

# 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. 31

TORONTO, DECEMBER 10, 1936

Whole Number 760

## The Jarvis Street Pulpit

### THE MENACE OF PRESENT-DAY ROMAN CATHOLICISM

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, December 6th, 1936

(Stenographically Reported)

Broadcast over Station CKOC—1120 Kilocycles

"For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?  
"Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"—Mark 8:36, 37.

There can be no question that the Word of God teaches that the supreme concern of every human soul should be the soul's relationship to God. Though a man could, by any means, make himself possessor of the world, or a very large part of it; though he should devise means by which he could make his own will the supreme authority over a large part of the earth; though he should find ways by which to make his possession and authority agreeable to a large part of the world, though thus he should win for himself the approval of the whole world, his profit would be nill, and his loss irreparable, should he, in so doing, lose his own soul.

The Christian religion is primarily concerned with the salvation of the soul. It is God's way of saving the souls of men. Therefore when the material and temporal interests of life are viewed in the light of divine revelation, and their values appraised by the principles of that revelation, the whole of life is set in a new perspective; and in that new moral and spiritual perspective the material and temporal things of life diminish to insignificant proportions; while to the imponderable things which are unseen and eternal, there accrues a "far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory".

Christian faith is essentially a quality and exercise of the spirit. If it be genuine Christian faith, it will manifest itself in Christian character. But the Christian faith—Christianity—is wholly, fundamentally, a function of the spiritual and moral nature: of the spirit in relation to God, and of conscience in conjunction therewith in relation to the law of God as expressed in His Word. Therefore once more let me affirm that the salvation of the soul is essentially an individual matter, and is determined primarily and causatively by the soul's relation

to God; and only secondarily and resultantly by a man's relation to his neighbour.

In the evangelical view, salvation consists in justification of the soul through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ: "That Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures: and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures"; and that such as believe in Him are justified by faith without works—but faith in relation to God, for He knows the genuineness, or otherwise, of the faith we profess. "Therefore", it is written, "being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ."

#### I.

FOR OUR SOUL'S SAKE, WE MUST INSIST ON FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE TO AVAIL OURSELVES OF THE BENEFITS OF CHRIST'S SALVATION.

We cannot accept, in lieu thereof, any material reward, any temporal honour, any worldly position or emolument whatsoever—we cannot, indeed, accept the "whole world" in exchange for our soul. That being so, we cannot willingly submit to any authority which would deny or limit, or in any way circumscribe, that primary and fundamental right of the soul.

Further, *we cannot consent to be made a party to the exercise of such prohibitive authority over others.* We must insist again and again on the separation of church and state. We must insist on a free church, in a free state, each independent of the other.

I would remind you that we are living in days of reaction, when the clock of human progress is being set back several centuries in many parts of the world. Conditions now obtain in certain parts of the world which

men felicitated themselves had been left behind in the days when darkness and superstition obtained, and that we should never see them again. But they have returned; and nothing in the middle ages—or even in the dark ages—could surpass some of the things which are taking place under the authority of certain governments of the world even in our day.

Democracy is a direct fruit of a religion of individualism; and in a democracy, the state, with all its resources, exists for the good of the individual. The present-day doctrine of collectivism, alike in religion and in politics, in church and in state, is the very reverse of Christianity. There is nothing Christian in Communism. There is nothing Christian in Nazism, or in Fascism. Christianity magnifies the individual; we are saved individually, one by one, even as we are born individually. Every one of us, according to the teaching of Scripture, "must give account of himself to God".

The modern concepts of the wisdom of Collectivism flow principally from two sources, both of which are anti-biblical, and therefore anti-Christian. Errors in principle or erroneous principles, which appear superficially to be opposed to each other, very often prove their fundamental kinship by uniting against the truth; just as apparently opposing principles incarnate in two historical figures, Pilate and Herod, became friends in order that they might crucify the Truth Incarnate.

Evolution is a philosophy of Collectivism. It assumes that the individual is but an atom in the mass, and must be sacrificed to the general progress with a view to effecting, in the dim and distant future, an ideal race. That strange principle is applied to social life; hence we hear much of sociological evolution. The individual is again merged in the mass. I sometimes wonder if that strange delusion known as Evolution is not the "strong delusion" of which the Scriptures speak which shall be sent to men "that they all may believe a lie". It is psychologically demonstrable that a persistent refusal to hear the truth "in the love of it", ultimately makes the rejecter of truth incapable of identifying the truth, of recognizing it when it appears, or receiving it when it calls. The man who is an habitual liar pays the price of his deceptions in this, not that other people do not believe him, but that he ultimately finds himself incapable of believing others. The easiest way in the world to deceive a liar is to tell him the truth. If our politicians would recognize that, they would win almost any time by telling the truth. Instead of that, they prevaricate, so that nobody can believe what they say.

Roman Catholicism is also a collectivist philosophy. Collectivism in religion is the fundamental principle of Roman Catholicism. Just as, in the application of that principle politically, the individual exists for the state, and not the state for the individual, so in Roman Catholicism the individual exists for the Church, and not the Church for the individual. The Church becomes an end in itself, as though the purpose of God in the establishment of His church was not to make it a means to an end, but an end in itself. It is a substitution for the divine proposal, "Let us make man", of this, "Let us make the Roman Catholic Church."

I affirm that Roman Catholicism is ever ready to use collective powers as represented in the Church, and as represented in the state if and when it can secure its subjugation, to coerce the individual conscience in the interests of the Church. I could recite to you this evening many quotations from the ancient teachings of the

Church of Rome. I could quote, for example, from the Council of Trent, or from the Council of Constance, and its famous dictum that "no faith is to be kept with heretics," to show that in the Roman Catholic view it is perfectly legitimate to violate one's vows, to disregard one's oath—that one may be absolved from all such obligations if indeed he is dealing with those whom the Church denominates "heretics".

I said something like that last week in East Hastings, and the Deputy Speaker of the Legislature, Major J. H. Clark, who came to heckle the speakers, said, "Silly nonsense". That was because to him, I suppose, as to a certain famous industrialist, history is "bunk".

## II.

The fact is, all history attests the truth of that statement. Yet it is assumed in many quarters that the Roman Catholic Church has become modernized. I know very well that much of Protestantism has become modernized. It is so modernistic that it has set aside the authority of Holy Scripture, and denies that there is any objective religious authority. But I shall quote to you to-night from a recent deliverance of Roman Catholic scholars. I have here a volume entitled, "Church and State". It consists of "papers read at the Summer School of Catholic Studies, held at Cambridge, July 27th to August 6th, 1935." It has a preface by Father C. Lattey, S.J. It is printed in London, by "Burns, Oates & Washbourne Limited, Publishers to the Holy See". It bears the *imprimatur* of the Vicar-General, signed at Westminster, February 13th, 1936. ("WESTMONASTERII, die 13a Februarii, 1936.") That surely is right up-to-date!

All these messages are full of interest, but for my purpose this evening I must content myself with quoting from one entitled, "The Claims of the Church". This particular essay was written by Rev. Father Alphonsus Bonnar, Professor of Dogmatic Theology at Forest Gate, London—a professor in a Roman Catholic theological institution, a professor of "Dogmatic Theology"! Give attention, please, to what I read. The writer speaks at one point of the distinction between the objects in view before the state and the church, and I quote this:

"It has been said by Gallican politicians that the object of ecclesiastical jurisdiction is purely spiritual and the means to be employed also purely spiritual. The rule for discerning the spiritual was supposed to be its invisibility: over external affairs the Church could have no power. The fourth of the pronouncements in the condemnation of the Synod of Pistoia (Aug. 28, 1794) reads:

"The proposition which affirms that it is an abuse of the authority of the Church to bring it outside the sphere of doctrine and morals, to extend it to external things, and to exact by force what pertains to the persuasion of the heart; and also that still less may she exact obedience to her decrees by means of external force: in so far as the vague expression extend it to external things notes as an abuse of the authority of the Church the exercise of that power which was received from God and which the Apostles themselves used in setting up external discipline and furnishing it with sanctions; IS HERETICAL." (Above emphasis Father Bonnar's.)

Please observe, this professor of theology says it is a heresy in the Catholic view to hold that the Church has no right to exercise force in compelling obedience to her decrees.

Once again:

"The falsity of the Gallican and allied systems lies in the wrong criterion which is applied to ascertain the respective objects of ecclesiastical and civil jurisdiction. The true norm of judgment is whether the object in

question is a necessary means for the attainment of the purpose of the society. If it is something which is necessary for the religious good of men, then whether it is external or internal, visible or invisible, is of little moment: it is certainly the lawful object of the Church's jurisdiction." (Italics T. T. S.)

Wrapped up in that paragraph is the Jesuit doctrine that the end justifies the means. Whatever, in the Roman Catholic conception, is necessary to the "religious" good of the individual may be sought and achieved by the application of force.

I quote again:

"In deciding the competence of Church or State with regard to any particular object we must first see whether there is any positive divine law settling the question as, for instance, there is in the question of marriage between Christians. If such positive divine law is lacking, then we must turn to the general principle that the Church has a right to employ all the means necessary for the attainment of the object for which the Church was founded, namely, the sanctification and salvation of mankind." (Italics T. T. S.)

Presumably even the aeroplanes, and bombs, and poison gas, and tanks, of Mussolini, in Ethiopia, and the bloody advances of Franco in Spain!

Once more I quote:

"It follows that many things, which at first sight appear to be of a purely temporal nature, will come under the jurisdiction of the Church. Thus the Church will have an independent right (not derived from the State) to the possession of material things (buildings, revenues, etc.) to excommunicate, if she thinks fit, and to enforce all the temporal consequences of complete excommunication; and so on."

Especially mark, this was delivered at a summer school in Cambridge University, by a Roman Catholic scholar, during the summer of 1935, and printed in the year 1936.

"With regard to this right of inflicting temporal punishment, it does not follow that, because we do not see the Church to-day using this right to any great extent, this right does not exist."

Let me read it again with emphasis:

"WITH REGARD TO THIS RIGHT OF INFLICTING TEMPORAL PUNISHMENT, IT DOES NOT FOLLOW THAT, BECAUSE WE DO NOT SEE THE CHURCH TO-DAY USING THIS RIGHT TO ANY GREAT EXTENT, THIS RIGHT DOES NOT EXIST."

This Roman Catholic authority declares, by implication, that the right of the Church to inflict temporal punishment upon those who do not obey her decrees, is inherent in the Church's organization. The affirmation here recorded is not ancient history: it is dated in the year 1936. And it is not in Spain, or in Mexico, but delivered in England—in Cambridge University! What is it? *That the Church has the right to inflict temporal punishment.* Continuing the quotation I read:

"Hence we must note as a general conclusion, that it is misleading to speak of material and spiritual objects, internal and external, etc.: the only satisfactory division is into ecclesiastical and civil jurisdiction."

I quote further:

"Hence, if man is to be properly governed for his own greater good and for that of society as a whole, it is essential that in these matters Church and State should work in harmony and unison. This concord between the two powers should, in the first place, be negative in that neither power should hinder the other by word or act. But, since both should work *together* for man's welfare, such negative concord is not enough. Since the Church never has had more than a very small measure of material force at her disposal (and to-day has none at all) and cannot therefore enforce her laws and decisions

by material compulsion, the State (we are supposing a Christian State)—by which, of course, he means a Catholic state—"has the obligation of giving material support to the Church. And, since the Church is an independent and divine authority, the State should mould her own legislation (in cases where it touches the same objects as Church legislation) in accordance with the rulings of the Church."

That is what has occurred in Ontario Separate School legislation. Dr. Ryerson said that the various amendments to the Public School Act from time to time were framed by the "acute Ecclesiastics and learned lawyers, and able statesmen of the Roman Catholic Church"; and that even after they had framed them, and the Legislature had adopted them, they were still not satisfied, but were continually asking for more. The writer from whom I have been quoting says the Church has the right to frame its own legislation.

"Moreover, when it is necessary, the State should provide for the temporal needs of the Church and her ministers."

Pay the salaries of the priests, and if not that as yet, at least of the religious teachers in the Separate Schools!

"This protection of the Church by the State must not, however, be understood as an exercise of authority by the State over the Church, but as a duty of service to the Church."

I wish I could discuss this matter with you for a week. I could then show you, from the teachings of the Roman Catholic scholars of our day, that the Roman Catholic Church has not changed one whit; that she is teaching her priests and all her people the same doctrines which issued in the martyr fires of Smithfield and elsewhere around the world.

From another passage, for lack of time I quote only a sentence:

"In *spiritual* matters, of course, the State is *directly* subject to the Church, as *e.g.*, in the matrimonial contract between Christians which is a sacrament."

How long will a free state tolerate the doctrine that those who are married without the pale of the Roman Catholic Church, and therefore without sacramental grace, are not married at all? That is the teaching of the Church—illustrated in the Province of Quebec by the fact that ecclesiastical law is given precedence over the civil law, and marriages effected by civil contract are declared null and void after twenty-five or thirty years of union.

I now quote the same author on another matter: *The "Unam Sanctam"*:

"It would be extremely interesting to analyse some of the outstanding pronouncements of the Church on the present subject and investigate their exact meaning, but that is impossible in a short essay. An attempt has been made in the preceding pages to give an accurate résumé of the teaching of the Church. There is, however, one document, the Bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII, which proved a storm-centre at the time it was issued and has ever since been pointed to as the classic example of the outrageous nature of the Church's claims. It has been wrenched from its historical setting in order that its meaning might be distorted: though, even if we had nothing but the text of the Bull itself, its evident meaning goes no further than the doctrine which we have expounded in this essay. . . . It was the considered pronouncement of a synod in which there were thirty-nine French bishops. Nor is it a document which the Holy See has ever in any way retracted. It was confirmed by the Fifth Lateran Oecumenical Council in 1513. The point in its teaching, to which exception is taken, is reaffirmed in the Syllabus of Pius IV. Here are the passages of the Bull which bear on the present subject."

And which have never been withdrawn! This is something the Church has never retracted: It is the doctrine of Roman Catholicism to-day:

"The Gospel tells us that in the Church and in its power there are two swords, viz., the spiritual and the temporal. . . The latter is wielded for the Church, the former by the Church: the former by the priesthood, the latter by kings and soldiers, but by the bidding and consent of the priesthood."

Did you hear that? The swords wielded by kings and soldiers *in the interest of the Church*, "BUT BY THE BIDDING AND CONSENT OF THE PRIESTHOOD"!

"But the sword must be under the sword and temporal authority be subject to the spiritual power . . . For in truth the spiritual power instructs the temporal power and judges it, if it be not good. . . Hence we declare, affirm and define that it is of necessity to salvation for every human being to be subject to the Roman Pontiff." (Emphasis Father Bonnar's.)

You cannot go to heaven, you have no chance of salvation, unless you are subject to the Pope! "Whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life", the Scripture says. But Roman Catholicism says: "WE DECLARE, AFFIRM, AND DEFINE THAT IT IS OF NECESSITY TO SALVATION FOR EVERY HUMAN BEING TO BE SUBJECT TO THE ROMAN PONTIFF." That is the definition of the church. There is no other church than the society of which the Roman Pontiff is the head. The same author so declares on page two hundred and thirty-nine:

"The Catholic Church is, by positive divine law, a supreme, juridically perfect and independent society. There is no legitimate religious society independent of the Catholic Church."

I continue Father Bonnar's comment upon the significance of *Unam Sanctam*:

"It simply enunciates the dogmatic truth that the Roman Catholic Church is the one true Church of Christ; that all its members (i.e., all who are baptized) are subject to its Supreme Head on earth, the Roman Pontiff, in matters of faith and morals; and that God has commanded all men to be members of His Church."

In Canada and Ontario we see the Church exerting its power over the state. The principle of compulsion is applied in the Hepburn amendment passed at the last session. That legislation is on trial in the East Hastings by-election, and in the discussion of this matter the Premier and his aides are encouraging a form of violence. He sat on the platform last week, with his aides about him, and did nothing to discourage the disturbance which made it impossible for his opponent fairly to expound the matter under discussion.

I am going to tell of my own experience in Tweed last week. You saw reports of it in the press. At two meetings we were honoured with the presence of the Deputy Speaker of the Legislature, and a number of others of the Hepburn camp. In Tweed, which was our third meeting, the hall was full. At the front of the hall were about twenty-five small boys and girls, and as we went on to the platform about seventy-five of the roughest men I ever saw walked in, obviously under leadership, and stood in the rear of the hall. Five or six policemen took up their stand across the hall between the men standing and the rest of the crowd.

As soon as the Chairman rose to make a few "preliminary remarks", these little children, which we soon learned were from the one Separate School in the riding, began to make a noise, booing, hissing, and shouting; and the

seventy-five men at the back joined them. I did not hear a word the Chairman said, although I sat on the platform. But that was only a skirmish: the real cannonading, we supposed, was reserved for me. But when I rose, I asked how many had come desiring an intelligent discussion of the issues involved. With the exception of the children, and the crowd of roughs and toughs in the back, the whole audience rose.

I want to give this testimony. That night, Jarvis Street people were in prayer. A solemn hush came over that meeting, and I continued for more than an hour without a whisper of interruption. They were absolutely silent. I finished my address, closed the meeting with the National Anthem, and a crowd of people came up to shake hands. But very soon a message came from the police, saying, "We are waiting for you. Please do not delay." The officer in charge said, "We want to get you home while there are still friends around, as the mob is organized." I went out, and was escorted to my car by two or three policemen. Police were on either side of the car. Opening the door on the driver's side, one policeman put down the window and then put himself inside the car while standing on the running-board. Policemen got on both running-boards, and then the officer-in-charge said, "Drive on"—and we went off under police escort.

I had no thought of danger, but I was told that the police had discovered the plot, and that those vicious men were there, if possible, to stop the meeting by fair means or foul. Some one may say, "That was only a company of rowdies; that was not Catholicism." I am not free to tell you how the police discovered the plot, but they did. I discerned no danger of any kind of trouble, but the police did, and it was sufficiently serious to bring a Provincial inspector twenty-six miles to take charge. That is what the present Government has released in this Province—and it will obtain from one end of the Province to the other if the embodiment of lawlessness called Hepburn continues long in the Premiership of this Province.

What shall we do? It may be there are some people in East Hastings listening to-night. If so, I would call upon you to do your duty for the sake of civil and religious liberty, and to let Premier Hepburn know that he cannot long retain a place in the public life of this country.

It happens that we cannot, at this time, strike a blow at the present lawless Government at Queen's Park without becoming involved in politics which seem to have a party aspect. That is not our responsibility, and if we cannot stand in defence of civil and religious liberty in any other way, we are willing to accept the odium of partyism for the moment.

Let me assume that all Premier Hepburn says is true on the credit side; and that he has saved the Province millions of dollars. Personally, I do not believe a word of it. I believe nothing that the Premier says without corroboration. Whether my mental attitude is induced by the Premier's record, or is due to political incapacity on my part, others may determine; but I find it impossible to believe the Premier's word on anything without collateral testimony. The man who sows deception must inevitably reap distrust. But for the sake of argument, let me assume that what Mr. Hepburn says is true. Nay, I will go farther, and for argument's sake, assume that he has wiped out the public debt altogether. What of it?

What of the debit side? His beer-parlours have debauched the youth of this country as they have never been debauched in the history of the Province. Thousands of young men and women have been made alcoholics. He has multiplied the number of drunkards by the tens of thousands throughout the Province. Millions of dollars saved could not compensate the Province for the wholesale debauchery of its youth. No one can estimate the toll in life and limb, the Hepburn beer-parlours have taken through drunken drivers on the highways of Ontario.

The genius both of his legislation and his administration involves a reversal of all British progress. At some points his practices would nullify the Great Charter, and, by refusing access to the courts, thus denying a cause or a person its or his "day in court", he would set the clock of civil liberty back more than two hundred and fifty years.

I do not mean to say that he has done all this with full knowledge of the reactionary principles involved. I would not credit him with sufficient historical knowledge as that would imply. An irresponsible demagogue, he has allowed himself, by his Separate School legislation, to become the tool of the malignant power that has ruined every state in which it has gained the ascendancy, and will ultimately ruin us unless we check its progress. But this man who has become the spearhead of this aggregation of political time-servers, who are deficient either in intelligence or in conscience—or in both—seems to exemplify the principle that might is right. Premier Hepburn has publicly held the courts of justice up to the contempt of the Province. Implicitly, he admits the legality of the court's decision, calling it "a hogshead of law, and a thimbleful of justice". We greatly fear that Mr. Hepburn is more familiar with a "hogshead" as a rule of measurement than he is with the law as an expression of sound justice. Thus the Premier of the Province, who ought to be the fountain of law and order, has set the whole Province an example of lawlessness. He has debased public discussion to the level of the gutter. The new voice of the Roman Catholic Church in Toronto, known as *The Globe and Mail*, last week entered a plea for the elevation of public life to higher levels—and then urged people to support his advocate of Rome's injustices! How can you elevate public life by following a man who lives in the gutter of verbal vulgarity and political chicanery? In defiance of every sound principle of civil and religious liberty, he has passed this amendment to the Assessment Act, which will compel Protestants to support Roman Catholic religious schools. I appeal to every citizen of Ontario whom I can reach to come to the defence of religious and civil liberty. I am not a politician. I would treat any party in exactly the same way. I do not care the proverbial fig for Liberals or Conservatives. Sometimes there is very little to choose between them. But this is the first time any part of the Province has had an opportunity to express itself on the political and religious illiberalism of this so-called Liberal Government.

I hope you who prayed last week, and gave us a great victory in Tweed, will continue to pray. I am hoping that on Wednesday East Hastings will turn the first sod in digging the political grave of the aggregation of papal puppets and liquor salesmen known as the Government of Ontario; and thereafter I hope the whole Province will

unite in a mighty effort to bury the rotting carcass of the political entity which has betrayed the highest interest of the boys and girls, and men and women, of the Province; and who have proved traitors to every principle of sound democracy. I hope it will be buried so deep that it will never know a resurrection, with never a burial-stone to mark the place of its dishonoured sepulchre. I can find no language too strong to express my reprobation of the influences of corruption which have been loosed by the present regime.

It may be some do not see it? No! Nor do these present-day politicians, who care nothing for the future, nor for the moral and spiritual welfare of the people, but seek only to gain positions, and enjoy for a season the fruits of office. Shame on us that we permit it! President Wilson said the Great War was designed to make the world safe for democracy: we need a campaign throughout this Province to make democracy safe for the world. That can be only as people are awakened to the seriousness of the present situation.

I remind you, as I have done before this evening, that this is only a part of the programme. The Roman Catholic Church has been seeking it in this Province for seventy years, here a little and there a little, nibbling away first at one Government, then at another. This immutable Church, that would commandeer all the powers of earth—not of heaven—of earth—and some other place, in order to effect its diabolical purposes, has found in Premier-Hepburn a ready instrument for its subtle employment. It is time the Protestants of our day, so-called, were awakened to a realization of what we are facing.

I have been here twenty-seven years. If I had not freedom on a religious question like this, to deliver my whole soul; I would walk out of that door, for I must before God warn people of this insidious, malignant disease, that is creeping over our body-politic. A reporter said to me last week, "It is amazing that your people follow you in what you do." To which I-replied, "Not at all. We believe the same thing, and fight for it together." No church or minister can be free until together they put Christ and the principles of His gospel before all other considerations: then they can defy the world together. Politics is not our interest; but it is our interest to maintain our liberties, and the liberties of all others, to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. We need another Reformation, a spiritual revival. The present situation has been brought about by the practice of the modern churches that are called Protestant, of setting aside God's Holy Book, and refusing to bow to its authority, until now, in many quarters, there seems to be neither conscience nor conviction left. Anything that pleases the fancy at the moment is popular, irrespective of the long reach of its influence, or of its relation to the salvation of the souls of men.

Let us personally, individually, make sure that we are saved. A Protestantism that has not an evangelical experience at the heart of it; a Protestantism that is not an expression of a regenerated life given up to God, that cannot say with Luther, "Here I stand; I can do no other: so help me, God," is worth nothing. Do you know what it is to be helped by God? Last week I came home happy. The Chairman of the meeting at Tweed said, "There is only one explanation of that meeting: that was the presence of the Divine Hand."

That is what we need to-day, the mighty power of God in a spiritual awakening in all the churches. No political organization can stop the progress of Romanism. But let us seek unto God, and pray that He will cause His church everywhere to awaken, and to return to God, to His Book, and to the great verities of the Christian gospel. Then we shall have men in all walks of life—in business, in public affairs, who will put God first, and who will do their duty as unto God, and not unto men.

Are you saved? I do not ask, Are you a church member? There are thousands of church members in this city who are not worth five cents a carload, and many preachers of the same ilk, who stand for nothing. My question is, Are you saved? Have you Christ in your heart? Have you been made a new creature in Christ? Are your sins washed away by the precious blood? Are you so sure of eternal salvation that you could go to the stake, if need be, and see heaven opened, as Stephen did? I think I could say before God, if this were to be the last sermon I should ever be permitted to preach—and if because of it, I were to yield my life—I would still declare the whole counsel of God. We must oppose error, and stand for the truth of the gospel of the grace of God.

Let us pray:

For Thy mercy to us, O God, we thank Thee. We pray that Thy rich blessing may be upon us. Help us that individually we may feel our responsibility to God, that in whatever position Thou dost call us to serve, whether obscurely or prominently, we may be enabled to discharge our full duty as unto God. If there be some who are not yet on Thy side, who have not yet openly avowed their faith in the Lord Jesus, who have not declared their allegiance to the King of kings and Lord of lords, we pray they may do so this night, that Thy name may be glorified in the salvation of souls.

Bless our efforts to register a protest against the iniquities of which we have been speaking. Give strength to all those who will assist in so doing. Guide even the people who know not Thy name. Let Thy power be manifest on Wednesday next.

We bring to Thee the affairs of this troubled world, of our own Empire, and of all the nations of the earth. What a world of confusion! Surely, surely, we need God! O that people by the tens of thousands may turn back to Thee. Give us a revival, we pray Thee—a world-shaking revival. Turn the hearts of multitudes to Thee. If it be so that Thou art coming soon, may we be ready when Thou shalt come down the skies. Meanwhile, prepare us that we may hold loosely by the things of earth, and set our affections on things in heaven, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. In His name we ask these mercies, Amen.

## SPECIAL ARTICLES IN THE NEAR FUTURE

THE GOSPEL WITNESS does not aim at any kind of religious sensationalism. We believe the paper has an informative and educational mission to fulfil. In harmony with that, we expect from this forward to continue from time to time, perhaps not every week, to publish articles and addresses which will give instruction respecting the present activities of the Church of Rome in Canada and elsewhere. On Thursday of this week the Editor will speak at his evening lecture period on the subject, "The Claims of the Papacy in the Light of Holy Scripture." This will be published. We are not sure that we shall be able to cover the whole ground implied in that subject in one address, but we propose to give a series of addresses on the Papacy, giving something of its historical background, and leading up to the claims made in its behalf by modern Roman Catholic scholars, as for example, we have done in regard to the claims of the church generally in the sermon of last Sunday evening, which appears in this issue.

Write us and let us know if THE WITNESS helps you, and send us a contribution in expression of your appreciation.

## PREMIER HEPBURN'S FIRST POLITICAL REVERSE

As we go to press Wednesday night, we have just heard that the electors of East Hastings have administered the chastisement which the Hepburn Government so richly deserved, by defeating the Government candidate. A full report is not available, but the Conservatives have a majority of about 1,200.

Readers remote from Ontario, who have followed our fight against the plague of Hepburnism, but who are not thoroughly informed on the local situation, may be interested in a few facts.

The Hepburn Government was returned with an overwhelming majority in June, 1934. From then until to-day, Hepburn has swaggered about like a bully, hurling insults at every deputation that approached him on any subject, seeming to believe himself to be secure in his position. It is quite usual, after a general election, when a Government has been returned with a large majority, for the first few by-elections to issue in the Government's favour. The East Hastings by-election afforded the first opportunity that any section of the Ontario electorate has had to express itself by legal vote regarding the Hepburn policies. To win this by-election the Premier has stayed in the East Hastings constituency for several weeks, speaking in every little village and hamlet in the riding. He was assisted by a number of his Cabinet Ministers, and in addition by a small army of members of the Legislature on his side of the house doing personal work. One paper said there were enough members of Parliament in East Hastings to form a parliament.

We have never read the speeches of any public man which showed such an utter disregard for fact, as the speeches of Premier Hepburn. As late as last night (Tuesday) he expressed absolute confidence that his candidate would win. Of course, leaders always say that. But, having said it, it is useless for Mr. Hepburn now to say that he never expected to win, and that it is a vote without significance. It is not only a "black eye" for the Hepburn Government, but a "knock-out" blow. The addition of one member to the Opposition will not count for much. It is the fact that it is the first time the Province has had a chance to express an estimate of Mr. Hepburn on his merits—and East Hastings has spoken in no uncertain terms.

What will happen now? If Mr. Hepburn has any political discernment, he will recognize the East Hastings result as a very definite turn in the tide against him. There is not much in Mr. Hepburn's past to guide us in our estimate of his future. A bandit who has his victim at his mercy, holding a revolver at his head, may appear to be very bold in his demands; but such a man is usually a coward of the yellowest variety. And a political leader, with a big majority supporting him, sometimes plays the part of a bully; but when the tide begins to turn, there is often a radical change in his demeanour. The present Government has yet two years in office if it decides to fill out its full legal term. Will Premier Hepburn use the next two years to do what damage he can, and take full advantage of his opportunity to reward all his friends, and especially, to give the Roman Catholic Church whatever she asks for?

We have never believed there was anything courageous about Mr. Hepburn. Brave men can afford to be polite, and invariably are gentlemen. The truly brave man is the man who can stand his ground for principles against an overwhelmingly superior opposition. Anybody can run with the crowd. We do not believe Mr. Hepburn is a last-ditch fighter. We believe his true character will soon show itself. Turning over our portrait album, to find a portrait of him, we found what we believe is a fairly accurate description in the book of Daniel: "Belshazzar the king made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand. Belshazzar, while he tasted the wine, commanded to bring the golden and silver vessels which his father Nebuchadnezzar had taken out of the temple which was in Jerusalem; that the king, and his princes, his wives, and his concubines, might drink therein. Then they brought the golden vessels that were taken out of the temple of the house of God which was at Jerusalem; and the king, and his princes, his wives, and his concubines, drank in them. They drank wine, and praised the gods of gold, and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone. In the same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote over against the candlestick upon the plaister of the wall of the king's palace: and the king saw the part of the hand



that wrote. Then the king's countenance was changed, and his thoughts troubled him, so that the joints of his loins were loosed, and his knees smote one against another. The king cried aloud to bring in the astrologers, the Chaldeans, and the soothsayers."

We heard a noise this evening, and it sounded to us like the noise of Premier Hepburn's knees knocking together, and we have little doubt that he will soon be sending for the astrologers, the Chaldeans, and the soothsayers, to interpret the handwriting on the wall. We should not be at all surprised were Premier Hepburn soon to discover some reason, of health or something else, necessitating his retirement from the leadership of his party. Be that as it may, we are strongly of the opinion that the campaign against Hepburnism should be pressed vigorously in every part of the Province; and every effort should be made by the holding of meetings, and the circulation of literature, by every organization interested, to open the eyes of all Protestants to the menace of Rome.

### REVS. C. J. AND P. B. LONEY BEREAVED

A tragic accident occurred in Toronto Monday evening last. Mrs. Thomson, mother of Rev. Alex. Thomson, Pastor of Mount Pleasant Road Baptist Church, and instructor in Toronto Baptist Seminary, had been calling on Mr. J. E. Loney and his daughters, at 9 Ferndale Ave. Mr. Loney is the father of Rev. C. J. Loney, of Stanley Ave. Church, Hamilton, and Rev. P. B. Loney, Pastor of Runnymede Road Church, Toronto.

Late in the evening Miss Edna Loney accompanied Mrs. Thomson down Ferndale Avenue to St. Clair Avenue, where Mrs. Thomson was to take the street car going east, and then north up Mount Pleasant Road to her home. What happened when they reached St. Clair Ave. is not as yet fully known. Miss Florence Loney was visiting her sister in the east end of the city at the time. Returning home, she saw the crowd at the corner of Ferndale and St. Clair Avenues, and the police measuring the road; but thought nothing of it until, on arriving home, she found that her sister, Miss Edna, had gone out with Mrs. Thomson, and had not returned.

Later it transpired that as they were crossing from the north side of the street to the south, to get the east-bound car, a motor-car travelling west, had struck them. Miss Edna Loney, as far as could be ascertained, had been instantly killed. Mrs. Thomson was taken to the hospital with a fracture of the skull, both legs broken, and painful chest injuries. At this writing (Wednesday evening) Mrs. Thomson is resting as comfortably as can be expected, but while there appears to be no necessarily fatal injuries, she is in a really serious condition, especially in view of the fact that at her advanced age, there is always grave danger of complications.

Both Rev. C. J. and Rev. P. B. Loney are well known to GOSPEL WITNESS readers, as is also of course true of Rev. Alex. Thomson, who for years wrote the exposition of the Sunday school lesson. Mr. J. E. and Misses Edna and Florence Loney were for a number of years highly esteemed members of Jarvis Street Church, but for some years now have been in attendance at Mount Pleasant Road which is nearer their place of residence.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS, in behalf of its readers who know the friends concerned in this tragic affair, extends its deepest sympathy to Mr. Loney, Sr., and his daughter, and to Revs. C. J. and P. B. Loney, and to other members of the family; and to Mrs. Thomson in her serious condition, and to Mr. Thomson in his present hour of anxiety.

The funeral of Miss Edna Loney will be held on Friday. There will be a private service at the house, 9 Ferndale Ave., at 1.30; and a public service at Mount Pleasant Road Church at 2.30.

### THE JARVIS STREET BROADCAST

Jarvis Street Church resumed its broadcast service Sunday evenings three weeks ago. We are now using a Hamilton station, CKOC. This involves a long distance Bell Telephone wire of over forty miles to Hamilton. The total cost of each service is \$125.00. Roughly speaking, our English readers will understand, about twenty-five pounds. We are depending upon our radio hearers to support the radio fund with sufficient generosity to make the continuance of our broadcast possible.

We are not appealing to Jarvis Street people. Indeed, frankly, with our very heavy missionary programme involved in our regular mission work of the Union, THE GOSPEL WITNESS, and the Seminary, it is about all that Jarvis Street people can carry; and therefore it is not desirable that Jarvis Street people should divert their giving to the Radio Fund. They really do not need it. They are able to attend the services, which is far to be desired before the long distance broadcast. But the radio is of great value. It reaches thousands of people who otherwise would not hear the gospel at all. Beside that, it ministers to those who are ill, who are shut in, and in some cases to those who are legitimately employed on Sunday, and cannot attend public worship.

When we were on the air before, we heard of one town of two or three thousand people where a garage owner turned on his radio. People stopped to listen. He was a Christian man, and the next Sunday he had gathered a few seats, and presently seated his garage. We were told there were more people listening to our service in that garage than in any one of the churches in the town. That would not be desirable, if the churches were preaching the gospel. But we appeal to our GOSPEL WITNESS readers, especially to those who are within hearing of this service, to assist us in continuing this radio missionary ministry.

Please do not suppose it is easy to get money by radio. We have heard of many who receive numerous and generous contributions. Frankly, it has never been our experience—perhaps because we are reluctant to make any pressing appeal for money over the air. Among the thousands who listen, there appears to be only one here and there who thinks of sending in a contribution. During the period we were off the air we constantly heard from people who missed our service, and we have heard from thousands, directly and indirectly, who desired that the radio ministry should be resumed. Please take it for granted that other people are not giving to the radio—for the fact is, very few people do give. Indeed, there are hundreds who apply for the printed sermon who do not even send enough to pay the postage. We do not believe it is a want of generosity, but thoughtlessness for the most part.

Will you please spread it abroad among your friends that we are on CKOC—1120 kilocycles—Hamilton, every Sunday evening from 7.00 to 8.30. Get your friends to listen in; and if you appreciate the service, send us a contribution, and urge other people to contribute also. We shall hope to give encouraging radio news through these pages from time to time.

### A VERY SUGGESTIVE ACTION

We recently read an account of the will of a wealthy Christian woman, who, among other things, left \$50,000.00 to a certain religious paper. That is almost an unheard of thing. People do leave money to great educational institutions that already have millions, and occasionally even to smaller ones; but it is a rare thing to hear of money being left to a religious paper.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS has been remembered only once or twice in anybody's will, and yet the religious paper is everybody's friend. On his way home from his office to his house, this Editor goes along a certain road where there is a large dairy, and then up a hill. The milk-wagons start out from this dairy sometimes with a very heavy load, and when we work late enough for the milk-wagons to be starting on their routes, we have observed that at the bottom of this hill, part way up, or at the top, we meet a single horse led by a boy. This horse waits at the bottom of the hill, and is hitched on to the heavy milk-wagon for the extra pull up the hill, walks down again, and waits for the next wagon.

We have often felt like calling that horse THE GOSPEL WITNESS, for that has been our job very frequently, to lay hold on some cause that needs pleading, and to give it a pull up the hill. We count it a great privilege whenever we feel able to do that. We endeavour, through the pages of the news of Union churches, and sometimes by direct editorial appeal, to render what assistance we can to the missions of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches. THE GOSPEL WITNESS is almost the only helper Toronto Baptist Seminary has. It tries from time to time to plead its cause. And now it is adding again the radio ministry to its pleas.

But THE GOSPEL WITNESS has no endowment. Its subscription price does not anything like pay for the printing.

We carry no advertisements, for the reason that we have always been afraid to begin. We are not opposed to advertising, but we are sure that our readers would interpret an advertisement in these pages as a recommendation of the article advertised. That would mean that, before we could advertise it, we should have thoroughly to investigate the article. Before we could advertise a book, we should have to appraise its doctrinal content. Otherwise, we could not be a true witness to the gospel. The solicitation of advertisements, and such investigation as they would involve, might cost as much as the profit advertisements would yield. Therefore we have not attempted it. So that THE GOSPEL WITNESS is a good round roast, without any bones or fat in it—and no gristle to be thrown away. It is all meat.

During the depression, many religious papers have had to cease publication, but by the blessing of God, through the generosity of his people, THE GOSPEL WITNESS has continued until this day. But we are writing this note to the Lord's stewards, to suggest that when making their wills, they might remember THE GOSPEL WITNESS, and leave a thousand or so to this paper, to assist us in disseminating the message of THE WITNESS, and also to make it possible for us to continue from time to time to plead such causes as are in accord with the mission of THE WITNESS, to testify the gospel of the grace of God.

Of course, none need wait to include THE GOSPEL WITNESS in their last will and testament, but if you have any money, send it along. The Editor will humbly say this for himself, that in all the years of its publication he has never received as much as one copper in remuneration for his work. If THE GOSPEL WITNESS had to pay an editorial salary, or the ordinary overhead costs of such a paper, its publication would be impossible. Therefore, we appeal to our readers, if they appreciate the paper, to assist us from time to time with a contribution.

### SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS

We have been much exercised about the above matter, as to whether to pursue what we have called "The Whole Bible Course." We have reached the conclusion that the large sections of difficult scriptures, of necessity taken for one lesson, are beyond the capacity of any part of a Sunday School unless it be the Young People and Adult Departments, and even there it would tax the capacity of untrained minds to cover so large a text.

Next week we will submit the first instalment of a six months' outline, which we think would be useful to all Schools. Setting aside for the time being, the Whole Bible Course, we would arrange for a systematic presentation, in a simple way, of the great truths of the gospel, which would make possible a campaign of evangelism in all our Schools. For example: what the Bible says about sin, about repentance, about faith, about justification, how we are saved by the death of Christ, the importance of His resurrection, His mediatorial ministry as our great High Priest, and so on.

Watch for next week's announcement.

### NEWS OF UNION CHURCHES

**DALESVILLE**—On the 26th of October we commenced four weeks of special services at Mabel School House, one of our regular appointments, with Rev. Roy Hisey as the speaker, assisted for two weeks by his brother Rev. Lorne Hisey, in bringing messages in song. In spite of the inclement weather and bad roads there were very good attendances and the Spirit of the Lord was there in convicting power. Though there was not so great visible results as we should have desired, yet the saints of the Lord were revived and three confessed their faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, two of whom were Roman Catholics who are now bearing rich testimony to their newly-found Saviour and have announced their withdrawal from the Catholic Church. Others of the same faith are thinking seriously of renouncing their church and coming to Christ. From what we have heard since the meetings, we believe there was greater good done than we realized at the time, and the fruit of these meetings is yet to be harvested. The Pastor, Rev. Chas. Hardie, and members of the Dalesville Church are very grateful to these brethren for their sacrifices and services rendered.

**MINER'S BAY**—On November 11th a number of churches were invited to meet with the Norland Baptist Church in the

afternoon and evening. There were present people from Kinmount, Lindsay, and Corson's Siding, as well as members from different sections of our widespread field. A happy time was spent around the tea table very lavishly spread by the ladies of the church, but the time of blessing was in the afternoon when short, inspirational talks were given by visiting brethren, Rev. A. Penman of Lindsay, Rev. Ross Almas of Corson's Siding, and Rev. H. L. Davey who came as a very happy surprise. In the evening Brother Frank Vaughan, who is assisting Rev. M. B. Gillion at Kinmount and Bobcaygeon, was asked to bring a short message and several solos which helped to prepare the people for the climax reached when Rev. W. E. Atkinson spoke. Mr. Atkinson also spoke on the Thursday and Friday evenings. Though the attendances were small, these were times of real blessing which the people of Miner's Bay will not soon forget.

**TOTTENHAM AND CHURCHILL**—Sunday, December 6th, was the 3rd Anniversary of the Churchill Gospel Mission, of which Mr. George Hicks of Toronto Baptist Seminary, is pastor. Rev. Gordon W. Searle of Orangeville was the Anniversary preacher, speaking at Churchill in the morning and evening, and at Tottenham in the afternoon. There were good attendances at each service, and the presence of the Lord was manifest. Miss Anne Coghill of Toronto was soloist for the day, and Miss Mary Jeffery gave several violin selections which were much enjoyed. Mr. Austin Sime also assisted in the musical numbers.

### LIBERIA

**GOOD NEWS FROM THE TOWNS**—"During September we could not leave the mission as much as usual on account of the rains," writes Rev. G. D. Mellish, "but God's Word has been given forth as usual. As our evangelists come in each Thursday and gather for Bible study, we take a few minutes to talk and pray about what has been done in the past week, and the men tell us of some of the people with whom they have met, in order that we may all pray for them. Perhaps some of these Bassa names may not mean much to you, nor the names of the towns, but we are going to give some anyway, in order that you may have them on your prayer list. They may be only hard names to you, but the Lord knows all about them, and He loves them. These are people who have professed to accept Jesus as their Saviour: Wede, a woman of Gia xwi Town; Mapa and her mother of Dye-hwede Town; Kanga and Dye-wodoo, a man and his wife of Dye-hwede, also Ba, another woman of the same town, and Moses; Ba Zo-kpe, the townmaster of Zo-kpe Town (What a wonderful thing it will be to have a townmaster really converted!); Moses of Badeke. Moses is a favourite civilized name of these people.)

"Three out of the four towns we mention above we have not visited, but now we are making plans to visit all the above towns and meet with these people and others who are interested in the things of God. This will be as soon as the rains slacken, likely in November, and then we can better plan the work being done by native evangelists. At some places there is already a small group of people who call themselves Christians, though we are afraid they need considerable teaching. To these we shall give special teaching, praying that they may put away all their sins to serve only the Lord Jesus Christ.

"These treks will take us into most of the territory within one day's walk of Gea ba Zondo Station, for there are many towns and many people, but there are still those beyond who must wait a little longer. We hope soon some more of our Christians will be ready to go out with the Word, and that will mean more towns can be reached week by week. Pray especially during November and December, for those are the two best months of the year for this work, and the only months when you find practically all the people in the towns, and when they are not busy, so they can sit down and listen to the message.

"On the Mission our medical work is keeping more and more busy, and we are surprised at the number of people coming for treatments from long distances. This is encouraging, for it speaks well for the results obtained in the treatment. They hear the gospel before they receive their treatment, too, and we pray as they return to their towns they may carry it with them, and the seed sown may bear fruit. Monday and Friday are Dispensary days, so we shall have to slip out for our trekking on the days between that, which means that we shall be busy, but we pray it may be to His glory."



# 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 VI.

In this chapter we continue our story of the period 1914 to 1918. Newspaper reporters sometimes describe certain of their narratives as "human interest" stories, whatever that may mean. I suppose they mean stories which have to do with personalities, and which touch life in experiences which are common to all men. It has occurred to me that the story of my years in Jarvis Street may be somewhat brightened by relating something of my contact with men whose names are widely known, and some of whom may fairly be described as famous.

One famous man it was my privilege to know somewhat intimately was the late Dr. Russell H. Conwell, of Philadelphia. Dr. Conwell was Pastor of the Baptist Temple, Philadelphia, a great church which grew from very small proportions under his ministry. Dr. Conwell was Founder and President also of Temple University, which, in point of attendance of students, is now one of the largest universities in the world.

It would be beyond my province to give even a brief biographical sketch of this great man. A lawyer in Boston, who had travelled widely, he was also a Bible class teacher, and gave free legal advice to little churches in trouble. It was by seeking to help a small church in a little town, who thought they could not afford to pay a Pastor, that Dr. Conwell was led to his decision to leave the law for the gospel; or, as I heard him once facetiously say, "I ceased practicing and went to preaching".

Temple University began with a small class of young men in the school-room of the church at Philadelphia, when it was but a small affair. When I first knew Dr. Conwell he was lecturing two hundred and ten nights a year. He had many lectures, but the most famous was entitled, "Acres of Diamonds". I heard him deliver it many times, and my enjoyment of it increased with every repetition. It was Dr. Conwell's practice to receive the names of students who were poor, and who needed help, and put them on his lecture list. He did not confine his benefactions to his own students, but when his attention was called to some poor young man who needed help, and who desired a college education, on being assured of his genuineness, Dr. Conwell would add him to his list.

As I have said, when I first met Dr. Conwell, over two hundred students a year were profiting by his lectures. It was his practice to deduct his travelling expenses from the last place, to the city where his lecture was next to be delivered, from his lecture fee, and the balance he sent off to the student whose name appeared next on his list.

Dr. Conwell came to us many times in Jarvis Street, by my invitation. On one occasion he got off the train in charge of a nurse, whom the insurance company had sent with him. He was scarcely able to speak. We took him to a hotel, insisted on his going to bed, called a doctor, and did what we could to get him on his feet

again. On that occasion he had been advertised to lecture in the evening, and there was no way of advising people that he would not be there. The great crowd assembled—and Dr. Conwell was in bed. I did not know what else to do, so I gave a lecture myself. I told as simply as I could, the story of Dr. Conwell's life as I knew it. I had no time for preparation, but the telling occupied an hour or more. I then explained to the people how that Dr. Conwell never profited by his lectures, but that he always deducted his personal expenses, and sent the balance to some poor student.

We have never allowed a charge to be made for anything held within the walls of Jarvis Street, but I appealed to the people for a collection; and received an offering of nearly three hundred dollars. The next morning I called to see Dr. Conwell at his hotel. He had been greatly distressed at his inability to fulfil his engagement, and asked with some apprehension what I had done with the crowd. I told him that I had done the best I could to take his place by telling the story of his life, and that they had given me an offering of nearly three hundred dollars—and handed him a cheque for the amount. He had a hearty laugh over it, saying, "I never heard of such a thing. The idea of getting a congregation together to hear a lecture, and when the lecturer did not appear to take a collection of nearly three hundred dollars for him." However, the student to whom that lecture had been assigned was not disappointed, and received whatever was left from Dr. Conwell's expenses.

Dr. Conwell's lecture fee was one hundred and fifty dollars, but on one occasion when he lectured in Jarvis Street we paid him the hundred and fifty dollars, and later I discovered that when we had deducted advertising expenses, I had an additional seventy-five dollars to send on to Dr. Conwell. The money was sent, and in due time I received a letter from him, saying something to this effect: "The proceeds of the lecture delivered in Jarvis Street Church were dedicated to one of our own students at Temple University. On receipt of your letter I sent for him. I wish you could have seen the expression of joy and thankfulness on his face when I told him there was another seventy-five dollars coming to him."

Thus Dr. Conwell lectured through the years, never receiving a cent for his services himself. Once when he was with me we talked over experiences common to the ministry, and he told me something of the travail of soul which Temple University had cost him. He said that on one occasion he had found it impossible to get money anywhere to meet the University's requirements. All that he had been able to save was the house in which he lived, which was free from all debt. He mortgaged his own house for ten thousand dollars, to meet the emergency. If I am not mistaken, it was about 1917 he told me this story, and then he added somewhat pathetically, "And you know, Brother, the Trustees of Temple University have allowed me to pay interest on that mortgage ever since. I suppose they have

not thought of it, and I never cared to remind them." Whether the mortgage was discharged before his death, I do not know.

If I mention no names, I think I may venture, now that he is gone, to tell a very intimate story. After one of Dr. Conwell's visits, he wrote my wife a letter, enclosing, if I remember correctly, a twenty-dollar bill, asking her to accept it, and make what use of it she liked; saying, "This is part of a wedding fee I had hoped to give your husband, but I discovered, to my great disappointment, that I had arrived on the scene too late. Another had anticipated me."

As I think now, after the years have passed, of Dr. Conwell, it seems to me that he was the most dynamic personality I ever met. A very quiet, very modest man, but to meet him, and hear him, made one feel that nothing was impossible.

I knew quite intimately also Dr. Robert Stuart MacArthur, for forty years Pastor of Calvary Baptist Church, New York City, and the second President of the Baptist World Alliance. Talking with Dr. MacArthur about Dr. Conwell, on one occasion, he said that Conwell was the most remarkable personality he had ever met. He said, "He has come into my office in New York after a long night journey, during which perhaps he had had to sit up all night, being unable to secure a berth, looking as though he would collapse from sheer weariness. An hour or so afterward I have seen him", said Dr. MacArthur, "walk on to a platform before a great audience, and lecture for more than two hours, holding the people with unflinching interest to the end, as though it were but ten or fifteen minutes, and go through the whole performance as though he had done nothing for a month but get ready for that lecture."

Dr. MacArthur also said, "I suppose, without immodesty, I might safely say that my ministry in New York would be reckoned as having been reasonably successful; but I have never had even a nodding acquaintance with such success as Conwell's. The people tumble over each other to get into his Temple to be converted."

The late Dr. A. C. Dixon also told me a story of Conwell, which I think is worth publishing. He said that Conwell had returned, as was quite common with him, to Philadelphia, on a Sunday morning, after a week's lecture tour involving thousands of miles of travel. He was very tired, and that particular morning he himself felt that he had dropped far below his average in preaching. As he stepped down from the platform, he could not help overhearing two of the women of his congregation talk together. One said to the other, "The Doctor was pretty thin this morning, was he not?" To which the other replied, "Very thin indeed." A moment later he overheard another member remark on the poor quality of the sermon.

He returned to his home much depressed in spirit. He had felt the preaching had been poor, but he was not the sort of man to set over against it the fact that during the week he had travelled thousands of miles, instructed and inspired thousands of people, and made it possible for five or six poor students to continue their college course—while perhaps the thoughtless critic had spent a week in comparative idleness. Poor as the preaching had been, as he thought, it distressed him to hear people complain of it.

In the afternoon he went to the Sunday-School, as was his wont. It was his custom to play the organ at Sunday School—or piano, I am not sure which. On

this particular Sunday, the Superintendent of the Primary Department asked him if he would talk to the little tots. He said, "Thank you for asking me. I ought to have stayed in the primary class; that is where I belong."

He went in and talked to the children, telling them gospel stories in his inimitable way, and at the end of his story-telling he said something like this, "I want each of you, when sitting at the tea-table at home this evening, boys and girls alike, to turn to your father and say to him, 'Are you a Christian, daddy?' or whatever you call your father. If he says, 'No', ask him another question: 'Why are you not a Christian?' Listen carefully to what he says, and try to remember it. I shall be here again next Sunday afternoon, and you shall each tell me what your father said."

Dr. Dixon said, "I can give you one example illustrative of the result of that talk to the primary department. The father of one of the little girls who heard Dr. Conwell was a druggist. At tea that night she did as she had promised Dr. Conwell she would, and said to her father, 'Daddy, are you a Christian?' To which he replied, 'A Christian? Certainly not.' Then she asked him the second question, 'Why are you not a Christian, Daddy?' To which he replied, 'Whatever makes you ask me a question like that?' Then the little girl said, 'Dr. Conwell talked to us this afternoon, and he said I was to come home and ask you if you were a Christian, and if you said, No, I was to ask you why you were not a Christian.' The father was momentarily angry and said, 'I will not have Dr. Conwell put such questions as that into your mind. It is none of his business.' He spoke angrily, and the little girl said, 'All right, Daddy, I will tell Dr. Conwell what you said when he asks me next Sunday.' 'No! No!', said the father, 'You must not do anything of the kind. I do not like Dr. Conwell's having put you up to this, but I have great respect for him, and I should not like you to report what I have said. It is a good while until next Sunday, and between now and then I will give you an answer.'

Said Dr. Dixon, "And that was that druggist's job for the rest of the week, to find an answer for his little girl that she might tell Dr. Conwell why her father was not a Christian. But he could find no answer until he had given himself to Christ; and, as a result of that one talk Sunday afternoon to the little children, Dr. Conwell ultimately baptized forty fathers on profession of faith, who had been led to Christ through the question of their children."

I have specially told of my relationship to Dr. Conwell that I might relate the following facts. About the beginning of the year 1917 I received a communication from Temple University, Philadelphia, advising me that at a recent meeting of the Trustees of that institution, on recommendation of the Faculty, the degree of Doctor of Divinity had been granted to me, and would be conferred at the June Convocation. I was very much distressed by this communication, for I had never set much store by honorary degrees, or ministerial titles of any kind. I had rather favoured the idea that it was well that ministers should be appraised, like furniture in the natural wood without any finish upon it, and before any sort of putty or paint has been applied to make a good joint of a bad one. But, without consultation with me, the Trustee Board of a great university had granted this degree. The President of the University,

who had never breathed a word about the matter to me, was my great friend.

In my dilemma, I consulted Reverend Professor E. M. Keirstead, who had received almost every degree which any university could confer, thinking perhaps he would advise me how to get out of it. When I showed him the letter he said, "But what previous correspondence have you had on this subject?" I explained that I had had none, that this was the first suggestion I had heard. "Then", he said, "you can do nothing. Temple is a great university, one of standing"; and he related to me a similar experience which had fallen to the lot of some famous man of very great distinction, who, without having been asked, had been made an honorary alumnus of Dalhousie University.

I have often wished that I had written down Dr. Keirstead's report of that incident, but I can only do the best possible to put in my own words the reply of that distinguished scholar. It was to this effect: "I could not decline the honour you have conferred without belying the modesty such a refusal would profess." Those are not the exact words, but as I recall, they represent the substance of that distinguished man's answer. And so, Dr. Keirstead, who was ever a kind of father-confessor to me, said, "You know, Shields, I think a lot of you, but I do not think you are quite important enough to be able to afford to refuse to accept an honour of that sort!"

But Dr. Conwell was under promise to lecture for me again in April, and I said to Dr. Keirstead, "I suppose the only thing I can do is to await Dr. Conwell's coming, and speak to him personally about it. Perhaps, when he understands the situation, he will be able to find a way out for me without my giving any offence." I thought this was a safe course, as the degree was not to be conferred until June.

Some perhaps may wonder at my strong objection to it. My answer is this: I knew that while McMaster University was by no means prodigal in the conferring of honorary degrees, there had been occasions in which prominent churches, through their deacons, had suggested to McMaster University that the church would greatly appreciate the University's recognition of their Pastor by conferring upon him an honorary degree. I do not know that such overtures ever received a response.

Then, too, a little while before this, I had received information, contained in a number of letters which are still in my possession, respecting discussions which had gone on behind closed doors in McMaster University. The Chairman of the Board of Governors, as well as three or four members of the Board, were Deacons or members of Jarvis Street Church. In addition to that, there were one or two members of Jarvis Street who were on the Senate of McMaster. A suggestion had been made by someone—which suggestion did not come to my knowledge until some years later—that McMaster should confer a degree upon the Pastor of Jarvis Street. There had been very strong opposition to the proposal on the part of some members of the Faculty.

In those days it was the practice of the University to appoint a Degree Committee. Sometime during the University term, the Degree Committee was appointed, which included several members of Jarvis Street. These, I was later informed, were determined to recommend the name of the Pastor of Jarvis Street. I think it was an undesigned compliment, that every one of them, including my then associate, Rev. B. W. Merrill, with-

held all knowledge of this course from me, instinctively knowing that I should have disapproved. My information was that the Committee was appointed when the Chairman of the Board of Governors was absent, and that he was included on the Committee.

As soon as Dr. Thomson learned of it, he objected; and I was told that he said something to this effect: Evidently some of you brethren do not know my Pastor. If any such proposal were made, and he were to learn that it were made on the recommendation of such a Committee, nothing on earth would induce him to accept it. Dr. Thomson therefore said there was nothing to do but for the whole Committee to resign. At all events, he was determined so to do—and he did. And from that forward, the Degree Committee consisted of certain officials who were members *ex-officio*. I believe it was to consist of: the Chairman of the Board, Chairman of the Executive, the Principal of Moulton College, the Principal of Woodstock College, and, if I am not mistaken, some representative or representatives of the Alumni Association on the Senate. Of these particulars, I am not certain; and they are unimportant. It is enough to say, by Dr. Thomson's wise counsel, the practice was changed, so that in future no Committee could be especially appointed with a view to honouring a particular person; his object being, I think, to make it as far as possible an impartial, judicial Committee.

Such information as had reached me was of a confidential character. Letters which had passed between those who had participated in the discussion were placed in my hands. The confidential character of the matter made it impossible for me to take any action, or I could have settled their difficulties in one moment. However, I knew these things had taken place, and for that reason I was even more anxious than I might otherwise have been to circumvent the proposal of Temple University. I felt sure that the known personal friendship obtaining between Dr. Conwell and myself would be held responsible for the action of the University of which he was President.

But April came at last, and with it Dr. Conwell. I met him at the station, took him to his hotel, and after a little talk he said, "Now I should like to see where you live, if you have no objection; I should like to visit your home." He had come on an early train, and after breakfast, we went to my home and spent the whole forenoon, as I recall, talking together. I broached the question of the degree. He did not say he knew nothing about it, but he feigned either ignorance or indifference by saying, "I am a lawyer. I will advise you: let us change the subject."

## BOOKS BY DR. SHIELDS

"Other Little Ships" - - - - -	\$1.50
"The Most Famous Trial of History" - - -	.50
"The Oxford Group Movement Analyzed" -	.50
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" - - -	.50
12 Copies	.50

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

# 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: .....