In *Acts* 7 and 16 it is recorded that *Abraham* bought this tomb in Shechem. In *Genesis* 33 and 18 it is declared that *Jacob* bought it. Which is right? *Mr. Sherlock* having settled to his satisfaction that Scripture is infallible, and "expresses the mind of God," will please turn his attention to the above and harmonize them with his theory. He might also harmonize the three stories of the purification of the temple by *Jesus*—also of the three stories regarding *Abraham* and *Isaac's* wives recorded in *Genesis* 12, 20 and 16 chaps. He can possibly harmonize the infallible record given in *1st Kings* 15 and 14 where it says, "The high places were not taken away," with *2nd Chronicles* 14 and 2 where it says the "high places were taken away," and *2nd Chronicles* 17 and 16 where it again says the "high places were taken away."

If *Mr. Sherlock* is honest and we believe he is, let him discuss the passages that bear on the "immaculate conception" the only ones that I even hinted the possibility of the disciples getting "mixed" about.

At the same time I agree with *Dr. Schoff* when he says "Although very serious

in a historical point of view," these immaculate conception passages are of "no account for the argument in hand," and with *Professor Beet*, an English Wesleyan, when he says speaking of discrepancies, "They have no bearing upon the more important matter in hand."

In anything we may say about the story of the immaculate conception we don't find fault without suggesting a remedy. We believe that the Holy Ghost power that *Jesus* obtained at His baptism at *Jordan* to be as efficacious as if he had obtained the same power by birth. We believe that in this matter of baptism by the Holy Ghost, we are "as he was." That when rightly understood, we care not whether men believe *Jesus' power* was obtained at His baptism or at his birth. The main thing we are solicitous about is that the Holy Ghost or as *Rev. Mr. Truax* puts it "Divine Guidance," was the secret of *Jesus' power*. That it was by the Holy Ghost, whether obtained at His baptism or at His birth, that *Jesus* did what he did, and all that was vouchsafed to *Jesus* is guaranteed to us.

If all that *Mr. Sherlock* cares for is to be sustained by documents and that is "his Father's business" to him, he must not claim to be in harmony with the Canada Holiness Association, if he is not aggressive against error wherever it exists, and at the same time without hurling epithets, give me all the liberty that he lays claim to. Neither must he imitate the churches in the matter of "promptly expelling."

In his comparison between himself and *Queen Victoria*, as I lay claim to be a "joint heir" with *Jesus* to all the inheritance of God, this has no application. The same with the Governor-General argument, it loses its force when we discover that "all power is given unto us," that it is our glad privilege to sit in heavenly places with *Christ Jesus*.

We would like to ask *Rev. Mr. Sherlock* whether he would be quite willing to stake his hopes for eternity on every incident recorded by the biographers of *Jesus* being strictly true?