

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

"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. 16, No. 20

TORONTO, SEPTEMBER 23, 1937

Whole Number 801

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

"WARS AND RUMOURS OF WARS"

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, September 19th, 1937

(Stenographically Reported)

"And ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars: see that ye be not troubled: for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet.

"For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places.

"All these are the beginning of sorrows."—Matthew 24:6-8.

On several occasions our Lord admonished His hearers, having ears, to hear: "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." Again, He implied there were people who had eyes but could not see, and ears but could not hear. By which saying He did not refer to the physical organs of sight or of hearing, but to the fact that being endowed with perceptive faculties capable of communication with the objective world, through eye and ear they perceived nothing of value, and failed to apprehend that which they ought to have known.

Supplementary to that, on another occasion, He said, "Take heed how ye hear." It is important to learn how to hear. When the drill sergeant commands attention, he simply bids the men to give attention to what is about to be said—"Take heed how ye hear." When you take down the telephone and say, "Hello", or, as they say in England, "Are you there?"—you recognize that it is useless to speak unless someone is listening.

Once again our Lord said, "Let these sayings sink down into your ears." By which I suppose He meant, Do not be careless and inattentive hearers. Receive the Word, and let it sink in so that you will remember and understand it. In His parable of the sower He described several classes of hearers. The wayside hearer was specifically said to be one who "heard the word, but did not understand it." He received the letter of it, but to him it might just as well have been a foreign language: it did not enter into his understanding. In respect to two other classes, the seed falling in stony ground and that falling among thorns, He implied the same thing: for, speaking of the fruitful hearers, He described them as those who "hear and understand".

There can be no fruitful hearing of the Word unless it enters into our understanding. God never intended that any of us should be mere automatons, much less mere animated gramophones, simply receiving impressions, and parroting them off again.

In the days of His flesh, when our Lord was seen of His disciples forty days after His passion, we are told that He opened their understanding that they should understand the Scripture. Many of those whose understanding He then opened, had heard the very same teaching before His passion, but "these things understood not his disciples at the first: but when Jesus was glorified"—in the light of their own fulfilment—"then remembered they that they had done these things unto him." After He opened their understanding, they saw, perhaps as did Saul of Tarsus, as by a flash from heaven at a later day, the entire Old Testament illumined with the light that shines from the face of Jesus Christ. They knew then why He died, and rose again, and ascended into heaven. They knew what even the prophets of old did not understand, who had written the very words then interpreted to them by the Lord.

And in that is contained the principle that underlies all mental processes. How many people really give attention to what they see, or understand what they hear? Their vagrant minds wander far afield although their eyes see the letter before them. In such cases there is little concentration or application, little apprehension of the truth written or spoken. It is hard to teach such wandering minds, and that is especially true religiously. We all need instruction; and there is only one Instructor, the Spirit of God Himself. I say again to you, Do not receive anything I say because I

say it. Search the Scriptures. I would fain make you all diligent students of the Word of God. I heard of one reputed to be "a great Bible teacher" who advised his hearers that it was dangerous to come to this place because they might hear something which he did not believe and teach.

I do not think there will be much difficulty in our understanding the things of God if we really come as willing pupils to the school of Christ, and to His Word, desiring to know His will, while disabusing our minds of all prejudice. How we need the light of the Spirit to understand this twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew! How carelessly it is read! How strangely—I had almost said, how grotesquely—it is sometimes interpreted. We claim no infallibility in this place, and shall endeavour to expound this scripture only so far as we believe God has enabled us to understand it. If you have a better understanding, I congratulate you. If, by the goings of God upon your own spirit, you are sure your ground is scriptural, I would rather you would rest there, than on anything I have to say. That may not be sound psychology, but it is sound theology.

The disciples of the Lord Jesus asked Him a three-fold question. They asked, "When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?"

There will be no difference of opinion among those of us who are believers, on this point; that this chapter does really teach—as do the Scriptures generally—that He who came once, will come again; not as an abstraction, not as some mere ideal of life, or philosophy of conduct, or anything of that sort. Surely the Scripture teaches the personal return of the Lord. He came literally once. Jesus of Nazareth is not a figment of the imagination, not a legendary figure; but a character of history. He had a real, literal existence. He was born in Bethlehem; He lived in what we call the Holy Land; and died and went to heaven. The Bible certifies to these facts, and it certifies that "this same Jesus" is coming again.

We all believe that truth. These are the two great events of all history. His first advent divides all history: His second advent will inaugurate a new age—and this chapter spans the intervening period, and is a comprehensive survey, in principle, of all that will obtain from the time He came once to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself, to the time when He shall come again "without sin unto salvation". This chapter, I say, spans the whole intervening age—this age, about the consummation of which the disciples enquired.

I.

My task this evening is to try to show you something of the relation of these things set out in the verses I have read—wars and rumours of wars, famines and pestilences and earthquakes in divers places—THE RELATION OF THESE MATTERS TO THE SCHEME OF THINGS WHICH MUST OBTAIN BETWEEN THE TWO ADVENTS.

Where do they belong? Obviously, "*wars and rumours of wars*" are not necessarily signs of the near approach of the Lord. There may be wars and rumours of wars just before He comes, but if so, it will be but a repetition of that which has obtained from the time He came first. These verses specifically say we are not to be troubled by these things in respect to the near approach of that

great event, that "the end is not yet". These things will come to pass, but are only the "beginning of sorrows", and not signs of the near coming of the Lord.

Yet how many dear friends who believe the Bible, who, hearing of wars and rumours of wars, say, "That shows that we are nearing the end of the age." The Bible does not say so; it says the contrary. Many hear and read so carelessly that they sometimes actually invert the teaching of Scripture, and refer to the Bible as their authority for believing the opposite of what the Bible teaches. "Wars and rumours of wars" are not signs of the near approach of the Lord's coming.

Surely we may safely say that *these conditions are but symptomatic of the underlying state which will obtain throughout this age*. "Whence come wars?" You may blame the Treaty of Versailles, or the ex-Kaiser, or the rulers of Russia, Spain, or Germany, for the present chaos. Fundamentally, the Scripture says, "From whence come wars and fightings among you? come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?" That is to say, war has its root and cause in human nature as it is. There may be great wars, and there may be little wars. It may be a vast international conflict, a war between two nations, civil strife, as in Spain, or only a domestic squabble between Maggie and Jiggs—the explanation of the death-dealing projectiles and the rolling-pin is the same. The Bible says "wars and rumours of wars" will continue; "Nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom": that has been true from the beginning. From the day of Cain and Abel, the world has never been without someone ready to repeat the deed of Cain. I repeat, on a small scale or a large one, it is all the same. Up to this hour, history attests the truth of this scripture, "Ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars." There always have been wars; there are now; there will be to the end of the age.

I call your attention to another matter: *the sympathetic relation between—how shall I put it?—between human nature as it is, and the whole cosmic order*. Have you ever coupled those verses together, "Wars and rumours of wars, kingdom rising against, and nation against nation"—there you have the human element; men, nations, in armed conflict. But there are to be famines and pestilences and earthquakes—and these are what would legally be described as "acts of God". But they are symptomatic of the condition of the cosmic order in this present age.

How far does the curse of sin extend? You are familiar with the word—unto Adam God said, "Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it; cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

Some young man says, "Excuse me, sir, but did you not read that from Genesis?" Yes, I did. "I do not accept Genesis." I am sorry. When you can delete the truth of Genesis from universal human experience, I will examine your objection to Genesis. It has been demonstrated in every age of the world's history, that the very earth on which we live has been corrupted by the inhabitants thereof, and that the curse which fell upon

the transgressor, descended to his inheritance. If you doubt the truth of it, get a garden—like mine. If you doubt it, try to wrest a living from the land. If you want really to make sure of it, go out to Saskatchewan, and you will find it to be true.

Let me give you an instance. There was a famine in David's day—I know this is old-fashioned. Many have lost the idea of a personal, ruling God—but there was a famine in David's day, and he enquired of the Lord as to why it had come; and the Lord said, "It is for Saul, and for his bloody house, because he slew the Gibeonites." There was a bit of history behind that famine. When Joshua was marching into the promised land, there came a large company of people in outworn sandals, with moldy bread in their baskets, and stale water in their bottles. Their garments were outworn, and they presented every appearance of having been long on the road. Joshua said to them, "Who are ye? and from whence come ye?" And they answered, "From a very far country thy servants are come because of the name of the Lord thy God: for we have heard the fame of him, and all that he did in Egypt, and all that he did to the two kings of the Amorites, that were beyond Jordan, to Sihon king of Hashbon, and to Og king of Bashan, which was at Ashtaroth. Wherefore our elders and all the inhabitants of our country spake to us, saying, Take victuals with you for the journey, and go to meet them, and say unto them, We are your servants: therefore now make ye a league with us"—"And Joshua made peace with them, and made a league with them, to let them live: and the princes of the congregation sware unto them. And it came to pass at the end of three days after they had made a league with them, that they heard that they were their neighbours, and that they dwelt among them." But Joshua had solemnly sworn that he would not hurt them, so he spared their lives, and made them hewers of wood and drawers of water.

Centuries passed, one ruler succeeded another, until there came a famine in David's day, and David enquired, "Why is it?" And the Lord said, "Because of Saul", the remote successor of Joshua; he slew the Gibeonites. He violated the covenant, and the very earth protested, and refused to yield her fruits.

We are told to-day that it is folly to be ruled by "the dead hand". Truce-breakers in all walks of life are multiplied. But I point out that there is a sympathetic relation between the material order and its human inhabitants, and as long as wars and rumours of wars persist, because of the unregenerate nature behind them, just so long will earthquakes and famines and pestilences characterize this earthly existence. Is it not written, "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together unto now . . . waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body"? Until He comes, at the consummation of the age, until those who sleep in Christ shall rise and, together with the living, at His coming shall be caught up to meet Him, that condition must obtain. Some time we shall have a new heaven and a new earth, "wherein dwelleth righteousness", but not now. These conditions have obtained, and will continue until Christ comes.

Again, old-fashioned as it is, in spite of all your agricultural science, all your endeavours to overcome the pests of life, the locusts and their confederates still come, as the Bible predicts. Did not I say to you a little while ago that God had all these things in His hand? I read a question of a man in Parliament, when Mr. Bennett was

Premier of Canada, asking if the Government was doing anything to reduce the wheat acreage in the West; and Mr. Bennett replied that the grasshoppers had already done it, and that governmental action was unnecessary. Ought we to elect the grasshoppers to Parliament? They would be as useful as some we do send there. In any event what the grasshoppers left undone, the sandstorms of the West have completed.

Look over the world to-day. The Bible is demonstrated to be true in the life of the individual, and of the nation; and just as it was said in the New Testament of those who crucified Christ, that not knowing the Scripture, they fulfilled it in crucifying Him, even the very enemies of the Book, under the sovereign hand of Him Whom we adore as our King, are made unconscious instruments in fulfilling His Word.

So then, that would seem to be the present condition, not characteristic of one century more than another, but in general, characteristic of the whole period between the two Advents. "Wars and rumours of wars", and a like condition even in the material world.

We do not know very much yet. We think we do; we pose as the embodiments of wisdom. Sometimes I think Science itself will be a witness against modern unbelief. We are only beginning to learn how sensitive the whole material order is, and how verily we live, not in a multiverse, but in a universe; that as there is one God, there is one law; and that a very close relation exists between the physical and moral constitution of things. Some day I believe we shall find that the whole universe is as sensitive and as truly a unity as these bodies of ours, and that it is for ever true that if one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; that we cannot violate the law of God in any realm without its registering everywhere, like the invisible radio wave that reaches to the utmost bounds of immeasurable space.

II.

WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS OF THESE CONSIDERATIONS? *There seems to be no immediate prospect of any sort of Utopia, of any millennium within this age.* Some of my dear friends know more about the millennium than I do—and not one of us knows very much. We believe that God is not going to be driven from His earth, that He will cleanse this material world some day. I cannot believe otherwise. I cannot conceive of God's being vanquished anywhere. Therefore some day this earth must see the elimination, the abolition, of war, and consequently of all rumours of such. There will be an end to pestilences and earthquakes and famines—but not now. Those conditions will obtain throughout this present age.

Then, very simply, *I believe they are grievously in error who assume that it is within the power of the church to abolish war*—I use the term in the broad sense, the people of God of all names, those who are genuinely born again, not the organized, nominal, visible church. If it be true of those who are in touch with God, it is more emphatically true of those who are not—hence there is no hope of the church's abolishing war. What nonsense we hear, that if the church did what it was designed to do, there would be no war. If the church were to recognize its social obligations there would be no famine! The church could just as easily abolish earthquakes as abolish war. God has not delegated to any organization the power to change human nature. I care not how faithful the

church may be, it can never within the bounds of these two events—Christ's first and His second coming, entirely abolish war, or any of these human disabilities which accompany it.

It follows then that *no human—strictly human—agency can accomplish any more*. You cannot educate people not to fight. You may send a man to college and university, and he may become a great physicist of some sort—and then produce a gas that will kill people more rapidly than bullets! People cannot be educated out of their natural propensities. I heard a man say once that the uneducated thief would go down to the siding and steal a melon out of a railroad car—especially if he had a little colour in him; but that the educated thief will steal the whole railroad! You cannot abolish wars and rumours of wars, or any of these conditions described in our text, by human agencies.

I am not at all surprised at the comparative failure of the League of Nations. It was a fine ideal President Wilson set before the world, of all the nations sitting around a conference table, and agreeing not to fight any more!—but just as impossible as it was lovely. His own nation proceeded immediately to demonstrate its impracticability by telling their President, as soon as he got home, that they would have nothing to do with it. I am not surprised at the failure of the principle of "collective security". There can be no security against human nature until that nature is regenerated; there can be no security from sin apart from divine interposition.

Make no mistake. *That does not mean that the church should not do its utmost to limit these evils*. We ought, by every means in our power, to keep these things within the narrowest limits possible. We have a graduate of the Seminary who is a missionary in Jerusalem. There were certain people there who talked much about a coming great tribulation which they identified with the day of Jacob's trouble. They said that was to be the lot of the Jews by and by. The Arabs were attentive to their teachings, and said, "If that be so, we will hasten it. Come on, Jacob; we will give it to you now."

Conversely people say, "Things are going to the bad. You cannot have a great revival. Let it go. You cannot stop war, let it go." I am for the League of Nations, and for every agency that can make this world even a little safer to live in; that will labour to postpone the evil day if it can be postponed. For example: I do not believe that if we shut up all the abominable beer-parlours around here we should thereby make their habitués heirs of glory: they would still need to be born again. But I believe they should be closed and that we should help to close them. To that end I shall labour in my speech to-morrow evening. "It must needs be that offences come; but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh!" Therefore Christian people ought, so far as possible, to be advocates of peace, and of good will among men; and ought to exercise themselves to the utmost to stay the progress of evil. But when we have done our best, we shall find evil still with us. Notwithstanding, we are under solemn obligation to do our best to bring the principles of Christ's gospel to bear upon individuals, upon society, and upon the wider national and international spheres.

That being true, and these verses being true, there will be to the end of the age *a necessity for the punitive element in all government, both human and*

divine. There will be wars and rumours of wars—why? War implies differences of interests and of wills. A gentleman who is an ex-Moderator of the United Church of Canada, and ministers not very far from where I now stand, recently was reported as saying in the United States that in the next war no church would pray for victory, because all churches believe in the evil of war *per se*. That position cannot logically be supported. War is evil. Every Christian must abhor it, and especially the necessity for it. But there may be righteous, defensive wars.

Many people in England, most of them ministers, have clamoured for peace at any price; whereas in this world, human nature being what it is, peace can be established and maintained often, only at a price of blood. Many teach that war is always futile. Some have contented that the Great War accomplished nothing. Did it not? I saw last night a picture of thousands of men in Germany, not with rifles but with shovels, marching past Herr Hitler; as he gave the Nazi salute. Did the Great War accomplish nothing? You and I might have been in that shovel brigade if Germany had been allowed to have her way. The British flag still flies over the greatest Empire the world has ever seen—why? Because our liberties were defended by blood. But the doctrines of pacificism have been so generally preached that in England, here, and elsewhere, a public opinion was created which compelled disarmament, and that has brought about the present confusion. There is no class of men so directly responsible for the chaotic condition of international affairs as that of the modernistic preacher. If we had had sound men in Britain and the United States, and in all the Dominions, there would have been developed a public opinion that would have recognized these scriptural principles, and there would have been an international police force able to say to the world's outlaws, Italy and Japan and Germany, "Behave yourselves!"—and they would have been compelled to submit. But the illogical doctrines of Modernism have sapped the very foundations of democratic society.

As long as there are wars and rumours of wars, we shall have to maintain armies. A man came to the office yesterday, a very pious gentleman. I did not see him, but he was very much concerned about my spiritual welfare. He thought I ought not to speak about Mr. Hepburn, that I ought to "keep myself unspotted from the world". Of course we must—but in doing so we must visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction; and that may involve dealing with those evils which made the children fatherless and their mothers widows. If our visitor had found a burglar in his house on returning from my office, no doubt he would have sent for the police, and would have discerned no inconsistency in doing so. The state is of divine institution and the magistrate must bear a sword, and bear it not in vain. And for this cause and service we must pay tribute.

Now I come to the crux of the whole matter. I said there must be that punitive element in order to the control of society, be it small or large; be it community, nation, or the world. Hence Britain has learned that she must re-arm. To-day her ships are scouring the sea—what for? The G-men of the United States are scouring the country for an outlaw—may they catch him! What is the British navy doing? In conjunction with those of France and other nations, she

is scouring the Mediterranean for outlaws. And is anyone simple enough in view of the present international state of affairs to say that she ought not to do so? What is the explanation?

In the last analysis, while human nature is what it is, it will yield to nothing but force. Hence the policeman must still carry his baton or some other weapon, with which to defend himself, and to assist in the apprehension of those whose predatory natures would put human life and property in jeopardy.

It all leads up to this. There is a Government enthroned on high. "Clouds and darkness are round about him: righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne." He has given His law—and He has said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word"—my law—"shall never pass away". "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail."

You and I are all law-breakers. We have incurred its penalties individually, and have had a share in bringing the curse upon the very ground we tread. We are all outlaws before God. "All have sinned." We had been banished from His presence for ever but that He had compassion on us, and sent His only begotten Son. What did He do? He "magnified the law, and made it honourable". He was made a curse for us; He took upon Himself the penalty of our sin. God's law was honoured—and is honoured in the salvation of everyone who trusts in the Lord Jesus; and the supremacy of the divine government is proclaimed, and the King Himself is crowned. That is the supreme function of the gospel, to save men in a way that is consistent with the divine honour, which means the glory of His holiness. Hence the expiatory death of Christ made it possible for God to be just, and yet the Justifier of him that believeth on Jesus. There could be no atonement without expiation, no salvation without the payment of a penalty.

Have you believed in the Lord Jesus Christ? If you have, in the midst of wars and rumours of wars, of famines and pestilences and earthquakes, your heart may be garrisoned by the peace of God.

But what about those who do not obey the gospel? Do not forget that Christ is coming again apart from sin, and without a sin offering. "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe." The divine government must ultimately be vindicated and the divine honour magnified, as men either glorify His grace—the meeting of mercy and truth and peace and righteousness at the place called Calvary, or as they glorify His justice in their everlasting destruction from His presence. There is only one Ruler, one King of kings, one Lord of lords; and some day when thus He comes, He will put an end to wars and rumours of wars. There will be no pestilences; there will be no famines, there will be no earthquakes. All will be peace, unbroken, everlasting peace. What a blessing is in store for us! Have you the earnest of it even now? Trust Him. Trust the Lord Jesus Christ now, and find everlasting salvation in Him.

THE ADDRESS ON HEPBURN

The addresses delivered by the Editor over three years ago, in condemnation of the administration of the Liquor Control Act by the Hepburn Government, were published in full in this paper; and, subsequently, a number of editorials dealing with the same matter. Dr. Shields' addresses on the Separate School question, one delivered in Jarvis Street Church, and the other in Massey Hall, were also published in this paper. Our readers, therefore, are entitled to know the Editor's views respecting the election campaign just now in progress in Ontario. For this reason, the address delivered Monday evening is published in full in this issue.

The address was issued in booklet form, and came from the press to the auditorium, and was sold at the doors at the conclusion of its delivery for 5c per copy.

We quote below the opening paragraphs of the reports contained in *The Evening Telegram* and *The Toronto Star*. *The Telegram* gave a one-column report, and *The Star* about two columns. *The Telegram* report begins with these words:

"There is but one answer to the question, what should Ontario do with Hepburn? With both hands and a strong right foot, throw him out."

Amid thunderous applause from an audience that packed the church to the doors, many standing throughout the two-hour discourse, Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D., pastor of Jarvis Street Baptist Church, thus concluded a denunciation of the present administration at Queen's Park last night.

The first two paragraphs in the report of *The Toronto Star* were as follows:

"With both hands and a strong right foot, throw him out," was Dr. T. T. Shields' answer to his own question asked in Jarvis Street Baptist Church last night: "What ought Ontario to do with Hepburn?"

Before an audience of more than 1,500 persons, and after he had warned possible hecklers that he had "police officers in the building," Dr. Shields condemned Mr. Hepburn for bringing the C.I.O. into the present election campaign "where it is not an issue," termed the Premier's policy in regard to Hydro "penny wise and pound foolish," characterized his separate school policy as "an attempt to buy Roman Catholic votes with money filched from Protestant pockets," and called the profits made by the Province under Mr. Hepburn from the sale of liquor "blood money".

We publish these reports merely to give our readers at a distance an idea of the meeting. It was a most orderly meeting throughout. Our reason for having plainclothesmen in the building was that it sometimes happens that on such occasions, perhaps one or two half-drunken objectors may cause a scene; and when they do, so much space is taken in the papers to report it, that they have no room to report the meeting itself. Except for frequent bursts of applause expressing approval of the points made in the address, the meeting was quite as orderly as a Sunday evening service.

We have no funds available for use in publishing the address in booklet form, so that we are obliged to make a small charge for them, to pay the cost of publication. A copy will be sent to any address for 5c and postage. We suggest that readers ordering individual copies, may help us to meet the expense of publication by sending 10c, which will cover postage and leave a little toward the cost of publication. If copies are ordered to the number of ten or more, they will be sent postpaid at the rate of 5c, or fifty for \$1.75. Our readers in Ontario who approve of the argument of the address are invited to assist us in circulating it as widely as possible among the electors of the Province.

WHAT OUGHT ONTARIO TO DO WITH HEPBURN?

An Address by T. T. Shields

Delivered in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto,
Monday Evening, September 20th, 1937

When a minister of the gospel attempts to apply Christian principles to public affairs, invariably he hears from certain people—and generally people who ordinarily are destitute of religious interest—who suddenly develop a passion for gospel preaching, and who proceed to admonish the preacher to leave politics alone, and preach the gospel.

I will take second place to no man in recognizing the primacy of that duty in the minister's vocation; but, as I have frequently said here, the gospel is designed for the whole man, and has application to the universal interests and concerns of the individual, of society, of the nation, and of the world at large. In consonance with that conviction, as occasions have required it, I have many times discussed important and far-reaching public questions, especially in relation to the moral principles involved.

When, immediately following Mr. Mitchell F. Hepburn's advent to power, the Liquor Control dam burst, and a flood of beer overflowed the Province, I protested as vigorously as I could, both against the Act which permitted it, and the Administration which promoted it. As a result of my repeated public protests, I received 40,679 signed protests against the beer parlours. Among the thousands of letters which reached me, were several lists of names accompanied by covering letters informing me that the names represented every name on the voters' list in the section represented.

As those addresses were broadcast, they reached tens of thousands of people throughout the Province; and no doubt thousands of others beside the more than forty thousand who communicated with me, approved of the position then taken. Those addresses were delivered immediately following Mr. Hepburn's accession to power, when, of course, there was no prospect of an early election. Since that time I have received enquiries from not a few as to why I was silent.

In justification of my not having spoken before, I need say only that I was absent from my pulpit, on my physician's orders, on account of a heart attack, for four months, and when I could not preach the gospel, it was obvious I could not speak upon anything else. But the enquiring and expectant attitude of the tens of thousands who responded to my protest on the beer parlours forbids my being silent on that subject now.

Furthermore, I spoke in opposition to the Hepburn Separate School measure, from this platform, and again in Massey Hall; and later in many places throughout the Province. And when at last a by-election was announced in East Hastings, and, for the first time after his accession to power, Mr. Hepburn appealed to the electorate for an endorsement of his policies, I accepted an invitation to go to East Hastings and deliver a number of addresses. Mr. Hepburn paid me the compliment of assuming that those addresses were rather effective; for when accepting the motion to repeal the Amendment to the Assessment Act, he assailed me on the floor of the Legislature, and seemed to hold me at least in part responsible for thus forcing his hand. I had no opportunity to reply to Mr. Hepburn in the House, but I shall do so now.

The addresses delivered in connection with the Separate School question were published and circulated throughout the Province to the number of about twenty thousand. The people who were in any way influenced by my protest against the Separate School matter will also expect, I have no doubt, some word from me now that the Province is afforded an opportunity to approve or disapprove of the Hepburn administration.

On the ground of all these considerations, I could not be silent if I would; and because my convictions on these matters have not altered, I would not be silent if I could. So then to my task.

I am not interested in party politics. I am profoundly interested in, and would like to the limit of my ability to serve the public weal. To that end, I feel it my duty as a citizen to promote and support sound government. When speaking on this subject before from this platform, I remarked that notwithstanding all its defects, democracy has this advantage over all other forms of government: that when government of the people ceases to be for the people, it can ultimately be remedied by the people. Under the Hepburn regime, the government of the people has ceased to be for the people; and I confidently believe that on October 6th it will be remedied by the people.

I propose this evening to analyze as carefully as I can the record of the Hepburn administration; to consider what ought to be the public attitude toward that record; and then to enquire whether there be any alternative to the continuance of the present order of things.

The Record of the Hepburn Administration

I begin, then, with an examination of the record of the Hepburn administration. My inclination would lead me to confine my enquiries to the great moral issues represented by the Hepburn liquor administration, and his Separate School legislation; but they are so wrapped up with other matters, and the public mind seems to be so generally confused, that were I to ignore the other considerations, I might be charged with unfairness in drawing attention only to the vulnerable spots in the Hepburn defences. In any event, we must consider the Hepburn record as a whole. It is useless to commend a man for spreading a good table and inviting one to dinner, if he burns the house over his head while he is eating.

Mr. Hepburn and the C.I.O.

I shall begin therefore with Mr. Hepburn's attitude toward the Labour Movement known as the Committee for Industrial Organization. I disagree with the critics of the Hepburn regime when they argue that there was no necessity for strong action on the part of Mr. Hepburn in the Oshawa strike. At that time the C.I.O. in the United States presented every appearance of being the spring of an incipient revolution. Its operations were characterized by violence and blood-shed. It usurped the functions of government, and in Michigan paralyzed the business of several cities in which it operated. In Ohio and Pennsylvania it exercised such an influence as temporarily to subdue to its will the Governors of those States; and troops were mobilized, not to protect workers in the exercise of their right to work, nor strikers in the exercise of their recognized right to strike, but to prevent men who desired to work from doing so.

The leaders of the C.I.O. in the United States were the political kinsmen of Russian Communism; and it

seemed for a while that even the President of the United States and his Government were to be dictated to by the President of the C.I.O. That being true, I believe Mr. Hepburn was justified in taking special precautions to see that the affiliates of that organization in Canada should not be allowed to disturb the peace.

It must be remembered that in a small city like Oshawa it would have been impossible for the ordinary police force to control the situation had violence broken out; and when the strikers in Oshawa were being directed by the same men who were responsible for the lawlessness exhibited in the United States, I believed then, and I still believe, that Mr. Hepburn was justified in having at hand an adequate police force; but I believe that he showed wisdom in keeping them in Toronto, that they might not be unnecessarily provocative. I said at the time that if, as we all hoped, force should prove to be unnecessary, the cost incurred would only be as an insurance premium, and would be money well spent.

As I had so sharply criticized Mr. Hepburn in other matters, I felt it only fair and honourable to commend him for a course which I believed to be an act of ordinary prudence. *But I did not then think, and I do not now think, that that one action of Mr. Hepburn should be permitted to becloud the major issues which present themselves to the electorate of Ontario for its determination.*

Since the Oshawa affair, conditions have entirely changed in the United States. The C.I.O. has more openly manifested its political character, and it has suffered so many defeats, that even in the land of its origin its influence is steadily diminishing. When the dreaded disease ordinarily known as infantile paralysis is epidemic, a physician should be specially careful of his patients; and until a patient's ailment has so developed that its symptoms unmistakably indicate its character, he should assume, and prepare for, the worst. In such case no wise man will reprove him for so doing. But when at last it is demonstrated that his patient is suffering from an ordinary cold, and not from infantile paralysis, should he then insist upon keeping the patient in quarantine, and turning the whole town upsidedown, he ought not to be commended, but treated as the later circumstances require.

The C.I.O. Not Now An Ontario Issue

I cannot see that the C.I.O. is at present an issue in Ontario politics. Many of you may not agree with me in commending Mr. Hepburn for his action at Oshawa. I am as jealous for the rights of workers of all classes—whether they wear collars or not—as any man; but I do not believe for a moment that the interests of Labour in the Province of Ontario, considered from any point of view—or of Capital either, except as it is represented by the liquor interests—require that Mr. Hepburn should be returned to power.

The Windsor Precedent

I cite one particular example in this matter. In Windsor in May last Thomas Parry and Walter Stillmack were convicted of having been members of an unlawful assembly before the premises of the Kelsey Wheel Company the previous December. Parry was sentenced to six months' imprisonment and Stillmack to a term in Essex County Jail. The case was appealed, and their counsel, before the Appellate Court, complained of the manner in which the jury at the trial was called and

constituted, his chief objection being that as a result of the action of the Crown counsel in directing jurors to stand aside, there were ten farmers on the jury. From the report it appeared that while nobody was seriously hurt at the Kelsey plant, there was an attempt to prevent cars from entering the premises, that one was prevented from entering, that cars were attacked and forcibly turned around, and attempts were made to upset them. The newspaper report, of September 13th says:

"The court did not call upon W. B. Common, K.C., to present argument of the Crown. Chief Justice Latchford delivered the decision. He said that the jury, whether it was composed of farmers or not, had a right to find Parry and Stillmack were members of an unlawful assembly. Picketing without any breach of the peace was permissible, he noted, but upon it there was, under the law, a serious limitation. His Majesty's peace, declared the Chief Justice, must be held by the court to be inviolable."

Therefore the conviction was upheld. So that on so recent a date as September 13th, we have a very practical demonstration of the fact that the ordinary machinery of Justice in this Province can be trusted to maintain order. Lawlessness will not be permitted by any regime at Queen's Park, or if it were, the public sentiment of this Province would soon make short work of it. I affirm therefore that so far as the peace of this Province is concerned, industrial or otherwise, it will be faithfully preserved without the continuance of Mr. Hepburn's regime. *I would therefore dismiss the C.I.O. incident as a bit of ancient history, and refuse to permit its discussion to becloud the more serious issues of the day.*

Hepburn's Hydro Policy

You may think I am going beyond my proper sphere if I venture even to refer to the Government's policy in respect to Hydro. But when one is conducting an examination to determine the credibility of a witness, it may be germane to the subject to consider what he has to say about the price of his wife's hat. I read the reports of the discussion of public affairs as carefully as possible; and knowing that members of the Legislature who have a right to all the facts, have asked for data respecting Hydro matters, and have been refused it, I recognize how impossible it is for anybody outside the administration itself to know the exact state of affairs.

I have had enough to do with public bodies, and the examination of their reports, to know that even the most careful examination of public documents may fail to disclose matters exclusively within the knowledge of the administration behind them. Ontario has never known a man more reckless in public speech than the present Premier. No one can positively say what the true state of this great public enterprise, known as Hydro, is. They know, of course, what Mr. Hepburn and Mr. Roebuck have said about it; but even in the short space of three years many of their criticisms have been demonstrated to be without justification.

In the Abitibi matter, the Hepburnites have been rather like a wife who accused her husband of being a prodigal spender, notwithstanding he defended himself by saying that his money was being spent legitimately. But the wife continued to complain, and succeeded at last in nagging him to death. After the funeral she discovered that his extravagance had consisted in paying the premiums on insurance policies of which she was named the beneficiary. Having killed her husband by nagging, she discovered that the thing about which she

nagged him was that which provided her with a comfortable living; and kept her out of the poor-house.

That is an exact parallel to the case of the Hydro in the North. The very thing which Hepburn condemned on such a wholesale scale has proved to be the foundation of the prosperity of the mining regions of the North, without which the prosperity of the North, with its many low-grade gold mines, would be impossible. That, the present Hydro Commissioners dare not deny.

I shall not discuss the matter further in detail, so far as the economic aspect of Hydro is concerned; except to offer you another parable. This time a man complains to his wife of an obligation at the fruiterer's. He learns that she has placed a large order for peaches and other fruits, and he insists that it is far more than is necessary to supply the requirements of the family. He thinks one or two small baskets should be enough for their present need, and sees no reason for buying in advance. But when the season is past, and the winter comes on, the man of the house wants some peaches or other fruit, but he is informed there are none in the cellar. "Well then, telephone to the store for them." But his wife replies, "Our budget will not permit us to buy peaches out of season, and we have no preserved fruit of any sort in store. I wanted to lay up a store of fruit, but you objected that my order was beyond the family's requirements, and so I cancelled the order and did not preserve the fruit. Now you will have to go without."

An evening or so later, a company of friends come in unexpectedly; and it is necessary to offer them a meal of some sort. But again the faithful housewife says, "I do not know what to do. I have nothing in the cellar to set before them. You would not let me store my cellar for emergencies such as this. That is the difference between us: you live from hand to mouth, and are content to provide for a few days or a week at a time; but the provident housewife must try to foresee the emergencies, and prepare herself to meet them."

Of course, there is a prophetic element in such a parable, the appositeness of which will not appear until winter comes. I feel sure it will yet appear that Hepburn & Co. in their conduct of Hydro have been but penny wise and pound foolish. But, even accepting Mr. Hepburn's representation of the case, and supposing it to be true that millions of dollars have been saved, is there nothing in life worth thinking of but dollars?

The Repudiation Principle

I am treading on dangerous ground perhaps, and yet I will dare to say it. Quite apart from all economic considerations, Mr. Hepburn's repudiation of public covenants has set a very bad example to all classes of society in the Province, and has thus invited people generally to become truce-breakers. Other people have entered into contracts that were unprofitable. Many a business man assumed obligations in prosperous times, of which he would gladly have relieved himself during the depression; but on moral and legal grounds, he had to face his responsibilities, even though it involved him at last in bankruptcy. Mr. Hepburn's principle of legislative covenant-breaking and denial of access to the Courts, is a reversal of all British procedure, and in principle would carry us back to beyond the days of the institution of *habeas corpus*, and to before Magna Charta itself. Indeed, his whole administration of Hydro has set before this country an example of lawlessness and covenant-

breaking that has seriously impaired and must inevitably work to the ultimate injury of our whole social fabric.

I am proud of our British institutions, and still believe that every man ought to be allowed to have his day in court. When the present Hydro Commission brought one case before the courts, the Court decided against it, and, for his conduct in the matter, the presiding judge told the Chairman of the present Hydro Commission that if it had been a jury case he would have felt compelled to indict him for contempt of court. No wonder the Hydro Chairman did actually hold the Court in contempt when the Premier of this Province has poured contempt upon the whole Judiciary ever since he came into power.

In this connection, however, I must say that in my view, Mr. Hepburn is slightly less dangerous than he was, in that he has freed himself from the machinations of one of his most dangerous accomplices in the person of the former Attorney-General, Mr. Roebuck. At the last Provincial election, I voted for Mr. Roebuck, but on October 6th I shall endeavour to bring forth fruit meet for repentance. In view of all the circumstances, we should be well advised not to allow a little reduction in our Hydro bills—even were we assured of the continuance of such reductions—to blind us to the flood of evils which has been released upon the Province by other Acts of the Hepburn regime. There are other questions bigger than the C.I.O. and, by any fair appraisal, there are moral values which far transcend the Hydro economic problem.

The Separate School Question

I come now to the Separate School question. I am well aware that the objectionable Amendment to the Assessment Act has been repealed. Sometimes a man is arrested and brought into court for an "attempt" at murder, or for an "attempt" to do grievous bodily harm, or for carrying offensive weapons. His intended victim may be uninjured, it may be evident to the court that he failed utterly to accomplish his criminal purpose; but if it can be proved that he attempted to do it, and especially if the accomplishment of his purpose was only prevented by someone else's interference, while I suppose he would be held slightly less culpable than if he had actually accomplished the deed, he would still be held to be guilty of the violation of law, and punished accordingly.

Mr. Hepburn put the Amending Act on the statute books, with a view to giving Separate Schools a larger share of corporation taxes. By the operation of that law, Protestants were to be compelled against their consciences to support Roman Catholic schools; and even though many in his own following—alleged to be something like thirty in number—were in rebellion against it, they were all at last whipped into line. I said "all"? No; all but three who valiantly stood out against it. But Mr. Hepburn put that measure on the statute books, with his eyes wide open; and, in the face of the protest of at least thirty of his own followers and of the Protestant conscience of this Province, he persisted in his course.

When the East Hastings by-election came, he defended his action, and made no suggestion whatever that there was any possibility of his accepting its repeal. He was at that time apparently determined to see it through. The consciences of Protestants were to be coerced, and the efficiency of our whole Public School system placed in jeopardy. I never believed that Mr. Hepburn had any personal interest in Roman Catholicism—or, for that matter, in any other form of religion; and therefore one

can only assume that his action was to be explained on the ground of some political motive. Certainly it was not to please Protestants. All the circumstances of the case point to the probability of his having promised the Roman Catholic Hierarchy the measure which he later enacted. Whether he promised it or not, it was in effect an attempt to buy Roman Catholic votes with money filched from Protestant pockets.

Mr. Hepburn says he made no such promise. He also says that he never proposed a coalition government. The answer to the first question is to be found in his persistent endeavour to coerce the Protestant majority of this Province; and, for an answer to the second question, ask Colonel Drew. The man who can accept Mr. Hepburn's denial on either of these matters would be gullible enough to accept the tales of Baron Munchausen as literal, authentic history. For myself, Mr. Hepburn's word on any subject is utterly without authority, unless and until it is supported by unquestionable collateral evidence.

If the Separate School question has been settled by the repeal of the Amendment to the Assessment Act, we cannot thank Mr. Hepburn for it: we can only commend him for his exemplification of the truth of the proverb, "The prudent man foreseeth the evil, and hideth himself: but the simple pass on, and are punished."

When Mr. Hepburn accepted the proposal of the Opposition, that the Amendment be repealed, in his speech in the Legislature he did me the honour of blaming me, among others, for stirring up religious strife. I said, he did me the honour of blaming me—and it was an honour, for to be blamed by Mr. Hepburn for anything is tantamount to a certificate of character. That is always the complaint of wrongdoers. The bandit bears no ill will toward a policeman as a man, but only because he is representative of the law which he is attempting to break. I have before discussed the School question at length, and cannot do so now, except to say that we who so strenuously opposed it while it was still upon the statute books, must now insist upon holding Mr. Hepburn responsible for his attempt.

In consenting to the repeal, Mr. Hepburn virtually promised the Roman Catholic Hierarchy something in its place. We know that Rome is never satisfied. It will ask for more. It is my own opinion that Mr. Hepburn was advised by the Hierarchy to consent to its repeal because they saw that it would work ultimately to their disadvantage rather than to their profit, and that some more effective, and less openly objectionable method must be found. But this we now know, that our Public School system is extremely unsafe under a Hepburn regime.

Hepburn and Liquor "Control"

I would add to the indictment against the Hepburn Government *its administration of the Liquor Control Act*. One does not need to leave the grounds upon which this church stands to see such a condition as would have made the face of Ontario blush with shame but a decade ago.

What shall be said of the *economic waste* occasioned by the liquor traffic in general, and of the beer-parlours in particular? Only a couple of days ago a young man told me that his sister's husband has a steady position, is making good wages, but drinks nearly everything he makes, and leaves the brother to support his sister and her two children. Time would fail me to tell of the scores of people who have poured into my ears their tales of woe. Families by the tens of thousands have

been ruined by drink. It is so self-evident that it scarcely needs more than mention. What profit is it if the woman finds her Hydro bill reduced by a few cents, or even a dollar or so, if the money that would pay a dozen Hydro bills is squandered in the nearby beer-parlour? Or what profit to the Province is the alleged Hydro saving when by the same Administration thousands of families are reduced to destitution and driven to seek public relief?

Mr. Hepburn boasts that liquor has paid into the Provincial treasury \$2,800,000 in the year—the Government's profit on liquor sales. If ever in the world's history a Government received blood-money, the Ontario Government is receiving it; and does any decent, morally-minded man believe that the tax-payers of this Province will appreciate being relieved of nearly three million dollars' taxation at the price of the destitution of women and children, whose drunken husbands and fathers, by their debauchery, have supplied the funds? For this Province to be spending millions in relief, and, at the same time, spending anywhere from fifty to a hundred millions in liquor, surely cries loudly for correction.

Whatever the direct profit to the Government may be, the economic wastage occasioned by such a large consumption of liquor must inevitably effect the reduction by a still greater amount of the earning power of the people, which, taken with the impoverishment of all legitimate business, is bound ultimately to result in a great net economic loss.

But what shall be said of the *political corruption which is always the price paid by the liquor traffic for its progress*? All sorts of stories have been bandied about of bribery and political patronage in connection with the distribution of licenses—or "authorities" as they are called. I do not know whether they are true or not, although it were easy to believe that the half of that matter has not been told. Nor is it necessary even to enquire. Everybody who knows anything of the liquor traffic, knows that it befouls everything it touches. One might just as well try to make a pet of a tiger, or a gentleman of a pig, as to try to make the liquor traffic respectable.

Mr. Hepburn promised to take the liquor business out of politics. The liquor traffic could no more survive out of politics than a fish could survive out of water. But the liquor business is a filthy fish which thrives in political sewers. In the end, its friendship and favour are as ruinous to a political party as to an individual or a family.

Mr. Hepburn proposed a non-partisan Commission, which *The Globe and Mail* innocently hailed as a triumph of statesmanship! He proposed to put it under the direction of a Supreme Court judge and two members of the Legislature, one from each of the leading political parties, each to be nominated by his own side of the House. It would tax the ingenuity of any man to devise a plan that would more certainly pollute all the springs of legislative action. It would be difficult to find a judge who would willingly step from the bench, to become a glorified bartender; and, moreover, to have both political parties represented in the administration of the Act would be to silence all criticism of it from both sides of the House, and make the Legislature an annex of the breweries.

I do not agree with those who say Mr. Hepburn's proposed change of liquor administration is an admission that the present administration is bad; but rather that

it was a cleverly designed and subtle scheme for making things still worse, if that were possible.

What shall be said of *the moral waste resulting from these beer-parlours?* Liquor in any form is bad, and difficult to control. But nothing could possibly have been devised which would more certainly increase the consumption of liquor than these beer-parlours. I need not waste your time, nor seek to harrow your feelings, by enlarging on the fact of liquor's moral wastage. You have only to think of the men and women of mature years who have been mastered by the multiplication and intensification of temptations as represented by the beverage-rooms; of the innumerable young men and women who, in them, have acquired a taste for alcohol, and subsequently developed habits of drunkenness. The shame and degradation of the youth of this Province by this means is altogether beyond computation.

The practice of converting garages or blacksmith shops, or any and every tumbledown shack, by painting the front and adding a couple of rooms, into what are called "hotels", is an insult to every person of ordinary intelligence. To multiply hotel accommodation at a time when legitimate hotels were half empty, as was done three years ago—and has been done ever since—was nothing but a clumsy attempt to humbug everyone concerned. So far as these rooms have had any use, to speak plainly, in not a few instances the rooms above have served as brothels for the victims of the beverage-rooms below.

It is too early statistically to demonstrate *the inevitable increase of illegitimacy and general moral debauchery in the Province as a result of the administration of the so-called Liquor Control Act.* Some of these places have been called "mushroom hotels". It would be truer to call them by the ugly name of a less respectable fungus, and call them *toadstools* which poison everyone who touches them.

But, taking the Government at its own word, and for the sake of argument, assuming all its claims to economy in connection with Hydro and its provision of revenue from liquor sales, together with any other economies which may have been effected by the Government generally, to be true, who wants to be saved a few dollars at the expense of the debauchery and moral destruction of so large a part of the youth of the land, or of any of it?

I need not labour the consideration of the ever-increasing toll of limb and life upon our highways resulting from the incompetence of drunken drivers. For the first six months of this year the increase of highway fatalities was over 68%, and the fatalities for June, 1937, double that of June of last year. Magistrates are paid to sit upon such cases, and in some instances send such drivers to jail, and cancel their licenses. It were wiser to go to the fountainhead of the trouble, and abolish the Government's authority to license the places which render men and women incapable, not only of driving, but of walking as well.

I have said that I received 40,679 signed protests against the beverage-rooms. Hundreds came from men who said they were neither prohibitionists nor total abstainers, but that for their own sake, and for their children's sake, they loathed the beer-parlours, and only waited an opportunity to close them. It would be easy to relate horror after horror, to harrow your feelings, and to exhaust the most extensive vocabulary of adjectives in denunciation of the liquor traffic in general, and the beer-parlours in particular. But we need more than denunciation: *we need votes to bring about a change.*

The Hepburn Use of The Spoils System

I repeat, I am not a party man, though some perhaps may charge me with partisanship for what I now say: I ask you to consider the well-known courses of the Hepburn regime which have been taken in the name of general economy. Everybody admits the government of this country costs too much. Everybody therefore will favour the utmost legitimate and prudent measures of economy. I speak now of matters apart from these major concerns to which I have drawn your attention. I will not dwell upon Hepburn's meddlesome interference with the magistracy of the Province, or of the changes which, in so many cases, involved, not a reduction, but a large increase of expense: I merely remind you that probably never in the history of this or any other Province of the Dominion did the spoils system find such exemplification as has been afforded by the Hepburn regime.

A woman who was a little past middle life came to me to explain that she had been a scrub-woman for years in the Parliament Buildings, in an endeavour to earn an honest living; but in the midst of the depression was summarily discharged. What for?

He has also effected the reduction or retardation of public services, such as various health clinics, hospital enlargement, and other things, that has been little short of scandalous.

Lowered Standards of Public Life

And what shall be said of the lowering of the standards of public life in every direction, which must result from the deplorable example set before the youth of this Province by its Premier? He has made the Legislature an annex of Billingsgate, and by his general demeanour he has reduced the discussion of great public questions to the level of gutter politics. If his critics refer to his personality and his personal conduct of public affairs, it will be only the inevitable answer to his own ridiculous billboard appeals in his own behalf.

What Should Ontario's Attitude Be?

What then ought to be the attitude of the conscience of the Ontario voter toward the Government with such a record of political debauchery behind it? I know there will instantly leap to the minds of many, the question as to whom we shall put in his place. I shall have a few words to say about that in a few moments, but in the meantime *let me enunciate a principle which ought, I believe, to be applied to our public life.* If a man is convicted of an offence against the law of the land, whether he be from the humblest rank of labour, the president of some great financial concern, or even a high-placed public official, in exacting such penalty as the law prescribes for whatever the offence may have been, the court cannot be deterred by the question as to whether there is anyone to put in the place of the offender. Punishment appropriate to the crime must be inflicted. *And there ought to be some way by which an outraged electorate could inflict punishment upon a Government that has betrayed its trust.*

Why a General Election Now?

What I have said does not apply to the Premier only, but to every weak and servile follower who, under the crack of the party whip, has followed in the Premier's pernicious ways. One cannot help asking why the Province has been put to the expense of a General Election when there were nearly two years yet to run of the

natural life of the Legislature. I have before now, at a sea-port, seen a ship made a veritable hive of industry by pressing into service an army of longshoremen and others, to make the ship ready that she might get out to sea on a rapidly ebbing tide. I believe Mr. Hepburn was shrewd enough to recognize that the tide of public confidence was on the ebb, and desired to put to sea for another official voyage, nearly two years before his time, fearing that otherwise, like Solomon's ships of Tarshish, his ship might be broken to pieces, and never sail again at all.

If I were a cartoonist, I could explain the holding of an election two years in advance of the time by a very homely picture. I would sketch the picture of a housewife's kitchen. I would put in the corner, and behind the housewife's back, one of the latest enamelled kitchen refuse cans, and, protruding from the top, holding up the cover, a bundle too big to be hidden from sight, and rather malodorous, which I would name *Separate School Question*. I would show the housewife lifting a basket of plums to the table for examination. I would call the plums in the basket, *votes*. I would put an expression of disappointment into the countenance of the housewife, and show her examining the plums in the basket. After examination, I would describe her as saying, "I thought they would keep a while longer, but they are already becoming very soft, and I must can them this very day. If I wait until next week I shall have no plums to can!" Then I would sketch the picture of the same kitchen and the same housewife, with a great preserving kettle on the stove, which I would call *election*. I would show the housewife as pouring her plums, which I have named *votes*, into the kettle, and then pouring in plenty of sugar, which I would name *election promises*, spiced with *Hepburn wisecracks*; and finally I would represent her as making the kettle boil by turning an election switch called, *Hydro*, with a booster named *C.I.O.*

What About Our Attitude Toward the Hepburn Administration?

What, then, should be our attitude toward the Hepburn administration in respect to his attempt to exploit the C.I.O. as an election issue? My answer is, It should be recognized that *his present pose as a champion of law and order is an attempt to divert public attention from the utter lawlessness of his whole regime*. Hepburnism is synonymous with lawlessness. In his administration of the Liquor Control Act he has trampled under foot the decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada and of the Judicial Committee of the Imperial Privy Council; he has deliberately violated the liquor laws of this country, and has insolently defied every expression of temperance sentiment. His boasted use of the liquor business to produce revenue involves the making of merchandise of the bodies and souls of men, and the pollution of the bloodstream of the whole body-politic.

His *Hydro legislation*, in its retroactive effect, and its denial of access to the courts, does violence to every British precedent, and undermines the very foundations of democracy. His *Separate School policy* attempted the coercion of the conscience of the majority; the prostitution of religious prejudices to political advantage; it constituted an undeclared war upon the Public School system of the Province; and was, in essence, a scheme of wholesale political bribery. His gross misrepresentation of *his conduct of the Succession Duties*

Department, his promise to collect further revenue from estates whose administrators have not as yet even been approached, portray his Government in the unlovely guise of a cloud of buzzards hovering over every dying man in the Province. *His general conduct of public affairs for three years* has outraged the public sense of decency of the whole Province, and has made every man and woman of conscience, and of any degree of refinement, utterly ashamed. His cheap buffoonery and coarse witticisms have reduced parliamentary debate to the level of the most vulgar and senseless burlesque. His minimizations and exaggerations, and his general misrepresentation of public affairs, have put a premium upon political deception; while, by his hand, Truth has fallen in the street, and Public Honour lies bleeding and mangled on the highway, under the wheels of conscienceless political expediency.

Search as I may into Mr. Hepburn's three years' record, I cannot discover one sound reason for his return, or for the return of his Government to power.

What is the Alternative?

We come now to enquire, What is the alternative? Whom can we put in his place? That is an inevitable question; for, under our system, it is impossible to put one man out in any other way than by putting another man in. The only other man for whom we can vote in lieu of Mr. Hepburn is the Honourable Earl Rowe. I have no personal acquaintance with him. I have no brief for him. And I speak now, as I have spoken throughout the evening, from no other motive than a desire to promote the public good. The question we must all ask—and the question I have carefully asked of myself—is this, *Is it in the public interest to exchange Mr. Hepburn for Mr. Rowe?*

What Can We Say for Mr. Rowe?

In the first place, *though practically untried in Provincial service, Mr. Rowe is not wholly a novice*; for though only in his prime, he has had many years of public life; and even his enemies will acknowledge that he has at least an absolutely clean record as a public man. Personally, he is known to be a man of unblemished character and reputation; and when spoken of as an "honourable gentleman", the parliamentary phrase has full significance in respect to his whole private and public life. Under his regime we could be sure that the mothers of the Province will never have to apologize for, or explain away, any vulgarities to their children. Any defects which may be charged against Mr. Rowe must, at least, be of a negative character; and the electors of the Province can be assured that the honour of the Province will never be sullied if committed to his hand.

It is charged against Mr. Rowe that he is too neutral, and that his proposed programme of public service is not sufficiently definite. At first blush, that may seem to be a reasonable criticism. But, after all, what are election promises worth? Was there ever a more reckless promiser than Mr. Hepburn? As between the man who promises anything and everything to secure votes, and the man who will promise nothing but what he is sure he will be able to perform, give me the latter.

What Has Mr. Rowe Promised?

What has Mr. Rowe promised? In the first place, he has promised a *faithful enforcement of the law*. He

will tolerate lawlessness nowhere. That, of course, would be expected whether promised or not. It would be superfluous to ask a man aspiring to the direction of the Department of Education to promise that he would not abolish the alphabet or the multiplication table.

What choice have we between Mr. Hepburn and Mr. Rowe on the liquor question? If Mr. Odette had been the salaried agent of the brewers and distillers, he could not possibly have served their interests with greater zeal. Both he and Mr. Hepburn have openly declared that they are administering the Liquor Control Act for profit in the production of revenue. On the other hand, what may we hope for from Mr. Rowe? Personally, I should like to see the whole liquor traffic, with all their breweries and distilleries, sunk in the deepest spot in the ocean. Since the people never asked for beer and wine by the glass, I should have been happier if Mr. Rowe and his party had definitely promised to repeal the Amendment which was never asked for, nor desired, by anyone but the liquor interests. I wish he had done so. But he has at least promised something. He has pledged himself in these terms:

"I will return to a policy of control by a responsible board, free from political patronage. A survey will be made by the new board of all licensed hotels. I promise you that these mushroom dives which have sprung up and flourished under Hepburn will be closed—and stay closed."

In an advertisement issued by his authority we are told:

"When Mr. Rowe is elected, beverage rooms will be confined to standard hotels which respect the law and give adequate service to the public.

"Restaurants, taxi offices, rooming houses and hot dog stands will not, by means of a few 'jerry-built' changes in construction, be able to qualify as standard hotels.

"Beverage rooms will not be forced on communities where they are not wanted. Nor will such places flourish in the shadow of the churches of the Province."

That certainly is not as far as many of us would have liked Mr. Rowe to go; but as between the Hepburn and the Rowe policies, surely the Rowe liquor policy is a thousand times to be preferred. I expect that every voter who is a member of Jarvis Street Church will be glad to vote for any supporter of Mr. Rowe if for no other reason than to clean up the filth which Mr. Hepburn has made to flow on Jarvis Street. I propose to support Mr. Rowe in preference to Mr. Hepburn on his liquor policy alone; and if he is elected, I shall not be slow to call his attention to the fact that he has definitely promised to close all these dives that flourish in the shadow of churches and educational institutions roundabout here and elsewhere in the Province.

Rowe's Separate School Policy

What about Mr. Rowe's policy on the Separate School question? If *The Globe and Mail* be an authority, it is very naughty to refer to the Separate School question at all. I had once thought of calling it "*The Globe and Mail, Junior*", but on consideration, it seems to me that the paper has combined, not the virtues, but the vices of both its predecessors, to such a degree that it is characterized, not by the immaturity of youth, but by the selfishness and stupidity of senility. It continues in circulation, I suppose, because it is the only morning newspaper. Its variable editorial page is without moral authority.

In the East Hastings by-election *The Globe and Mail* expressed its horror that the Separate School question

should even be made an issue in the election. How amazing! A government could attempt the wholesale robbery of the Public School treasury, and that was quite legitimate! It was only wicked to expose the crime, and name the political criminal.

Referring to the Separate School question, *The Globe and Mail* says in an editorial today:

"Mr. Hepburn's courage at that time (in accepting the repeal of the Separate School measure) prevented the fires of religious hatred from sweeping the Province during this campaign." Was there ever such a piece of journalistic humbug issued from the press? Who kindled the fires of religious hatred? Who proposed to coerce the Protestant conscience of this country? Who, but Mr. Hepburn? The editorial concludes: "Mr. Rowe ought to hang his head in shame for trying to rekindle this blaze." My answer to that is that Mr. McCullagh is apparently incapable of feeling any shame. He either needs to be examined by a psychiatrist, or else, he and his paper supply one of the most striking examples of political knavery this country has ever known."

Here is an excerpt from another editorial in *The Globe and Mail* of this morning, entitled "A Shocking Record of Killings":

"Seventy-five persons killed in motor accidents in Ontario during June! The official figures are both amazing and discouraging. Are the efforts of promoters of safety on the highways having no effect at all? During the year there has been a progressive increase in traffic accidents. In the first six months there were 68.6 per cent more fatalities than in the similar period of 1936. Fifty-four children were fatally injured as compared with 28 in the first half of last year. This is a tragic situation."

And yet *The Globe and Mail* supports the administration largely responsible for having brought about this condition.

What shall we say of Mr. Rowe and the Separate School question? *The Globe and Mail* naively contends that the objectionable legislation was repealed, and, therefore, we ought to forget it. But how was it repealed? Did Mr. Hepburn initiate the repeal? Had he not repeatedly declared that he never would repeal it? *The Globe and Mail* says he displayed courage in accepting the motion of the Opposition. So the initiative was taken by the Opposition? Why was it taken by the Opposition? Because that Party had solemnly pledged itself that it would be satisfied with nothing less than its repeal. Mr. Hepburn's government had an overwhelming majority in the House. He had driven his followers with a whip, and threatened to resign unless they supported him; and like "dumb, driven cattle" rather than face the necessity of giving an account of their stewardship to their constituents they accepted Mr. Hepburn's dictation, and passed the Separate School legislation. But now this Government, with an overwhelming majority, accepts direction from the Opposition, comprising only seventeen in the House.

Thus Mr. Hepburn admitted his error, not because he had repented of the principle of the legislation, not because he was unwilling to coerce the Protestant majority. The Government was like a company of bandits frustrated by the police in their attempt to rob a bank, and who desist from their effort only that they may later on make a cleverer plan with better hope of success.

That is the situation with respect to the Separate School question. As Mr. Hepburn's own speech implied, he will devise some other way to give the Roman Catholic Hierarchy what it demands.

But what is the logic of the situation? Merely this, that when a Government has to accept direction from the Opposition, it is about time the people made the Opposition the Government.

Mr. Hepburn's Coalition Proposal

Once more, why did Mr. Hepburn recently propose to Mr. Rowe the formation of a Coalition Government? Notwithstanding the defection of some of his ministers he still had an overwhelming majority in the Legislature, and his Government's lease of power was nearly two years short of expiration. Why then the proposed coalition? How do I know? I am not going to tell you. But I know positively that such a proposal was made, and I challenge Mr. Hepburn, and "The Globe and Mail" to deny it. A definite proposal was made to Mr. Rowe; and Mr. Hepburn definitely showed his willingness to share the responsibilities of Government with the Opposition; which would have involved, of course, the dismissal of some of his own ministers. As to the fact of such a proposal, there can be no question. Neither Mr. Hepburn, Mr. McCullagh, Mr. Rowe, nor Col. Drew, will or can successfully deny it.

What was the reason?

Was it an attempt to silence all opposition? I cannot say. But I do say that if the Government composed of a proportion of Hepburnites, plus the Opposition, was good enough for Mr. Hepburn, then the Opposition minus Hepburn ought to be good enough for everybody else. So then, in a choice between Hepburn and Rowe, the least and the worst that could be said of Rowe is that he could not possibly be worse than Hepburn; and that, by every principle of probability, he must prove immeasurably his superior.

If I could reach every elector in the Province, with all earnestness I would urge him or her to vote against every Hepburn supporter. I care not what his professions are, anyone who is so lacking in moral and political discernment as to follow Mr. Hepburn, thereby absolutely proves his unfitness for a seat in the Ontario Legislature. On the other hand, I would counsel every elector to constitute himself a committee of one pledged by vote and influence to do his utmost to defeat the Hepburn Government; and in order to do so, I would recommend every voter in the Province to vote for men pledged to the support of Mr. Rowe and his policy.

There is but one answer to the question, What should Ontario do to Hepburn? **WITH BOTH HANDS AND A STRONG RIGHT FOOT, THROW HIM OUT!**

ON THE BANKS OF THE NIGER

From time to time items of interest about the work of Rev. Arthur Lee in French West Africa have been published in these columns, and his many friends in the homeland will learn with joy of the progress of the work. The mission is now fully organized under the name of the "Africa Christian Missions", and as all the workers are Baptists by conviction, the statement of faith and the policy of the mission is definitely Baptist. This mission is recognized by Ohio Independent Baptist Association, and Mr. Joseph McCaba, recently returned from the field is going about among their churches telling of this missionary effort in West Africa.

A recent letter from Mr. Lee tells the sad news of the loss of one of their missionaries. Under date of July 21, he writes:

"Since last writing we lost one of our workers, Miss Van Heemst. She was sick only nine days in the hospital. We feel the loss keenly but the Lord has done as it pleased Him. We think her death was either from malaria similar to my sickness, or from sunstroke. May the Lord raise up new workers for His harvest field here."

The strongest tribe in the district is known as the Jerma people, but there are also Fulanis and Kurtes; the former live along the river, while the latter occupy the large islands that are not covered during the flood season. Before the

Gospel can be preached to these tribes, the missionaries must learn several native languages, while the fact that the work is in French Territory necessitates a speaking knowledge of French. The mighty Niger River is an important means of communication and Mr. Lee and his fellow-labourers makes use of boats to reach various tribes. Of certain of these peoples Mr. Lee writes:

"In so far as we know no missionaries have ever actually carried on work among them, until this work was begun in 1930. Last year a trip was taken down the river in a native boat. In all we spent six days going from town to town preaching the Word. Our method was to go ten or fifteen miles and then stop for the night. After supper the people would come to hear what we had to say, and on more than one occasion, we believe the whole town was present; the other day when down by the river a native boat passed with cassava root, going to market, and when they were saluted, they immediately said, "It is the white man who stayed at our town and preached.

"Sometimes one becomes very weary and discouraged because of the heat and physical weakness, but after giving forth the Word of Life there is a feeling of restfulness and satisfaction and a heart full of joy."

Because of the marvelous development in communication by air, it is now possible to fly across the Sahara and arrive in Paris within forty-eight hours of leaving Niamey, the mission's headquarters. Mr. Lee hopes to make use of this means of travel in his return home, which will take place early next year if the funds are available.

BOOK REVIEW

God's Work in God's Way, by John Wilmot and James H. Pizey, published by Highgate Road Chapel, London, N.W.5.

A review of, and a tribute to, a half-century of abiding ministry in London, England, is the memoir of James Stephens, M.A., well entitled *God's Work in God's Way*. Pastor Wilmot, Jarvis Street members, in particular, and THE GOSPEL WITNESS readers, in general, will remember from his happy visit to Toronto a year ago. He is successor to Pastor Stephens in Highgate Road Chapel.

In Scotland, Mr. Stephens laboured for five years in the ministry of the United Presbyterian Church. Then he saw the error of infant baptism and himself received believer's immersion. He soon became pastor of Highgate Road Chapel. Under him this Baptist Church was multiplied many times, not by sensational methods, but by sound teaching, carefully prepared by a scholar, delivered in faith, and followed by the human touch of one who largely confined himself to his own parish.

"The glamour of drawing people' never influenced Mr. Stephens. Yet the people were drawn, and during his ministry 2,710 persons joined the church. For a long period at the evening services, extra seats had to be provided in the aisles, and not infrequently at the back of the capacious pulpit". (p. 42).

For a time he lectured at the Pastor's (Spurgeon's) College, and "an average of one missionary per year went forth "to the regions beyond" from his Fellowship.

In theology he was soundly Evangelical. He stood with Spurgeon in the Down-Trade Controversy, and Highgate Road Chapel has continued to stand by the Word.

This carefully written book will lead the pastor of experience to thank God and take courage. It sets before the young Timothy a standard of values in the Lord's work. Any devout believer will read to rejoice.—W. G. B.

TENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION

Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario
and Quebec

JARVIS STREET BAPTIST CHURCH, TORONTO

October 19th to 21st

Special Speaker:

DR. HARRY HAMILTON, BUFFALO, N.Y.

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 XXIV.

As I begin this week's chapter I am reminded that yesterday, September 21st, marked the sixteenth anniversary of our great deliverance, and I would here once more record an expression of my gratitude to God for His having so manifestly made bare His arm on that occasion.

The adjourned ninety-third Annual Business Meeting of Jarvis Street Church was duly convened on Wednesday evening, June 29th, 1921. At this point we quote from the minutes of that meeting:

"The Chairman announced that the next order of business of the Annual Meeting was the election of officers, whereupon Deacon J. F. Brown rose and read a resolution with the request that it be considered before proceeding to the election of officers:

"Whereas it is clear from the Pastor's special letter of the 22nd of April, sent out with the approval of the Deacons, that many of them could no longer work with him, and that the mutual arrangement was arrived at, that if two-thirds of the votes cast on the 29th of April, were in support of the Pastor then the dissatisfied Deacons were to resign, but if less than two-thirds then the Pastor was to resign,

"And whereas much less than two-thirds of the votes cast at that meeting were in support of the Pastor and he has not yet seen fit to tender his resignation,

"Now, therefore, it is moved by J. F. Brown and seconded by J. E. Clark that before proceeding to the election of Deacons, and in order that any one nominated may know whether he can accept or not, the Pastor be and is hereby requested to carry out his promise by tendering his resignation,

"And that any resolution contrary to the above be and is hereby rescinded."

This motion shows the determination of a minority group in the church, by fair means or foul, to accomplish their will. To refresh the memories of our readers, we quote again from the minutes of the meeting of April 29th, which explains the setting aside of the two-thirds condition upon which the majority of the Deacons had insisted:

"It was moved by Deacon Hall, and seconded by Mr. E. C. Green that,

"Whereas in the matter of the letter addressed by the Pastor to the members of the church under date of April 22nd, and respecting clause 3, whereby it is proposed that a fraction over one-third may deprive a majority of the ministry in which they have found profit, and which would thereby establish the precedent, that a condition already existing, and approved by the majority of the members of the church, may, at any time, be overturned by a minority, which principle would give no reasonable security of tenure to any officer of the church, nor any assured continuity to any of the church's undertakings, now, therefore, be it resolved that the church, in Annual Meeting assembled, hereby rejects the principle of minority rule, and calls upon the Pastor to withdraw clause 3 of the letter."

"In the discussion the Pastor stated that the clause had been inserted in the letter because the Deacons insisted on it. He saw no analogy between the election of a Deacon requiring a two-thirds vote and the present instance where it would be a case of upsetting something already established by a fraction over a one-third vote. Deacons Brownlee, Greenway, and Record, separately disclaimed approval in Deacons' meeting of the insertion of the clause. It had been inserted because the majority of the Deacons would not approve the sending out of the letter without it.

"On being put to the meeting, the motion carried. The Pastor withdrew clause 3, and added that he could not continue in the pastorate unless he should be supported by a 'substantial majority'."

At the meeting of April 29th, four hundred and eighty-nine ballots were cast: six were blank, two hundred and eighty-four were for the Pastor, and one hundred and ninety-nine against, giving him a majority of eighty-five. But those who had then been in a minority of eighty-five now proposed that, because the vote was thirty-eight short of the two-thirds, the majority should be overruled; and that, notwithstanding the two-thirds condition had been repudiated by the unanimous vote of the church.

It should be borne in mind that, for the greater part of the time between April 29th and June 29th, the Pastor had been in quarantine. His enemies had been systematically calling upon the members of the church almost as regularly as the baker and the milkman. Furthermore, it was the end of June. The vacation period had begun. A great many were out of town, and could not attend the meeting.

After the motion proposed by Deacon J. F. Brown had been duly seconded, the minutes of the meeting record:

"The Pastor rose to a point of order and read from J. G. Bourinot's 'Procedure of Public Meetings': 'No question or motion can regularly be offered, if it is substantially the same with the one on which the judgment of the house has already been expressed during the current session.' He pointed out that in the meeting of April 29th a resolution had been passed repudiating the condition imposed on him by the Deacons that unless he were supported by two-thirds of the votes cast he was to tender his resignation, and following that, in the vote on the question whether he should remain pastor of the church or not, he had been sustained, and the question had then been closed. The resolution submitted to this meeting proposed to raise a question already determined and was, therefore, out of order if the meeting were to follow parliamentary procedure."

The Church minutes state that the Chair did not sustain the Pastor's protest, and there follow nearly three pages, closely-typed, of the discussion which followed. Then follows a paragraph to the following effect:

"The Pastor protested that at least two votes had been cast by men who were not members of the church."

Thereafter is a report of the scrutineers. Three hundred and eighty-five ballots had been cast; two hundred and four of them supported the motion, one hundred and seventy-six opposed the motion, five ballots were blank. The Chairman declared the motion carried. Then follows this paragraph:

"The Pastor then replied to the resolution that he had yet to choose whether he should yield to the majority of twenty-eight when he had been supported in the former larger meeting by a majority of eighty-five, and announced that he had no intention of resigning."

The meeting was then adjourned until September 21st.

I was under engagement at this time to conduct a two weeks' evangelistic campaign in New York City, under the auspices of the Old Tent Evangel; and from

there, I had planned to journey to London, England, where I had promised to supply Spurgeon's Tabernacle. But following the meeting of June 29th, I telegraphed New York and cabled London, asking release from both engagements, which ultimately was acceded to. We set ourselves immediately to conducting an evangelistic campaign throughout the summer. Under date of July 27th, there appears in the minutes a paragraph relating to Tent Evangel meetings as follows:

"It had been widely announced that the Pastor would conduct services afternoons and evenings in the Tent Evangel, New York, from July 23rd to August 2nd. On account of the situation in the church, Mr. Shields had asked to be relieved of this engagement. In the prayer-meeting on Wednesday evening he read a telegram he had just received from the Chairman of the committee in charge of the meetings in Tent Evangel, saying that the previous evening a congregation of 3,000 people had passed a resolution in commendation of Dr. Shields and the stand he is taking for Christ in Toronto. On the suggestion of Mrs. J. Lillie, it was agreed to ask the Pastor to answer the telegram by night-letter expressing the appreciation of this prayer-meeting."

When I came to the church the morning of the first Sunday in July, I found not a single member of the choir present. My readers will remember that the choir had been the first of the organizations of the church to be pressed into the service of the opposition. At that time the choir was costing the church nearly four thousand dollars a year. I discovered that the Music Committee had granted the organist leave-of-absence for a trip to the Mediterranean. The soloists also had been granted leave-of-absence, and an unknown man reported for duty at the organ as a supply; his remuneration for playing at the two services was to be \$50.00 a month.

The opposition had cancelled their weekly offering subscriptions, some of them substituting a very small weekly, monthly, or quarterly contribution. They all absented themselves from the services, but as yet the so-called Weekly Offering Tellers were in office, as was also the Finance Committee, and the Treasurer. These young men called Weekly Offering Tellers waited in the corridors until the collections were taken, took them into the office and counted them, put them in the safe, locked it, and went away. Later I demanded that they at least leave a memo of the amount of the offerings. But from April until after the September 21st meeting, all the offerings of Jarvis Street Church were under the control of an official body that contributed nothing, and did not even attend the services.

But the Lord did not forsake us. Before the end of July the church was crowded in every part, and the choir seats, deserted by the regular choir, were first used, like all other pews, to seat part of the overflowing congregation, and a little later by earnest Christian souls who laid no claim to great musical ability, but who took their places to assist in leading the great congregation in the praises of the Lord.

During August the Pastor was assisted in evangelistic services by the late Dr. John Roach Straton, Pastor of Calvary Baptist Church, New York City. All the services during this period, Sundays and week-days, notwithstanding it was summertime; were very largely attended, the church being always crowded on Sundays, and very frequently at week-night meetings as well. Large numbers were converted, and between fifty and sixty were received into the membership of the church.

Under date of July 27th, a minute appears of a motion moved by Mrs. C. J. Holman, and seconded by Mr. E. C. Green, and carried with three dissenting votes, in the following terms:

"That this Monthly Meeting of the Jarvis Street Baptist Church desire to place on record its great gratitude to its Pastor, Dr. T. T. Shields, and its appreciation of his giving up his vacation to remain at home and to conduct evangelistic services; and it would declare itself as in hearty accord with the action of the church on the 29th of April, 1921, when at a meeting specially called to consider the matter, the membership by a large majority voted its wish that Dr. Shields should continue as pastor of this church; and this meeting again express their deep desire that we may long enjoy the blessing of his ministry, and we pray God's abundant blessings on his labours and messages among us."

(Continued next week.)

THE SEMINARY OPENING

The public service in connection with the opening of the Seminary will be held in Jarvis Street Church, Thursday evening, September 30. Several of the students will give brief reports of their work during the summer, and Dr. Shields will deliver an address. All friends of the Seminary are cordially invited to attend this service and to join with us in prayer for special blessing upon faculty and students in this new school year.

MORE GOOD NEWS FROM THE NORTH

For the past few weeks the Gospel Tent for work in the North has been in Kapuskasing, and we are happy to share the following letter from Pastor Robert Brackstone:

"Conviction of sin and the presence of the Lord characterized nearly every service. The last night Brother Harold Slade preached several walked to the front publicly to signify their desire to be baptized, and one to return to the Lord. A few nights later two teen aged children walked to the front to accept Christ as Saviour. Last Sunday some brethren from Timmins visited us, and Deacon Aceti, a converted Italian Roman Catholic, preached in his inimitable way, and a woman responded to the invitation.

"Last Sunday afternoon I had the joy of baptizing five believers, two young ladies, a young man and his wife, and an elderly lady. It was conservatively estimated that six hundred people assembled to witness the baptismal service which was held in Kapuskasing Bay. There was admirable order throughout, and Brother Aceti and I preached to the assembled multitude.

"The Daily Vacation Bible School held in the tent was a great success. On Friday last in the evening about sixty children gathered with their parents. The children demonstrated before the adults what they had learned. It was a great night. The brethren have left me with a goodly number of new prospects and have done their work well.

"I can sincerely say that the Tent Campaign has accomplished much for us, for which we praise God."

The great baptismal service in the natural amphitheatre formed by the rocky, sloping shores of Kapuskasing Bay around which a beautiful park has been laid out, must have been an impressive sight. A number of Roman Catholics and some Communists were present and heard the gospel preached. While the preaching was going on the young men distributed Scripture portions among the audience.

"Interest among the children in the meetings of the Daily Vacation Bible School was keen. In all, one hundred and nine children passed through our hands and they were not confined to the Protestant community. The Bible was the text-book, and was presented by way of new hymns, choruses, Bible stories, chalk-talks, Scripture memorization, and, on the last day, a test. The last night the tent was almost filled with parents and children for their own performance and the reception of prizes, after which a lively gospel message was brought. One year ago these same boys and girls did not know who Adam was, now they are able to quote a number of verses of Scripture. Two have already taken their stand for Christ, and we pray many more will while it is still fresh and new to them."

—W. S. W.

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 1 3rd Quarter Lesson 40 October 3rd, 1937

OLIVE L. CLARK, Ph.D. (Tor.)

TEACHING OF CHRIST ON HUMILITY AND DISCIPLESHIP

Lesson Text: Luke 14.

Golden Text: "For whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted."
—Luke 14:11.

In this chapter we see Christ as the dinner guest of the critical Pharisees, teaching the lessons of humility and discipleship. The illustrations are appropriate to the occasion—the proud guest, the selfish host, the great supper, the savourless salt.

I. The Hall-marks of Humility—verses 1-14.

1. Recognizing the Master's Authority—verses 1-6.

The Pharisees, with an exaggerated notion of their own importance, sat in judgment upon the Master. They failed to submit to His authority, and to take their places as humble scholars in His school. They watched Him, seeking to ensnare Him. Instead of listening to His exposition of the law, they waited to see if He would violate their notions of the law.

The Lord Jesus spoke to them, answering not their words, but their spiteful thoughts. Anticipating their criticism, He asked them the very question which was in their minds, the question they would have asked Him, should they detect His purpose to heal the man ill with dropsy. So does Christ bring a man face to face with his sin; he is compelled to look at himself. Happy the one who realizes his sin, and looks to Christ for deliverance.

Christ silenced His enemies by well-doing (1 Pet. 2:15), again using the argument of the kind treatment afforded by them to dumb animals (Luke 13:15).

2. Choosing the Humble Place—verses 7-11.

The Pharisees ever sought for honour and position; they desired the uppermost seats at the feasts, the most honourable reclining-places on the couches. All their works were done to be seen of men (Matt. 23:5, 6). They invited tributes of esteem, loving the praise of men more than the praise of God (Prov. 27:2; John 12:43).

Christ taught that men should not covet the place of honour, uninvited. A Christian should seek the place of service, not that of preferment (Rom. 12:10; 1 Pet. 5:5, 6), even as Christ came not to be ministered unto, but to minister (Matt. 20:28; 1 John 3:16).

God's way up is down; promotion comes from Him (Psa. 75:6, 7). The self-centred, proud man who exalts himself, does not give the Lord His due honour, and he will fall, sooner or later (Prov. 16:18; 18:12; Jas. 4:6). On the other hand, God delights to honour those who honour Him, and are of a contrite spirit (Isa. 57:15; Psa. 138:6).

3. Inviting the Lowly Guest—verses 12-14.

Christian hospitality is almost a lost art in these days, though enjoined upon us by the Scriptures (Heb. 13:2; 1 Pet. 4:9). Blessing comes to those who give to others, as unto the Lord, not expecting to receive something in return. The principle of grace is to govern all our actions. The Christian motive is to please Christ and to serve others.

Some seek their recompense in this life, but they that are wise seek to merit their Master's "Well done" and His eternal reward.

II. The Demands of Discipleship—verses 15-35.

1. Called of the Lord—verses 15-24. Compare Matt. 22:1-14.

If Christ be our Lord, He is also our Saviour. He first calls men to believe on Him, and then to follow Him.

Blessed indeed are they who are called to feast with the King in His banqueting-house (Song of Solomon 2:4; Rev. 19:9). Teachers will find this parable of the great supper an excellent illustration of the principles of the Gospel.

For notes on this section, see the sermon by Dr. Shields entitled "The Wedding was Furnished with Guests" in THE GOSPEL WITNESS of August 26, 1937.

2. Bearing the Cross—verses 25-27. Compare Matt. 10:37-39; Matt. 16:24; Luke 9:23; Mark 8:34, 35.

The love and devotion of the believer to Christ should be so great as to make all other love seem as hate. Duty to Him transcends all lesser duties.

Christ will be on the throne, and self on the cross, in the life of every true disciple. We shall not count our lives as dear unto ourselves (Acts 20:24). To follow Christ will mean to go with Him wherever He goes, to be identified with Him in death, resurrection, and life.

"Jesus, I my cross have taken,
All to leave and follow Thee."

3. Counting the Cost—verses 28-33.

Christ never deceives; He desires that all who enlist under His colours should realize the nature of their commitment, that they should count the cost, and be willing to pay the price. The wisdom of a builder, a king or a general is needed, as well as the obedience and devotion of a soldier. The Romans had a coin bearing the image of an ox, and on the coin an inscription to this effect: "Ready for service or for sacrifice".

Yet the Christian life is not primarily a matter of giving, but of receiving. It is impossible to surpass God in giving. Considering His love for us, and His unflinching faithfulness, nothing we are or have is too precious to give to Him (Rom. 12:1, 2; Phil. 3:7, 8; 1 Cor. 6:19, 20). David Livingstone used to say: "I count nothing I possess of value, except in its relation to the Kingdom of God."

"Jesus paid it all,
All to Him I owe."

4. Retaining the Savour of Christ—verses 34, 35. Compare Matt. 5:13; Mark 9:50.

Discipleship involves walking in fellowship with Christ, walking in the light (1 John 1:7). "The Christian is bound to Christ by two ties; the tie of life and the tie of fellowship. The tie of life can never be broken (John 10:28, 29), but the tie of fellowship can easily be broken." The one who continues to walk in darkness, out of fellowship with his Lord, is in danger of losing his testimony.

The salt which has lost its saltiness, its distinctive quality (2 Cor. 2:15), is of no use. If a Christian lose his testimony, he is of little service. They tell us that in many districts of Europe, the once fragrant musk seems to have lost all its perfume since the war.

The Christian is spoken of as the salt of the earth, acting as a preservative, a check upon moral decay in the world. Apart from Him, we can do nothing (John 15:5).

The only way to restore flavour to savourless salt is to place it back again in contact with the native rock. So may Christian influence and fragrance be restored by returning to the Lord in confession (1 John 1:9; Psa. 51:12, 13).

BOOKS BY DR. T. T. SHIELDS

"Other Little Ships".....	\$1.50
"The Most Famous Trial of History".....	.50
"The Oxford Group Movement Analyzed".....	.05
25 copies	1.00
"The Hephburn Government's Betrayal of Its Public Trust" (Separate School Address).....	.10
12 copies	1.00
"The Roman Catholic Horseleach".....	.05
12 copies	.50
"The Papacy—In the Light of Scripture".....	.10
The Gospel Witness, published weekly, per annum.....	2.00
"What Ought Ontario To Do With Hephburn?" per copy.....	.05

Address: THE GOSPEL WITNESS

130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto, Can.