
For private circulation only

A LETTER

Copies may be had gratis on request.

J. W. H. Nichols
714 West Poplar, Ave.
San Mateo, California

Dear Brother in Christ:

You will no doubt remember our correspondence after visiting you in E-- last year. In your letter written some time later you assured me that those in the so called "Mory fellowship" in your town repudiated the objectional teaching advanced in New York by F. A., that our adorable Lord was a creature **subject** to pain and **death**. This was, as you know, what led James Boyd to write his tractate in which he also erred; but afterward withdrew his statement and by subsequent teaching repudiated his first utterance, the last from his pen appearing in "Scripture Truth" in 1932 shortly before departing to be with Christ. An excerpt follows: "The evil of which we are warned in 2nd John seemed to be going **forward**, that is, adding to the revealed thoughts of God things which are not plainly in the text. This would set forth a Christ, not the Christ of God, but a Christ after the mind and heart of man. The Christ of God is One who has come in flesh and blood, otherwise He could not have made propitiation for our sins. But apart altogether from what we might deduce from the denial of this holy and all important truth, the word of God is plain and definite (John 1:14; Heb. 2:14). The man who does not confess this great truth of the incarnation has not God. But he who abides in the doctrine hath both the Father and the Son.

"Anyone, if even a little acquainted with the Word, is not likely to deny **BODY, SOUL AND SPIRIT**" to our blessed Lord. But supposing this were denied, it would be easy to turn to Luke 23:46, 'And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice He said, Father into Thy hands I commit my spirit!' In Mathew 26:38, He says, 'My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death.' In Hebrews 10:5, He says, 'A body hast Thou prepared Me.'

"But out of this another question is raised and that is, 'Was His body the same as any other human body?' To this question the answer is NO. His was holy. Another important truth to keep in mind is that He was begotten of God. He was

God's Son. Even if He could be viewed as man only, which I should deny, He still was Son of God. Nothing of this was true of any other man."

In a book recently published in London containing the last ministries of James Boyd and entitled "The Authority of the Word of God" on page 30 we read: "That Jesus was a Man every true Christian will confess—a real Man—as truly Man as was Adam or any of his race. A Man with **spirit, soul and body**. A Man so like every other man in Judea that, as He sat by the well of Sychar, the woman who came to draw water took Him to be an ordinary Jew, resting from His journey, and waiting for some one to come and draw a little water to quench His thirst. But 'Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten Thee,' marks Him off as being very different from other men, as does also 'That Holy Thing' (Luke 1:35), and Him 'who knew no sin' (2nd Corinthians 5:21). Still, that there is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all' (1st Timothy 2:5) settles the question of His Manhood both in humiliation and also glory. Again on page 78: 'What mere **creature** could undertake such a work as that of redemption? Who could stand in the Presence of incensed Deity, and bear the brunt of wrath's terrific storm broken loose against sin? Who could answer to God for the rebellion of His apostate creature, and stand in the breach when He was giving expression to His righteous judgment and holy abhorrence of that of which the Devil was author and man the willing slave? No mere **creature** could do this. None but THE INCARNATE SON could enter into this awful question with God."

There the matter should rest, and the "love that hopeth all things" and "covers the multitude of sins" should prevail. No one as far as I know, has ever held to his first utterance, and I am assured that it does not have any place among the so-called Glanton saints in England. In this connection please remember there never has been a complete return, to what I might call **complete organic fellowship** with those meetings, but individuals have generally carried a letter of introduction to well known laborers there, and then been commended by them to any meeting free to receive such.

In New York the gathering you are now in fellowship with

did put out a statement disclaiming sympathy with the statement by F. A., but beyond that I have not heard of the fellowship as a whole clearing itself. It would rather appear by your letter to J. MacK—that you have not taken this into account, and that if those with whom you now fellowship, meet on the basis of the truth "There is one body," the fact of the town you are in being E— is just an accident of circumstance—the body is one.

You stated in your letter to J. MacK— that brothers J. G. and R. L. say that the word was only used, in connection with the Lord taking flesh. This of course we know, but if the word "Creature" is not repudiated entirely, as dishonoring to our blessed Lord, the heterodoxy still remains*. F. A. in using it, quoted a Dr. Sadler, who logically shows the use for he adds "Subject to pain and **death.**" Need I say, the sentence is fatal error? This is given on page 12 of R. L.—s. booklet "The Firstborn of all creation." In a book written by the Editor of "The Bible Monthly" (London, Eng.) where the booklet is referred to, he labels the teaching BLASPHEMY! Doubtless our brother did not realize what was involved in the use of this objectionable word, or he would have avoided it. In his anxiety to preserve the full humanity of our blessed Lord he trespassed.

Controversy as to the Person has often led to the promulgation of error, for we must remember we have our human limitations. "No man knoweth the Son but the Father" and we read (1 Tim. 3:16) "The mystery of piety is great, GOD has been manifested in flesh." There was to be two thousand cubits space between the Ark of the Covenant and the people (Joshua 3:4). The holy Person of our adorable Lord is not a subject for discussion or dissection, but for the worship of His people.

The following is the extract from "The Son of His Love" by W. J. Hocking, pages 96 to 104; 113 to 118.

The Son styled "First born of all Creation."

"In the scriptures, the Holy Spirit sets manifold guards to the sacred Person of the Son who became flesh. When Jehovah

* Seventh Day Adventists teach that our Lord was a wonderful creation of God, endued with power to create everything, and that He was given authority to do so, but that HE HIMSELF WAS CREATED by God! This is of course fatal error.

came down upon Mount Sinai in sight of all the people of Israel, He commanded Moses to 'set bounds,' lest any of them should profanely intrude into the mystery of the divine Presence on the mount. (Exod. 19.)

"And, in Colossians, the Spirit 'sets bounds' to guard the glory of the Son. When He mentions that the Son of the Father's love came into the world to secure for us 'redemption (through His blood), the forgiveness of sins' (1:14), He at once affirms His supreme dignity as **'Firstborn of all creation'** (1:15), together with His vast and all comprehending creatorial work which establishes that dignity beyond all question (1:16-17). Thus in the Son of the Father's Love, the Holy Spirit has united before our eyes **the Creator and the cross**, that we may everlastingly adore and worship, love and serve Him, confessing His eternal Sonship-glory, which was undiminished even in the lowest depths of His humiliation, to which He was pleased to descend.

...

"By this revelation, the Spirit has 'set bounds' to isolate thereby the Son in His own proper majesty and transcendent glory, **marking off the Creator from the creature** by impassable barriers, lest the proud thoughts of man should violate the Son's essential glory by presuming upon His self-humiliation to abase Him still more, on the one hand, and set up some rival to His supremacy on the other.

The Use of the Word "Creature"

"The Firstborn of every creature" (A. V.) is a less faithful rendering of the original than "Firstborn of all creation," and the propriety of this change is acknowledged by scholars generally, the reason being that in this clause "created thing" are viewed collectively rather than individually. . . . This particular correction from "Creature" to "creation" should itself act as a warning. We must know and respect the "bounds" divinely set to guard the sanctity of the Person of the Son, and we must not allow either our imagination or our logic to trespass upon forbidden ground. **We have no liberty to choose our own words in speaking of the Son.** And to do so without warrant would be to fall into dangerous and presumptuous error. To this danger we are ever liable, and our only safeguard against our own irreverent fancies and those of others is to cleave implic-

ity to the precise utterances of the Spirit concerning the Son, "Whom no man knoweth."

"Man" But Not "Creature"

"In point of fact, while the ever-blessed Son is in Col. 1 described as 'Firstborn of all creation' (ktisis), we do not discover in this title nor in any part of scripture that the Son became part of His own creation (ktisis), nor that He is anywhere in the Holy Spirit's language called a creature (ktisma).

"But, as with holy caution we seek to trace the 'bounds set' by the Spirit in the names and titles of the Incarnate Son, we read elsewhere that He was made a little lower than the angels. We also find in several places that inspired tongues and pens call Him 'Man' in a way which shows us that He became 'Man' most truly and definitely. Paul speaks of Him as 'the man (anthropos) Christ Jesus' (1 Tim. 2:5), and Peter of Him as 'a Man (aneer) approved of God among you,' (Acts 2:22). Indeed, the Lord speaks of Himself as 'a man (anthropos),' (John 8:40). But in vain do we search the scriptures for any reference to that blessed One as 'a creature,' and therefore, we feel bound to respect the reserve of the Spirit in this matter, and to restrict ourselves to the language of revelation in regard to the incarnation.

"In this connection, we do not forget that words are sometimes used in a poetical or metaphorical sense, but in such instances no one would contend seriously for the literal meaning. The Spirit of Christ in the psalmist, speaking of the Holy Sufferer said, 'I am a worm, and no man' (Psa. 22:6). The expression is a figurative one, and refers to His abandonment upon the cross. And no one sees any contradiction between the 'no man' of the Psalm and Lord's own words of Himself to the Jews, 'a man that hath told you the truth' (John 8:40). The language of David is poetical, while that in John is historical and literal, but both are expressive of the truth contained in the two passages respectively.*

(* It is by way of poetical emphasis of Christ's humiliation that "creature" is used in the lines, "Who hast a creature's form assumed That Creature God might know." The license of the hymn writer took him beyond the wording of Scripture—"the form of a servant." The precision of expository prose is not always found along with the ardour and exuberance of verse.)

"But the very suggestion to apply the word, 'creature,' to the Son in its **literal sense** is repulsive to our spiritual instincts. Yet some have ventured with more boldness than reverence to do so, and to infer that because the **Son is truly God and truly Man**, which scripture plainly teaches, they may say with equal accuracy and meetness that He is '**God and Creature.**'

"But this inference goes beyond revealed truth. And in view of the significant silence of scripture and the lack of divine permission, it would have been wiser to have said like Job, 'I will lay mine hand upon my mouth. . . . I will proceed no further.' (Job 40:4, 5). '**Man**' is authorized by the usage of the Spirit, but '**creature**' is not.

"Let us cultivate a becoming reticence of language in speaking of these holy mysteries, and remember that the glories on the Mount of Transfiguration vanished altogether when Peter's deprecatory words concerning the Father's Beloved Son were uttered, though they were spoken sincerely enough. That striking rebuke of the apostle's unruly tongue coming from the cloud of glory is surely recorded for our warning (Mark 9:1-8).

Why is the Term "Creature" Avoided in Scripture?

"It must always be difficult to assign reasons for the absence of a given word from scripture, but sometimes the positive truths revealed there enable us to discern the propriety of the omission. And the truths revealed concerning the Son certainly indicates that **to Him 'creature' is an inapplicable word, and derogatory to His glory.** We know the 'Spirit of truth, and the spirit of error' (1 John 4:6)—finding the former throughout the scriptures, and the latter throughout man's commentaries thereon.

" 'Creature' (ktisma) is a general designation of animated nature, covering in its wide scope every variety of being produced at the will of the Creator. Few words, if any, have a broader significance than 'creature,' embracing, as it does, everyone and everything except the Creator Himself, God. All, however great their diversity, are included in its range. Gabriel and Satan are both creatures. So were Pharaoh and Moses, Herod and John the Baptist, Nero and Paul. The lion and the lamb, the eagle that flies and the worm that crawls are alike creatures. Creaturehood is **their** nature, and they can have no

other. But we will **never use the confusing and dishonouring, because ambiguous, word, 'creature,' of the Blessed Lord Jesus,** but rather, like one of old, confess to Him with adoring fervor, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.'

"We believe that it is in the wisdom of God, guarding thereby the glory of the Son, that 'creature' is withheld from every scriptural designation of Him. The Holy Spirit avoided every ambiguous word that might lead us to think less worthily of the Son than we ought to think. It is true that we may safely affirm that **every man is a creature,** but obviously we **cannot** even in human speech say that **every creature is a man.** And if we were to say of a certain man that he is but 'a poor creature,' it would be understood that we spoke of that man with some disparagement and contempt. And there lies the danger that a similar element of disparagement and contempt would be conveyed by us when this word is applied to our Lord, and that in consequence His name would be blasphemed among His enemies by us, and His glory dimmed in our own eyes to some extent.

"Let us, therefore, moved by reverence and godly fear, refrain from using this unauthorized word when speaking of the Lord. Neither let us ignore these particular boundaries of revealed truth concerning the Son set up by the Spirit of God to safeguard His glory. We are not entitled to call Him 'creature' because He is Man, any more than we are entitled to call Him 'Brother' because He calls us His 'brethren.' (Heb. 2:11-12).

The Son in Manhood

"It is revealed truth that the Son at His incarnation became 'Man.' The words of scripture are distinct and definite that the Lord from heaven was the second Man (anthropos), 1 Cor. 15:47. Being Man, He was, therefore, of that class in the diversified orders of earthly creaturehood, to which God assigned the rank of highest eminence and the office of earthly government. The first man received this place of superiority by the express appointment of Jehovah, Who breathed into Adam's nostrils the breath of life. Hence man by the exceptional manner of his creation is distinguished from other created beings on the earth, all of which were from the beginning placed under his dominion (Gen. 1:28). The Lord Jesus during His earthly ministry frequently spoke of Himself as the 'Son of Man.' . . . Ac-

cordingly, the Lord Jesus was in due time made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death (Heb. 2:9). In becoming man, He became a little lower than the angels for man's redemption. Scripture teaches us this measure of His descent for our meditation and praise; but it **does not teach us that He was made 'lower' than man, as well as angels;** nor does it introduce the vague term, 'creature,' in speaking of His humiliation. The gospel is that even as by **one man** sin entered into the world, so God's free gift in grace is by the **One Man**, Jesus Christ (Rom. 5:2,19). In describing the Incarnate Son and His work, 'man' is specified but 'creature' is avoided.

The Mediator, the Man Christ Jesus

"Therefore, when the Son of the Father's love came in flesh into His own creation, He appeared as Man, truly and in all respects as a Man, sin excepted. The Son Incarnate is the Mediator, for 'God is one, and the Mediator of God and men one, (the) man Christ Jesus' (Tim. 2:5). In this great mystery, the **Holy Spirit speaks of manhood, never of creaturehood.** Godhead and manhood are, in the text just quoted, declared to be the comprehending limits of this mediatorship. To extend or to modify these limits by the introduction of 'creaturehood' is a foolish disregard of the precision of scriptural language. Our Mediator is the Man Christ Jesus.

The Son No Creature Either Before or After Incarnation

"While all thought of the Son's subordination in Deity is contrary to Colossians 1, so also is **the blasphemous assertions** that He is a creature, first and highest of all creatures, but yet a creature. This scripture declares that He is the **Creator of 'all things.'** using this comprehensive phrase four times in the two verses (16, 17). **The Creator is not a creature;** He creates, but is not created. The Son created all, but He did not create Himself.

"Yet some, who would not apply the unbecoming term creature, to the Son **in His eternal essence, do not hesitate to apply it to Him in His incarnation.** They declare that the holy humanity of our blessed Lord was a special creation, and on this unfounded assumption they claim that it is permissible to speak of Him as a 'creature.'

"But there is not a word of scripture to justify this use of the ugly unsavory expression. The Holy Spirit does not write of

the Lord as a creature, nor as One created either before the worlds were made, or at His incarnation. We read of His **birth**, not of His creation. Why not let holy sobriety and godly prudence govern our language in matters like this, wherein the utmost scrupulousness is demanded? We should beware of adding any words of our own choosing to the scriptural vocabulary concerning the Son.

Woman-born, not Created

"In the word of God, the **incarnation of the Son is recorded, not as a creation, but as a birth**: we read that 'the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise. . . .' (Matt. 1:18; 2:1). God created Adam the first man, but Eve gave birth to Cain and Abel (Gen. 1:27; 4:1, 2). In the case of Adam, **life in maturity** was directly bestowed by Jehovah upon the inanimate dust of the ground, of which man was formed by his Creator; but in the case of Cain and Abel, their **infant life** was received by transmission from their living parents. And the whole of Adam's race began their being in a similar manner.

"Now the manner of our Lord's entrance into the world was by birth, not by special creation as Adam's. His imminent birth with its miraculous character was specially announced to Mary by the angel, who said to her in her virginity, 'The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that Holy Thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God' (Luke 1:35). In these words, the personal agency of the Holy Spirit acting in unspeakable power upon Mary is plainly promised, and also the consequent birth of the 'Holy Thing' to be called Son of God.

"It is, however, a mere gloss upon this text to claim that according to its teaching the Lord's 'holy humanity was created' --that it was 'brought into existence by the creative act of the Holy Spirit of God.' Nothing is stated here or elsewhere in scripture which implies that the birth of Jesus Christ was a 'creative act,' that is, in the sense that the birth was a production of something from nothing. Such a theory rests upon the imagination of man, not upon revealed fact in scripture. . . .

The Seed of the Woman

"Here in Bethlehem was the Seed of **the woman**, as dimly foretold in Eden (Gen. 3:15); and therefore the birth is un-

paralleled in human history. But its marvel of marvels is that the **Holy One of God was born without taint of sin of a woman who herself was born in sin** and shapen in iniquity (Psa. 51:5), a state true of every member of the whole race. The explanation of the unique miracle was given to Joseph by the angel of the Lord; 'that which is conceived (or begotten) in her is of the Holy Ghost' (Matt. 1:20). By His sacred and pervasive influence, every trace of evil was excluded and every risk of contamination was avoided. Speaking in typical language, the fine flour was kneaded with oil. And He who was born of Mary was the thrice-holy Son of God.

"With the profoundest gratitude and praise it is recognized that this event was of God in a manner that no like event has ever been, or ever will be. The virgin birth of Jesus was unique, marvelous, miraculous as a birth. At that point of time 'the Word became flesh.' This is scriptural language, but **we do not read that this 'flesh' was created**, as is sometimes stated without adequate authority.*

"The attempt made to justify this unwholesome phrasing by a quotation from J. N. D. (coll. Writings, Vol. 10:P.521) stultifies itself. It should have been seen from the passage itself that J. N. D. deliberately **refrains** from applying the word, 'creature' to the Lord. He is speaking of the 'personal connection, in incarnation, between God and the creature—God and man in one person.'

"Now, in these words J. N. D. first refers to 'God and the creature'; and by the latter term, he plainly alludes to Rom. 8:20-22—to the creature in bondage to corruption, whose deliverance will come about through the Incarnate Son. But J. N. D. does not write 'God and **creature** in one person,' but 'God and **man** in one person.' It was in becoming man, that the Son was the 'personal connection' 'between God and the

* If it be said, by way of palliation, that "creating" is employed not in the absolute sense of calling out of nothingness into being, but in the secondary sense of fashioning by divine power out of something already created, it may very properly be inquired why "creating" should be used at all in this solemn connection? If "creation" has this ambiguous sense, why not avoid the term altogether as scripture does?

creature.' The two commas enclosing the words, 'in incarnation,' which appear in the Coll. Wr., but **which are omitted in two reprints of the words**, make the meaning of the author clear and unmistakable. His reference is to the mediatorial, not the creatorial, connection between God and the creature.

"W. K.'s words have also been forced out of their contextual meaning with a like object. W. K. does **not** speak of the Lord becoming a creature, but of His being in the place or sphere where the creatures of His hand were. His words, which occur in a condensed report of his lectures, cannot be so construed without violence. He says 'He never took the **creature place** until He became man (a), and then must needs be the first-born. Even if He had been the last-born literally, He must still be the first-born.' And again, 'He was first-born, because He Who entered the sphere of **human creaturedom** was the Creator, and therefore must necessarily be the first-born' (Lectures on the Colossians, pp. 19, 20). The phrases, 'the creature place,' and 'the sphere of human creaturedom,' clearly refer to **His environment**, and not to His person, as some have assumed.

"Indeed, it is inaccurate and misleading, seeing it is a plain **departure from scripture, to assert that the human nature of Christ was created (that is, formed out of nothing) in the virgin's womb**. Mary undoubtedly had her part in the sacred mystery, as the angel said to her, 'Thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son' (Luke:31). But to assert that the Lord's 'holy humanity was created by a creative act of the Holy Spirit' is in effect to deny the angel's words to Mary herself concerning her conception.

"Scripture does not divide between the Deity and the humanity of the Incarnate Son, even in the womb of the virgin. Believing that the Person of the Eternal Son abode unchanged and unchangeable when He became the woman's Seed, we are content to be ignorant because we are confident that the method of the Incarnation is inexplicable to the human mind, though scripture describes it so simply as 'the birth of Jesus Christ' (Matt. 1:18).

The Body Prepared

"In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Holy Spirit applies to the coming of the Lord into the world a quotation from Psalm

40, in which the Son, the Messiah, describes His own incarnation: 'A body hast Thou **prepared** (or, framed) Me' (Heb. 10:5). There is not hint of 'creation' here, but in this important passage, where the mind of the Spirit is to teach us the unique nature of that body, so that 'The body of Jesus Christ' was suited to become the sacrificial offering to God 'once for all' (vs. 10), the word '**created**' is **avoided** and '**prepared**' is **used**. On account of its peculiar origination this 'body' has its own special feature, which was its intrinsic and unequalled holiness, secured by the agency of the Holy Spirit, in order that the Son's obedience 'unto death, even the death of the cross' might be displayed therein."

Then, too, Brother R. L. justifies the use of the word "creature" by quoting from various writers who used the word, but he wholly disregards the connection and sense in which it was thus used. The careful avoidance of the error into which F. A. fell (and others have fallen—at least in words), is evident to any unbiased mind in the writings from those he quotes. The following from our beloved brother J. N. D., taken from "Dialogues on Essays and Reviews," is a sample. He says "I maintain no creed, but I do maintain the proper Divinity (Deity) of the Lord Jesus. That He was in personal relationship as Son to the Father, every one who believes in His Divinity (Deity) owns, unless he be a Sabellian. It is to me evident as possible, that historically the Arian doctrine came from Philo—at least from the Alexandrian school of philosophers, or Platonist Jews who held that the supreme God could not be directly connected with a material creation, and who spoke of the Logos (the Word) as between God and the creation, begotten perhaps rather than made, yet after all existing AS A CREATURE by the will of the Creator the Supreme God! I ACCEPT NONE OF THIS. I find it fully met by John and Paul, carefully and fully met. I read 'In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God.' Whatever my mind can go back to as a beginning as to time, there HE WAS. As a Person He emptied Himself—ekenose eauton (Phil. 2:8). He could not have done so save as GOD. A CREATURE WHO LEAVES HIS FIRST ESTATE SINS THEREIN. The Sovereign Lord can descend in grace—in Him it was love."

Our departed brother J. G. Bellett wrote: "Is it mere human-

ity I ask, I get in the Person of Christ? Is it not something immeasurably greater, even 'God manifest in the flesh'? He would not, as a Savior, do for one as a sinner, if He were not Jehovah. Every creature owes all he can render. None but One who thought it not robbery to be equal with God, can take the form of a servant, for he is a servant already. No creature can supererogate* as another has said, the thought would be rebellion. None could be qualified to stand surely for men, but One who could—without presumption, claim equality with God, consequently be independent." J. G. B. in "The Son of God."

W. Kelly is quoted but he states emphatically; "Christ is NOT, and I think could not be called "ktisma," for this would be derogatory to His Person as Creator. He is called "Firstborn of all creation" (pases ktiseos) and also "Beginning of the creation of God."

Again F. W. Grant is quoted, but in his book "The Crowned Christ," page 23, he wrote, "What an amazing thought is this, that God should come down INTO THE CREATURE PLACE, not simply for a time, and to do a work, in which however wonderful, would be but for a time, but of His own free choice to abide in it after this manner. God and the creature HIS CREATURE, thus permanently together clasped in an embrace that will never be sundered."

These quotations are surely far from calling the Creator a creature. Now it is by no means with a desire to widen the breach existing, that I write thus, but rather with a desire that we may all take our place in self judgment before God, in the spirit of NEHEMIAH: "We have sinned against Thee, I and my Father's house have sinned," (1:6). Thus the way may be prepared for mutual confession, and if the Lord so leads, to conference, so that the little while still remaining to us here, we may once more be found walking together in happy, holy unity.

While writing thus, I suggest it is well to remember that it was NOT this issue which caused the sad breach of 1928 but the Mory-Grant business matter; **which should never have been taken up by the gatherings outside Philadelphia.** That this was

* The performance of some meritorious act, in excess of the demands of duty, hence something superfluous. (Ed.)*

so, the fact that tons of literature were mailed out to all parts of U. S. A. and Canada prove, and furthermore the Philadelphia meetings in 1927 were called to go into the business matter.

I think all recognize that in the "Referees report" upon which judgment was rendered in the "J. C. McEvoy v.s. Grant Supply Co." case, the most serious charges made against C. Grant were proven unfounded. May I here quote from a paper in my possession.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE IN THE MATTER OF THE UNFULFILLED CONTRACT OF DISSOLUTION IN THE C. J. GRANT SUPPLY CO.

"At the close of the meetings, in the Grant-Mory matter, the undersigned committee of three was appointed by the Assembly to determine why the dissolution agreement, signed February, 1925, has not been fulfilled, and to make recommendations to effect a proper settlement. To accomplish this, four meetings have been held in the course of which were interviewed the principals in the case, the witnesses to the original agreement (Messrs. Booth and Ridout) and the Auditor representing Mr. Mory. Papers marked "Exhibit A" and the committee has unanimously arrived at the conclusion that the opposition on the part of Mr. Mory to the payment of the balance still due according to the terms of the agreement is NOT RIGHTLY TAKEN. The evidence submitted to this committee indicates that the dissolution paper was a completed paper at the time it was signed and witnessed, and there remains nothing further to be done by Mr. Grant—as the first party thereto.

"In conclusion we therefore earnestly and seriously recommend that the balance of \$9,743, with interest accrued at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from the date of June 1st, 1925, be forthwith paid by Mr. Mory and that Charles Grant withdraw his claim for any additional amounts. We feel that this course of settlement is in accord with both the spirit and letter of the original agreement and is therefore a moral obligation of the parties thereof to fulfil. In this connection we suggest the following Scriptures to bear upon the conscience of those concerned: 'Pay that which thou hast vowed. Better is it that

thou shouldest not vow, than thou shouldest vow and not pay.'
(Eccles: 5 4-5).

Signed

Robert Little
John S. French
John N. Grant

"This, to any reasonable mind, will be sufficient to prove that no matter what objections Mr. Nelson and Mr. Mory raised, brethren there gave their impartial judgment that Mr. Mory had no righteous ground whatever in **CONNECTION WITH WITHHOLDING THIS SUM** of money from Mr. Grant."

Shall we not, in these closing hours of this dispensation, like Ezra "Seek of Him a right way for us and our little ones" (Ezra 8:21). We are warned in 2 Tim. 3:1 that "In the last days perilous times shall come," days surely when those who seek—in any measure—to maintain the truth inviolate, need to encourage and strengthen each other. May we then take heed to the admonition of the word: "Let us not judge one another any more, but judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling block, or occasion to fall, in his brother's way." Again, "Let us therefore follow after the things that make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another." (Romans 14 13-19.)

Yours in our soon coming Lord,

—J. W. H. NICHOLS,