

The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF EVANGELICAL PRINCIPLES
AND IN DEFENCE 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
Editor S.S. Lesson: WILLIAM J. JONES

"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. 15, No. 30

TORONTO, DECEMBER 3, 1936

Whole Number 759

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

WHY THE SO CALLED "SACRIFICE OF THE MASS" IS UNNECESSARY

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, November 29th, 1936

(Stenographically Reported)

Broadcast over Station CKOC—1120 Kilocycles

"For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.
"Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us: for after that he had said before,
"This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord,
I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them;
"And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more.
"Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin."
—Hebrews 10:14-18.

It is commonly believed that there is another life than this. Belief in the immortality of the soul, in the continuity of existence, in a life beyond the grave, is instinctive to the human soul. That, as I have pointed out to you on several occasions, is not distinctively a Christian doctrine. Belief in the soul's immortality, of another life beyond, seems to be common to all mankind. Religion—all religions—are based upon that assumption.

It is therefore of supreme importance to every one of us that we should know upon what terms we may pass from this life into the next, with the assurance of the enjoyment of everlasting felicity hereafter. A man may well afford to lose a fortune if he has one, his health, or even his life; but he cannot afford to lose his soul. "What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" This life, at the longest, is brief, and is but a preparation for a life that is yet to be revealed.

What, then, are the terms of entrance upon another life? Most of the world's business in our day seems to be done by credit, with an initial payment, and the balance in instalments. That credit and instalment-plan seems to have invaded the realm of religion—or perhaps it was borrowed from there. In the thought of many, salvation consists in some engagement of the soul to set its face Godward and heavenward, with an understanding that thereafter, by instalments, certain good works shall be performed, which, in the aggregate, it is hoped may store up merit sufficient to obtain salvation.

Those good works may take various forms. I do not mean to say that salvation is actually formulated in such terms as I have suggested, but some such principle is implied in many modern forms of religion which bear the Christian name. There is much talk of salvation by character. A man must be honest, faithful, truthful, and righteous, in all his dealings with his fellow-man. All that is true and right so far as it goes. But because of the shortness of human sight, and man's inability to penetrate beneath the surface of things, it has to do only with an external morality; for none but God can know the human heart.

Sometimes such good works bear a religious form. Men go to church, and assume that some merit is involved in assembling with those who gather for the worship of God. They say prayers, they observe religious ceremonies, they give alms to the poor, they attend mass, and again and again professedly offer the sacrifice of the cross for an atonement of the soul—on the assumption that salvation cannot be received, possessed here and now, and that one may not be assured that he is saved forever, even as one cannot be said to own his house, or a radio, or anything else, when he has paid only a part of the price of it. It is not until the last payment has been made that the soul can be said to be really saved.

Without intending offence to anyone, I must affirm that that conception of salvation is wholly human, and has its origin in the carnal mind. There is nothing in the Word of God to support that theory. On the con-

trary, the Scripture teaches that there is no instalment plan possible in the matter of the soul's salvation; that the full price of redemption must be paid before redemption can be effected. I propose to try to open this text in a simple way this evening, to show you that that price has been paid, and that therefore these various works of righteousness which men attempt to do in the hope of meriting eternal life are as unnecessary as they are futile.

I.

My text declares that **THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST WAS ADEQUATE FOR THE PERFECTING FOREVER OF "THEM THAT ARE SANCTIFIED"**, that one price has been paid: "By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." That is the significance of the cross, the death of God's only begotten Son: the price paid by God Himself; a price, if I may without irreverence say, which required all the resources of Deity, which put under tribute all the powers of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. And in the payment of that inestimable price of redemption, the wealth, not of the world, or of many worlds, but of the universe at large, was outpoured. When Jesus Christ cried on the cross, "It is finished", He meant that the price was wholly paid. It was not the first instalment: the complete price, to the last farthing of a sinful world's indebtedness, was there counted down for the liquidation of the world's debt: "By one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified."

I would remind you that by *the death of Christ provision was made for far more than*—I had almost said, *than the mere forgiveness of sin*: well, let me say it. Great as that is, impossible as it is for a just God to forgive sin without the payment of the law's penalty, yet it is but part of, and the beginning of, the whole scheme of redemption; for thereafter those who are thus redeemed are to be "perfected". They have become babes: they are thereafter to "grow up into Christ in all things", and "in the exceeding great and precious promises", of which John three and sixteen is but one, He has given to us "all things that pertain unto life and godliness". There is a deposit made to the credit of the believing soul which not only provides for the forgiveness of his sins, but guarantees the soul's education and continual enlargement until it is perfected in the divine presence; and provides also for his everlasting enjoyment of all the felicities of his heavenly home of which you sang a few moments ago. Everything was included in that one offering; the price paid by the Lord Jesus was of His own design "to perfect for ever them that are sanctified".

Please remember that *Christ did not die to deliver us only from sin's penalty, but actually from sin's power*. "Unto you first", saith Luke, in the Acts, "God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." It was said of the Incarnate God before His advent to the world, "Thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins."

The coming of Jesus Christ into the world was designed to destroy the works of the devil, to undo all the wreck and ruin effected by man's sin, and to restore man to the image and likeness of God, and thus effect the fulfilment of the divine purpose when in the first creation He said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Hence that one offering "hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." The one payment, paid by

the Son of God Himself, was adequate to make complete atonement for our sins.

II.

In the second place, **THE ADEQUACY OF THAT ATONEMENT, THE FULNESS OF THE PRICE, IS DIVINELY ATTESTED**, for my text says, "Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us."

In this important matter, *nothing less than the authority of God Himself should suffice us*. Human opinion has no value in this court. Human reason is not qualified to practice at this bar. God is the Judge, and His word must be the supreme authority. To Him the debt is owed: by Him the obligation must be cancelled. He only must be satisfied when the price is paid.

We read this evening that Christ "through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God". The Holy Spirit was the Heavenly Fire by which that sin-offering was consumed, and by which it became acceptable to a holy God. The Holy Ghost witnesses to the perfection of Christ's sacrifice, to its absolute sufficiency for the cancellation of the debt of every guilty sinner who believes.

The Holy Ghost witnesses *in the Word*. There are many promises throughout the New Testament. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life", is but one of them. In the chapter Mr. Brown read is this promise: "Once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Time would fail me to quote the words of the Holy Ghost which assure us beyond all peradventure that God asks nothing more of any soul than that it should be cleansed in the precious blood of His Son.

But not only by His word, *but by His works, the Holy Ghost witnesses to the adequacy of this Sacrifice*. When the people marvelled on the day of Pentecost at the spiritual phenomenon they witnessed in the disciples, as "there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance", Peter's explanation of it was that the sacrifice of Christ had been accepted, that He had returned to the Father's right hand: "Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear." The power of the Holy Ghost had never been at the command of faith, had never been available in its fulness for sinful men, had not the price of our redemption been paid at the place called Calvary. We read that in the days of His flesh, "the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified". The Old Testament saints were blessed with the ministry of the Holy Ghost, but His ministry to them, even as their forgiveness of sins, was possible only on the ground of the promise of the eternal covenant that in "due time" the one adequate offering would be made; and the promise made by the Son to the Father was accepted as an actual performance. When our Lord had returned to the Father, and the completeness of His sacrifice had been divinely certified by His session at the right hand of God, then the Holy Ghost came to begin His work of regeneration in the souls of men.

The very character of salvation proves the payment of the price. We are not merely to be assisted by the Holy Spirit laboriously to attain to a certain ideal, but here it is said that *He gives us a new nature*. He writes the

law of God, not objectively before us, but subjectively upon the fleshly table of the heart. He gives us a new nature, makes us partakers of the divine nature.

That transaction is set forth by many figures: we are "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever". "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." The Holy Ghost witnesses to His own divine satisfaction in the acceptance of the Sacrifice, and *by coming to accomplish in the souls of men that which is designed in the Sacrifice of the cross*, namely, that they may be purified, sanctified, separated wholly unto God, "a peculiar people, zealous of good works". Thus the Holy Spirit witnesses by changing our hearts, and making us new creatures in Jesus Christ.

We have a new plan now to improve some of the houses in the slums of the city, a "housing scheme". I understand the Government undertakes, through the municipalities, to lend fifty dollars a room. Thus on a house of six rooms one might secure a loan of three hundred dollars to renovate and repair a house, to make it reasonably habitable. I have seen a good many houses that would require more than three hundred dollars to make them fit to live in. But even then, it is only a loan, and has to be repaid over a period of years at five per cent. I have no doubt it is a good scheme. It is limited, of course, because of human limitations: but it is better than nothing.

But this human nature of ours is a poor tenement, spoiled and all but completely destroyed by sin, certainly so corrupted that it is beyond human power to renovate it, and make it a place in which the Spirit of God can dwell. What we need is not the old house painted and papered: we need an entirely new house; we need to be made "new creatures".

But who can afford to pay the price of that new creation? Where is the power that can effect, not merely an outward transformation of character, but an essential change of nature, making a man new at the very core of his being? You will readily recognize that there is no power than can effect such a change as that but the power of God Himself.

But upon what terms will God the Holy Ghost obliterate the slums of human existence, and create palaces fit for the King of glory to inhabit? Upon what terms? Not on an instalment plan. Nor upon any plan of lending us a little help to do it. If that which is required to effect such a change were lent to us, we should never finish paying through all eternity. Our Lord Himself paid the price to render satisfaction for the complete obliteration, the ultimate destruction, of the "old man", for the putting off of the old man, and the putting on of the new.

By virtue of that payment, the Holy Ghost comes to such as believe, and changes our natures, writing the law of God within our hearts, and making us new creatures in Christ Jesus. That cannot be done by celebrating Mass once a week, by any amount of praying, by all your alms-giving, or by any works of righteousness which you may do. It is a divine work that requires the creative power of Him Who made the heavens and the earth. And that creative power can be exercised in our behalf only on the ground of the payment of that infinite price.

When that is done, *it is promised—and to this the Holy Ghost witnesseth—"Their sins and iniquities will I re-*

member no more." They are blotted out for ever. It is not like your set of books with a debit account on one side, and a credit account on the other, the one set over against the other. Although your books may be balanced, and all accounts marked, "Paid", it is possible to turn back to the record and discover that at a certain time you owed a certain bill which was afterward paid. Not thus does our gracious God keep His books; for when the infinite merit of the sacrifice of Christ is reckoned to our account, He absolutely blots out from His book every record of our sin.

And not only so: He does what only God could do. While He writes His law in our hearts, *He blots out from His own mind, from the memory of Deity, all the sins which we have ever committed*, expunges them; so that the blood of Christ not only cleanses us, but it blots out the record of our sin. Thus we have standing before God as though we had never sinned at all: "Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." What a miracle! There are things that some of you would like to forget. Is there a man here who would not like to forget some things? I may safely assume that there is not a man or woman here who has not a page or paragraph in his or her life that such an one would not fain blot from memory, and bury in everlasting oblivion. Who of us does not wish for the power to live over the day we blackened, that that which is recorded might never be written? "But it is there", says some man, "how shall I escape from my record?"

There is only one way, and that is by having our record blotted out by the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. That is what grace does:

"In Christ, the sons of Adam boast
More blessings than their father lost."

Adam was innocent, not righteous, until the temptation came; then he fell. But we are made in Christ more than innocent: indeed a sinner could never become innocent, but the record of our sin is blotted out, and we are justified before God by faith, from which it was impossible for anyone to be justified by the law of Moses, or by the doing of his own works of righteousness.

III.

ANY ATTEMPT TO SUPPLEMENT THE DIVINE SACRIFICE IS UTTERLY UNNECESSARY: "Where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin." If the debt has been paid, if the Sacrifice has been accepted, if the record has been blotted out, why do you want to present an offering for sin? You do not pay your electric light bill twice: most people have all they can do to pay it once. You do not pay any of your bills twice if you know it. Why will you try to offer to God something toward the payment of an account that has already been settled? God has paid it because it was impossible for us to do so. "There is no more offering for sin", because it is entirely beyond human power to make such an offering. Therefore did Jesus Christ come.

We honour God by refusing even to make the attempt. When you offer your good deeds, and set them over against the righteousness of Christ, you insult God by offering your poor defaced penny as an addition to the payment of a debt which could be met only by the outpouring of the blood of Incarnate Deity. Do not suppose God is honoured or pleased by any effort at self-justification which anyone could make. By doing so, we imply the inadequacy of the divine Sacrifice, and actually

presume to say that we are capable of doing that which only the Son of God can do. Why make the attempt? Why bring your poor taper to add to the light of the sun? When the sun comes up, all lesser lights go out. Men have never yet devised a light that could compete with the sun. Since Jesus Christ appeared as the great sacrifice, all human effort has paled into absolute nothingness in comparison.

He died—why should I try to add to the value of His sacrifice? *They honour God most who accept what He has done in their behalf*, who come in humble penitence and simple faith, saying, "I cannot understand it. I never could deserve it. But I recognize the truth of it. I acknowledge my everlasting indebtedness. I accept salvation as the free gift of Thy sovereign grace, and by the power of the Holy Spirit I will henceforth yield myself to Thee as one who is alive from the dead, and my members as instruments of righteousness unto God."

Trust Him this evening. I beg of you to cease from all efforts at self-saving, and accept this full and free and perfected salvation. Our one and only Great High Priest has entered into heaven, having obtained eternal redemption for us.

I wish I had time to lead you through the argument of the chapter, but read it for yourselves. Having laid down this salvation, the writer says, "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having an high priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith." As though he would exhort his soul and ours, saying, "Come now, enter into the presence of God in spite of all opposition. If any spiritual tempter stands in the way, brush him aside. If priest or preacher should interpose between the soul and God, have none of it. Come with boldness into the holiest of all through the blood of the Lord Jesus, by this new and living way which He has consecrated forevermore. Blessed be God, the way is open into His presence. If we trust Him, up the shining pathway of the skies will He escort us in due time, and bring us through the gates into the city, there everlastingly to enjoy the glory of Jerusalem the golden.

SHOULD PROTESTANTS "THANK GOD" FOR THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH?

An Address by Dr. T. T. Shields

Delivered in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto,
Thursday Evening, November 26th, 1936

(Stenographically Reported)

The address of the evening is but one of several addresses which I hope to give on Thursday evenings throughout the Winter. They may not follow consecutively, as it may be necessary to turn aside from time to time for the consideration of other subjects; yet they will all be related. I propose at an early date to speak on the claims of the Papacy in the light of Holy Scripture; then, to give a further address on the claims of the Papacy in the light of history. I shall not announce all the subjects now: that will be enough for the present.

I was half-minded to read to you this evening a communication which I have sent to certain persons to-day, but upon further consideration I think I will say nothing

about it except to announce that it will appear in *The Evening Telegram* of to-morrow. It is a communication that I believe will interest most of you.

I am to speak this evening on the subject of Roman Catholicism; that we may determine whether indeed it has any kinship with Christianity, whether it is Christianity diluted, or Christianity denied; whether there be any reason for Christians to "thank God" for it; or whether rather they should be engaged in seeking divine help that they may courageously combat it.

It is not uncommon to speak somewhat facetiously of what, colloquially, is called the "germ theory". Notwithstanding, I think it must be admitted that that theory is largely based in demonstrated fact. The bacilli of many diseases have been isolated; and the treatment of the diseases invariably is based upon that identification.

It will be agreed further, I think, that it is impossible absolutely to escape contact with these bacilli, some of which are malignant in the extreme. Some of them we breathe; some, we may take into our systems in our food, or in our drink, as is said to be the case with the typhoid germ. Others may affect us through contact with an infected person. But doctors tell us that germs of deadly potentialities are all roundabout us, and that no isolation hospital could be built large enough to insure the complete isolation of every body from them.

Certain persons become their victims, but those who succumb to their attack are those who afford the germs certain physical hospitality. There must in such cases be something in the system which forms a culture-bed for their rapid multiplication. The difference between the person who is prostrated by the attack of one of these diseases, and the person who still, in the enjoyment of robust health, goes about his work, is not determined by their respective circumstances, nor always by the degree to which one has been exposed and the other has been exempt; but rather to an internal condition. The physical frame of the healthy man offers positive resistance; in other words, it fights. The body that is responsive, or that is even neutral, almost certainly falls a prey to the disease. Immunity to such diseases, therefore, is due to some positive, inherent, antagonism toward them.

That simple physical fact provides an analogy toward conditions which obtain in the realms of the mind and of the spirit. There are people who boast of their "open-mindedness". They have no lock on any door of their mental establishment—and sometimes they advertise the fact as though it were an evidence of their mental superiority.

In my own house, I never retire until I have assured myself that all the doors are locked. They have hinges, and can be opened to receive those whom I want to receive; but my doors are locked against the professional tramp and the would-be burglar.

There are people who combine this so-called "open-mindedness" with religion. Their doors are open to any and every religious vagrant that may pass their way. They have no conviction of truth; which means that they have no personal possession of truth. And I suppose, where the house is empty, it is not specially necessary that the doors should be locked. Thus, a religion of *laissez faire*, of drift, of summer-sauntering, of don't care, will find it easy to be tolerant of anything—perhaps on the ground that anything may be reckoned to be better than nothing.

Thus in recent years the popular religion has been the religion of the open mind, of the unlocked door. The Bible has been set aside, and any kind of authority in religion has been at a discount. When once that is allowed, one man's opinion is just as good as another. Therefore, as none of us can be sure, we can well afford to be tolerant.

I most boldly assert that so far as I am concerned religiously, I lock my doors. I believe, when one has bought the truth, he should neither sell it, nor surrender it; and I believe the Lord Jesus made no vain promise when He said, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

I deeply regretted reading in a daily paper the report of an address delivered by my friend, Rev. W. A. Cameron, of Yorkminster Baptist Church. Mr. Cameron and I have very little in common religiously—and we both know it; but, agreeing to disagree, we are mutually friendly. The heading of the report was, "Thank God for Roman Church, Asserts Baptist in Sermon". The first paragraph read:

"We may thank God for the Roman Catholic Church. There are certain doctrinal beliefs that we as Protestants cannot accept, but we may agree that it is a mighty force in human affairs and renders a vast service for good."

Some might assume from the headline that Mr. Cameron agrees very generally with Roman Catholicism, but a careful reading of the article will show that this is not true. There are several things Mr. Cameron specified as things which he could never accept. I desire to be wholly fair in my discussion, and must therefore read to you what he said. Mr. Cameron said:

"Some of its doctrinal beliefs I am opposed to—its belief in the infallibility of the Pope, in the power of priestly absolution from sin, and in the idea of the actual sacrifice of Christ in the service of the mass, also its conception of purgatory. It would be impossible for us to accept these.

"Personally I am opposed to every sort of encroachment by ecclesiastical authorities, either Roman Catholic or Protestant, on civil authority. Exercise of that civil authority in a democracy like ours belongs to all people alike. I am opposed to any interference by church authorities with the work of public education."

But, as Mr. Cameron would differ from Roman Catholicism, I would take issue with Mr. Cameron on some other matters.

With very much that Mr. Cameron says, I find myself in agreement. But I cannot, as Mr. Cameron says, agree that the Roman Catholic Church "is a mighty force in human affairs and renders a vast service for good". That "it is a mighty force in human affairs", no one will deny; but that it "renders a vast service for good", finds no corroboration in history, observation, or experience. Again, Mr. Cameron speaks of certain practices, saying:

"We need not be so blind as to fail to recognize the immense spiritual value it may have in service rendered to the Kingdom of God."

While Mr. Cameron did not go so far in approving of the Roman Catholic Church as the headlines in the report would indicate, it must be observed that in spite of all these reservations, Mr. Cameron did say:

"We may thank God for the Roman Catholic Church."

He may. I cannot! I believe God has nothing to do with it. There may be individual Roman Catholics—doubtless there are—who find their way through all its maze of superstition and idolatry, to the Lord Himself.

I have met individual Roman Catholics who, in spite of and not because of their Roman Catholicism, were devout Christians. I am not speaking of Roman Catholics, but of Roman Catholicism, of the Roman Catholic Church and its teaching. I am myself thoroughly convinced that it is utterly pagan; essentially anti-Christian; that it is the enemy of the home, the church, and the state; and that it is at this hour, in the counsels of the nations, and its machinations among the people, the greatest of all menaces to the peace of the world.

Mr. Cameron says of the Roman Catholic Church:

"I am grateful to God for the immense moral and spiritual influence of that great church, and I would stand with it against the atheism that would dethrone God and the materialism which would degrade man."

It is my conviction that such spiritual influence as the Roman Catholic Church has exercised has been akin to that of the rulers of the darkness of this world, and spiritual wickedness in high places. It has, through the centuries, on the whole, probably done more to make atheists than any other single institution. In saying that, again I speak of the influence of the Roman Church as a whole, and exempt many devout people who were Roman Catholics. And, so far from standing against materialism, Roman Catholicism is a synonym for the grossest materialism the world has ever known: the doctrine of the Mass, its central and distinctive sacrament, is so crassly materialistic as to be devoid of any affinity for things spiritual; while its horribly grotesque doctrine of purgatorial flames and tortures, would picture God, if He be anything like His alleged viceregent in Rome, as an insatiable materialistic Shylock of infinite proportions.

That, in brief, is my thesis, which I shall now endeavour to prove by argument. I think you will bear me witness that I have endeavoured to be fair to Mr. Cameron, and to recognize that he does not, without many important reservations, endorse the Roman Catholic Church. But my contention is that he concedes too much when he says it has exercised an influence for good, that the world is indebted to it, and that anyone should "thank God" for the Roman Catholic Church. From that position I dissent entirely.

Thus I have laid a foundation. I shall have a few strong things to say before I finish. If part of my address seems prosy, you may be sure it will prove interesting enough later.

I.

I am opposed to the Roman Catholic Church, first, ON RELIGIOUS GROUNDS—AND FOR SEVERAL REASONS.

First, that it exalts the authority of the Church and its head, the Pope, above the authority of divine revelation. It virtually takes the Bible out of the hands of the people. It constantly and consistently teaches that the Bible is of value only as it is interpreted by an infallible Church; and that, for anyone to read the Bible for himself, to receive it as God's word, to open his heart to its teaching, is an error that is not to be tolerated. I would remind you that when Luther—I had almost said, originated or initiated the Reformation—that would scarcely be true historically: it is always difficult in such movements to establish their real origin. Luther did, however, become the leader of the Reformation, and was given strength of God to shake Europe—I say, I would remind you that Luther's emancipation from the thraldom of Rome, and the Reformation which followed upon that emancipation, were due to his recognition of the

authority of the Word of God, and to his acceptance of that authority as being superior to that of the Church and of the Pope. But for that, there could have been no Reformation; and the Reformed Religion from then until now, in theory at least, has ever recognized the supremacy of Holy Scripture.

That has been, historically, the distinguishing difference between Romanism and Protestantism. Romanists bow to the authority of the Church, and its head; the will of that Church being registered through its ministers. Whereas Protestants have submitted rather to the authority of Holy Scripture. I cannot "thank God" for any man, or any institution, that would teach men that there is a higher authority in the world than the Word of the living God. To me, that is the ultimate court of appeal, the supreme court of the universe. And the authority of the written Word is wrapped up with the authority of the Word Incarnate, for the Bible bears witness to the Lord Jesus, even as He bears witness to the Bible. You cannot have One without the Other.

In this place, we stand for the authority of the Book, and for the lordship of Jesus Christ; and I cannot "thank God" for any institution which would destroy that authority, and substitute itself for that word by claiming to be God's sole and exclusive representative and medium of communication in this earthly sphere.

The Roman Catholic Church arrogates to itself, and to its priests, absolute authority over the souls of men. The priest is the representative of the Church, and the voice of the priest is said not only to be the voice of the Church, but the authoritative voice of God Himself. The institution of the confessional seems to have been devised by the enemy of the souls of men, in order that the innermost secrets of the human heart should be divulged, and committed to the custody of a man who claims to be possessed of the absolute power of forgiving sins, or withholding forgiveness.

Think of what that means. It puts a premium on every kind of iniquity which hell itself can invent, and commits the one who has been guilty of it to the caprice of a man who claims to be to that person God's sole representative upon earth. Surely anyone who has not been brought up amid the darkness and tyranny of Rome itself, must recognize that that combination of the confessional and the confessor, with power to send a soul to heaven or to hell, is one of the cleverest of all the devil's devices. Do not say God instituted that. It is a libel upon God. The whole Romish system has the mark of the prince of darkness upon it, and ought never to be viewed charitably, or even tolerantly, by men and women whose minds have been enlightened by the word of God.

It thus interposes the Church and its ministers between God and the individual soul. The Church shuts the door into the presence of God. The Church claims to have the power to open that door, and dares to arrogate to itself the right to say whether a poor sinner shall come directly to God or not.

"There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." I wish you could see the value of that single text. I preached somewhere a few years ago, I forget where, and a man came forward at the close of the service, to shake hands. A mutual friend introduced him by saying, "This man is a deacon of our church. He says he was converted through your ministry." "That is interesting", I said, "how did it happen." "I met you only once", he said, "on which occasion I told you I was a Roman Catholic; to which you replied

by quoting a text: 'There is . . . one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.' That was all you said. I went away—and thought, and thought, and thought, until the Church, its ministers, its Pope, and all its sacramentarian system, were dissolved and removed as barriers out of my way; and through Christ I came to God, and found forgiveness for my sins."

There is nothing in common with the gospel in the Roman Catholic system at that point. *It nullifies the whole scheme of redemption by its doctrine of the Mass.* The teaching of Scripture is that, "Once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." "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 on the right hand of God." "Once in the end of the world"! Once He died! And by that all-sufficient death, and by the value of His precious blood, He is able absolutely and forever to blot out the vilest sin, to wash us and make us whiter than snow.

But Roman Catholicism teaches us that it is never finished, that it never can be finished, and that every time the sacrifice of the Mass is offered, a bloodless sacrifice is offered again to an offended God; and we are told there is no salvation but through the Mass. I say, it is a damnable heresy; something that was invented in the pit; it has no divine inspiration, no divine sanction, no scriptural warrant. There is nothing that ever issued from the mind of the father of lies that was farther from the truth of God than the doctrine of the Mass. Do not tell me we should "thank God" for the Roman Catholic Church. It is the very antithesis of the religion of Christ.

You will readily see that *whereas the gospel of Jesus Christ is a gospel of grace, Roman Catholicism offers one wholly wrought by works.* In infinite mercy God has found a way whereby "mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other"; has provided a way whereby God can be just, and yet "the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus", and therefore offers salvation as the free gift of His sovereign grace. "The gift of God is eternal life." It is not to be sold, it is not to be earned by works of righteousness a sinful man may do: it is the free gift of God Himself. Yet the Roman Catholic Church interposes its whole sacramentarian system, and conditions the salvation of the soul upon obedience to it. It makes itself the middle man, and says to all the world, "There is no salvation outside the Roman Catholic Church."

Would you say I am uncharitable? Let me tell you, the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church in respect to every one of you is that you are a heretic, that you ought to be extirpated, that you ought to be blotted out of existence. It shows no charity to us. There is nothing godly about it. That were no justification for our being uncharitable toward individuals; but it were a heinous sin surely to be even tolerant of a system which so dishonours God, and destroys the souls of men. I cannot, while hating the devil and all his works.

The Roman Church *adds to its people's enslavement by its doctrine of purgatory.* I need not labour that; everyone who is religiously intelligent knows that. But did you know that, according to the teaching of Rome, it is possible for a soul to be in purgatory as long as a hundred million years? That is a long sentence! It seems absurd to us, but it is terribly serious. It is not

a thing to laugh at. If we had been brought up in that darkness, and had lost a child, or a wife, or a husband, and had been persuaded to believe that the soul of that departed loved one is in purgatorial fires, and that it could be liberated by the payment of money for the saying of masses, is there anything in the world we would not do to bring a soul out of purgatory? I have said it before from this platform, that Roman Catholicism is the biggest racket the world has ever known, and the Pope is the champion racketeer of all racketeers. Al Capone? He is a mere nobody in comparison! He has not learned the business at all! If you doubt it, listen to this extract from *The Bible Standard*, of New Zealand:

"I have before me a page from *The Universe* of October 25th, 1935. I will quote from two advertisements. One, headed 'Liverpool Metropolitan Cathedral of Christ the King', asks readers to have the names of themselves and their friends, living or dead, inscribed at five shillings a name in the books of the 'clients of Mary'. The reward is as follows: a share in a weekly Mass in perpetuity, a share in Mass on the principal feasts of our Lady this year, a share in a Mass each day in June this year for the intentions of subscribers. Whether the share in June Masses is retroactive I do not know. Lower down I read, 'Masses, Masses, Masses, until the Last Day. If you want to make sure of Participation in Countless Masses for your soul during life and after death, here is your Golden opportunity. The Members and Participants in the Seraphic Mass Association share in 187,000 Holy Masses during the course of the year. 187,000 Masses annually work out at the rate of about 516 a day, 3,600 a week, or 15,580 a month. . . Enrol now for 2/- per annum or £1 for all time. The dead can be made to participate in the same Masses: 2/- per annum, or 8/- for all time.' Were I a Scot, I should leave 8/- in my will for this purpose, and save 12/- on the deal!

"But this is no joking matter. I wonder what the more intelligent and spiritually minded Romans really feel about it? These advertisements appear in England not in the wilds of Quebec or Mexico. Who will say there is no Roman menace? The expenditure of money upon these highly comprehensive policies may perhaps provoke some feelings of anxious satisfaction, but it will be something very different from the joy of salvation or from the holy cheerfulness of those who in the twelfth century were known as *joculatores Dei*, the Merry Men of God."

Can anyone without the pale of the Roman Catholic Church come to any other conclusion than that that is a fraud, a piece of religious humbug, sheer religious racketeering? Make men pay while they live, and either chase them through purgatory—or hold them there after they are dead! Surely I am right in saying that Roman Catholicism nullifies the Atonement, sets at naught every distinctive principle of the gospel of grace, makes merchandise of the souls of men, and, so far from extending the kingdom of God, is one of the chief agents in establishing a kingdom of darkness.

Religiously, is Rome as bad as that to-day? I had in my office last week a gentleman who has spent his life in South America since nineteen hundred and one, just now in his thirty-fifth year as a missionary. He told me about the hospital he has there, as I happened to know the surgeon-in-chief of that hospital. He told me how and why that hospital was begun. He said, "I had no intention of doing hospital work in South America: I went solely to evangelize the people." This man has done much preaching in all the South American Republics, to assemblies that sometimes reached two or three thousand people. Two years ago he did much the same work in Spain. He told me of holding such an evangelistic service in Barcelona.

Referring to the hospital, he said it came about in this way. There was a lovely young girl of seventeen years who received Christ, and received Him fully; and was out-and-out for the Lord. She was taken ill with appendicitis, and the only hospital to which she could be sent was one in which the nurses were nuns. She went to that hospital. The sister endeavoured, by every means in her power, to persuade her to return to "mother church". Please do not compare a hospital in South America, where Roman Catholicism is in the ascendancy, with any Roman Catholic hospital in this city. Do not forget that the Roman Catholic religion is like some people: it can be on its best behaviour sometimes, and under some circumstances; and be entirely different when it has all its own way. But really to know Romanism you must study it in its native sphere, and where there is nothing to restrain it.

This girl gave her testimony, told the "sister" how the Lord Jesus had saved her, of the joy and peace she had in her soul; and that there was not the remotest possibility of her ever returning to the Church of Rome. The sister was very angry. Again and again she approached her, but always with the same result—which never failed to make the "sister" angry.

Then came the operation. It was discovered that it was rather late, that the appendix had burst. The operation was successful, however, and by the insertion of drainage tubes, the girl was soon on the way to recovery. The "sister" at this point promised to have her out of the hospital in a certain time if she would recant and return to "mother church"—naming as the time the time such cases usually required for convalescence. But she was obdurate. She believed in Christ and would not recant. My friend said, "Our workers visited her regularly as soon as she was able to be seen, and reported the joy she had in the Lord, and how thankful she was that she was getting well. One day, after having seen her the day before, the worker called and found the cot had been wheeled into the corner of the ward, and was informed by the "sister" that the patient was dead. When the worker remarked that she had been doing splendidly the day before, the "sister" but answered, 'Well, she is dead to-day.'"

At this juncture the native doctor came in on his rounds through the ward, and enquired for the young girl. When informed that she was dead, he said, "That is impossible. I saw her but a couple of hours ago; she was all right then." He stepped behind the curtain, and, in sight of the lady-worker, raised the sheet over the body to examine the wound—only to discover that that "sister" had withdrawn the tubes and sewn up the wound, enclosing the poison—and in two hours she was dead. The native doctor exclaimed to the Roman Catholic "sister", "You murdered that girl!"—and so she did.

That is Roman Catholicism. The principle underlying that "sister's" action is taught in every school; it is fundamental to its whole philosophy, that if you do not bow to Rome, you will be damned—and the sooner the better. That is not an exaggeration—witness the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the fires of Smithfield and all the martyr fires of the world. I too agree with Rome only thus far, I acknowledge that she never changes!

II.

I am opposed to the Roman Catholic Church and find it impossible ever to "thank God" for her FOR THE REASON THAT SHE IS A POLITICAL INSTITUTION, more

political than she is religious. It is an old story to many of us, yet I must remind you of it, that *it is a cardinal doctrine of the Church of Rome that the Pope is God's vicegerent, His representative on earth; that he is a temporal king.* He wears three crowns, to indicate his sovereignty over the abyss, over the earth, and in heaven. And furthermore, the Church of Rome claims, and teaches, that there is no legitimate ruler or government on earth save as he or it has derived authority from the Pope of Rome. Every king, every president, is an usurper; and has no legal right to exercise authority unless he has received his authority from the only person who can speak for God upon earth, the Pope of Rome. Therefore any oath of allegiance made by a real Romanist to any government is never more than lip service, an oath from which he may be absolved since no non-Roman Catholic Government can legitimately require it.

I repeat at this point what I have said before: no truly devout Roman Catholic can possibly be a loyal subject of any non-Catholic government on earth. He is a traitor at heart, he is so taught; and is excused for rebellion against any authority save that which the Pope confers. I say, the Pope by his absurd pretensions proves himself to be the enemy of every non-Catholic state, and therefore Roman Catholicism in any state is the enemy of that state. Preach tolerance if you will, I will have none of it. I object to Rome on Christian grounds; but if I were not a Christian, as a Canadian citizen, as a lover of British freedom, I should abhor Roman Catholicism as the most destructive force in any state on earth. By its very nature it is bound to be so.

We shall yet discover that it is so in this country. I would remind you that forty-two per cent. of the population of Canada is Roman Catholic. If it were ninety-nine per cent. Protestant, the one per cent. Roman Catholic element could be sure of their liberties. But let me tell you that the moment Roman Catholicism gains the majority in this country, there will be no freedom. There is no religious freedom even now in many parts of Quebec. There is some in Montreal, for it is a large city with a large English-speaking, Protestant, element; and there are organs of publicity that can make things known. But even there the marriage law is flouted, and ecclesiastical law, even in the courts, is set above civil law.

I am opposed to the Roman Catholic Church *because it employs secular power for the propagation of its doctrines.* I believe there is only one way the gospel of the grace of God should be propagated; and that is by His redeemed people. I can find nothing in the New Testament to warrant our going to the state for aid. Wherever any branch of the church has sought state aid, it has always wrought mischief. When it does so, it trespasses upon the liberty of the individual soul. The state, in the last analysis, must represent force of some sort, and there should be no principle or power of compulsion in religion.

We have a case before us just now. I shall not discuss the Separate School question this evening: I will do so to-morrow evening when speaking in St. Clement's Parish House. I will take you into my confidence thus far: I expect to be in East Hastings three nights next week—but I will not tell you whom I have invited to come on the same platform with me, and debate the question! Read *The Evening Telegram!* The Separate School issue is only a symptom, an illustration of what the Roman Catholic Church is always doing. How many here carry insurance on your motor-car, on your life, or your property? There is not a man or woman in this Province who is

paying a premium to an insurance company who is not being compelled by the recent Hepburn Separate School legislation, indirectly, to support Separate Schools. You do not need to own gold mine stocks, or be a shareholder in the Bell Telephone Co. or C.P.R.—every corporation must pay. The legislation is a piece of downright robbery. The Roman Catholic Church is a robber; it always has been. The Hepburn measure is a carefully planned raid upon Protestant pockets and bank-books, and upon the treasury of our Public Schools.

Rome employs force to stamp out everybody who does not agree with it so far as it is able to do so. It corrupts all governments. I will not enlarge upon that this evening. But I must say that so far as it is possible, it commandeers every organ of publicity. From this platform not so very long ago I took *The Toronto Globe* to task. I told them that they were going to fall between two stools. I challenged *The Globe* to deny that it had at that time on its editorial staff a Roman Catholic—which would partly account for its somewhat lukewarm attitude toward the Separate School issue. It did not very heartily endorse it. In fact, in several editorials it mildly opposed it. I saw a cartoon in *The Evening Telegram* about that time on the beer question, which represented the then Editor of *The Globe* as being given a glass of beer by Premier Hepburn. The Editor was making a wry face about it, saying, "I would not take it from anyone but you, Mitch." "How are the mighty fallen in the midst of the battle! . . . how are the mighty fallen, and the weapons of war perished!" The poor *Globe* is no more! But we have another one. We have an "independent" paper! Do not laugh: try to be sober. We have a gloriously "independent" morning paper, *The Globe and Mail!* I believe what it says. I believe it is perhaps the most independent paper in Canada. They used to speak in England of men who had a little competence as being "independent"; which meant that they had enough money to keep them. I believe *The Globe and Mail* is absolutely independent of everybody but Senator Frank O'Connor, and Premier Mitchell F. Hepburn, and their ecclesiastical employers. If you want to read in future the Daily Roman Catholic Herald, read *The Globe and Mail.*

You say, "Why do you speak thus from a Christian pulpit?" Why should I not speak of it? I will go farther. The paper that supports the man who mocks at our courts of justice, that treats with disrespect the judiciary of this country, who ought rather, as Premier of the Province, to be the very fountain of law and order—the man, I say, who holds the Supreme Court of the Province up to contempt, is not fit to hold office in any British country. Because I believe the Bible, and because I hate Hepburn's beer-parlours, for the same reason I hate his Separate School measure; and while I have breath I intend to do my utmost to remove that scourge from Ontario.

The day may yet come when we shall feel the pinch of this. There is no doubt in my mind that the inspirer and supporter of the bloody revolution in Spain resides in Rome. Nor do I think there can be any reasonable doubt that the gold that financed the Ethiopian massacre came from the coffers of the Vatican. And all to give Mussolini prestige in Europe. Rome is pacific only so long as she is allowed to have her own way. The history of the past is red with the blood of her martyrs. Rome is Canada's greatest gangster. She is actually Canada's greatest robber: she has the will, had she the power, to

be the greatest murderer too. Do not be pessimistic, however, Rome has never regained the power she lost at the Reformation. There was a time when there was not a government in Europe that was not a vassal of the Pope of Rome. The Reformation broke that power; but always she returned to the attack, there has been a re-rudescence of her satanic power. Though here and there her power revives for a little while, on the whole, her power is waning. The mother of harlots is doomed.

We are witnessing a revival of Rome's power to-day—in Spain, in Italy, in Ethiopia; and, strangely enough, although Nazism seems to be at the poles from Rome, they are coalescing; Pilate and Herod are becoming friends; Pharisees and Sadducees are co-operating; and the democracies of the world may yet have to unite against the totalitarian, authoritarian principle of government represented by the Church of Rome.

I have not spoken on this subject to tickle your fancy, much less to say things that I might reasonably expect to be agreeable to your prejudices. I desire rather, so far as my little influence may effect it, that the people who come under my ministry may have their eyes open to the perils of the day that are about us on every hand.

May I ask you to pray earnestly for the meetings to be held next week. I know it is cynically said, "Elections are not won by prayer meetings." They could and would be if we could do nothing else. But God never places a premium upon indolence and inactivity. We are to do our utmost, but we are to remember too there is a God above us. I beg you to give this matter in East Hastings a place in your prayers. It is not merely a political battle. Should the Hepburn candidate win, Mr. Hepburn will insist that his Separate School legislation has been endorsed—and it will be but the beginning of further demands which will be made by the Hierarchy at a later time. We have the Book, and the Lord of the Book, and being saved by grace, the Pope and the Church of Rome to the contrary notwithstanding, "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."

I have exhorted you to prayer respecting what some would regard as exclusively a political matter. I don't so regard it. Therefore I send you away with this Scripture without comment—it will speak for itself: "And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God out of the angel's hand. And the angel took the censer, and filled it with fire of the altar, and cast it into the earth: and there were voices, and thunderings, and lightnings, and an earthquake."

Before we are dismissed with the benediction, we shall sing the Doxology and after that the National Anthem. Let us stand.

DR. SHIELDS' CHALLENGE TO THE PREMIER AND MINISTER OF EDUCATION

The communication to which reference is made in the above address, and which was sent both to Premier Hepburn, and Honourable L. J. Simpson, Minister of Education for the Province of Ontario, appears below, and is self-explanatory. Although delivered by special messenger a week ago to-day, no reply has been received

from either the Premier or the Minister of Education.

Dr. Shields is in East Hastings this week, speaking in connection with the by-election in that constituency, protesting against the injustice of the recent Separate School legislation, and against the beer-parlours. We are sorry we have no space in this week's issue to report these meetings. Doubtless our Ontario readers are following with keen interest the daily press—and we promise the Editor's own comments next week.

Following is the letter sent to Mr. Hepburn. Substituting Dr. Simpson's name for that of Mr. Hepburn, the same letter was sent to the Minister of Education:

November 26th, 1936.

"The Honourable M. F. Hepburn,
Premier of Ontario,
Queen's Park, Toronto.

"Dear Sir:

"I write you as a Canadian citizen, and an Ontario taxpayer and voter. I believe profoundly in civil and religious liberty, in the separation of church and state, and therefore that all religions should have equal rights under the law, and that special privileges should be granted to none.

"For these reasons, I feel that my own religious convictions are outraged by your recent Separate School legislation which diverts revenue from the treasury of our Public School System to the support of Roman Catholic Separate Schools; and especially because such diversion is effected in a way which compels non-Roman Catholic taxpayers to support a religious system of which their consciences do not approve.

"The by-election in East Hastings will afford the first opportunity any section of the electorate has had to express, by legal vote, its approval or disapproval of your Separate School legislation since it became law. Notwithstanding the attempt in East Hastings to divert the attention of the electors from your Separate School legislation to other issues, every intelligent person must know that if, by any means, the Government candidate should be elected on December 9th, other issues would thereafter be relegated to the background, and the Government would hail the election of its candidate as an endorsement of its Separate School legislation. And, in my opinion, the Government would be right in so doing.

"The result of the East Hastings election, I believe, will be viewed by the Ontario electorate in general as an expression of the electorate's attitude toward your Separate School legislation.

"As one who believes that that Legislation should be repealed, quite independently of all politics, I hope to see the Liberal candidate in East Hastings overwhelmingly defeated. As a citizen of Ontario, and having such convictions, I feel I ought to make what contribution I can toward this end. I therefore hereby challenge you to a public debate on your Separate School legislation, any evening next week from Tuesday to Friday, the debate to be held in any building in East Hastings that can be secured, and that may be agreed upon. The terms of the debate can be arranged between us at your convenience.

"I am sending a similar letter to the Honourable L. J. Simpson, Minister of Education, merely changing the order of your name and that of Dr. Simpson. I shall be glad to debate with each of you on separate occasions, or if you care to do so, I will meet you both on the same platform.

"I think it only fair to inform you that whether this challenge is accepted or not, arrangements are being made for me to visit East Hastings to speak on this subject in several places. Should you fail, either or both of you, to accept this challenge, I promise you to make the best possible use of your absence.

"I would respectfully remind you that the father of our Public School System was a clergyman, the Honourable Dr. Ryerson; and from reports of your discussions of the school question, which I have read in the press, I am strongly of the opinion that you and Dr. Simpson need some other minister to give you a little instruction on this subject.

"Copies of these letters are being handed to the press, and I am sending this letter by special messenger to your office in Queen's Park.

"Awaiting your reply, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) T. T. SHIELDS."

THE STORY OF THE PLOT THAT FAILED

The History of a Church's Struggle to Maintain an Evangelical Ministry in a Free Pulpit

By T. T. SHIELDS

CHAPTER V.

In the third chapter of this narrative we brought our story up to 1914, and last week we went back again to the Convention in Bloor Street in October, 1910, in order that we might relate the beginning of the denominational controversy when protest against Professor Matthews' teaching was made by Dr. Elmore Harris. We begin this week with the story of the war period.

While the main auditorium of Jarvis Street Church, as an ideal preaching place, has not been improved upon by any modern auditorium in Toronto, and while the large Lecture Hall and other rooms and vestries were commodious, we began to feel, even in 1914, the need of improvement in what they call in the United States, our "plant". After a good deal of discussion, plans were approved for the erection of a new building, to be known as the B. D. Thomas Hall. The plans were never satisfactory to me, but, having two architects of prominence on the Diaconate, it was very difficult to get past their ideas. I have long since had a building in my mind which I am hoping some day to see constructed. But a church cumbered with a Diaconate of twenty members, and twenty deaconesses, and a finance committee of over thirty members, is about as well equipped for efficient service as a snail would be to take first prize in a running-race at the Olympic games. Sometimes one has to be satisfied with a second, or a third—or even a tenth or twentieth, best, for the sake of agreement. And in a church where every little Tom, Dick, and Harry, who has absolutely no competence to form a judgment, not only claims the right to his opinion, but often insists upon some concession being made to it, it is difficult to accomplish all one desires.

In those days, notwithstanding all these committees, the Pastor had to do all the planning, and all the organizing—and then try to get people to understand how the work should be done. Thus the plans were made for raising the money for the new building. Every bit of advertising matter, and the preparation of the illustrated booklet, the Pastor had to do. It was very amusing to hear some young men tell about what "your committee" had desired, what "your committee" had planned, and what "your committee" proposed to do, when the said committee had made no contribution to the programme in hand.

However, the canvass was made, the money was subscribed, and work on the building was begun.

At the end of July I went for my holiday, and on the fourth of August, war was declared. Business was in a panic, and work on the new building stopped. The foundation/walls were not quite complete, but were nearly up to the ground level. But, returning home, things were set in operation so as to cover in the walls, to protect them until the work should be resumed.

What a time of fear and questioning that was! But of course that was in Canada: people were not afraid anywhere else! Here I may tell a story. One of the

Deacons of Jarvis Street, D. E. Thomson, K.C., LL.D., was in England during the summer of 1914, and was there when the war broke out. Dr. Thomson himself told me this amusing story. He was personally acquainted with Sir Max Aitken, now Lord Beaverbrook. Apparently he knew him well enough to call him, "Max". Dr. Thomson said that the evening of the day when war was declared or the day after, I am not sure, Sir Max came into the hotel where Dr. Thomson was staying. He had with him a bag of sovereigns! He was in such a panic he had gone to his bank and got what gold he could, or as much as he could conveniently carry; for he did not know what condition the war would bring about! That story may throw some light on the reliability of judgment of the great Lord Beaverbrook, the publisher, on international affairs. We tell the story for what it may be worth.

In the years following, more and more of Jarvis Street men enlisted. Indeed, when I returned to Toronto in the midst of my holiday I discovered that already some of our men had "joined up", and were away to Valcartier where the first Canadian contingent was assembled.

Like ministers everywhere throughout the Empire, I felt it a duty to support the Government in every possible way in the prosecution of the war. I have never regretted doing so, and in like circumstances I would do so again. Even from the pulpit, from time to time, I made appeals; and I recall one Sunday evening when five men who had come to church as civilians, went from the church to the Armories, enlisted, and went home in uniform. In all, nearly three hundred enlisted from Jarvis Street. To be exact, on our Honour Roll we have two hundred and ninety-eight names. Of these, forty-one did not return to us.

In 1917 a Union Government was formed, which included the leaders of both parties of all the Provinces of Canada except Quebec. Roman Catholic Quebec was against the Allies in the war. Many French-Canadians enlisted, including Roman Catholics; but the contribution in voluntary enlistments from the Province of Quebec was relatively small. In 1917 a conscription measure was passed. It was opposed by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and certain of his aides, including the present Premier of Canada. Sir Robert Borden dissolved Parliament, and appealed to the country for support of his Union Government on the conscription issue. I felt at the time it was no little honour to be included in the list of speakers selected by the Union Government, and it was my privilege during that election campaign to make a number of speeches in support of the Union Government's policy. The Union Government was returned, and conscription became effective.

I have always been proud of the fact that when conscription came into force, there was only one young man left in Jarvis Street Church who was eligible for military service; but I was chagrined that he managed to manipulate things in such a way as to secure ex-

emption for himself. He figured largely as one of the tools of McMaster University in 1921. Some irresponsible member, at one Annual Meeting, some years after the war, nominated this man for the Diaconate. One of the Deacons remarked to me at the time that he could never be elected, he was sure, because, by his conduct during the war, he had forfeited the respect of the whole church. I think the Deacon was right. I am practically certain that the Sanhedrin had no respect for Judas Iscariot—but they were not above making use of him as their tool. And the man to whom I have referred, played the part of Iscariot through the troublous months of 1921. He would not risk his skin in the Great War, but displayed a depth of depravity, of cunning and treachery, in 1921, which proved his moral kinship with Iscariot.

But this man alone excepted, the splendid young men of Jarvis Street Church conscripted themselves, and gave themselves freely in defense of the world's liberties.

The years under review were difficult in church life. The prayer-meetings were well sustained, and always the hundreds of Jarvis Street representatives across the sea were remembered. From time to time the dreaded messenger came with a telegram to say someone was wounded, or someone was missing, or someone was killed in action. So from week to week we gathered to pray that God would graciously preserve, so far as it was within His will, those who were dear to us. All ministers, in that day, had much to do in helping to keep up the morale of the people at home, and in ministering comfort to those bereaved.

In the years 1915, 1917, and 1918, I spent a good deal of time in England. In 1915 I crossed on the *Arabic*. A day or so after I had booked my passage, there appeared in the morning paper a despatch from Berlin naming the *Arabic* as one munitions-carrying ship which ought to be sunk as the *Lusitania* had been sunk. The despatch said that the U-boat commanders should be given instructions to get the *Arabic* and a certain other ship at all costs. I found some way of tearing that little despatch out of the paper so that my wife might not see it.

I recall that on the afternoon of that day a certain lady, who was a member of Jarvis Street Church, called on me. I do not know that women, as a class, have any advantage over the men in the matter of talking; although some cynics would give them that reputation. But if all women were like this particular lady, the gentler sex would certainly be worthy to be classed as the chief talkers of the world.

This particular woman had a habit of looking at one with a penetrating stare, and then opening up a veritable machine-gun battery of words. Vainly would one wait for the proverbial opportunity to "get a word in edgeways". Before one's lips could part to utter a syllable, her own talking-machine would be reinforced by a warning hand as though to say, "Not yet; I am not finished"—and away she would go again. She was a good woman who, but for her goodness, would have been impossible; but who, because of her talkativeness, was almost unendurable in spite of her goodness!

This was the purpose of her call: She had in her hand the report which I had torn from my morning paper, and she explained that she was going to England, and had booked her passage on the *Arabic*. She

was very anxious to know whether, in my judgment, she should be showing the white feather as a Britisher were she to transfer her passage to another ship. On being assured by her that she was not shut up to a particular date for arrival in England, and learning that she could go by another ship, a few days later, not especially marked for destruction as was the *Arabic*, I assured her that, in my judgment, she would be taking only a prudent course in transferring to another ship! She told me she was greatly relieved by my counsel, and that she would go immediately to the ticket agent, and instruct him to find her a berth on another ship. I bowed her out without telling her that I was booked to sail on the *Arabic* myself. One of us had to transfer, I was sure of that, and I followed the rule of the sea, "Women and children first"! Frankly, it would have required more courage to be shut up on the same deck in company with that tongue for a week or more, than to run the risk of a German torpedo at sea! In this story I have said nothing by which this most excellent woman could be identified, unless she be the only one of her type.

I reached England in 1915 in the beginning of July, and preached for my friend, the late Dr. A. C. Dixon, in Spurgeon's Tabernacle during July and August. I was therefore in England on the 4th of August, the first anniversary of the outbreak of the war.

By the kindness of the Canadian High Commissioner, I received an invitation, which I did not solicit, to be present at the great service of thanksgiving and intercession held in St. Paul's Cathedral on that date. I could write a small volume descriptive of that great occasion. Hundreds of thousands thronged the streets, regular vehicular traffic was suspended along the Strand, Fleet Street, and Ludgate Hill; and only those going to St. Paul's were permitted to drive along those streets. I had my pass, and so drove along the route which was followed by the King to St. Paul's.

All the members of the Cabinet were present, including Lord Kitchener and Premier Asquith. (Mr. Lloyd George was absent on urgent business.) The seat reserved for me was in the third row back, in the left transept, looking from the pulpit. The first two rows were occupied by the Ambassadors of the Allied Powers. I shall not forget the sensation I felt when we heard without that great Cathedral the subdued cheers of tens of thousands, which heralded the approach of the King.

As he entered, the vast assemblage, of course, rose, and stood at attention as His Majesty King George V., Queen Mary, and Queen Alexandra, walked up the aisle. The King stood aside as his mother, Queen Alexandra, took her seat, and then he followed, with Queen Mary on his right and his mother on his left, seated directly under the dome. Standing roundabout the walls were giant figures of Indian officers of rank, wearing their different coloured turbans, with all their marks of honour and rank upon their breasts.

The service was simple, but profoundly impressive. The sermon was preached by the Archbishop of Canterbury. It was a simple message, recognizing the nation's dependence upon God. I think all who were able to see, must have felt the same thrill that I felt when, in the prayers, His Majesty knelt, and the great crowd of thousands knelt with him. I doubt not that a nation's prayers on that day, and on many other days,

were heard, and answered in the ultimate victory of 1918.

I greatly enjoyed ministering in Spurgeon's Tabernacle that year. There were still many living at that time who remembered the great preacher, and who had been associated with him, for that was only twenty-three years after his passing. I especially enjoyed several contacts at the Tabernacle, in the Pastors' College, and at his home, with Rev. Thomas Spurgeon. We talked together not a little about the great preacher. Deacons and elders who had known his father, told me that Mr. Thomas Spurgeon's gracious spirit, his winsome personality, his deep devotion, his quiet humour, made him, in these respects, largely a second edition of his father. While Pastor of the Tabernacle, he worthily carried on the Spurgeon tradition.

Once when at his house he said to me, "I should like you to have something of my father's, and I have been looking for something that would last. I have come upon this", and he handed me a magnificent paper knife, a large brass knife the size of a small bayonet. He told me he remembered it as being on his father's table when he was a boy. It was used—and was necessary—in the days when newspapers needed to be cut. That knife is on my own desk now, and I prize it most highly.

One little passage in a letter which Mr. Thomas Spurgeon wrote me, I thought was distinctly Spurgeonian, and I recall it at the moment. He wrote me several times, and in one of his letters he reported an air-raid through which London had passed. He remarked, "But I am thankful to say that the people seem to have been more scared than scarred."

Only recently I received a letter from a minister in Australia, saying he was among the students in the Pastors' College when I was privileged to take Mr. Spurgeon's place one Friday afternoon—and the Australian minister remembered the address!

Returning from England that year, I came on the S.S. *Lapland*, and discovered that about half the crew of the ship had been on the S.S. *Arabic* a couple of months before when I went to England from New York. The *Arabic* completed another round trip from Liverpool to New York and return, but on setting out again for New York she was torpedoed.

To tell the story of that voyage, and the people I met, would make a small book in itself. Half the crew had had the experience of taking to the boat when two other ships within sight, having been torpedoed, were going down. Among the passengers at the one and only table that was occupied, except one by an official party to which I shall later refer, was a veterinary surgeon, who had been travelling on a mule ship from New Orleans to Avonmouth, when she was halted by a submarine, on the afternoon of the day on which the *Arabic* and two other ships were sunk. He told us the story of their having to leave their ship in boats, and of the effort of the submarine to sink the mule ship by gun-fire, because apparently she had no torpedoes left, when another ship came into view from behind the mule ship, and was warned to stop by a shot from the submarine—when instantly the disguise of the newcomer was thrown off, and the white ensign floated to the breeze, and with three shots, every one of them taking effect, the submarine's usefulness was ended.

I shall not tell the rest of the story here. It was a subject of discussion in the House of Commons, and of newspaper comment the world over; and was known as the "*Baralong* incident". I was interested to hear the story from the lips of one who had been through it all.

One simple story in this connection may be reassuring to some who have been told they must go softly for the remaining days of their life. There was an old gentleman sitting at my table who had been a passenger on the *Arabic* when she was torpedoed. I should think he would be about seventy years of age. He said that he came down to breakfast late the morning the ship was torpedoed, and as he was looking over the menu, the steward called his attention to a ship that could be seen through the porthole, sinking by the head. He said, "I remarked to him, I think I will not wait for breakfast, steward; the safest place is on deck." Just as he reached the deck he saw the torpedo coming. It struck almost amidships, and she was soon under water.

There was splendid discipline on the part of the crew, and I should judge among the passengers. He told of one woman who, when helping her little girl into the boat before it was lowered, as the little girl began to cry, said to her, "Do not cry, dear; you remember I told you we should probably have a ride in a little boat as well as in the big ship before we got home."

This old gentleman said he was in the boat, in a choppy sea, for eight hours. The stewards and others of the ship's crew became deathly sick, and most of them were unable to serve at the oars. He said he was able to pull away at an oar for practically the whole time, but when at last they were picked up by a destroyer, as he put it, "I was all in." He described how the "jackies" came down the rope-ladder and helped him up, one pushing and a couple pulling, as they cheerfully said, "Come on, grandpa, we will soon have you safe." He laughed heartily at his experiences, and seemed to me to be a splendid exemplification of the British spirit.

Having told this story, he related that before leaving London, he had gone to see his doctor, to learn in what condition he was. The doctor had told him he had a serious heart condition, that he must avoid all excitement, and that his condition was so delicate that the sudden alarm of a motor-horn might finish him. Having told the story he said, "When I got back to London, I was so busy, having to get a new outfit"—for everything he had was lost—"I had no time to go to see my doctor; but I think I shall call on him when I get back from New York!"

On the same ship, I have said, was an official party, an Anglo-French finance party headed by Sir Rufus Isaacs, later Lord Reading, who were going to the United States to arrange a loan or something of the sort. I recall that, at our last breakfast before reaching New York, Sir Rufus Isaacs came over and sat beside me at the table, to talk with the veterinary surgeon from the mule ship, to warn him to exercise care in telling his story to the reporters who would shortly be boarding the ship. He did not ask him to withhold anything, but told him what parts of his story should be specially emphasized.

Going and coming we were escorted by destroyers through the submarine zone, but both voyages were pleasant, and as we had only a little over twenty passengers, with a cabin capacity of four hundred and fifty, we could each have a steward to himself. They were thrilling days, however, whether on land or at sea, and I have never enjoyed crossing the ocean more than during the war.

I do not recall any very special incident of 1916, except that it was a fearfully hot summer.

Viewing these experiences in retrospect, another matter occurs to me which will be chronologically out of order here, but it is worth telling. In 1911 the World's Baptist Congress met in Philadelphia. I attended, and listened to addresses by noted preachers from both sides of the sea. Dr. John Clifford presided, and as I knew he was coming to Toronto, I thought I should like to have him speak in Jarvis Street Church. Between sessions, I learned he had gone up Broad Street for a saunter, and I followed him. Someone told me that he had turned into a church that was open. I went into the church and looked about, and at last went up into the gallery. There I found Dr. Clifford, sitting alone. I knew then it was very selfish, and yet I was prompted by a certain unselfish selfishness in intruding upon his privacy. I introduced myself, and told him my errand. He said something to this effect: "I am willing to do anything which my strength will permit; but I am in charge of one of my deacons, and he is making any speaking arrangements that are made; perhaps you had better have a talk with him."

Later, I met Dr. Clifford in Toronto. A luncheon was given in his honour at McMaster University, and I was one of the victims selected to give short complimentary addresses after the luncheon. Two or three of us, I believe, were selected to speak for two or three minutes each. When we had finished, Dr. Clifford was called upon, and he said something like this: "I have no doubt what these brethren have said has been all very good, but frankly I have not heard a word of it, for I have been enjoying my usual mid-day sleep"! I was told that it was his habit to sleep in a chair as often as he could; and those little periods of rest, snatched between engagements in a busy life, very probably contributed much to his longevity.

I then endeavoured to arrange an evening meeting in Jarvis Street Church. The wisdom of it was doubted by his good deacon, but at length I asked Dr. Clifford if he would give us at least ten minutes, promising to ask a couple of the other visiting brethren from England to speak. I explained they were not known, and it would be difficult to secure a large hearing for them, whereas his name would be sure to attract a crowd. Dr. Clifford said, "Oh! If you would like me to act as a decoy, I am willing!" The meeting was announced. Later in the afternoon I learned that the brethren who had promised to speak had discovered that they would have to leave for their ship, for a trip down the St. Lawrence, through the Thousand Islands. The burden would then rest upon Dr. Clifford. I spoke to the deacon about it, and he said, "Do not ask anybody else. Leave it all to the Doctor, and he will be far more comfortable." The church was crowded, and Dr. Clifford seemed to be in his glory, with no one before him, and no one to follow after—and he gave us a

great message which occupied him perhaps an hour and a half! What a "decoy"!

I met Dr. Clifford on several occasions years afterward in London. He paid me the compliment of once coming to the Metropolitan Tabernacle when I was preaching. He sat in the gallery near the pulpit, and in a seat accessible from the pulpit, but asked to be excused from taking part in the service. By his kind invitation I visited his home, had tea with him and Mrs. Clifford and their daughter, in the garden; and when I went to the train, he insisted on accompanying me to the station. He must have been about eighty years of age then, or thereabout—I have no data before me by which to verify the assumption, but I think I am correct. He told me he had just recently been invited by a number of American universities to visit them, and give a series of lectures. He smiled as he related the matter to me, and said, "I should like very much to go, but it would be absurd for a man of my age even to think of it."

I could not always have agreed with Dr. Clifford theologically, but he was one of the world's great men, beyond question, and one of the most gracious and Christlike souls it has ever been my privilege to meet. The story of the War years will be continued next week.

THE SEMINARY'S FIRST CHRISTMAS PRESENT

The Seminary received its first Christmas present today. It is a little early, but it was not marked, "Do not open until December 25th." We opened the package with fear and trembling—for all cheques look alike until one reads the figures. A \$2.00 cheque is just as large as a \$200.00 cheque—but this one was for \$200.00. The sender said, "By the grace of God I have been enabled to place the Toronto Baptist Seminary at the head of my Christmas presents." That is the conception of Christmas we all should have—placing first the maintenance of those organizations that stand for the honour and Saviourhood of Him Whom the angels heralded on that first Christmas morning.

Thank you, Timmins friend; and may yours be but the first of many offerings at this Christmas season to the work of Him Who was born "to be King".

BOOKS BY DR. SHIELDS

"Other Little Ships"	\$1.50
"The Most Famous Trial of History"50
"The Oxford Group Movement Analyzed"5
25 Copies	1.00
"The Hepburn Government's Betrayal of Its Public Trust" (Separate School Address)	.10
12 Copies	1.00
"The Roman Catholic Horseleach"5
12 Copies	.50

Address: THE GOSPEL WITNESS,
130 Gerrard St. E.,
Toronto.

BOOK REVIEWS

Moody, Winner of Souls, by A. Chester Mann, published by Zondervan Publishing House, 1936, 135 pages, cloth boards, \$1.00.

Next February 5th marks the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Dwight L. Moody, the practical business man whom God used to stir nations. Converted in the back of a shoe store, he was soon bringing flocks of children into Sunday school that they might be saved. At twenty-four, "relinquishing an annual income of five thousand dollars, (Moody) entered on 'full-time' Christian service, without any guaranteed salary" (p. 33). After work among the soldiers in the Civil War, and the organization of what is now the Moody Church, enlisting Ira D. Sankey as singer, Mr. Moody suddenly became in England the centre of "two great spiritual awakenings which swept thousands upon thousands of men and women in to the Kingdom of God" (p. 52). Tremendous success accompanied his continuous evangelism in America for many years. He died worn out in the work.

What a lasting influence his work exercised,—the *Sacred Songs and Solos* with a total sale of 80,000,000 copies; the Northfield Schools and Conference; the Moody Memorial Church, Chicago, whose new auditorium seats 4,040; the Moody Bible Institute and the Colportage Association; not to mention a host of workers for the Lord! This book is not a "life", it is a tribute "by a trained journalist", a fitting tribute, and an inspiring one.—W. G. B.

Ambassadors for Christ by Mildren Cable and Francesca French, published by Hodder and Stoughton, 159 pages, paper covers, 1s. (35c in this country).

In answer to many requests for information concerning missionary information this book was written. It deals with the missionary's call, training, relationship to his co-workers and his service abroad. The missionary is likened to an ambassador who is a marked man (p. 53). Other aspects of his service are loyalty to his Master (p. 70), the importance of his message (p. 103), and his Kingly appointment (p. 114). Although relating the hardships and discouragements of a missionary's life, the book concludes with a forceful description of the ambassador's reward when he receives summons to the presence of his King.—F. R. W.

Elsie Sandes and Theodora Schofield, by Ella Potter and Winifred Matheson, published by Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 160 pages, paper cover, 1s. (35c in this country).

When Miss Sandes wrote her autobiography, in '13, she thought she had about finished her work, but the War found her ready for greater usefulness. This book deals with the twenty-one years she added to her former forty odd. A playmate of Lord Kitchener, she early befriended a soldier, then started a club for the men, and gradually increased the scope of a Christian endeavour to furnish homes which would overcome the evils of army life with good. Homes were established in Ireland, England, India and Jamaica; and Miss Sandes was called "the Mother of the British Army". Miss Schofield was long a worker in India.

The Patron of the Society, H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught, contributes a foreword, and General Sir C. H. Harington writes from Gibraltar: "Miss Sandes was one of God's best women."—W. G. B.

NEWS OF UNION CHURCHES

VAL D'OR WORRIES MORE OVER SEWERS THAN VIRTUE!

"Clean-up Squad Comes, Sees But Fails to Conquer Mining Camp While Trial of Raid Victims Merely Raises Yawn."

The above headline appeared in a Toronto paper recently giving a reporter's estimate of the state of morals in a "two-fisted northern mining town". The newspaper man was interested in this particular town because it is the centre of one of the most prosperous mining developments in the North today. Readers of this paper will be interested in it when they learn that Rev. Frank Wellington and his wife are there seeking a richer treasure than that gold which perisheth, the souls of men for whom Christ died. From time to time we have received requests from members of various churches asking for information about our Home Mission work, that will make it live to our people. Let us advise all such, and all others who are interested in the work of

preaching the Gospel in the North, to obtain a copy of the daily paper referred to above, for we are sure that the picture of the gross sin and need there portrayed will result in a great movement of prayer among our churches for those who labour in these sin-cursed towns in Northern Ontario and Quebec. This account may be obtained by writing to *The Evening Telegram*, Toronto, asking for the issue of Monday, November 30. Enclose seven cents in stamps.

Judging by the rest of the account the newspaper headline was quite justified. Yet even where Satan's seat is, there are some few who hold fast the name of Christ, and we ought to pray for them and for our brother and sister as they proclaim the Gospel which is the power of God unto salvation. Only men who are ready to endure hardness as good soldiers of Jesus Christ are willing to do this kind of pioneer work, but we need more money to support them, and above all we need those who will hold up their hands in prayer that the victory may be the Lord's.

Seven "Beer Parlours"

Rev. Robt. Brackstone who has heroically stepped into the gap at Kapuskasing writes as follows: "God has been blessing recently. Last Sunday forty-four children attended the children's services, and about forty adults attended the Gospel Service. The people interested in the work pledged last Sunday evening to support the cause faithfully, and financially to the extent of their ability as they are able.

"In Kapuskasing there are seven 'beer parlours' and many dens of iniquity where sin abounds; the Gospel is urgently needed. I learn that visitation, tract distribution, personal evangelism, and prayer, are indispensable for the beginning and maintaining of vital work in the North."

"Another Page in History"

"Another page has been written in the history of Kirkland Lake", writes Pastor John Cunningham who has taken charge of the work there. "We had our first broadcast on Sunday night. A congregation of children was a great help in the singing. The Sunday-school continues to be encouraging and we shall soon have to be on the lookout for more teachers. I asked them to come out at night to help with the singing and they responded in a fine way. Last Sunday some of them stayed after the evening service to have a sing, and last night they did the same again. I am thinking of starting meetings for the children soon. I also think that we might have them sing for one of the broadcasts."

This broadcasting has been made possible by the generosity of friends in Timmins and Stouffville, as well as in other places. This great opportunity presents another call to prayer.

The spirit of sacrifice shown by these young men who are doing pioneer work in the North country is, to any one who knows the North and who knows the shortness of their rations, nothing short of heroic. It is a challenge to our people to greater prayer and sacrificial giving.—W. S. W.

GALT—Rev. W. S. Whitcombe visited the Galt Regular Baptist Church on Sunday, November 30th. There were good congregations at the services, and a happy time of fellowship was enjoyed. A good work is being carried on in Galt under the leadership of Pastor A. J. Burnham.

BAKER HILL—On Sunday, November 15th, Rev. W. E. Smalley, pastor of the Baker Hill Church, had the joy of baptizing two young men.

FORM OF BEQUEST

Date.....

I give, devise and bequeath to the UNION OF
REGULAR BAPTIST CHURCHES OF ONTARIO
AND QUEBEC, 337 Jarvis Street, Toronto, Ontario
.....dollars (\$))
for Missionary purposes.

Signature

Witness.....

Witness.....

Whole Bible Course Lesson Leaf

Vol. 11 4th Quarter Lesson 49 December 6th, 1936

REV. WILLIAM J. JONES, EDITOR

THE REMNANT IN EGYPT

Lesson Text: Jeremiah, Chapters 42 to 45.

Golden Text: "And seekest thou great things for thyself? seek them not: for behold, I will bring evil upon all flesh, saith the Lord; but thy life will I give unto thee for a prey in all places whither thou goest."—Jeremiah 45:5.

Bible School Reading: Jeremiah 44, 45.

DAILY BIBLE READINGS: Monday—Is. 31:1-9; Tuesday—Hos. 7:8-16; Wednesday—Hos. 2:1-13; Thursday—Hos. 2:14-23; Friday—Jer. 7:12-26; Saturday—Rom. 12:1-21.

THE EXPOSITION

The Journey to Egypt (42:1-43:7). The Captains and all the people asked Jeremiah to pray for the guidance of the remnant. He promised to do so, holding back nothing (Acts 20:20, 27) with the result that with an oath the people promised to abide by the result whether good or ill, and to obey Jehovah. "Came near" shows the unfamiliarity of approach to Jehovah, perhaps, while the impersonal "thy" God is accentuated by Jeremiah's attempt to show them "your God". So their request was hypocritical, as the sequence shows (see App.). They made up their minds having gone towards Egypt already (41:17)—then enquired of God to confirm their own will!

Possibly in order to distinguish between God's will and his, after ten days' wait, Jeremiah announced God's Promise (9-12) to them all (8)—that if they would abide in the Land, He would bless ("build"—cf. 1:15) them, for He has changed his conduct towards them. He did not repent (App. 18:7-10), but changed His action, not His purpose or nature (10). The people need fear no hurt from Nebuchadnezzar; they would receive mercy. He also announced God's Threat (13-18)—if they insisted on going to Egypt to escape war and hunger (14) they would be followed by the sword and famine and death (14:12; 28:17; note 15:2) none escaping (16, 17, but cf. 44:14). As His wrath had been poured out on Jerusalem (25:18; 29:18) so it would be poured on them in Egypt (18).

Jeremiah Comments (19-22)—God had given due warning (19), for they dissimulated in their request for prayer (20). In fact, they had disobeyed the Prophet's revelation (note the pathos, 21) consistently. Their fate, therefore, was sure (22).

In 43:1-7 the hearers refused to accept the message as from Jeremiah, but absurdly attributed it to Baruch whom they accused of Chaldaizing (2, 3). In spite of the defiant and proud men, all the people listened to all the words (Jeremiah had a whole gospel [cf. 25:3 ff. and App.] until the Prophet ended. They, afraid to attack the inflexible Jeremiah and thinking, perhaps, that they would be beyond Jehovah's reach, went to Egypt (4-7), taking Jeremiah too. They took up residence at a frontier post where permission to enter the country would be secured. Tahpanhes (*Gr.* Daphnae) on East branch of Nile, commanded the road to Palestine.

Prophecy of Nebuchadnezzar's Conquest of Egypt (43:8-13). While at Tahpanhes the Lord commanded Jeremiah (8) to take great stones and hide them by laying them with mortar in the pavement (or square, mg. R.V. 9)—that is secretly, in the brickwork close to the palace fort built by Psammetichus I (B.C. 664-610). As he did so (perhaps at night) he was to reveal to the men of Judah that God would take Nebuchadnezzar, His servant (note 25:9) who would place his throne (1:15 f.) or glittering pavilion on the very stones the Prophet had hidden (10). The symbolical action which may have been occasioned by the torture of soul of 43:2 showed how the fixed stones of divine plans were often kept secret, but ultimately fulfilled. The Jews in Egypt would be given to death and captivity (11); the Egyptian temples burned; and their gods carried away (12). As easily as a shepherd would carry away spoil or wrap himself in a garment, so the land of Egypt would be taken. Even the obelisks of Beth-shemesh (Heliopolis, or On) where Thothmes III had built a temple (c. 1500 B.C.) (6 miles N.E. of Cairo) would be broken down.

Last prophecy of Jeremiah (44). Note the message of doom, illumined only here and there by patches of pathos and grace: In 1-10, Jeremiah delivers the word of the Lord to the Jews at Migdol, a place East of Tahpanhes; at Tahpanhes; at Noph, site of the pyramids and Sphinx, South of Cairo—all cities in Lower (Northern) Egypt; and at Pathros Upper (Southern) Egypt at which place during a heathen festival (15) the Prophet gave his message. The Lord reminds the fugitives that because of their idolatry (8) Jerusalem and Judah were desolate (2, 6). Repeated pleadings (7:13, 25; 11:7) and remonstrance (note pathos in pathetic appeal of v. 4) had been useless, for they had refused to hear Him (5). Could it be that in defying Him and risking punishment by remaining in Egypt and worshipping idols (7, 8) they had forgotten the similar sins of all ranks in former generations (9)?

The remnant in Egypt was to be punished terribly (11-14) so that though their souls longed to return, only a portion would escape (cf. 42:17 f.).

At their festival (15-19) to the Queen of Heaven (cf. 7:18) the idolaters resisted Jeremiah and refused his message (16) asserting their intent to continue their false worship (17). They had vowed allegiance to the cult, for like the exiles in Babylon who probably argued the same way (Ezek. 8:12), they regarded their infidelity to the gods and the temporary cessation of idolatry during the passing reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah (cf. 2:26 f.; 7:9; 11:1-5) as the cause of their calamities (18), not infidelity to Jehovah. As if Israel were immune from punishment (23:17; 26:9; 28:3 f.) as if Jehovah were blind to their sins (7:11; 23:24) and were impotent to help or punish beyond Palestine (16:13)! Such, however, were the arguments of the average Jew. By a curious inversion they attributed health and peace to their ancient, united, universal, cultured (royalty), worship of idols simply because cultus and prosperity were simultaneous (17). A sort of utilitarian materialism (Hos. 2:5) filled their spiritual horizon. Moreover, the women blamed their husbands (19) who had countenanced their pagan rites (15) and consented to their vows (Num. 30:6-12).

Jeremiah replied (20-30) by virtually repeating the causes of their calamities given in v. 3. Should they again enquire the causes (cf. 16:10) he could answer that because Jehovah had exhausted His patience (22) punishment came. He ironically urged (25) performance of their sinful vows (17), showing by repetition (27 f.) of his earlier warning (11-14) that the outcome would be the wiping out of His Name through the virtual extinction of the Jewish people in Egypt (26). Only a remnant of the remnant would escape (28). The sign of His Word was that Pharaoh-Hophra would fall into the hands of his enemies as Zedkiah did, to Nebuchadnezzar (29, 30).

It is significant that in the midst of prophecies concerning men and nations, an individual should receive attention (Ch. 45). Baruch who was pained at the prophecies of doom he copied into the Roll (cf. 36:2) and was sorrowing for his own future (3) evidently had been planning great things for himself (5), either because he was falling away to the Chaldeans (43:3), or was overly ambitious because he was of high rank (note 36:4). The prophetic word to him was that Judah had to be punished (4), but that he would have his life snatched up hurriedly, rather than a secure possession (38:2; 39:18).

THE APPLICATION

Men ought to go to God's messengers for help in distress, but they ought not wait until then (42:1). Trials and testings are no sign that God is displeased with believers as such (44:2) any more than blessings are a sign that He is pleased with unbelievers (44:17). Often He blesses His own physically or materially and punishes direfully sinners. God will guide the Christian, but only by His Spirit through the Word. For the general lessons of the Old Testament, God gives more light for interpretation than the often more specific New Testament requires. Should prayer be delayed (42:7) it is that we may be the more ready by testing or other means to receive answers. But let not prayer be hypocritical. The unanimous request of the fugitives (42:2) was sincere only in its intense importunity. Outwardly it indicated humility, assurance, obedience, earnestness (proper pre-requisites of prayer in their place), but at bottom it was insincere, as their subsequent action (43:1-7) showed dissimulation. From the sight of men they were hiding their true motives, but not from the sight of God or His prophet.

GET YOUR CHRISTMAS PRESENTS OFF YOUR MIND

Many people grow weary, are all but tired out, before Christmas comes, trying to select Christmas presents for their friends; which must be, first, within their means; which will be agreeable to their friends' tastes, and so be to them a gift of real value; and last of all, which in some degree will reflect their own desire for their friends.

To those who are really believers, the further consideration will be added: whether the present will express the donor's testimony for Christ, and thus tend to further the spiritual interests of the recipient, and in the end be glorifying to God.

TO THOSE WHOSE MINDS ARE THUS EXERCISED

We offer the following suggestions:

Send "The Gospel Witness" to as many friends as possible for 52 successive weeks. Every week it will preach the gospel to the unconverted, edify the saints, and minister comfort to the shut-ins and the bereaved. We therefore make these

SPECIAL CHRISTMAS-PRESENT OFFERS

No. 1 "The Gospel Witness" with copy of "The Most Famous Trial in History" to any address—\$2.00.

No. 2 "The Gospel Witness" to six separate addresses—\$10.00.

No. 3 "The Gospel Witness" to three separate addresses—\$5.00.

No. 4 "The Gospel Witness" and a copy of "Other Little Ships"—\$3.00.

(Regular \$2.00 and \$1.50 respectively, or \$3.50)

No. 5 "Other Little Ships" to any address, postpaid—\$1.50.

No. 6 Four copies of "Other Little Ships"—to one or four addresses—\$5.00.

The binding of "Other Little Ships", the publishers say, is such as is used for books selling for not less than \$3.50. You will not be ashamed of this book as a Christmas gift.

Order your "Gospel Witness" subscriptions now, and we will mail on any date you direct. If you desire to use your own card of Christmas greeting, and will forward it to us, we will enclose with "Witness" or book; or, otherwise, we will provide the card and use as you direct.

The year's subscription may begin with any issue you name between now and Christmas. To all subscribing between now and the year's end, we will supply back numbers of "The Plot that Failed", from the first chapter, free of charge.

ORDER FORM

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

Please find enclosed \$..... for which send No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, as per above advertisement (cross out number or numbers not ordered) to the following address or addresses:

Name

Address

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Signature:

Address: