

The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF EVANGELICAL PRINCIPLES
AND IN DEFENSE OF THE FAITH ONCE FOR ALL DELIVERED TO THE SAINTS.
\$2.00 Per Year, Postpaid, to any address. 5c Per Single Copy.

Editor: T. T. SHIELDS

Associate Editor: ALEXANDER THOMSON

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

Address Correspondence: THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2, Canada.

Registered Cable Address: Jarwitsem, Canada.

Vol. 13, No. 43

TORONTO, MARCH 7, 1935

Whole Number 668

Hepburn's Alliance With Rum and Rome

An Address by Dr. T. T. Shields

Delivered in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Friday Evening, March 1st, 1935

No man has any right to engage in controversy of any sort who is not willing, in good spirit, to receive as hard blows as he gives. Such progress in the direction of civil and religious liberty as the world has made, has not been reached by the operation of any principle of Fascism or Nazi-ism; nor by any effort of autocracies, whether of the people or the prince. Truth is never injured by full and free discussion: "He that doeth truth, cometh to the light." For this reason, every human idea, proposal, plan, or scheme, whether it belongs to the realm of science, or education, or industry, or commerce, or government, or religion, must be subject to the most thorough analysis for the discovery of its defects, and for its general improvement. For that reason, everything human, in the nature of the case, is a fit subject for discussion, and therefore for controversy.

Human society owes whatever progress it has made by human effort to its controversialists; to men who, seeing things they believed to be wrong, refused to say they were right; and who have had the courage to contend for principles which they conscientiously believed were indispensable to the public welfare.

Evil, in all realms, is positive in its nature; and therefore is always aggressive. To cease from controversy, would mean to offer no resistance to the progress of evil, and to acquiesce in its dominance.

These things being true, we must expect people of contrary opinions to oppose such opinions as we hold. We must insist, however, upon the right of free and full discussion; and out of such discussion the truth ultimately will emerge triumphant.

I venture now to assert that in my discussion this evening, I bear no ill-will toward my Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. Though I do not expect them to recognize the truth of this assertion, and therefore cannot expect them to believe it, I dare to say that I speak quite as much in the interests of Roman Catholics as in the interests of Protestantism. It would be beyond the scope of matters germane to this discussion for me to discuss the merits of Roman Catholicism as a religion, except to

say there is much in it that commands my respect and admiration; and that I reject it because, in my opinion, the error of the system outweighs its truth. I should expect my Roman Catholic friends to say just as much in opposition to Protestantism in any form. Nor should I be offended by their saying it.

Against Roman Catholicism as a religion I have nothing to say this evening, save that it is contrary to my own personal conviction of religious truth. But I would contend for absolute religious liberty for everybody—for Roman Catholics quite as much as for Protestants. I believe it does not lie legitimately within the function of the state to fetter any man's conscience, or to dictate his religious beliefs.

When I speak, however, of religious liberty I do not mean that such liberty imposes an obligation of acquiescence upon anyone. Such freedom involves, not only the right to proclaim what you yourself believe, but the right also to discuss what others ask you to believe, and to give reasons why you cannot accept their teaching. The very essence of British Nonconformity indisputably involved, and still involves, the right to dissent.

This evening I am forced to discuss, not so much the religious as the political aspect of Roman Catholicism. It is impossible for one to speak of Roman Catholicism apart from the Roman Catholic Church; for Roman Catholicism, as a religious system, finds its expression in the Roman Catholic Church as an organization. The recognition of that fact will lead us immediately to see that we are transported from the realm of the abstract and the theoretical, to a realm of the concrete and the practical. The Roman Catholic Church is an organization. Beyond question, it is the most perfectly articulated, the most widely operative, and the most powerful, organization in the world. Against the Roman Catholic Church as a religious organization, I have nothing to say, except to insist upon the right to discuss the merits of its teaching, and seek thus to emancipate, as I should believe, its devotees. But as all Christian history attests, and as the Roman Catholic Church, by its present profession and position must acknowledge, the Roman

Catholic Church is not only a religious institution, but it is also a powerful international political organization.

The Roman Catholic Church claims the right of temporal power. It claims that its Sovereign Pontiff, as it calls him, is superior to all the kings of earth, and, by implication at least, that any ruler holding office without his permission is a usurper. The Roman Catholic Church has never refused to employ secular power for the propagation of its principles. The Roman Catholic Church in Canada is virtually a colony of a foreign kingdom; and the devout Roman Catholic owes a primary duty of obedience to the Church as being an authority superior to that of any merely human government. That it does not refrain from contravening the laws of the land is notoriously evident by Quebec decisions in matters of marriage and divorce. A German, or Italian, or French, or Russian colony, however numerous, established in this country, and daring to set the laws of a foreign government above the laws of this land, would never for one moment be tolerated. Yet that is permitted in respect to the conduct of the Roman Catholic Church.

We come now to consider the question which especially calls us together this evening. And, aside from all technicalities or reference to legal enactments in Ontario or Quebec, let me set before you very clearly what the Separate School principle involves.

Years ago, at the time of the erection of the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, I had occasion to make a very thorough study of the whole question in connection with a discussion of the matter, for which I was then responsible in the city of London where I was then ministering. I recall that Sir Wilfred Laurier, who was Prime Minister at the time, frankly admitted that the primary function of the Separate Schools was to teach the dogmas of the Church. I commend the Roman Catholic Church for its—shall I call it, its psychological shrewdness, in insisting upon keeping the children strictly under its hand.

Some years ago I had what I thought, and still think, was the distinguished honour of being, by his special invitation, the guest of Lord Carson at dinner in his home in London. I had made a tour of Ireland, and had had opportunity of meeting many of the Irish leaders, as I thought, on all sides. I had met leading Ulster-men in Belfast and Londonderry; I had met John Dillon, leader of the Irish Nationalists; the Acting-President of the Sinn Fein organization (De Valera was then in prison), and the Secretary. I had talked with the famous Tim Healy, and with both Archbishops of Ireland; the chief Land Commissioner, and judges of various ranks. I also had met large numbers of the rank and file of Irishmen in the South of Ireland. At Trinity College, London, I had met the great Provost, Dr. Mahaffy. He said, "And what are you doing in Ireland?" I said, "I have been trying to study, so far as I am able, the Irish question; and trying to understand something of the principles involved." "And," said he, "how far have you progressed?" To which I replied, "I believe I must have met a representative of every shade of Irish political opinion." He shook his head and said, "Not unless you have met every Irishman"! However, that in explanation.

Sitting beside Lord Carson at his own table, he said to me, "What is the matter with Ireland?" I said, "It would be immodest on my part to express an opinion on such a complicated subject, especially to such an expert."

He said, "Never mind that. I should like to have your opinion. What is the matter with Ireland?" I said, "I think Ireland's problem is one of education." Almost roughly he said, "How in the world did you get that idea?" I said, "I found many of the people in Ireland still living in Cromwell's time. It is unnatural for people to live nearly 300 years behind their own day. Who is teaching them to do so?" "So far," said Lord Carson, "you are right. It is a problem of education. But what is the remedy?" To that I answered—and some of you will not agree with this principle, but I think I shall show you later that it is the only possible solution of the problem, "The unification and secularization of your whole educational system. Take religion out of the schools altogether, and have a system of state schools. Let the various religious bodies do their own teaching—at their own expense—Catholics of all sorts, and Protestants of all sorts. If they want to have day schools in which to teach their religion, let them pay for it." Having said that, he answered, "And what then?" I said, "Twenty-five years of inexorable, impartial, British rule." Lord Carson said, "Ah, could you do that, you would have solved the Irish problem. But your programme is impossible; for the Roman Catholic Church will never surrender its control of education."

That, as every informed person must know, is a cardinal principle of Roman Catholicism. From birth to death, the Catholic child is never permitted to escape from the superintendency of the Church. Is there any objection to that? None whatever, providing the Roman Catholic Church pays for its superintendency with its own money.

The Separate Schools of Ontario are religious schools. They exist primarily for the teaching of the dogmas of the Church of Rome. If the Ontario public schools were made religious schools, the Roman Catholic Church would have an indisputable right to have religious schools of their own, for they ought not to be compelled to send their children to receive religious instruction from teachers who teach the opposite of that which Roman Catholic parents believe; and, for that reason, the public schools of Ontario must be maintained as state schools, and not as religious schools. But if there be any just ground for Roman Catholics being permitted to devote their school taxes to their own schools—that is to say, to employ their share of taxes imposed for the purpose of education, for the establishment and maintenance of schools in which the dogmas of Rome shall be taught—then every other religious body in Ontario has an equal right to its separate schools. I have a right, as a Baptist, to ask that what I am required by law to pay for the education of the youth of this Province shall be set aside for the support of a school which will teach the distinctive principles for which I, as a Baptist, stand.

The same is true of the United Church, of the Anglican Church, of the Presbyterian Church, of the Brethren, of the Salvation Army, of the Unitarians, of the Jews—of every religious body, however small. If public funds are to be used for the teaching of religion at all, then every man of any religious conviction has a right to demand that his share of the taxes shall be used to teach his religion.

If that principle were followed, where should we arrive? Could there be any development of a national consciousness, if we were going to divide the population into fragments through our school system? How can

we develop any sort of coherent body politic? And if that be not possible, why should the adherents of a particular church, which is distinguished from all other religious bodies by this one fact that it claims the right to exercise sovereignty over the consciences of the people, even by invoking the secular arm—why should such a church be permitted such privileges?

I had thought first of all to discuss this evening at some length the legal aspect of things, but I shall reserve that for another occasion.

For the sake of argument, let it be admitted that agreements entered into by the representatives of the Protestant majority and the Catholic minority in this Province, by which certain special privileges were promised the Roman Catholic minority—I say, let it be assumed for the sake of argument that these agreements are constitutionally binding, and that therefore Separate Schools are as a tree so deeply rooted that it cannot be dug up, and that it were an injustice to cut down, surely in this present day of enlightenment we are justified in insisting that no more such trees shall be planted; and that other trees shall not be felled in order to give room for the wider expansion of this separatist organism!

I leave the technical discussion of these matters to a later date, and content myself this evening with discussing the principle, that the citizens of Ontario should, under no circumstances, consent to the diversion from the funds of our public school system of any money now contributed by Protestants, for the maintenance of schools with the teaching of which Protestants have no agreement.

I have announced that I would speak this evening on Mr. Hepburn's Alliance with Rum and Rome; and I must justify the implication of that announcement.

I suppose we shall have to assume that Mr. Hepburn speaks for the Government, and for the Liberal Party. Apparently neither is yet of age, for scarcely is even a responsible minister permitted to speak for himself, while the loquacious Mr. Hepburn is present. Putting aside for a few moments the School question, to return to it a little later, I refer to the present administration of the Liquor Control Act for the double purpose of showing the seriousness of the present situation, and of showing also something of what may, or may not, be expected from the present Ontario Administration.

I first raised my voice against the iniquity of the Beer Parlour on Sunday evening, August 19th last; that is to say, I then protested against the present administration of the Liquor Act. But we sent to Queen's Park nearly one thousand signatures protesting against the passage of the measure, when it was proposed by the late Henry Government, so that we have been consistent and persistent in our opposition to this measure.

On the 19th of August I did not attack the Government, but merely assumed that in proclaiming the Act it was but yielding to political exigency, and I took it for granted that Mr. Hepburn and his Government would need only to be informed of such irregularities to ensure their correction. I at least anticipated that the head of the Government would treat with respect any respectful approach made to him by one, or more, responsible citizens. But before I had opportunity of addressing Mr. Hepburn personally, he hurled insulting epithets at me through the public press.

I say now that I am not at all disturbed by his strictures; that I can conceive of no higher compliment that

could be paid to any reasonable man than to have it established that he had nothing in common with the Premier of Ontario on the ground of intellectual affinity, nor in respect to the amenities of public life. My address of the nineteenth of August last is in print as stenographically reported, and no one who reads it will find in it any word of disrespect toward Mr. Hepburn or his Government.

From that time it became evident that Mr. Hepburn would not welcome any suggestion from anybody respecting the administration of the affairs of this Province. He is a man who is utterly without administrative experience. Nothing in his career has provided him with opportunity for the exercise of such judgment as an executive, accustomed to dealing with, and directing men, must possess. We supposed that he was possessed of potentialities which, by the discipline of experience, might make him useful to this Province. But it is logically impossible to improve upon perfection, and psychologically foolish to essay an argument with assumed infallibility.

It might be argued by some of our detractors that the Premier of Ontario was particularly averse to this man, whom he had never seen nor heard, and that it was because I had the temerity to dissent from his policies that he was angry. But a Temperance Delegation, presumably representative of a very considerable sentiment, at least, in this Province, waited upon the Premier, and approached him, so far as I could see, with all respect. But from the press reports it would appear that they received no more respectful hearing than I might have expected. Their motives were impugned, and they obtained no satisfaction whatever.

On the School question a deputation, if I am not mistaken, of about two hundred waited upon the Premier. That deputation included many men who had had a far larger experience of public life than the Premier, and whose records in various spheres showed that they were not without at least a modicum of intelligence. But they met with equal insult. According to press reports they were told that a deputation of one dozen would have been just as effective as one of two hundred, and implicitly they were charged with political partizanship, and credited with no sincerity of purpose, in the representations they made, and were told that neither the Premier nor his Government would be influenced in the least by any "propaganda"—whatever that is.

I return now to this question of the beverage rooms. I have not presented our protests to the Premier. I have no intention of doing so. I shall send him a letter stating my reasons for refusing to expose myself to his insolence, and informing him that while the temperance deputation presented a protest bearing between seventeen and eighteen hundred signatures, I have in my office here protests bearing forty thousand, six hundred and seventy-nine signatures. But I shall not submit these names to the Premier, for what are forty thousand, six hundred and seventy-nine voters to this miniature, intellectually diminutive imitation of Hitler! And this is the letter I shall send to him:

"The Honourable M. F. Hepburn,
Premier of Ontario,
Legislative Buildings,
Toronto.

Sir:

I enclose herewith a declaration made by the Secretary of Jarvis St. Church to the effect that we have in our

possession protests against the continuance of the present beverage rooms, and particularly against authorities being granted to such places adjacent to educational, charitable, or religious institutions, which protests bear forty thousand, six hundred and seventy-nine signatures. These lists are open to inspection, and if there be any doubt as to the accuracy of the count, you are at liberty to send anyone you like to inspect the lists and to count the names in order to the verification of this statement.

I intended sending you a sworn statement, but was advised only this afternoon that such a course was really unnecessary. But if doubt be cast upon this declaration, I am willing to pursue the course outlined above, or otherwise, to call in a firm of accountants to count the lists, and issue a certificate.

Having informed you of this fact, I venture now to present my reasons for not asking for a personal interview in order to present these protests.

In my initial discussion of the evils of the beverage rooms I assumed the good faith of yourself and your Government, and took it for granted that you had only to be informed of the evils to ensure their correction. The address I delivered on that occasion has been printed as stenographically recorded, and I am sure no one could find a word of disrespect in that address.

A report of my address appeared in the press, together with accounts of interviews with yourself in which you mocked at "temperance cranks", including therein, I suppose, not only myself but all who seek the moral welfare of this Province.

I have read accounts of the reception of other deputations which have waited upon you, all of whom have suffered like insults. I am a voter of the Province of Ontario. I have been a resident of Ontario for many years; and for nearly twenty-five years have occupied my present position in this city. I shall magnify my office sufficiently to tell you that I refuse to submit to your insults, or to take second place even to the Premier of the Province in respect to my ability to estimate the quality of moral issues as affecting the life of the people of the Province.

I send you this declaration of the possession of these protests with no hope whatever that it will have any effect upon you. Apparently your mind is impervious to reason, and I am logical enough to avoid the folly of trying to improve upon perfection; I know enough of the constitution of the human mind to recognize the futility of holding an argument with professed infallibility.

I tell you, frankly, sir, that as a citizen of this Province I hang my head in shame at every new manifestation of your incorrigible ungentlemanliness; and I feel a sense of deep humiliation at the reflection that I cast my vote in the last election for one of your supporters.

I find some compensation, however, in the reflection that with every passing day your crudities are serving to enlighten the understanding of intelligent voters all over the Province; for I have, myself, had contact with many hundreds of people who cast their votes in your support at the last election, who are eagerly awaiting an opportunity, as I am, to atone for their folly.

The beverage rooms have debauched the youth of this Province. There is much that cannot yet be told, but rest assured, sir, I am receiving information almost daily which at the proper time, and when I have had full opportunity for its verification, will be released.

The criminal waste of money at a time of universal distress, incident to the opening of these beverage rooms must leave your Government condemned before every citizen who puts the moral welfare of the Province before its material interests. And indeed, such waste is just as devastating, materially, in view of present conditions.

It is my observation that your conduct of affairs is turning multitudes of people not only against you, but against every person and every party that would offer you any support. It is still my hope that among your followers there may be some who see the impossibility of long continuing under such leadership. Your premiership has reduced the conduct of the Legislature to the level of a barroom brawl.

I attempt no argument; I can see nothing but for the Province, with what fortitude it can command, to resign

itself to suffering the indignity of your premiership, until by the lapse of time the citizens of this Province, in the exercise of their constitutional right, will be able to cast you into the political oblivion which your personal insolence so richly merits.

Having thus written, I subscribe myself,

Very sincerely yours,

THOMAS T. SHIELDS.

I return now to ask the question: How can Mr. Hepburn's attitude toward this Liquor Question be explained?

Why should Mr. Hepburn flout the temperance sentiment of this Province? Why should he assume that any and all who disapprove of the appalling moral, economic, waste involved in these beer parlours are only "temperance cranks"? Are the only people of this Province entitled to respect those who muddle their senses with some kind of liquor?

I have never heard it suggested that Mr. Hepburn had any personal interest in any brewery or distillery. I am sure he has not. Many temperance experts insist that we shall never amend liquor conditions until we take the personal profit out of it. But I feel sure that Mr. Hepburn has no personal profit in a pecuniary sense in these things. Why, then, is he such an enthusiastic defender of these matters?

Why his enthusiasm for the whole liquor business? One can only assume that the liquor business has thrown its political influence on Mr. Hepburn's side; and that he owes the brewers a political debt which he is now discharging to the full. This, indeed, is about the most charitable interpretation that can be put upon his otherwise inexplicable course.

Let us now consider Mr. Hepburn's attitude toward the demands of the Roman Catholic hierarchy respecting a larger share of taxes for Roman Catholic Separate Schools. I have sufficiently discussed the principle of Separate Schools for the purpose of this address. I stop now to ask for some explanation of Mr. Hepburn's attitude. If Mr. Hepburn were a Roman Catholic, and had any personal interest in the propagation of the principles of Roman Catholicism, one could understand his apparent readiness to respond to Rome's demands. But Mr. Hepburn says himself that he has no religious bias. I hope he does not mean by that, that he has no religious principles. But certainly he is not identified with the Roman Catholic Church.

What, then, is his motive? Did he receive the help of the Roman Catholic Church to secure his election, by some implied or expressed promise, to give that church a larger share of school taxes? just as undoubtedly his election was assisted by the brewers in order that he might give them all that they asked. What other possible construction can be put upon his course of action? And if that be so, even assuming his reported economies to be a fact, must it not appear that the damage he has done to the morals of this province, by the opening of the beverage rooms, and the further inestimable injury he proposes to inflict upon our public school system, altogether outweigh and nullify the advantage of such economies? If there be truth in these assumptions, we face the fact that through Mr. Hepburn the liquor business which he promised to take out of politics has become one of the most potent factors in Ontario politics; and that now he drags into the political arena the whole Roman Catholic Church in this Province. If thus these reactionary forces are to be mobilized, surely there will

be nothing left but for every liberty-loving citizen of the Province to accept the guage of battle, and to put on his whole armour for the fight.

Many, wisely, will deprecate the introduction of religious questions into Ontario's political life. I share profoundly their regret. But those who stand for the maintenance of our public school system, and insist that it shall not be impoverished by the diversion of funds legitimately its own, to the support of Roman Catholic Separate Schools, have not introduced the religious question. They have not proposed the abolition of Separate Schools, but they do, justly, resent the demand of the Roman Catholic Church for a share in taxes which rightly belong to our public schools.

I venture to express an opinion at this point—and had I time to examine and bring forth historical illustrations of the principle, I think I could abundantly prove that it is possible for any privileged person, or group, or organization, to ask too much; and in so asking, not only to fail to receive it, but to lose very much of what they first possessed.

I do not at this moment discuss the constitutionality of Separate Schools, *per se*, but reserve that for later treatment. If Mr. Hepburn or others should undertake to say that a mere minister is out of court in the discussion of constitutional questions, I would remind him that I have had association with many lawyers for whose legal acumen, in many instances, I have had, and still have, great respect; but I am far from believing that the legal mind is the only mind that can understand these matters. I have had to do battle on many occasions with gentlemen of the law behind the scenes, and I will go so far as to say that on more than one occasion I have read in the papers a quotation by some learned judge, taken from the plea of one side or the other, and justifying that judge in giving judgment, and in the basis of judgment thus given, have recognized words which my own hand had written. That is egotistical perhaps! Call it so if you like. I still have a long, long way to go to overtake the Premier of Ontario! Indeed if the most egotistical man in the Province could travel day and night for a year in Sir Malcolm Campbell's "Blue Bird" at its two hundred and seventy miles an hour speed, he could not hope to attain equality with the St. Thomas Solomon in his progress toward infallibility.

How I wish I could meet him on his own ground! The man who, more than any other man, was responsible for our present public school system, whose name is second to no other name in the educational annals of this Province, was a minister of the gospel, whose name was Ryerson. With such a Premier, with such a man as Mr. Hepburn at the head of the Government, argument is utterly useless. Whether his followers in the Legislature will ultimately rebel and force a change of leadership before another election, I cannot say. I noticed that Mr. Hepburn, intending no compliment to ex-Premier Henry, said on the floor of the Legislature, that his speech sounded somewhat like Dr. Shields' radio speeches. I thought Mr. Henry was particularly moderate under the circumstances; and the Premier may be thankful, if his egotism will permit it, that "Dr. Shields" was not in Mr. Henry's place making that speech.

I think I can quote from one of the letters of *Junius* in connection with another matter, and, applying it to Mr. Hepburn, say, that the Premier of Ontario will con-

sult the tranquility of his soul in not provoking the moderation of my temper, for if ever my contempt should rise into anger, he should find that all that I have yet said of him was lenity and compassion!

Sometimes it is permissible for one to dream, and to give expression to an impossible ideal. What, after all, have the affairs of this Province to do with national political parties or their policies? They have no more to do with them than with municipal affairs. What is needed in this Province for a short period is a visitation to our Political House of the most powerful cleaner that could be invented. We need an Ontario Reform Party composed of the strongest men obtainable from all walks of life, Liberal, Conservative and no party at all; men from the professions, men of business, educational and religious leaders, who would, for the good of the Province, bind themselves together to serve without remuneration; and set Ontario's house in order; to be ready for any amendment to the British North America Act that would simplify the government of this country, and that would set the public weal above all personal considerations. A company of men thus devoted to the service of this Province, could, in three or four years, make it one of the ideal spots of earth.

I would not recommend further deputations to the Government at this time in the matter of the beverage rooms, or of the school question. I am not extreme when I say that we have scriptural authority for the principle of that counsel. We are enjoined, "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you." Let us then rather address ourselves to the "people": Let us educate the "people"; and promise the present Government and the Roman Catholic Church that if, under Mr. Hepburn's leadership, the present Government should grant the request of the Roman Catholic Church, citizens of this Province who believe in civil and religious liberty will never rest until they put in power a Government that will cancel such legislation.

NEWS OF UNION CHURCHES

Missionary Itinerary

Rev. Gordon D. and Mrs. Mellish, accompanied by the Secretary, Rev. W. E. Atkinson, will visit the following places within the next week. Essex, Wednesday, March 6th, at 8 p.m.; Thursday, March 7th, at Calvary Baptist Church, 1020 Assumption St., Windsor; Friday, March 8th, at Ambassador Baptist Church, Windsor, Curry Avenue; Sunday, March 10th, Courtright and Wilkesport at their usual Sunday services; Monday, March 11th, Chatham Regular Baptist Church, on Chatham's Main Street; Tuesday, March 12th, at Wheatley; Wednesday, Bethel Baptist Church, Orillia. A hearty invitation is extended to the readers of THE GOSPEL WITNESS to attend these services.

Make the Missionary Offering on March 10th a Liberal One

Most of our churches have set aside Sunday, March 10th, as a day of sacrificial giving to the Missionary work of the Union. Since these arrangements have been made, disaster has come to our New Cess Station in Liberia, where Rev. and Mrs. H. L. Davey are stationed. The brief cable told the story of the loss of the Missionaries' houses, and all of their equipment. It not only means the loss of Mr. and Mrs. Davey's household effects, but also of Rev. Edward and Mrs. Hancox, Miss Minnie Lane, and Miss Florence Stacey. Their goods were stored in the one big mission house at New Cess. The cable read, "nothing saved". It will mean the expenditure of hundreds of dollars to replace these missionary out-

(Continued on page 10)

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

"ETERNAL REDEMPTION"

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, March 3rd, 1935

(Stenographically Reported)

"But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us."—Hebrews 9: 11, 12.

A misplacement of emphasis may involve a misinterpretation. Certain aspects of truth may be disproportionately emphasized to the minimization of other truths equally important. It would be difficult, however, too strongly to emphasize the central truth of the Christian revelation, namely, that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself". That is the *sine qua non* of the gospel. Without that, there is no gospel. That understood, anyone may know how to be saved.

As we come to the Table of the Lord this evening, we do well to remind ourselves of the significance of the ordinance we are to observe. Both ordinances of the New Testament are preaching ordinances. Baptism witnesses to the fact that it is by the death and resurrection of Christ, sinners are saved: the Lord's Supper, which is equally enjoined upon all who believe, witnesses to the truth that the life which is given by God can be sustained only by Him. We live supernaturally, and are dependent upon heavenly supplies.

Furthermore: "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he comes." The fact that the frequent observance of that ordinance is enjoined upon us must surely teach the necessity for the frequent proclamation of the death of Christ. Indeed, it is related to all that God has ever said to men. The promise of His cleansing blood runs through all the books of the Bible, and binds all the books together. Once again, therefore, we shall give our thought for a little while to this great fact that Christ has come as an High Priest of "good things to come"—for there are better things in store—and that "he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us".

I shall ask three questions this evening: *What Christ did without the veil? What He carried within the veil? And what He is now doing in the holy place?*

I.

WHAT HE DID WITHOUT THE VEIL? Our text tells us that He "obtained eternal redemption for us". To effect that great redemption *He first came from within the veil Himself*. You recall how the veil separated the holy of holies from the sanctuary, and how that was entered only by the high priest, and by him only once a year on the great day of atonement—and then never without blood, "which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people". All other priests went from without, within the veil, with the blood of bulls and of goats. But this High Priest is differentiated from all others, in that He first came from within.

He is thus distinguished from all others. In the days of His flesh the people talked to Him and of Him as though He were a man among men. But He said to them, "Ye are from beneath; I am from above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world"; "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father." Repeatedly He said, "I came down from heaven." He came from within, without; in order that He might "obtain eternal redemption for us".

Thus coming from heaven to earth, *He came to qualify Himself to be a Redeemer*; for "verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham". He became our Kinsman. He took our nature up into His own, and fulfilled in Himself that for which Job instinctively longed, when he lamented that there was no daysman betwixt his soul and God: "Neither is there any daysman betwixt us, that might lay his hand upon us both." Job yearned for someone who could combine in himself all the feelings of humanity, with all the perfection and powers of Deity, and who could bridge the great gulf, and lay his hand upon us both, and bring us both together.

That is exactly what Jesus Christ came to do. Coming from above, He laid hold of our nature and united it with His own. He became our fellow, bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh, "touched with the feeling of our infirmities", "in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin".

Having thus come and qualified Himself by birth to be a Redeemer, *He really effected our redemption*. Redemption, from our point of view, and in respect to ourselves as I shall presently show you, necessitated a birth from above. We must be born from above. We are to be born of the Spirit, for "that which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit". Shall I be misunderstood when I say—hear me carefully—that the redemption effected by our Lord Jesus, for us, was just as surely contingent upon a carnal birth as our participation in that redemption is conditioned upon a spiritual birth. He took our human nature up into His own thus, "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons."

Thus, fitted to be a redeemer, He redeemed. That was the purpose of His incarnation. That was ever present in His view through all His earthly career. My object always is to enable you to understand the great fact that

men are saved by grace, and by grace alone. Unless we understand that, there can certainly be no peace for us.

While Christ did set us an example, while He did teach such truths as men had never heard before, while it was true that "never man spake like this man"; while it is true that He showed us how to live, and how to die—these influences, or effects, of His earthly life and death were but incidental to the fundamental purpose, which was that He might redeem us with His own precious blood. It was for that He came, and—call me controversial if you will, call me what you like—I have got used to being called names, and it does not disturb me much now—I must insist that where that note is absent from preaching, that Jesus Christ is the Redeemer of sinful men, dying "the just for the unjust that he might bring us to God", the gospel is not preached at all. It profits little to name Him in the hymns we sing, or to add His name as a kind of subscription to our prayers, unless without ceasing we faithfully witness to this great central truth of redemption by blood. That is our supreme task.

I say, the Lord Jesus Christ came to redeem. And men know nothing of the gospel, nor have they entered into the wealth or luxury of His salvation, unless and until that great truth has dawned upon their spiritual consciousness, that they are for ever redeemed by the blood of Christ.

You recall perhaps the story in Jeremiah's prophecy, of how the Lord said to Jeremiah, "Hanameel the son of Shallum thine uncle shall come unto thee, saying, Buy thee my field that is in Anathoth: for the right of redemption is thine to buy it." That which was predicted came to pass, and the field was bought in the presence of witnesses. The purchase price was paid, the documents were drawn up, the evidences were subscribed as the proof of sale. You remember too the sweet story in the Book of Ruth. Boaz called a certain kinsman to the gate of the city and detained him as others passed by, saying, "Ho, such a one! turn aside, sit down here." After gathering about him witnesses he said to his kinsman, "Naomi, that is come again out of the country of Moab, selleth a parcel of land, which was our brother Elimelech's: and I thought to advertise thee, saying, Buy it before the inhabitants, and before the elders of my people. If thou wilt redeem it, redeem it: but if thou wilt not redeem it, then tell me, that I may know: for there is none to redeem it beside thee; and I am after thee." The kinsman said, "I will redeem it." Then said Boaz, "What day thou buyest the field of the hand of Naomi, thou must buy it also of Ruth the Moabitess, the wife of the dead, to raise up the name of the dead upon his inheritance." The kinsman was not so sure that he wanted this encumbrance, and asked to be excused. When he refused Boaz said, "I come next; it is my turn." He bought the inheritance, Ruth included. He paid the price, without the gate of the city, in the presence of witnesses. He was the redeemer, who had the right to redeem.

Our Lord Jesus came from Heaven, and when He had taken upon Himself our nature, He not only went without the veil, but without the gates; and counting down the ruby drops, He paid the price of our redemption. He redeemed us, not "with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from our vain conversation, received by tradition from our fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: who verily was fore-ordained before the foundation of the

world, but was manifest in these last times for (us)". That is the gospel. Call it mechanical if you like, but that is exactly what He did. That is involved in the very term, "redemption". He bought it back; He paid the price; He bought us—and this whole world too: "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." Some day these material bodies are to be redeemed from all corruption: when this mortal shall put on immortality, and this corruptible shall put on incorruption, the whole creation "shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." He Who made the world, and all things therein, will not be denied the possession of that which is legitimately His by right of creation, and by the added right of redemption as well.

But it was an eternal redemption Jesus Christ effected. My Lord Jesus engaged in no experiment. He did not come to "try" to do something: He came to carry out the predetermined will of the Father, to execute to the last detail the counsels of the Eternal. And He did not fail. "I know", said the Wise Man, "that, whatsoever God doeth, it shall be for ever: nothing can be put to it, nor anything taken from it." We build houses—and then tear them down again; and, if we do not, they fall down. We lay streets, and then find we do not want them—and then cut through other streets. We are always repairing, going back over our steps, and doing again what ought to have been done right in the beginning. How many people to-day wish they had known half a dozen years ago what they know now! We can all be wise after the event—but God is wise in advance of it. He sees the end from the beginning. He never turns from His purpose, nor changes His plan. Jesus Christ came to redeem us, and, redeeming, He paid a price adequate to the purpose. And that redemption is for ever, "eternal redemption".

What else is worth having? Who wants a thing that will wear out, that we may lose? I insist that that which is wrought by the power of the eternal Spirit, through the eternal Son, in fulfilment of the plan and purpose of the eternal Father—that which is accomplished by God, needs no improvement, no amendment, of any kind. It is redemption, and it is eternal. Hallelujah! It is done once and for all: it needs no correction.

Do not listen to the man who talks about improving the gospel, of "restating the gospel". The next time your preacher says the gospel is outworn, and we must improve it to meet the needs of our modern minds, you say to him, "Mr. Preacher, improve on the sun; and when you have done that, come back and talk to me." What God does is perfect from the beginning. It needs no change. Therefore our redemption is eternal.

He "obtained" it. He became the possessor of it. That is to say, clothed with all sovereign right, He claimed His own. What a glorious word that is in which He says, "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man"! Or again, "Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he

should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." He obtained "eternal" salvation. It is now within His sovereign gift. He is able to bestow it upon us who believe. That is what he did without the veil.

II.

Let me try to show you something of THE SIGNIFICANCE OF WHAT HE CARRIED WITHIN THE VEIL.

When the high priest in the Levitical economy went within the veil, he entered with one purpose: he carried the blood of sacrifice, and sprinkled it upon the mercy seat. After he had sanctified the whole tabernacle, for "all things were purged with blood", into that holy place he went with the blood of sacrifice. Jesus Christ went into the holy place, within the veil. You remember how, when He cried, "It is finished", and bowed His head and gave up the ghost, symbolically the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, signifying that the way into the holiest was now made manifest. When Jesus Christ entered, He went in, not with a partial payment: He did not obtain redemption on the instalment plan. "Neither with the blood of calves and goats", did He enter. Not with a symbolical, nor an inadequate, sacrifice. The tabernacle in which the priest ministered was but a pattern of things in the heavens, and that was purged with the blood of bulls and goats; but the heavenly tabernacle with a better sacrifice, for "Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building", entered into heaven itself, and He carried with Him His own blood.

I would, if I could, explain that to you. But "great is the mystery of godliness", and who can fathom that mystery? Thus far I can see: "The life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." But our Lord Jesus joined all the wealth, the value, the capacities, the potentialities—if it be legitimate thus to speak of Deity—He joined all there was of Deity to human perfection as embodied in Himself, the only perfect Man who ever lived; the very best of men who had fulfilled the law in every particular, joined to His own perfect nature the infinite capacities of Deity, and all that was expressed in the blood which flowed from His heart—and He went into heaven Himself with His own blood. That was the price.

Ah, but what did it mean? What did the blood which Jesus Christ carried into the holy of holies mean? Sometimes we speak among men of a "gentlemen's agreement". Two men engage, let us suppose, in a matter of business. They have no witnesses to the transaction, they sign no document; but two men of integrity and honour come to an agreement. One man pledges his word and says, "I will do so-and-so." The other man cannot hold him legally to the fulfilment of that promise, but because he is a man of honour he keeps his word. That is to say, it was an engagement of honour, but therefore, perhaps, more binding than law.

Suppose our salvation had been conditioned upon such an agreement as that? If the parties to the agreement were the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, three subsistences, as Joseph Cook used to say, in one Sub-

stance, three persons in One—if salvation had been based upon such an agreement, that surely would have been enough; for the honour of God must have been at stake. But the blood of Christ means even more than that. Do you understand the significance of the blood? "For men verily swear by the greater: and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife. Wherein God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath: that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us: which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast, and which entereth into that within the veil; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." That He should forever put it beyond all possibility of question that God should change His mind, He was willing thus to meet our capacity to understand Him. It is as though He said, "I have given My promise. It is an obligation of honour. But that you may be left without any shadow of excuse for doubting Me, I will seal it with an oath, and swear that I will do it."

What, therefore, is the blood? It is the "blood of the everlasting covenant". It is the sign and seal of the oath-bound covenant of "God that cannot lie". Our great Redeemer carried that into the holy place, His own blood, the proof before Deity, if you will, that all His covenant-engagements had been kept, His promises implemented, redemption effected, and obtained by the payment of His precious blood, for it was thus He subscribed the evidences. How sure God has made this salvation for us! Into the holy place He went with His own blood.

III.

WHAT IS HE DOING NOW THAT HE IS IN THE HOLY PLACE? "There to appear in the presence of God for us." Once He appeared among men for God, for men said, "Who is God? Where is He? What is He like? How ought we to think of God? How can I imagine Him? How can I conceive of an infinite Spirit?" Paul touched upon that when he preached to the philosophers of Athens: "Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device"; "As I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you" as though he had said, You have been trying to imagine what He is like, and He has sent you His portrait in the person of His Son Jesus Christ. Paul preached to them Jesus Christ, and doubtless told them that He had said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father?" He came out of the unknown that He might reveal God to men, and appear among men as the Representative of God. He returned within the veil to stand in the holy place, to "appear in the presence of God for us".

I do not understand this truth: it is altogether too wonderful for me, but I believe it as a fact, though I can offer no explanation of it, that Jesus Christ, having a body in form, I suppose, like unto ours, for He appeared as a man among men, and yet without taint of

sin, for He was "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners"—I say, I do not understand how it could be that He "was made sin, who knew no sin". No sin! The sinless Christ, and a sinless human body! After His resurrection He said, "Handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." If language means anything, it means that Jesus Christ in His resurrection, clothed His infinite spirit with a material body. With that body He went to heaven.

He carried a part of this material world into glory, something from this sin-cursed earth fit, though material, to be in the holy presence of God: "Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." If that be so, with the redemption of our bodies, comes, as I intimated by quoting that scripture a moment ago, the deliverance, the emergence, of the whole creation from the bondage of corruption, "into the glorious liberty of the children of God". He has gone into the holy place, to appear in the presence of God for us.

What for? Poor sinner, would you like to have someone represent you? Down in the police court to-morrow morning there will probably be some poor soul who has been drunk, or who has committed some other offence. His name will be called, and the magistrate will ask if there is anybody to represent him. He has no money to engage anyone, but there will be a few young lawyers about, untried—or perhaps older ones who have been tried and found wanting. Having nothing to do, partly for experience, and in some cases in the hope of getting some remuneration for it, after a whispered conversation, one says, "I represent this man." I do not want a representative like that. No, thank you! Against that great day of assize I want someone to represent me who is properly qualified to do so.

Here is One Who had been preparing for that event through all eternity. He came to this earth and passed through long training, died, and was buried; was raised from the dead, and went home again to glory: "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." He appears, even now, "in the presence of God for us".

Did you pray to-day? Did it do any good? Did it reach heaven? It did if you handed it to your Representative. There is no other way of presenting your plea before the throne of heaven but through Christ. He appears in the presence of God for us. When we petition the throne of heaven in the name of Christ, He takes our prayer, stamps it with His own perfection, and presents it to the Father. He intercedes for us; "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost, (completely, forevermore) that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them."

You have found it necessary at some time to fill in a form that required someone else's signature to give it authority. After you signed it, the man stamped it with his imprimatur. That is what Jesus Christ does with every prayer of yours: "I am sponsor for that man. I died for him. He belongs to me. Grant him what he asks for My sake." That is what it means to pray in the name of the Lord Jesus.

And I must not fail to remind you of this, though I have no time to elaborate the principle: "He entered in once into the holy place." Once! In some cases you can never get the matter settled. What you try to settle to-day is undone to-morrow. When the high priest went

into the holy place each year, he had to offer another sacrifice; to do his task over and over again: "Every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down." Once! Only once! He did not need to do it more than once.

Let me put it simply, yet strongly. If your sins are not atoned for by the blood of Christ, if all your obligations to the law of God are not covered by the death of Christ, there is not only nothing that you can do, or anybody else can do for you—I say it reverently, if you are not saved by the death and resurrection of God's only Son, and cleansed by His precious blood, there is nothing that even God Himself can do for you. If that does not satisfy all the claims of justice, there is no hope for you; and no help for you anywhere in the universe. But He has done it. He entered in "once" into the holy place—and He has never come out since.

It is difficult to find some people at home, is it not? When I had more time, and made pastoral calls, I used to find people out. I found them out, literally out! Out! It is difficult to find some people in. You will never find Jesus Christ out. "He entered in once", and He has never emerged from the holy place. He has been there ever since. And He will remain there until the striking of His hour, and He shall once more appear "without a sin offering unto salvation". Some day He will appear again. Jesus is coming again! I wish some of my friends would not associate with that glorious truth so many fantastic theories. I wish they would not associate with His coming, Mussolini, and Stalin, and Hitler, and all the rest of the conjectural nominations for the anti-Christ. Do not becloud the precious doctrine of the Lord's personal return by your utterly foolish speculations. Let us hold fast to this truth: He appeared once, and He has disappeared because now He appears in the presence of God for us. And He will remain there until once again He shall appear: "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all the kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him."

What a Saviour we have! As we take the bread and drink the wine, may God help us to see that they are but the material symbols of this great spiritual truth, that so our hearts may worship Him as we remember that by virtue of that which here is symbolized we have received eternal redemption, and are saved for time and for eternity.

If you have not trusted Him, trust Him now. If Jesus Christ cannot save you, who can? And if He can, why not submit to Him? "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved."

Let us pray:

Thou great High Priest, the Mediator of the new covenant, by Whose precious blood we have been redeemed, who through the eternal Spirit didst offer Thyself as a Lamb without blemish and without spot, what a sure foundation Thou hast laid for our feet! We pray Thee that this evening those of us who are Thine, may be able to perceive in Thee more than we have ever done before, and to magnify the sovereign grace of our glorious Lord. If there are some who have been halting, hesitating, sometimes hoping, sometimes doubting, sometimes almost despairing, enable such to look with the eye of faith, clearly to behold the Lamb of God Who taketh away the sin of the world. Bless us every one with Thy full and eternal salvation, for Jesus Christ's sake, Amen.

Whole Bible Course Lesson Leaf

Vol. 10 No. 1
 REV. ALEX. THOMSON, EDITOR
 Lesson 11 First Quarter March 17th, 1935

REJOICING IN GOD

Lesson Text: Psalms 29-34.

Golden Text: "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile."—Psalm 32: 1, 2.

Bible School Reading: Psalm 34: 1-22.

DAILY BIBLE READINGS: Monday—Num. 6: 22-27; Tuesday—I. Chron. 16: 29-36; Wednesday—Jer. 9: 23-26; Thursday—Mark 9: 1-8; Friday—Phil. 4: 15-23; Saturday—John 19: 31-37.

PSALM TWENTY-NINE

In the background of this psalm there is evidently a severe thunderstorm, such as had been witnessed by David frequently, and in which he observes the manifestation of divine power. The psalm opens with a call to the "sons of the mighty", implying possibly angelic beings, to give praise unto the Lord, and to worship Him in the "beauty of holiness". Such an honour is due unto Him, and should be rendered by men, as well as angels. Note the desire of God respecting this (John 4: 23, 24), and the spirit in which He must be worshipped (I. Chron. 16: 29). A description of the storm is then given, with the voice of God heard throughout its course. It thunders upon the waters (vs. 3, 4); it affects the cedars of Lebanon (vs. 5, 6); the lightning flashes; and then passing from the north to the south, its thunders reverberate in the wilderness of Kadesh, affecting animals as well as nature (vs. 8, 9). And the psalm closes with the recognition of the divine sovereignty, and the experience of heavenly peace. Note the power, majesty, and nearness, of the divine voice; other occasions when the voice has been heard (Deut. 5: 22, Matt. 3: 17, 17: 5), and the possibility of hearing God's voice in the midst of nature's actions.

PSALM THIRTY

This psalm is an expression of gratitude to God for deliverance from enemies. On many occasions David had experienced the divine power working on his behalf, and he quite properly gave the Lord the glory for the victories gained. Observe the nature of the deliverance effected (vs. 1-3), the call to thanksgiving, the goodness of God manifest in connection with the duration of the divine anger, the false confidence arising from prosperity, the dependence of the psalmist on the favour of God, and the reality and blessedness of answered prayer (vs. 8-12). Note also the dangers of prosperity, the possibility of blessing through affliction, the necessity for God in the life, the gratitude, hope, and praise which characterize the psalm, and the fact, manifest in the record, that prayer changes things.

PSALM THIRTY-ONE

In this psalm there is first a statement of trust (vs. 1-8) wherein after assuming such trust the psalmist prays for deliverance, claims the Lord as his rock and fortress, requests salvation from the snares of his enemies, restates his trust in the Lord, and gives thanks for deliverance. Note the significance of the terms used respecting God and His work: "strong rock", "an house of defence", "rock", and "fortress"; denoting strength, safety, and "large room"; implying liberty. Those who are set free by God are free indeed (John 8: 31-36). Observe also the nature of the psalmist's requests, as "deliver", "bow down", "lead", "guide", "pull"; and his devout attitude manifest in his trust, and his hatred of evil.

The second part of the psalm relates a call for help (vs. 9-18). In this, after requesting mercy, and mentioning his trouble (v. 9), the psalmist describes his sad condition, expresses his trust in the Lord, and prays for deliverance for himself, and judgment upon his enemies. Attention may be drawn to the description of the psalmist's condition, intimating his suffering, sorrow, and dire need; also to such expressions as "My times are in thy hand"; "Make Thy face to shine upon thy servant"; denoting the sovereignty of God, the safety of His servants, and the blessing of His favour.

The last part of the psalm records God's goodness to His own (vs. 19-24). Such goodness is great, and manifests itself in protecting trusting souls, showing marvellous kindness to them, hearing their prayers, and preserving and strengthening them. Observe the significance of the Lord's action in hiding His own in the secret of His presence, with its implied quietness, calmness, comfort, and safety.

PSALM THIRTY-TWO

This psalm sets forth the blessing of forgiveness, after acknowledgment of sin. God desires repentance (Acts 17: 30), and freely forgives on confession of sin (I. John 1: 9). Three terms are used respecting sin, indicative of its nature, "transgression", or "rebellion against rightful authority"; "sin", or "a missing of a mark"; and "iniquity", or "crookedness". Three words are used in the description of God's action respecting sin: as "forgiveness", or "taken away"; "covered", or "shrouded"; so that God no longer regards the sin; and "imputeth not", bearing the implication of cancellation of a debt. The blessedness of the forgiven soul is great. Note the weight of sin on the conscience (vs. 3, 4), the way of forgiveness (vs. 5-7), a promise of divine aid, an appeal for obedience, and a call to the righteous to rejoice (vs. 8-11).

PSALM THIRTY-THREE

This is a psalm of praise to God for His goodness to men, and containing an account of His works on their behalf. After a call to praise God with harp and voice, a statement is made respecting the universality of His goodness, and His work of creation is referred to. Note the method of creation intimated here, and the greatness and wonder of the work. In view of this, the inhabitants of the earth are called upon to fear the Lord (vs. 8, 9). In these days of Atheistic propaganda it is well to draw attention to the Creator of the world (Eccles. 12: 1). The Lord frustrates the counsel of the heathen. The divine counsel stands forever, His chosen people are richly blessed by His presence in their midst. He looks down upon all the inhabitants of the earth, who are all of one blood (Acts 17: 36). And through Him alone deliverance comes to men. Note the unity of the human race, the interest of God in His creatures, and the favour shown by Him to those who fear Him.

PSALM THIRTY-FOUR

This is another psalm of praise, with an exhortation throughout to "taste, and see that the Lord is good". The psalmist makes declaration of his praise. He gives testimony to answered prayer, and divine deliverance. He invites others to taste and experience the goodness of God; bears witness to the divine care of the saints; explains the way of God's favour; and again emphasizes the divine deliverance of the righteous. Special note may be made of the duty and blessing of bearing personal testimony to the goodness of God; the desire of the person who has been blessed of God to lead others to Him, that they may share in the blessing; the wisdom of living a righteous life; the eternal security of those who trust the Lord; and the comfort and practical nature of prayer. Observe also the conditions necessary to forgiveness of sins (v. 8), and the consequence of continuance in sin (v. 21).

THE UNION BAPTIST WITNESS

(Continued from page 5)

fits, besides the rebuilding of a better type of dwelling for the Missionaries now in Africa.

Some churches have responded earlier than was expected, and this has greatly encouraged the hearts of our Convention Officers. Pray for the work that out of this seeming calamity the hand of the Lord may be seen in arousing the whole constituency to a greater zeal for the Foreign Mission Cause.

Rev. Edward Hancox and Miss Florence Stacey have sailed from England, via the Duchess of Bedford, C.P.R. Steamship, on March 1st. They will be arriving in Toronto on Sunday, March 10th, in all probability. Word was also received that Miss Stacey was much improved in health and was well on the way to recovery.

Mr. Hancox and Miss Stacey had both served their first full term of service, and their furlough was due as of January 1st, 1935. As stated in a communication sent out to the churches some time ago, twenty-five hundred dollars would be needed to bring home the two workers and send the others back. Help us make this objective, and also to send on sufficient to meet this other emergency.

The Cry of Our Hungry Children

The readers of this paper will have had a weekly visit from the eldest of our children,

The Gospel Witness

throughout the year. The paper has maintained a consistent testimony, we believe, to the gospel of grace. During the year we have heard from a good many, most of whom were ministers, telling us that their income was so greatly reduced that they were unable to continue the paper. In not a few instances we have continued sending the paper, and in some cases the subscriptions have been covered by others' contributions.

We have maintained the strictest economy in the publication of THE GOSPEL WITNESS, but the fact remains that the subscription price does not, and cannot, pay our bills. We are therefore under the necessity of making

Our Annual Appeal to the Whole Gospel Witness Family

We believe it is not possible to estimate the blessing which the paper has been God's instrument of conveying, first, in the salvation of the lost; then in the edification and comfort of God's people; and, we are happy to say, in not a few instances, in affording some inspiration to hard-pressed ministers who find their task particularly arduous in these trying days.

The end of our fiscal year will be reached March 31st, and we appeal to every member of the GOSPEL WITNESS family—**THAT MEANS YOU**—to send us at once as generous a contribution to The Gospel Witness Fund as is possible. You cannot send too much. We shall need all that our most generous friends can send us, to enable us to close the year without a deficit. Large numbers of religious periodicals have had to cease publication from want of funds. Hitherto the Lord has helped us, and He has helped us through His believing people who have fellowship with us in the testimony this paper has endeavoured to give. We have never needed your friendship, and fellowship, and practical help, more than now. *Please help us!* **HELP US ALL YOU CAN! AND HELP US NOW!**

All that we have said about the hungry WITNESS Fund we can say with even greater emphasis about

Toronto Baptist Seminary

The work of the Seminary amazes us. We are only in our eighth year, and yet we have more than forty pastors and ministers preaching in Ontario and Quebec; a number in the Prairie provinces; some in British Columbia; several in the United States; one in Scotland; three in Jamaica; one in Central America; one in China; four in Africa; one in Palestine; and a large number of others who have taken the Seminary course, and as trained workers, have resumed their places in the churches to which they belong.

All this has been done without a cent of endowment. We need at least \$15,000 a year. We need about \$10,000 immediately. But do not let the large amount frighten you, nor say to yourself, "What I could give would be but a drop in the bucket." Let us have the "drop in the bucket", if that be all you can give us. We mention the larger amount to remind any of God's stewards to whom He has entrusted some of His funds, that there is no better place to invest money in distinctively Christian Education than in Toronto Baptist Seminary. Read the leading article in this paper and see the influence of theological seminaries upon the ministry of the day, and the reaction of their teaching upon home, and church, and state.

Remember the Seminary in Your Will

May we remind our readers also of their privilege in remembering Toronto Baptist Seminary in their wills. Many are being suddenly called away in these days. If you intend to remember us, please do it now. We know of some cases where procrastination in this matter deprived the Seminary of funds that their owners intended we should have. But do not wait until you die. Having given the Seminary a place in your will, send us also a contribution to meet our present need.

And over and above all this, join us in earnest prayer that God will move His stewards so to give of their substance that the need of these hungry enterprises may be supplied. In naming the Seminary in your will, to avoid all possibility of mistake, name it as "Toronto Baptist Seminary, Associated with Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto."

"OTHER LITTLE SHIPS"

FREIGHTED WITH COMFORT Is the Title of a New Book by the Editor

The book will consist of a selection of Jarvis St. sermons designed to bring sinners to Christ, to build up the saints, and to comfort the afflicted.

It will contain from 225 to 250 pages and will be bound in cloth boards with gilt title letters.

It will be suggestive for ministers, and therefore would make an ideal gift for a pastor; it will be especially useful as a chalice of comfort for the bereaved; and may well be employed to send a message to the unconverted; and to establish in the faith any disposed to be driven about by every wind of doctrine.

"OTHER LITTLE SHIPS" will be launched, or, otherwise, will be off the press and ready for sale, THURSDAY AFTERNOON, MARCH 21st.

The size of the book will be 7½ by 5 inches and the price one dollar and a half. It will make an appropriate gift with which to remember your friends at Easter.

For further information the Preface of the book is printed on page 11 of this issue.

It will be on sale at the Church office, and in the leading Book Shops in Toronto and other Canadian cities. For prompt delivery write THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard St. E., Toronto.

In order to induce patrons to send us advance orders which would afford some indication of the probable sale

A FREE COPY WILL BE SENT TO EACH OF THE FOLLOWING:

The first order opened on March 8th and 9th. The first order received from any part of Great Britain or Ireland. The first order received from Australia, and the first from New Zealand.

In order to qualify for a free copy the order must be accompanied by cheque or money order for one dollar and a half. The winners of the free copies will have their money returned.

It will be seen that the requirement that money accompany the order will insure every order's being *bona fide*.

Every order will be immediately acknowledged, and the winner of each of the free copies will be immediately advised. All orders received in advance of the date of issue, March 21st, will be shipped that day or the next. Order at once.

NOTE

The first order received by mail was on Friday afternoon, March 1st, from Mrs. C. J. Holman, 75 Lowther Ave., Toronto.

The first from the United States was received Monday, March 4th, from Rev. Paul Kolesnikoff, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

The first on March 5th from Mrs. M. E. Card, Port Huron, Mich.

The first on March 6th from Mrs. F. C. Burnett, Clementsvale, N.S.

The first order received on each of the next three days will be announced next week. A free copy to each of the four subscribers named above will be sent by the first mail following delivery of the books, March 21st, meanwhile their cheques will be returned according to promise. We greatly appreciate the promptness of the four winners of free copies.

In addition to the above the office has received about 125 orders to date (Wednesday, March 6th).

ORDER FORM FOR DR. SHIELDS' NEW BOOK

THE GOSPEL WITNESS,
130 Gerrard St. East,
Toronto, Ont.

Please find enclosed ^{cheque} _{money order} for one dollar and a half for which please send me one copy of "Other Little Ships", as soon as launched. I understand by GOSPEL WITNESS advertisement of February 28th that should my order qualify for a free copy my money enclosed will be returned.

Name

Address