

Echoes of the Protest Meeting—Page 7
"The Clergy and Religion"—Page 8

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. 20, No. 21

TORONTO, SEPTEMBER 25, 1941

Whole Number 1010

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

"BEHOLD, THE LAMB OF GOD!"

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, September 21st, 1941

(Stenographically Reported)

"Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."—John 1:29.

The preacher is always at a certain disadvantage when announcing a familiar and well-worn text. It is too often assumed that all that may be learned of it is already known. But these well-worn texts of Scripture are so worn, because of their very importance, and we ought never to pass them by, or to assume that we have exhausted their wealth of truth.

Furthermore, it is inadvisable that we should always be seeking new things. There are some old things that are better. We are admonished to "ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein." We may be sure of this, that the oldest and most familiar of revealed truths of Scripture are vastly important. A few years ago you had a few dollars which you spent, and obtained something in exchange. Although it would be by no means a new thing for you to have a dollar or so, you would not refuse to accept even the old bills which were larger than those now in use. If you have any of the old ones lying around of which you have grown tired, you may bring them to me! Old as they are, they still have value, and still have the same purchasing power. So these "exceeding great and precious promises" which have nourished the saints through all generations, are still the currency of Heaven, the coin of the realm, and are accepted at Heaven's bank. They will still bring us rich spiritual treasure, as they have brought to others. There is nothing older in this world

than the sun, and yet there is nothing newer than the sun at his every rising.

Nor dare we assume that it is possible to become familiar with the Infinite. We must not take it for granted that we have learned all there is to be learned. There is always new light to break forth from God's Word. After His resurrection our Lord appeared in many forms. He appeared unto the disciples "in another form", that showed something in Him they had not seen before, notwithstanding He was "this same Jesus" of Whom the angels spoke as He ascended into heaven. I ask you, therefore, worshipfully to look this evening at the old truth, the great central truth of the gospel of redemption, that we may revel once again in the unsearchable riches of Christ. It may be that this many-sided, many-hued jewel of redemption may disclose some new glory to us that has escaped our observation hitherto. We may see some unfamiliar beauty as we look again at the old truth.

Nothing is older than this text, and I do not know of any text of greater value. There is a story in Mr. Spurgeon's autobiography, that in his later life he was asked to see a man who was dying. He found him a very happy Christian, rejoicing in hope of the glory of God. He told Mr. Spurgeon his story.

Many years before, when Spurgeon was a young man, scarcely out of his teens, there was to be a great meet-

ing in Crystal Palace—which has now been removed, partly destroyed by fire, and the rest torn down that it might not be a landmark for the Nazi bombers—on the occasion of the restoration from illness of the Prince of Wales, later King Edward VII. Spurgeon was to preach, and he went to the palace to try out his voice, and to give direction where the platform was to be erected, for the Crystal Palace would hold countless thousands. As he did so, he quoted my text; from different parts of the building that marvellous voice rang out like the peal of a trumpet, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

Away up in the roof there were some men working on a suspended scaffold, painting the sashes of the roof of the Crystal Palace. They did not know what was going on below, but one of the painters on that scaffold heard that voice ringing round the Palace, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." The happy Christian who was now dying was that man, and he told Mr. Spurgeon, "Standing on that scaffold away up in the peak, all unknown to you, I looked; I beheld the Lamb of God; and He took all my sins away. I have been rejoicing in Him ever since."

Oh that God may give us eyes to see Him this evening, to behold Him in His beauty, that we all may have our sins taken away.

I.

Here is the truth that JESUS CHRIST MUST EVER FIRST BE INTRODUCED TO THE SOUL AS "THE LAMB OF GOD." That is the all-important matter, that we should begin our acquaintance with the Lord Jesus by seeing in Him the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world. It is surely significant that John should have so introduced the Lord Jesus. He might have introduced Him in many other ways, but he chose to introduce Him in that distinctive character, as the Lamb of God Who had come to take the sin of the world away.

So once again let me remind you that *that is the distinctive thing about the Christian religion; that is the central theme, the atoning, the expiatory work of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

Why did we protest Tuesday evening against the celebration of a Pontifical Mass on Parliament Hill? Have not Roman Catholics a perfect right to practise their religion? And if they see value in the Mass, a right to celebrate it? Why should anyone object to their doing so anywhere, in the House of Commons, the Senate, or anywhere else? We believe in religious liberty, do we not? Certainly we do. But anyone who knows anything at all about Roman Catholicism, knows that just as truly as the Sacrifice of the cross is the distinctive truth of the Christian religion, the sacrifice of the Mass is the distinctive dogma of this anti-Christian system.

But did not Protestants hold a Protestant service on Parliament Hill on Wednesday night? Yes, but there is no analogy between that united Protestant service, which emphasized nothing distinctive in Protestantism, and the celebration of the Mass there on Sunday. It was merely a religious service attended by Salvation Army people, Anglicans, United Church, Presbyterian, and whatnot, where they sang hymns together, read the Scripture, and prayed, and I suppose there were one or two addresses. It was not a challenge to others, as was the celebration of the Mass. It was not a divisive and discordant act. Refusal to accept the dogma of transubstantiation cost many a martyr his life.

If you have a copy of "Fox's Book of Martyrs", refresh your memory by reading a few of the stories there, where simple men and women who declared they did not believe that the consecrated wafer is the veritable body, soul, and divinity of our Lord; nor that the wine is the veritable blood of the Lord Jesus,—for their refusal to subscribe to that dogma, were carried to the stake, and burned with fire. They would not concede that there could be any substitute for or supplement to the death of Christ, and His infinitely meritorious sacrifice.

We protested because the Mass is really the flag of the Roman Catholic Church, it is the trade-mark of the most divisive organization in the world, in the presence of which there can be neither peace nor unity, except on terms of absolute surrender and submission to its totalitarian tyranny. It was like raising the Italian flag at the masthead of the Canadian House of Commons.

What do we mean by the Christian religion? The teaching of Christ? The sermon on the mount? Yes; that is an element in the Christian religion. Do we mean the example of Christ, that He came to live, and to show us how to live, as some of our friends are wont to say, "to live life the Jesus way"? Is that Christianity? Some years ago there was a book that was sold by the million, entitled, "In His Steps", by Charles M. Sheldon. There was much truth in it. It is true that we should walk in His steps so far as we can—but that in itself is not Christianity. The heart of it all is that the Lamb of God came to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. The host of the redeemed in heaven sing the song of Moses and the Lamb. They are said to have been washed in the blood of the Lamb; and for ever and ever they live in the light of the Lamb:

"All earth's flowing pleasures
Were a wintry sea;
Heaven itself without Thee
Dark as night would be.
Lamb of God! Thy glory
Is the light above.
Lamb of God! Thy glory
Is Thy light of love."

And without that truth of the expiatory work of the Lord Jesus Christ, there is no Christianity. There is left only a fragment of it.

I remind you that the lamb of sacrifice under the Old Testament dispensation *had to be without blemish*, the very best that could be found. I read to you this evening that our Lord was offered as "a Lamb without blemish, and without spot." He was the very incarnation of divine righteousness. He was the incarnation, the embodiment, of the holiness of God, absolutely perfect in the fulfilment of His obligations to His Father, equally perfect in the discharge of His obligation under the law to His neighbour. He wrought out a righteousness for us, and was before God as a Lamb "without blemish, and without spot."

"Jesus, all perfections
Rise and end in Thee;
Brightness of God's glory,
Thou eternally."

And such an One as that, Who Himself knew no sin, came to be a propitiation for our sin.

But He is called in the text, "The Lamb of God." He was so *because He was of the same nature with God, of the divine nature; not only man but God.* No such perfect lamb could be found in any earthly fold, and so

there came to earth One from the heavenly fold Who was "the Lamb of God." We sing it in Mrs. Alexander's hymn:

"There was no other good enough
To pay the price of sin;
He only could unlock the gate
Of heaven, and let us in."

And so He came as "the Lamb of God." There can be no gospel in any message which denies the virgin birth of Christ, and the essential Deity of the one great Sacrifice. Unless He was God, He was not perfect enough to offer an atonement for our sin.

He was "the Lamb of God" in the sense that He was God's gift to this bankrupt world. He paid our debt; He came as God's special gift. You remember when Abraham and Isaac were on their way to the mount, and Isaac said, "My father . . . behold the fire and the wood: but where is the lamb for a burnt offering", Abraham answered, "My son, God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt offering." It was a prophecy, and He did at last provide a Lamb when in the fulness of time Jesus Christ came as God's gift to the world.

But more than that, the lamb had to be a lamb of the first year. I suppose it was to be a lamb whose life was unspent, that it might have the largest possible expiatory value. It was, of course, but a symbol of the Lamb of God. We are to remember that the Lord Jesus is described as "the Firstborn of every creature". It is said that He was "before all things". He spoke of Himself as "the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God." Oh, I wish I could make it clear to you—but we gaze here upon the Infinite, and we can get only the barest glimpse of it. The life of Jesus Christ was the life of God. "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men." He was the Source of life; from that infinite Fount of life, all life in the universe is derived; and the life that was in Him was of greater value than the sum-total of all life of every sort, in all worlds. And it was that life that was laid down in behalf of yours and mine, as the full payment of an infinite price.

Hence the blood of the Lord Jesus once offered is sufficient to atone for the sin of the whole world. I think, dear friends, as men see that, and if the heart can respond to it and rejoice in it, one must feel a holy indignation at the merest suggestion that anything or anyone could anywhere in the universe arise who could successfully compete with that infinite Sacrifice; or add even an infinitesimal fraction of value to the blood of Christ. That is why the Westminster Confession of Faith, regarding the Mass as a repetition of the sacrifice of Christ, the offering again of an unbloody sacrifice, according to Romanist teaching, in their confession, absolutely indispensable to the salvation of the soul, that, I say, is why the Westminster divines called it "most abominably injurious to Christ's one only sacrifice, the alone propitiation for all the sin of the elect."

We ought to protest always against any disposition in our own hearts, or anywhere else, presumptuously to assume that it is within human power, individually or collectively—though we could sum up and assemble the aggregate of all human virtue displayed through all the history of the world—to add to the absolute perfection of Jesus Christ. Even the contemplation of such an attempt would be an insult to the divine Majesty, and an aspersion upon the perfect sacrifice of the Cross. For the simplicity of the truth of this text we may well con-

tend, and in its fulness we may well, as believers, greatly rejoice.

II.

The text says that THE LAMB OF GOD TAKES AWAY "THE SIN OF THE WORLD". I wonder how He takes it away?

There is a passage in the book of Revelation, the first chapter, ascribing glory to God, to the Lamb, to Him "that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever." The Revised Version changes that and renders it, "Unto him who hath loved us, and loosed us from our sins." At first blush perhaps that word, "loosed", does not convey quite the significance of washing; yet on re-examination, you will find it is the better and the stronger word.

For instance, there is a stain upon a garment, or some article that is thrown into the wash. It goes through all the processes to which all other garments less stained, are submitted. But it comes out with the stain remaining. The stain is not "loosed"; it is there; it has become part of the fabric; it has interpenetrated the warp and woof almost like a dye. Then perhaps some stronger washing solution is used, in which there is a strong chemical element. When the article is put again into the washing solution, the stain is loosed, and it moves away; as you women say, "It comes out in the wash." It has to be "loosed" before it can be "taken away."

What is it to "loose" our sins, sins that are deep-dyed, that have stained our very souls, that have polluted every faculty of the mind like an irradicable stain? The dye of it is there. We cannot remove it. It is in heart and conscience. The man cannot get rid of it; he cannot wash out the blood stain, or some other stain. It still remains.

There is that in the blood of Christ which "looses" our sins—looses them. Like a cleansing element, it purges the conscience, purges the heart. That is what David meant when he said, "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me." There is a scripture which says, "Though thou wash thee with nitre, and take thee much sope, yet thine iniquity is marked before me, saith the Lord God."

Somewhere I read in a journal—I cannot certify to the scientific accuracy of it; I only report what I read—something of the history of soap as a cleansing agent. The article said that soap was invented, or rather that the cleansing properties of certain of its common ingredients were discovered, by observing the purging action of the combined ashes and tallow-residue of certain sacrifices. I do not know whether that can be historically established, but the analogy is most suggestive. It is the sacrifice of Christ, the blood that purges us, and "looses" our sins, so that they may be taken away—but first they are loosed. "If the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" Of course we are not to suppose that physical blood chemically cleanses an immaterial soul. But "the life of the flesh is in the blood." Blood is representative of

life, and the blood of the Lamb is the life of the Lamb of God,—of the life of God Himself.

We say that "blood is thicker than water". The child is of the same blood as his father and mother. The likeness to both appears because the blood is there. Ah, but Jesus Christ is the "express image" of the Father, "the image of the invisible God", the only begotten Son of God, the beginning of the creation, the First-born of every creature; and all the holiness of God—that is the big word, but the lesser elements in that totality of the divine nature which we indicate when we speak of His holiness—His righteousness, His truth, His justice, His mercy, His love, His faithfulness, His eternity, "made after the power of an indissoluble life"—all these are in the blood, if I may so say. The blood of the Lord Jesus is the very essence of what God is; and by that blood, by the co-operative action of all the powers of Deity, we are "loosed" from our sins.

I object to the substitution of a wafer for such a Sacrifice, or equally to the presumptuous attempt to supplement its infinite value. We will abide by that which is revealed and written. Our sins are loosed, or washed, by the blood of Christ.

But *there is another meaning here*. You remember that on the great day of atonement, the people of God were required to select two goats. They were to cast lots as to which of the goats should be offered in sacrifice, and which should be the scapegoat. The one thus selected for the sacrifice was brought to Aaron the high priest, a type and symbol of our great High Priest, who laid his hand upon the sacrificial goat, confessing all the sins of the people, and thus laid them in a figure upon the goat. Then the goat was slain, its blood outpoured. What had become of the sins that thus, in a figure, were loosed? Here is the sequel: Then came the scapegoat, and the priest laid his hands upon the scapegoat, taking in a figure the sins that had been loosed, and laying them upon the living goat which was also a type of Christ—it takes more than one figure to represent the Infinite One—Aaron again confessed the sins of the people; and the scapegoat was led away, by a fit man, away—away—away into the wilderness, "into a land not inhabited." And it never was seen again.

I have a picture in my home—I wish I had the original: mine is only a copy—of a great painting, representing the scapegoat in a most desolate and barren land, where no life appears. The sins of the people were carried away where no one could ever find them again. We are to remember that Jesus Christ was "delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification." By His death He loosed us from our sins, and by the power of His resurrection He takes away the sin of the world. Where does He take it? He takes it to "a land not inhabited."

There is another figure in Scripture where Hezekiah said, "Thou hast cast all my sins behind thy back." What a figure! God, taking the sum-total of the sins of a man's life, and hurling it away behind His back! Do you know where that is? Behind the back of God? I do not. Where can it be? I know it is "a land not inhabited". I know it is a place where no one can ever find my sin. I wish you would do something for me to-night: supplement my sermon when you get home by reading the fortieth chapter of Isaiah. If ever you want a tonic for your faith, read that chapter, read it again and again. That is the chapter in which Jehovah said,

"Behold, the Lord God will come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him: behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him. He shall feed his flock like a shepherd: he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young. Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance? Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his counsellor hath taught him? With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him, and taught him in the path of judgment, and taught him knowledge, and shewed to him the way of understanding? Behold, the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance; behold, he taketh up the isles as a very little thing. And Lebanon is not sufficient to burn, nor the beasts thereof sufficient for a burnt offering. All nations before him are as nothing; and they are counted to him less than nothing, and vanity. To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare unto him?"

Oh the might of our God! And this mighty God is in Christ, and He comes to take away the sin of the world. I heard a great preacher once remark: "The Lord Jesus Christ, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, stooped to become the sinner's scavenger—He taketh away the sin of the world." No one but God could do that, but He does it. Blessed be His holy name for ever, He has taken my sin away, and yours.

But someone says, "What of the record of it? The record of it!" Perhaps you will read in to-morrow's paper of some man who has been arrested as a suspicious character, and detained on a nominal charge of vagrancy. When the case comes up, the police will no doubt ask for a remand in order that they may have opportunity to look into the man's record. Presently the man will be in the news again; the police will come back and say, "This man has a record: He was convicted, and has served five years for an offence; he was convicted again, and served another term. He has all sorts of crimes to his credit. He is an unsafe man to be at liberty." He has not done much this time, he is detained only as a vagrant; but when the books are opened, and his record is laid bare, it is discovered he is a great criminal and perhaps he has to his credit still another crime, as yet unexpiated. That puts another complexion on his whole history.

How are we to get away from our record? How is the record of our wrongdoing to be expunged, so that when God reads the record in His book, He may be able to look upon His beloved, and say, "Thou art all fair, my love; there is no spot on thee"?

There is something in the Bible that staggers me. There are indeed many things far beyond my understanding. Some people have difficulty in remembering—I suppose we all have difficulty in that direction. But there are other things you wish you could not remember, things that are written in the record of your mind. It is there. Do you remember the old duplicators we used to have in offices? The letter was written, then put on some sort of gelatin substance. The letter was pulled off, and the copying ink left a copy on the gelatin. You put another piece of paper on, removed it, and you had a reproduction of the original. You could print only a limited number, because the ink sank in; and

perhaps in a day or so a piece of clean paper could be applied and removed without a mark on it. But the impression was in the gelatin, you could read it, it had sunk right through it to the bottom. The memory of sins of the past sometimes haunt people. They cannot get rid of it. The record of them in the mind is like the mark of the letter in the copying press. But what is worse, it is written in the mind of God. I wish we had the power—and I know you do at some particular time—to make our minds a complete blank and say, "I will remember it no longer. When I meet that man, I shall have completely forgotten his offence. My mind will be a complete blank in respect to that. I will remember it no more." But you cannot. Hence we have that wretched saying, "I forgive, but I cannot forget."

Divine forgetfulness is just as much a miracle as the miracle of divine remembrance. "I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." The record is expunged, blotted out, even from the divine memory. "I will blot them out as a thick cloud." They will be dissolved, dissipated, carried away, so that no one will ever find them. The devil is called "the accuser of the brethren." Would he not like to find an occasion against you for the great assize? Would he not like to turn all the imps of the pit loose on your record and mine, saying, "I will get something on him?" But the blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, "cleanseth us from all sin"; so that we are able to challenge the great adversary and say, "I can go before the great white throne, and know I shall be without fault before the throne of God."

What a salvation that is! And it is all in Christ. He "taketh away the sin of the world."

III.

LET US NOW BEHOLD THE LAMB OF GOD. As He hung upon the cross, it is said, "And the people stood beholding." We do not behold Christ on the cross. The Roman Catholics do. They put up their crucifix with Christ on the cross. Jesus Christ is not on the cross: He is in the glory. He was; but He Who endured the cross, now wears the crown. We are not to behold Him merely as suffering on the cross—He did suffer "the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God"; but, blessed be His name, the nails are now withdrawn; the crown of thorns is no more; and "him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins. And we are His witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him."

We are to behold Him as John did, yonder in the glory, when heaven was silent, and an angel cried, "Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof?" John said there was no one. There was a mortgage on this old sinful world. John said he wept much until one of the elders said to him, "Weep not: behold, the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof." And said John, "I beheld, and, lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain." "As it had been slain"! Now clothed with authority and power, the Lion of the tribe of Juda coming forth for our deliverance—but still a Lamb "as it had been slain".

Can you thus behold Him? Once on a holiday I went into a country church, not a large church, but an historic Presbyterian church. There were not many people there,

but it was a worshipful service. The minister's text was, "And I beheld." He told us how people can look at things, and see nothing, that there is a real art in beholding things. John said, "Behold the Lamb of God." Do not glance at Him: behold Him; fix your attention upon Him; gaze upon Him, *until your heart understands who He is*, and what He is. We must behold Him with our hearts. The heart beholds many things the eye cannot see. You have observed that principle, and so have I, when the marriage day comes. We have all said it—we were too polite to say it out loud, but in our hearts, "I wonder what she saw in him?" Or perhaps occasionally, notwithstanding all the bride's finery, we said in our own minds, "I wonder what he saw in her?" "Why did they see what they saw? They did not behold with their eyes: they beheld with their hearts. They wanted to see something—and they did. They beheld qualities that others, perhaps more careless observers, never did see."

Have you looked at the Lord Jesus with your hearts, until you fell in love with Him, until your heart cried out, "Hallelujah! What a Saviour!" John said, "Behold the Lamb of God." The spouse in the Song said, "His mouth is most sweet: yea, he is altogether lovely. This is my beloved, and this is my friend, O daughters of Jerusalem." She had really beheld the lovely One. And if only we could see Him, we should fall in love with Him;

"For, ah, the Master is so fair,
So sweet His smile on banished men,
That they who meet Him unaware
Can never rest on earth again!

"And they who see Him risen, afar,—
On God's right hand to welcome them,
Forgetful stand of home and land,
Desiring fair Jerusalem."

Oh, to be at home with Him! Oh, to be so close to the Beloved of our souls that naught can ever separate us more! It is, my dear friends, with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and if we can behold the Lamb of God with broken hearts, broken and contrite because of our sins, I know we shall love Him for ever more.

We ought to behold Him *intelligently*. Someone may say, "That is all very well for people who do not think." If you want a religion that makes no tax upon your I reply: If you want a religion that makes no tax upon your thinking power, be a Roman Catholic; that is a religion of crass superstition. If that does not suit you, try Christian Science. But if you want to think, if you want to use all the powers of intellect that God has given you, behold the Lamb of God. He is the centre and sum of the whole universe. You can study Him forevermore. You will never get to the end of it.

And when you see Him for what He is, the God-Man, when you see in the death of Jesus a suffering God, when you see in His resurrection, Deity triumphantly bursting the bands of death and rising as Victor over all the powers of darkness, you will say, "That appeals to my reason; that is a philosophy that is rationally grounded; that is eminently right. If Jesus Christ be God, He ought to be able to save me." Then, trust Him and let Him save you. Therefore I say, believe intelligently: Behold Him.

And behold Him *exclusively*. See Jesus only! Jesus only! "They saw no man save Jesus only." "Behold

the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." Therefore, do not behold anyone else. Do not look to yourself: look away.

Look not to yourself. Look not to your good works. Nor to the church. Look to none of these things for salvation. Not to ordinances, not to any preacher, not to any book not to any priest, or pope; but to Jesus only. "Behold the Lamb of God." Even when you read the Bible, get through it all that you may see in it the portrait of the Lamb, the living Word. "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.

That is the way to get ready for heaven; for when we get there it will not be the golden streets, nor the jasper walls, nor the tree of life, nor the angels, nor the seraphim, not even our loved ones who have gone before. There will be no church building with a cross on it in heaven; no crucifix bearing an image representing Christ: "And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb, are the temple of it." Then let the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb be your temple now! Then you will need no altar, no priest, no Mass, but Jesus only.

Can I make it any plainer? I have tried to make the way of salvation so plain that no one could possibly make a mistake. I leave the text with you, "Behold, the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 5

Fourth Quarter

October 5th, 1941

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

DAVID AND GOLIATH

Lesson Text: 1 Samuel 17.

Golden Text: "Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield; but I come to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom thou hast defied"—1 Samuel 17:45.

I. The Challenge—verses 1 to 11.

The warriors of the enemy are likely to appear great and powerful in our eyes (Num. 13:28-33; Judg. 6:2-5; 1 Kings 20:27). They may not actually be giants, as in this case, but at any rate they usually seem to be very formidable, possibly because their strength is unknown to us.

The resources of the enemy will likewise seem to be great, their weapons huge and destructive. It does not do to underestimate the strength and resources of Satan, our arch-enemy, but we must not forget that our God is greater than any foe who can oppose us (2 Kings 6:13-17; Isa. 59:19; Rom. 8:31; 1 John 4:4).

Goliath belittled the cause of Israel. He tried to make it appear ridiculous that they should set their battle in array against the Philistines. In modern language, he tried to gain a diplomatic victory. But Israel's cause was a just one.

His next move was to belittle their nation. He claimed to be a member of a so-called superior race, and he looked down upon all others. The Israelites were to him a race of slaves. Such thoughts and such language are familiar to us to-day.

Goliath of Gath also defied the armies of Israel. Surely he had forgotten the victories which God had given to those armies over his own people (1 Sam. 7:11-13; 13:4; 14:47).

The giant's challenge was enough to cause dismay to the faint-hearted among the Israelites. They could not hope to produce a champion to match the huge Goliath. Christians make a great mistake when they attempt to fight against their spiritual foes on equal terms. They should keep to

their own ground and to their own weapons (1 Kings 7:6; Eccl. 9:18; Jer. 21:4, 5; 2 Cor. 10:4; Eph. 6:10-17).

II. The Champions—verses 12 to 40.

David returned from the royal court to his father's sheepfold unspoiled. He could "walk with kings, nor lose the common touch" (Prov. 22:29). The Lord would have us do our duty, whatever or wherever it may be (Eccl. 9:10; 1 Cor. 10:31; Col. 3:17). David behaved himself wisely in all his ways, and the Lord was with him (1 Sam. 18:14).

Every morning and evening for forty days Goliath hurled his defiance against Israel. In Scripture the number "forty" suggests the idea of testing (Exod. 24:18; Deut. 8:2; Lk. 4:2). His action had value as propaganda; it wore down the morale of the Israelites.

The Lord heard the proud words of the Philistine warrior, and He also hearkened to the cries of His people (Exod. 3:7, 8; 2 Kings 19:14-20; Psa. 28:1, 6). He was already preparing a champion for their cause. David was sent on an errand to the camp, a seemingly trivial mission, but it led to mighty results since it was a part of the Lord's plan to humble His enemies and deliver His people.

Although so young, David was taught of the Spirit to recognize the significance of Goliath's challenge. Goliath was casting insults, not merely at the armies of Israel, but at the armies of the living God (Exod. 16:8; Josh. 3:10; 1 Sam. 8:7; Isa. 63:9). It is the same to-day. Those who despise the good, despise God, and those who oppose Christian principles and civilization, are opposing God Himself (Acts 5:38, 39).

A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country and his own house (Matt. 13:57). David's brethren did not believe in him (Gen. 37:8; Psa. 69:8; John 7:5). They accused him of pride, mischief and espionage.

To the natural eye the champions of Philistia and of Israel seemed to be extremely ill-matched. Goliath was a mighty warrior, about 9 feet 8 inches tall, while David was but a youth. Yet David humbly recited his previous exploits and bravely bore testimony to the power of the Lord in his life. His confidence in the Lord was the source of his courage (Psa. 56:4; Isa. 26:3, 4).

David refused to fight with any weapons but his own. In His wisdom the Lord has made no two of His children alike; He endows each with individual gifts and talents (Rom. 12:6-8; 1 Cor. 12:4-11; Eph. 4:7-11). Every Christian is at his best when serving the Lord in his own way, using the instruments tried by his experience, those befitting his own character and training. The general tendency is to try to imitate others.

III. The Contest—verses 41 to 58.

Goliath disdained and despised the young Hebrew champion. Evil-doers may despise the righteous, but the time is coming when the tables will be turned and the wicked will themselves be put to shame and utterly destroyed (Psa. 9:3-6; 11:6; 34:21; 91:8).

David was small, young and seemingly poorly armed, but he was not alone, for he stood before the giant as the representative of the Lord God of hosts (Psa. 124:8). The battle was the Lord's and His honour was at stake (Exod. 14:14; 1 Sam. 25:28; Hos. 1:7). David was clothed with the power of God, and weapons of steel were of no avail against him (Isa. 54:17). We, too, may be assured of the ultimate victory of the Lord over His enemies.

David conquered the giant through faith in God (2 Sam. 22:33; Heb. 11:34). Yet, he also used means—his staff and five small, smooth stones. Faith and means go together.

David had not performed his service with a view to gaining a reward of riches, fame or position (verse 25), but he was jealous for the honour of the Lord (verse 26). The youthful warrior, bearing the trophy of his victory in his hand, was presented to the king. One day all Christians will stand before their Saviour to receive rewards for the deeds done in the flesh (Psa. 126:5, 6; Rom. 14:10). Let us so serve Christ that we may have confidence and not be ashamed before Him at His coming (1 John 2:28).

Saul's failure to identify David may suggest a lapse of time since David had acted as minstrel at the court (1 Sam. 16:23), or faulty memory due to Saul's mental condition when he first saw David. It may be, however, that Saul had forgotten merely the name of David's father.

ECHOES FROM THE PROTEST MEETING

So far as the office of this paper can judge, the response of the Protestant public to the Protest Meeting has been most gratifying. We have received hundreds of letters already, not only approving of the meeting, but asking for additional copies of THE GOSPEL WITNESS containing the report of it, ranging all the way from five, ten, twenty-five, up to fifty copies. We have been encouraged too by the fact that the majority recognize that it costs something to print them, and usually enclosed sufficient to pay for the number of copies they desired, while a great many have sent generous contributions to meet the additional expense.

In time past very often when we have spoken on the question of Romanism, we have received a shower of scurrilous letters in reply. This time, so far, we have received only one such letter.

We print elsewhere an editorial comment from *Le Droit* of Ottawa, a Catholic-action paper. We have also an item by the Papist columnist, R. M. Harrison, of *The Windsor Star*. Of course, he writes from a Papist point of view, and says, "Bigotry's in for a big night in Toronto to-night", etc. Mr. Harrison did not believe that self-respecting people of any denomination would turn up. More than two thousand "turned up", and some of them stood up in Jarvis Street, while many hundreds—how many we do not know—were unable even to find standing room. But we are always complimented by the opposition of Papists, for we know then we have hit the mark.

A press report in *The Ottawa Journal* says that "Archdeacon Snowdon in a sermon at Christ Church Cathedral on Sunday deplored the 'prejudice and misunderstanding' which prohibited church union in Canada and prevented Christians from recognizing as Christians those of another denomination." We are reluctant always to judge any man by a newspaper report; we suppose we may go thus far, however, in assuming that Archdeacon Snowdon indulged in the usual cheap talk about toleration.

It was Britain's appeasement policy, under successive Prime Ministers, culminating in Munich, which has allowed Europe to drift into its present blood-bath. We suppose there will always be some people too blind to recognize that beasts of prey, whether quadrupeds or bipeds, cannot safely be "tolerated" in civilized communities. That principle is as applicable to the Papacy as to Hitler or Mussolini.

We stumbled upon another paper—we do not remember its name—which, while inveighing against the Protest Meeting, acknowledged that permission to celebrate a Pontifical Mass at the entrance to the House of Commons was a colossal and utterly stupid governmental blunder.

We noted also in a Saturday advertisement of Sunday's services that a United Church minister in Toronto was advertised to speak on "Protestant Popes". We sent a stenographer to obtain a verbatim report of the address, and we have it before us.

The preacher told his congregation that in the course of his pastoral contacts on Thursday afternoon he had stumbled upon the discussion of the Protest Meeting "in four or five different kinds of places", and said:

"In this pastoral visitation, and in such letters as came to my desk this week, the Protest Meeting called for last Tuesday evening, was under attack."

So this minister felt, on the ground of four or five criticisms, and such letters as came to his desk, that he ought to change his subject and protest against the Protest Meeting. The speaker had not learned why such a meeting had been held, and implied that a united service of all communions—Protestants, Roman Catholics, Jews, etc.—would have been better; and he said:

"We have a right to know why we could not have had a common act of worship among all communions in the Dominion House of Parliament."

We do not need to go to Ottawa to answer the gentleman's question. When the war broke out, the Roman Church insisted upon having its own separate chapelain. It insists always, in all camps, on having its own separate service. So far as it has power to do so, it prevents its people, soldiers and civilians, from attending any Protestant service. If such a union service had been arranged, the Roman Catholic Church would not have participated in it, for the reason that it is a separatist and divisive organization always.

As to why the Mass was celebrated at the entrance to the House of Commons, we can inform our critic with equal accuracy: it was held there because the Mass is the distinctive feature of Roman Catholicism. It was celebrated at the entrance to the House of Commons to indicate the hold Roman Catholicism is getting upon this country, particularly upon the Ottawa Government. Moving picture cameras were busy during the progress of the service, and many still pictures were taken. Already they have appeared in American papers, showing the holding of a great Roman Catholic service at the entrance to the Canadian House of Commons; the implication, of course, being that it was an official service, and that Canada is predominantly Romanist.

We may as well mention the name of our critic. It was Rev. Gordon Domm, minister of Bathurst Street United Church. If Mr. Domm does not know that the Roman Catholic Church learned the importance of a Propaganda Department long before Hitler was born, we venture now to supply that defect in the sum of his information. The holding of Mass at such a time, and in such a place, was a distinct, a direct challenge to Protestantism in this country.

Mr. Domm then undertook to criticize—obviously without knowing what he was talking about—on only a few meagre newspaper reports. He must have known that a full official record of the proceedings of the Protest Meeting was available to anyone who wanted it; but Mr. Domm presumed to speak without even troubling to inform himself as to what had been done. Mr. Domm criticized the passage of the resolution on the Roman Church's annulment of marriages in Quebec, as though the decision of the Court of King's Bench settled it. If he were better informed, he would know that these matters have been carried beyond the Court of the King's Bench, to the Supreme Court of Canada, and then to the Privy Council—the highest authority in the British Empire. Judgments have been given against the decisions of the Quebec courts, but they continued to grind out their annulments just the same—and this, the institution that pretends to regard the institution of marriage as sacred.

Poor Mr. Domm! He said "this is not the way to national unity." Does he not know that the great

hindrance to national unity in Canada to-day—and for many years past—has been the Roman Catholic Church? By its every action, and by all its teaching, it divides: it does not unite.

Mr. Domm said "this is not the spirit of the Master." We answer with an inspired record of the spirit of the Master: "Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered." And here is more of the spirit of the Master, and we venture to believe that there never has been on earth an institution more deserving of such denunciations than the Roman Catholic Church: "But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves."

Then Mr. Domm said: "I am as much a Protestant as any Protestant in Toronto." A Protestant is one who protests. Mr. Domm protests against our Protest Meeting. He protests against certain "Protestant popes". And certainly we have just as much right to protest against the Roman Catholic Pope as Mr. Domm has to protest against "Protestant Popes."

Mr. Domm fears "we do not think straight, or as clearly as we should." We are absolutely certain that that is true, so far as Mr. Domm himself is concerned. He said:

"We are in the war to preserve freedom, freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, and above all, we must think of the freedom of worship."

We agree. We have said it perhaps a score of times: we would fight as readily for the freedom of Roman Catholics as for our own. While we abhor the whole Papal system as anti-Christian from top to bottom, we would accord our Roman Catholic friends the fullest possible freedom to worship God in their own way. But we would not allow the Roman Catholic Church to celebrate Mass in Jarvis Street Church, for example: we hope Mr. Domm would not be so liberal as to allow them to celebrate Mass in Bathurst Street United Church. As a citizen of Canada, and as a taxpayer, this Editor owns a part of the Canadian House of Commons—and so does Mr. Domm. It is a symbol of our common Canadian citizenship, and therefore it is the wrong place for the Roman Catholic Church—which insists that it is the only church, and that there is no salvation for anyone who will not submit to the Roman Pontiff—to celebrate its distinctive dogma.

Mr. Domm concluded his sermon as follows:

"I read a story of a ship travelling in Mediterranean waters. The captain was very given to watching the stars. He fixed his course by the stars, and their formations. But the practical mind of the crew on board said, 'Never mind the stars.' They were travelling on the sea, and the things to watch out for were the waters, the tides, the waves, the currents, the winds. These were the things to be governed by. They became so impatient with this mystical character guiding his course by the stars, gazing on them, that they confined him to the hold, and then they went merrily on—to shipwreck!

"Have we all found in Him, Who is the best of all friends, a Guide, a Stay, a Compass, something fixed, to tide us over the rough waters, Jesus Christ the Lord? So may God help us to do."

That was the best part of the sermon in many respects, among other reasons, because it justifies our Protest Meeting. The captain of Mr. Domm's ship who insisted on taking his direction from the stars—most likely from the Pole Star—was a protestant; but for his protestantism he was confined in the hold, and the ship to Davey Jones' locker. Protestantism fixes its eyes upon the Star, the bright and morning Star. Protestantism steers its course by the more sure word of prophecy "whereunto we do well that we take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts."

Roman Catholicism substitutes the Pope for the prophets, and a study of "the waters, the tides, the waves, the currents, the winds", for the Word of God. And Romanism, when it has the power, always "confines to the hold" those who insist on setting their course by heavenly directions.

We must apologize for giving Mr. Domm so much attention. We have not done so because of the weight or worth of his criticisms, but only because he is a symptom of the religions indifferentism of the times. It is hard to make bread without wheat, and difficult to make bricks without straw. Mr. Domm's sermon was not entirely without clay: it was muddy enough; but such flecks of thought as was mixed in with it was not even straw, but rather like "the chaff which the wind driveth away." Mr. Domm may be useful to rock the cradle of Protestantism that Protestant babes may sleep on; but though with abounding Christian charity he advertised his intention to speak on "Protestant Popes"—and that must have attracted a few to hear him, whether in agreement or not, for instance, our stenographer, and three others we know were there—notwithstanding the gallery was roped off, and within the centre circle of the church there was nothing but empty seats, and a mere handful of people—two hundred or so—sprinkled around under the gallery. That is the kind of Protestantism that empties churches, and earns—and receives—the contempt of Roman Catholics and Protestants alike.

Against Mr. Domm's handful of inarticulate Protestants, we set the thousands who came to Jarvis Street Church to protest, only about 2,000 of whom got in, and the tens of thousands who will hear of the Protest Meeting through the printed page, and take courage.

"THE CLERGY AND RELIGION"

Translated by Rev. W. S. Whitcombe, M.A.

We print herewith a translation of a front page article appearing in a recent number of *Le Jour*, a French-language paper published in Montreal of which M. Jean-Charles Harvey, is the Editor. On several occasions we have quoted from the writings of Mr. Harvey in order to give our readers some idea of the spirit that is abroad in French-Canada, and to which this French-Canadian editor has consistently dared to give public expression.

Many Protestants are either ignorant of the true nature of Roman Catholicism or do not dare to criticise

it because they take it at its own appraisal and regard it as all powerful. Here is one who was born and brought up a French Roman Catholic, but who dares to criticise it because he knows it thoroughly and because he is well aware that inside the imposing machinery of organization which it presents to the public there are many elements of fatal weakness.

We print the following article partly at least because it represents a different point of view from ours. Our readers will notice that Mr. Harvey has no criticism to offer of the theological claims of Rome, it is the economic, social, and more particularly the educational aspect, that he criticises. As Protestants we see that the cause of Rome's corruption in these various external matters, has its root in this apostate church's perversion of the simple teaching of the Word of God. We give our protest for the Word of God and that One Mediator between God and men, and hence against dictatorship by any human priest whether it be in spiritual matters or in the social, economic, political or educational realm.

"THE CLERGY AND RELIGION"

By Jean-Charles Harvey

"We have often been accused of anti-clericalism, nevertheless we have never attacked the clergy. We have never made the least attempt to lessen the religious influence of the priests over the consciences of their people. Catholic dogma and moral laws always have received as much respect from us as anywhere else. In what, then, and how can we be accused of anti-clericalism?"

Such an accusation evidently arises from our attitude toward education. It is impossible to enter on this reserved ground without touching certain ecclesiastical personalities. Our educational system from the little country school up to the university, is directed and inspired by the clergy. The Council of Public Instruction is almost exclusively formed of bishops and men in submission to them; almost 50 per cent of the teaching staff of the province of Quebec is formed of ecclesiastics and members of religious orders; out of thirty classical colleges, twenty-nine are entirely controlled and taught by the clergy, and the thirtieth is far from being exempt from their control; in our cities and in all our important towns Brothers and Sisters of teaching orders dominate; the greater part of our school books used in the numerous confessional institutions (Roman Catholic Schools) are written by members of religious orders; almost every French-Canadian is formed directly or indirectly by the same influence.

In the light of this brief recital of facts, it is evident that a lay journalist cannot undertake a public discussion on education without being immediately treated as an anti-clerical. Ought we for this reason to hold our silence? If this be so, a French-Canadian citizen would be forbidden to speak these recognized truths, to wit: that the primary school in the province of Quebec has completely failed; that the level of instruction there is inferior to that in neighbouring provinces; that our secondary schools specialize in the mass production of misfits; that our universities are almost the poorest on the continent. How can anyone present such facts without casting a reflection on those who are responsible for them?

However we do not claim that the clergy alone have failed in their task. The various provincial governments which have succeeded one another in this province since Confederation have shown no interest in this vital problem. There have been some courageous voices, such as Mr. David, who have cried in the wilderness, and more recently Mr. Perrier; but almost always fear and indifference have finally overcome our politicians. In many of our families no care whatever is bestowed on education: and the proof of this is the fearfully poor school attendance: almost 75 per cent of our children leave school between eleven and twelve years of age.

If one really becomes an anti-clerical because he has repeated such truths one hundred times, well then, to my great regret I must say that it would be the duty of every citizen who has any care for the future of this country to be

anti-clerical in this fashion. We have no right because of a fear of words or a fear of losing some temporal and material advantage to throw the mantle of oblivion over such a great affliction. If, in order to live in peace in our beloved country, we must walk amid white sepulchres without even having the right to hold our noses, then that is a kind of patriotism too dearly and too cruelly paid for.

What initiative will be left to us ordinary citizens in the realm of thought or even in the field of action? What fear could we poor earthworms inspire in the clergy? We have no associations which are not either founded or directed or narrowly surveyed by the clergy. The members of our government attempt in a thousand ways to do nothing and to say nothing which will displease the clergy for they see in them the first hidden influence of our political life. At least 99 per cent of our college and university students follow clerical directions. The greater part of our doctors, our lawyers, our notaries, and our civil servants—and especially outside of Montreal—know that they will scarcely be able to succeed in life if they openly displease the clergy. And again the total amount of property in its possession is such that the clergy taken together probably represent the greatest economic power in the country.

I deal with this situation, of which no one is ignorant, not in order to complain but in order to show the seriousness that the accusation of anti-clericalism has in our province. It hinders the good that the best informed men among us might do by creating a terrible prejudice: it stifles voices which should be heard; it hides truths which are essential to our national salvation; above all it wounds one of the sacred rights of every democratic régime: the right to criticize. On the day when by undue influence, intimidation, or blackmail, this privilege will have been suppressed, then it would be useless for us to fight against fascism; it would be criminal to spend millions on the war and to allow our young men to perish on the field of battle: fascism would be installed here at home in its most hideous and hypocritical form.

Let no one misunderstand my words: I respect and love the clergy, who console the afflicted, heal moral plagues, relieve consciences, preach good things, aid the sick, and close the eyes of the dying on an eternal vision; I believe that men need to raise their looks above the low and sad realities of this world to lose themselves in an infinite hope. But I claim my full liberty of speech in questions which have to do with the temporal realm, where each and every citizen has his share of responsibility. In politics, in education, in numerous social and economic problems, if it falls to our lot to cross swords with one of the clergy, we do not attack him in his sacred character but in his quality as a citizen who has come down of his own will to a common ground on which he ceases to be a man of God and becomes our equal with the same rights, the same duties, and the same privileges.

I have already said these things in the past. But I am repeating them now in order to obviate all misunderstanding. But even when we exercise our right as free men in democracy we do not deny to the clergy the merit of their works. We know that for an abandoned people they were the only support not only as priests but as school masters, lawyers, counsellors, organizers, comforters and animators. It is doubtless in gratitude for this past that the ordinary obligations of the taxpayer are not required from them. Christ said; Whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water he shall in no wise lose his reward." The Canadian church has surely had its reward.

Romanists Invoke Religious Toleration

In the following editorial note the French-language Roman Catholic *Le Droit* of Ottawa appeals to British religious toleration to defend its celebration of Pontifical Mass on Parliament Hill. Until now this paper has been howling for the blood of all those who dared to criticize the Roman Catholic Church. It featured the various speeches of Roman Catholic Members at Ottawa and elsewhere who demanded that Dr. Shields should be interned because he had preached and distributed a French translation of a sermon entitled "Why I am not a Roman

Catholic". Now that the shoe is on the other foot they appeal to the British principle of religious tolerance.

"This evening there is to be held in Toronto a protest meeting of the various Protestant denominations in Jarvis Street Church, a protest against the celebration of Pontifical Mass on Parliament Hill. What are the organizers of this meeting going to do with religious liberty? And do they forget that tomorrow the various churches themselves will have their ceremony of consecration on Parliament Hill? Truly such things could only take place at Toronto and even there only among the most limited elements of that city."

The Protest Number of The Gospel Witness

We are anxious, so far as possible, to put a copy of last week's number, with an account of the Protest Meeting, into the hands of men and women in key positions. Of course, we want everyone to read it; but we especially desire to have it read by men and women who will convey its message to others.

We suggest therefore that our readers make a list, first, of the most influential men and women in their town or community; and, secondly, of other people whom they desire to read the message of that issue. The type of that issue is still standing; and should it be necessary, we will put it back on the press and print thousands more. But to make it possible for us to do all this, we make this proposal: that the reader of THE GOSPEL WITNESS in any given place make himself or herself a convener of a Canadian Protestant League, make a list of all the people in your community whom you know are awake to the menace of Romanism in Canada; call them together in your house; then, when together, make a list of the influential people of the community. Send a list of the names to us, and if possible, with the names, a sum of money equal to 5c for each copy of THE WITNESS you ask us to mail. Perhaps you could secure the necessary amount by a collection taken among the group you call together in your house. But in doing that, *send us the list of interested persons apart from the list of those we have named, "influential persons";* and if all the persons named are agreed, you could put the names and addresses on one piece of paper, with something like this at the head of it: "The persons named below will be glad to enroll as members of a Canadian Protestant League if and when such a League is organized."

In addition to the foregoing suggestion—or quite apart from it—it may be there are people in isolated places who would find such a procedure as that we have proposed above, impossible, but who could send us a list of names of people to whom they would like to have a copy of last week's issue of THE GOSPEL WITNESS sent, and if possible a covering amount.

And further: talk about it to all your friends.

We reprint what we said last week about sending THE GOSPEL WITNESS in quantities:

"Single copy05
10 copies40
25 or more03 each

"May we venture respectfully to suggest to ministers and other Christian leaders who may have read the Protest issue, that if they find it according to their mind, and feel that it ought to be more freely circulated, they might perhaps send for a quantity that could be distributed in church or Bible class, or in other ways."

Premier King Pleases Vatican Vichy

The following appeared in *L'Action Catholique* of September 11th or 12th, 1941. Note that it was printed in bold faced type. (*Translation by W.S.W.*)

VICHY SATISFIED WITH MR. KING'S SPEECH

Vichy, Sept. 11.—(BUP).—An authorized source commented on the recent declaration of Mr. Mackenzie King on his arrival in Canada and expressed great satisfaction.

The government spokesman declared: "We are very happy over Mr. King's words. There has been permanent contact between us during the last few months by means of the Canadian chargé d'affaires at Vichy, and there is no reason why good relations should not exist between the two governments, especially since there is a large French-Canadian population which is always dear to our hearts."

We have repeatedly protested against the retention at Ottawa of M. René Ristelheuber, the Vichy representative, ever since the collapse of France. M. Ristelheuber was not loyal to the Republican government of France whom he came to Canada to represent, because shortly after France's fall, in a public speech the Vichy *chargé d'affaires* attributed the fall of France to her disobedience to the Church. It was openly stated that he was retained at Ottawa to please Romanist Quebec; and no doubt, as another diplomatically immune channel of information between Ottawa and the Vatican. The vigilantes of the Vatican—and through the Vatican of political Rome, Berlin, and Vichy, threaten to become so numerous at Ottawa as to produce a house-shortage in the Canadian Capital!

In the Capital of Neutral Argentine

A press despatch says:

Buenos Aires, Sept. 23.—(AP)—Police arrested 16 persons tonight after stones were hurled at the French embassy by a crowd which gathered outside and shouted insults against the Vichy government. About 40 persons took part in the demonstration, police said.

We are not in favour of throwing stones at the Vichy representative, at Ottawa; but we would like to see him handed his passports at once, for the reason that this country is at war with the enemy with which Vichy freely "collaborates".

POOR QUEBEC!

*Still Another Grant of Public Monies to
The Roman Church.*

A Roman Catholic paper published in the province of Ontario prints the following news item:

QUEBEC GOVERNMENT AIDS CATHOLIC YOUTH WORK (By N.C.W.C. News Service)

Montreal, Sept. 5.—The Quebec Government will give \$2,500 annually for the next ten years to the A.C.J.C.—Association Catholique de la Jeunesse Canadienne Française—French-Canadian Catholic Youth Association—to aid its work and finances.

Quebec is so poor that the Dominion Government proposed in the Sirois Report to give it special financial privileges—at the expense of the other eight provinces. But what does poor Quebec do with its money? Here is the answer in this Roman Catholic paper: \$25,000.00 of public money given to a Catholic Society whose aim is to bring French-Canadian youth even more closely under the control of a foreign potentate in Italy, than they are now. And this is but one example among many of the way in which the provincial government of Quebec takes money from the public and lavishes it upon the Roman Church. Poor Quebec!

Excerpts From *The Canadian Freeman*

The Canadian Freeman is a Roman Catholic paper published in Kingston, Ontario; and unless we are mistaken, is the official organ for that diocese of the Italian Church. The excerpts which we print below are interesting as appearing in a Roman Catholic paper.

The Freeman quotes *The Catholic Herald* to tell us that the new head of the British Ministry of Information is a Roman Catholic. Surely the warnings of the Protestant Truth Society of Britain are not superfluous. This pestilential Roman rodent is gnawing its way into influential positions everywhere. Germany's estimate of a propaganda department as being scarcely second to that of the war department was long ago recognized by the Roman Catholic Church—and now the head of the British Ministry of Information is a Roman Catholic. We hope he will tell the truth about the war; but we may be absolutely sure he will not allow the truth about the Roman Catholic Church's part in the war to be told.

The Anglo-Catholic British Ambassador to Washington enquires for the nearest Roman Catholic Church in Montreal—not the nearest Anglican church, however high, but the "nearest Roman Catholic Church".

Then our third item very clearly defines the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church toward education. We would remind our readers that Cardinal Villeneuve, Premier Godbout of Quebec, the Honourable Ernest Lapointe—and the redcap for them all, Premier King—are continually prating about "national unity". It appears that according to canon law "Catholic children must not attend non-Catholic, neutral or mixed schools, that is, such as are also open to non-Catholics." That is to say, it is laid down in canon law that the children of Roman Catholic parents must not be allowed to associate with non-Catholics. What arrant hypocrisy for representatives of such a separatist institution to talk about "national unity"!

We are further told that parents who send their children to such schools without the Bishop's approval, "if when warned, they steadfastly refuse to comply, cannot receive sacramental absolution, as is evident from the Catholic teaching." That is to say, if Roman Catholic parents, having been warned by the Church not to do so, permit their children to attend non-Catholic schools, they imperil the salvation of their souls! What an utterly satanic institution the Roman Catholic Church is! And this is the Church which disguises its aim by prating about "national unity"!

The excerpts below are taken from *The Catholic Freeman* of August 28th:

What Canon Law States Regarding Catholic Education

Canon 1113: "Parents are bound by a most grave obligation to provide to the best of their ability for the religious and moral as well as for the physical and civil education of their children and for their temporal well-being."

Canon 1372: "From childhood all the faithful must be so educated that not only are they taught nothing contrary to faith and morals, but that religious and moral training takes the chief place."

Canon 1373: "In every elementary school religious instruction, adapted to the age of the children, must be given."

Canon 1374: "Catholic children must not attend non-Catholic, neutral or mixed schools, that is, such as are also open to non-Catholics. It is for the bishop of the

place alone to decide, according to the instructions of the Apostolic See, in what circumstances and with what precautions attendance at such schools may be tolerated, without danger of perversion to the pupils."

Canon 1375: "The Church has the right to establish schools of every grade, not only elementary schools, but also high schools and colleges."

Decree 16 No. 3 Provincial Council of Kingston: "Parents who send their children to schools which are not Catholic without a sufficient reason approved by the Bishop and without safeguards, if, when warned, they steadfastly refuse to comply, cannot receive sacramental absolution, as is evident from the Catholic teaching."

These principles hold good for schools of secondary as well as primary education.

Halifax Visits Basilica

MONTREAL, Aug. 20 — Lord Halifax, British Ambassador to Washington, stopped off here en route to Ottawa. From the porter of his hotel he enquired where the nearest Catholic Church was situated. The porter pointed out the Basilica of St. James Major and the Ambassador set out on foot to visit the Cathedral.

Brendan Bracken A Catholic

"Writing from Templemore, Co. Tipperary, to the Irish Press, Mr. T. F. Meagher corrects the report that Mr. Brendan Bracken was born in Co. Limerick, and cites the baptismal certificate which shows that Mr. Bracken was born in Church Street, Templemore, and baptized in the Sacred Heart Church there on February 25, 1901.

Mr. Meagher mentions that Mr. Bracken's father, the late Joseph Kevin Bracken, was one of the founders of the Gaelic Athletic Association and its first vice-president. "A sterling Nationalist, he was prominent in the politics of his time. He was engaged in the business of monumental sculptor and building contractor. Members of the Bracken family are still in Templemore, where Mr. Patrick Bracken, U.D.C., first cousin of the Minister carries on the monumental business."—*Catholic Herald*.

BOOKS BY DR. T. T. SHIELDS

"The Adventures of a Modern Young Man" ..	\$1.00
"Other Little Ships"	1.00
"The Plot That Failed"	1.00
"The Oxford Group Movement Analyzed"05
25 copies	1.00
Russellism or Rutherfordism, (103 pages)35
"The Papacy—In the Light of Scripture"10
"Why I Believe the Rapture Cannot Precede the Tribulation." Also "The Meaning of the Parousia". In Booklet of 32 pages.....	.10
20 copies	1.00
War Sermons from "A Sword Bathed in Heaven" to the Sermon in this issue—postpaid, individual sermons, each05
The Gospel Witness, published weekly, per annum	2.00

Address: THE GOSPEL WITNESS,

130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto, Can.

The Convention's Special Speaker

The special speaker for our coming Convention, October 7th to 9th, is Dr. L. H. Lehmann, of New York city, a converted Roman Catholic priest, Editor of *The Converted Catholic*, and author of a number of books. One of his books is entitled, "The Soul of a Priest", which is really Dr. Lehmann's autobiography, and is described as "a candid account of his life as a priest on three continents, and of his soul-quest after the light of true Christianity itself." The book relates the disillusioning result of his work in Rome itself, and tells how he came to recognize "the uselessness of Roman priestly ministration".

Those who have read the monthly issues of *The Converted Catholic* for any length of time will have observed that Dr. Lehmann speaks with the authority of thorough scholarship. As our next Convention is to be given chiefly to the consideration of, "The Menace of Romanism in Canada", it will be of great advantage to have as our special speaker one who for years served as a priest of the Roman Church, and who will be able to speak of its corruptions and anti-Christian character from his own personal observation.

Dr. Lehmann will give at least four addresses, but he will be present also at the sessions where these questions are discussed, and will be there to answer such questions as can be answered effectively only by someone who has known the Roman Church from the inside.

This writer can scarcely wait for the dates of the Convention to come. We are sure it will be our greatest.

TENTATIVE PROGRAMME

Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec—Jarvis Street Baptist Church,
October 7, 8, 9

Convention Theme: **THE MENACE OF ROMANISM**

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 7th

11.00 a.m.—Registration of Messengers.

Afternoon

2.30 p.m.—Prayer and Praise Service led by Rev. J. K. Yalland.

Opening of Convention, Dr. T. T. Shields presiding.

Adoption of Tentative Constitution.

Appointment of Committee on Nominations.

The Baptist Relation to State Education

Address by Mr. L. H. Saunders, Editor of "Protestant Action": **Public and Separate Schools in Ontario.**

Revs. J. R. Boyd, Lorne Hisey, and Arnold Dallimore have been asked to lead in a discussion of this theme in which all are invited to participate.

Evening

7.30—Song Service led by Mr. W. J. Hutchinson.

8.00—Rev. H. C. Slade presiding.

Presidential Address, **The Basic Anti-Christian Principles of Roman Catholicism**, Dr. T. T. Shields.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 8th

Morning

9.30—Prayer and Praise Service led by Rev. Wilfred Wellington.

10.00—Rev. R. D. Guthrie presiding.
Annual Report of Board.
Election of Officers.

Afternoon

2.00—Prayer and Praise Service led by Pastor H. Butler.

2.30—Rev. H. C. Slade presiding.

The Evangelization of Roman Catholics

In Europe—Rev. W. H. Frey.

In Canada—Rev. W. S. Whitcombe.

Revs. Robert Brackstone, J. Fullard, Stanley Wellington have been asked to lead in a discussion of this theme which will be concluded with an

Address by Dr. L. H. Lehmann:

The Conversion of Roman Catholics

Evening

7.30—Prayer and Praise Service led by Rev. John Hunter.

8.00—Rev. R. D. Guthrie presiding.

Address by Dr. L. H. Lehmann:

Relationship of Catholicism and Nazi-Fascism.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9th

Morning

9.30—Prayer and Praise Service led by Rev. T. D. M. Carson.

10.00—Rev. W. S. Whitcombe presiding.

Home Missions: Addresses by

Pastor V. J. Lehmann, Kapuskasing.

Rev. W. C. Tompkins, Fort William.

Rev. J. R. Armstrong, Snowdon.

How we increased our Sunday School givings by more than 800% in one year—by Mr. A. M. Cooper, Supt. of Long Branch Sunday School.

Afternoon

2.00—Prayer and Praise Service led by Rev. W. H. MacBain.

2.30—**The Seminary: Our Greatest Asset: An Address by Dr. T. T. Shields.**

Rome's Political Aims in Canada.

Revs. John Byers, E. C. Wood, and Richard Jones, have been asked to lead a discussion on this subject, which will be concluded with an

Address by Dr. L. H. Lehmann:

Rome's Corruption of Christianity

Evening

7.30—Prayer and Praise service led by Pastor W. R. Slade.

8.00—Dr. T. T. Shields presiding.

Catholic Action and Hitler's New Order—
Dr. L. H. Lehmann.