

Beverage Rooms No "Problem"—page 3; Toronto's Roman Catholic Protagonist—page 4; Jarvis Street Pulpit—page 5; Roman Church and C.B.C.—page 8; Jack Benny or the Gospel—page 8; Quebec and the War—page 10; Pastor's Column—page 11.

The Gospel Witness and Protestant Advocate

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.

Telephone ELgin 3581.

Registered Cable Address: Jarwitsem, Canada.

Vol. 21, No. 35

TORONTO, DECEMBER 31, 1942

Whole Number 1076

The Lord of the New Year

"Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." Many of the things which have entered into life during 1942, we shall all hope will "vanish away". This paper is dated the last day of 1942. In the morning we shall all be wishing our friends a "happy new year". But in what sense can 1943 be a *new* year? It will, of course, be another measurement of time; but the same old world, with its human population, and its truly awful aggregate of human sin, will still be with us. The traitor Darlan is gone; but Pétain, and Laval, and Quisling, and others, near and remote, still remain. How can the year, in any true sense, be "new"? And unless, in some respects it is to be really new, how can it be truly a happy new year? —

We are growing accustomed to using things over the second time. Cars are old, clothes are well worn; and everyone everywhere is exercising his or her ingenuity to see how some things can be "made to do" for the duration. Some people who were wont to be very particular about how they made their tea, now actually use the tea-leaves over; and some people even boil them to make them go as far as possible:

But in some of the essential elements of life, many people have lived on rations for

a longer period than the duration of the war thus far. They have used the old over and over again, when they might have had new. The habit of patching old garments, even with new cloth, is a very ancient one. Now-a-days, some stores open but a few hours a day, they are so rationed they cannot get supplies. Housewives are growing accustomed to being told that stores are sold out of certain very ordinary and common commodities. What a day it will be when the flood breaks again, and new things begin to flow in with abundance—plenty of butter, plenty of cream, plenty of tea and coffee, plenty of new clothes, plenty of gasoline, plenty of tires—plenty of everything!

Were we to ask, with the coloured elder of Pittsburg, "Can I get an Amen to that prospect", we should receive a chorus of them. Why should anyone bother himself with used articles of any sort if he can get new ones? Is there any storehouse anywhere of unlimited supply? Is there any manufacturing concern whose products have not been reduced by the exigencies of war? It is a commonplace, but a tremendous commonplace, to remark that even in war time "our sufficiency is of God". No one else can use His language. The speech

(Continued on next page)

of the Divine bears Heaven's "hall mark" upon it.

Let us quote a few of His sayings. Perhaps some of our ministerial readers may find a few texts: "He hath put a new song in my mouth." Therefore may we exhort each other, "Oh, sing unto the Lord a new song." The present war has produced many new secular songs, as of course is natural; but the Christian has a new war every day, and his new victories ought to inspire him with new songs. But this is the language of Heaven: "Behold, the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare: before they spring forth I tell you of them. Sing unto the Lord a new song, and his praise from the end of the earth, ye that go down to the sea, and all that is therein; the isles, and the inhabitants thereof."

Or take a passage like this: "Remember ye not the former things, neither consider the things of old. Behold, I will do a new thing; now it shall spring forth; shall ye not know it? I will even make a way in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert. The beast of the field shall honour me, the dragons and the owls: because I give waters in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert, to give drink to my people, my chosen. This people have I formed for myself; they shall shew forth my praise."

But we have not time to quote a tithe of them. Take your concordance, look up the word "new", and then turn to such passages as these: "It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassion fail not. They are new every morning: great is thy faithfulness." And what of these?—"I will put a new spirit within you." "Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed; and make you a new heart and a new spirit; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?"

Of course there are more comprehensive passages. Our Lord came to be the Mediator of a "new" covenant. The wine of Communion is the "new covenant" in His blood. By His death and resurrection, He released a power sufficient to make us all "new creatures in Christ". He found a way to bring Jew and Gentile together, and make of twain "one new man". He has opened up, we are told, "a new and living way"; and we are promised some day a "new name". In what directory will that name appear? It will not be ours until there has been created "a new heaven and a new earth"—something vastly more than "a new order," something that shall be entirely because essentially new. And the capital of that new heaven and new earth will be the New Jerusalem, which will come down from God out of heaven. And there will be a new experience for all its citizens; and a new prospect for faith through all eternity.

Therefore because the Saviour we know is the Lord of the New Year, most-sincerely we wish all our readers a very Happy New Year.

REV. W. G. BROWN GOING TO FORWARD

On Sunday last, the Jarvis Street pulpit was occupied both morning and evening by Rev. W. G. Brown, M.A., who for three years has been Pastoral Visitor and general assistant to the Pastor in the work of Jarvis Street Church. Mr. Brown, as we intimated last week, has accepted a call to Forward Baptist Church for the duration, taking charge while Rev. J. Scott, the Pastor, one of our Seminary graduates, is Chaplain in the R.C.A.F.

There is a great shortage of ministers in every direc-

tion; and never has the necessity for the work of Toronto Baptist Seminary been more apparent than now. Because our men went into the services, we suspended operation of the Seminary; but the Seminary will open as soon as there are sufficient student-candidates to justify it. Had we the students, we would open immediately. We are now, in the Union, three years behind in our ministerial supply. In view of this, Mr. Brown felt it his duty to fill in at Forward for the duration.

The Pastor fully expected to be present at the morning service last Sunday, and to preach in the evening; but was visited by one of those very uncomfortable companions, a common cold—but this was of a variety that combined a kind of Euroclydon with Vesuvius. For that reason, we were unable to be present at either service. But at the morning service a letter was read by Deacon S. C. McKee, to Mr. Brown; to which he made a very happy reply, speaking of his long and happy association with Jarvis Street, and explaining that he was going to Forward only to fill in during this ministerial shortage occasioned by the war.

Sunday evening was a terrible night—literally terrible. Rain descended in torrents, and the shortage of gasoline combined with the weather had its effect upon the congregation. There was, however, a large attendance Sunday morning at which Mr. Brown had been announced to preach.

Following is the letter:

Rev. W. Gordon Brown, M.A.,
Jarvis St. Baptist Church, Toronto.

Dear Mr. Brown:

The Pastor and Deacons learned with great regret of your decision to resign your position with Jarvis Street Church. Your communication to us intimating that you had accepted the call of Forward Church as interim Pastor for the duration left us no option but to accept your resignation. This we have done with the deepest regret.

Your ministrations in the Jarvis Street pulpit in the Pastor's absence, and your assistance of the Pastor in the general services have been greatly appreciated; and we are sure have been most profitable to all the congregation. Your ministration in the homes of the people, your visitation of the sick, and the kindly help given to many in distress, have endeared you to all the Jarvis Street congregation.

We appreciate your desire for opportunity for regular preaching such as the interim pastorate of Forward Church will afford you; and we want you to know that you carry with you to your new and important work the best wishes of Jarvis Street Church. We would assure you further that you will constantly find a place in our prayers.

We ask you to accept the enclosed cheque as an expression of our esteem.

(Signed) THOMAS T. SHIELDS, *Pastor.*

ROBERT DOWNING

THOMAS KEAR

J. E. JENNINGS

S. C. MCKEE

P. J. JONES

W. J. THOMPSON

W. S. WHITCOMBE

Deacons.

REV. W. S. WHITCOMBE ACCEPTS JARVIS STREET'S INVITATION

Rev. W. S. Whitcombe, M.A., who is himself a deacon of Jarvis Street Church, has accepted the invitation of the Pastor and Deacons to take over the work of pastoral visitation and general assistance to the Pastor, which has been so faithfully and acceptably done by Mr. Brown for the last three years. We are most happy that Mr.

Whitcombe has found it possible to accept our invitation. He knows Jarvis Street intimately, and Jarvis Street Church knows him. Rev. W. G. Brown and Rev. W. S. Whitcombe are Jarvis Street twins. We may not betray any confidence when we say that in the last election of Deacons, Mr. Whitcombe and Mr. Brown, we learned, each received exactly the same number of votes. We have no doubt that everyone who voted for the one, voted for the other.

Both these young men are greatly beloved in Jarvis Street Church, and we are sure the news that Mr. Whitcombe has responded to our overture, will be received with thankfulness by the entire membership.

This creates a problem for the Union, as Mr. Whitcombe has done a marvellous piece of work as Secretary of the Union: for several years, as Honorary Secretary, and for the last three years giving his full time to the work. However, the Head of the church, we are sure, will make some provision for this need. Mr. Whitcombe is known to all our GOSPEL WITNESS readers by his invaluable contributions to the GOSPEL WITNESS pages, particularly his translations from the French-language press of Quebec.

THE BEVERAGE-ROOM, NO PROBLEM

We are being continually told that the beverage-rooms of Toronto are a "problem". It is always a problem with wicked men, how to continue in their iniquity without having to pay the price of their sin. That is the only problem involved in the beverage-rooms.

The conduct of the Ontario Government in this matter is worse than criminal. Less guilty men are in Kingston Penitentiary, men who have been tempted and tripped by these Government traps—many felons are less guilty, we say, than the men responsible for setting them. Between Dundas and Gerrard Streets, in one block on Jarvis Street, there are eight beverage-rooms. What problem is there about that? Only this, that there are eight too many! Why should they be there at all? They are the answer of Mitchell F. Hepburn, a political agent of the underworld, to our protest against his liquor policy. Before protest was made anywhere else, as soon as the beverage-rooms were instituted, we spoke against it over the air; and as, we said in a recent article, we sent Mr. Hepburn word that we had received forty thousand, six hundred signatures to protests, voluntarily made and sent to us.

The answer of the Premier was not a postcard, but an attempt to flood Jarvis Street with liquor. When the fire took place in Jarvis Street Church, and the whole city knew that Jarvis Street Church was burning, we were credibly informed that in some of the Government offices in Queen's Park, there was outspoken jubilation that Jarvis Street Church was burning. After the fire, we were warned and threatened. We were told that Jarvis Street Church would never rise again. But it did, finer, and larger, and more influential than ever.

Mackenzie King's pitiful attempt to silence the protest of temperance people by his recent announcement of the curtailment of liquor consumption was enough to make angels weep. Yet we received a letter from the Ontario Temperance Federation requesting us, if we had not already done so, to send a telegram of congratulation to Mr. King! We shall never have temperance reform while such men direct the temperance forces. In this

matter there is little to choose between Hepburn and King.

The consumption of beer had increased sixty per cent. during the war, and the Government's decision now is to reduce it ten per cent. That, we suppose, is ten per cent. off the present total, which would fall far short of reducing the beer consumption to its pre-war level—and it was at the flood even then. If, at the beginning of the war, the Government had announced to the sober people of Canada that it would not allow a larger increase than fifty per cent. of the consumption of beer as of that date, would anyone in his senses have proposed that we should congratulate the Government for so doing?

The liquor business is very largely in the hands of Roman Catholics. "Rome and rum" is not a slogan of fanatics: it is simply a statement of facts. Some of the Bishops of Quebec talk sobriety to the people, but they do not practise what they preach; and when the private car of a certain Quebec Prelate was being fitted out for a journey, it was generously supplied with liquor. This we know from a reliable man who was an employee of the railroad, and had no choice but to see that the liquor was put on board the car.

That is the situation we face in Canada to-day. Rome and rum together take millions from the people, from those who are willing to be seduced from the ways of righteousness—then they use their millions to bring the people into subjection to their tyrannous rule.

The Talk About Prohibition Bootlegging

There are people in City Council and elsewhere who raise their hands in horror and say, "We do not want the days of bootlegging back, the dreadful days of prohibition!" What nonsense! There is more bootlegging to-day than there was in prohibition days. And in addition: in these days of gasoline and rubber shortage, there is absolutely no curtailment of expensive liquor trucks which are almost freight-trains, to be found everywhere on the highways of Ontario.

For nearly thirty-three years this Editor has been Pastor of Jarvis Street Church. It was said thirty-three years ago, to be a downtown section. It is still more so now. There were no beverage-rooms on Jarvis Street then; there were no hotels where liquor was sold. We had to do with thousands of people then week after week, month after month. We were in a position to know the situation far more intimately than these irresponsible or ill-informed men who express their horror at the recollection of conditions in the days of prohibition: Let anyone ask any bank manager, and he will tell the story. In the days of prohibition, men saved their money instead of squandering it on liquor.

We are not advocating prohibition now. In the present state of public opinion, it would be folly to do so. But we do advocate the absolute abolition of these accursed beverage-rooms. No language could be extravagant that would adequately describe their horrors. The only "liquor problem" we have today is the problem which consists of the lack of clear-minded, sober, righteous men, who have the will to govern the province and the country righteously. It is because we have men in all these high places who are so manifestly, openly, in league with all these vicious influences, that the morals of the Canadian nation are steadily deteriorating.

TORONTO'S PAPAL PROTAGONIST

An editorial in *The Globe and Mail*, of December 28th, praises the Pope's Christmas message as "a blueprint of the essential fabric for lasting peace".

We would not do *The Globe and Mail* an injustice. As a paper, editorially, we assume it has no religious affiliation. It gives place to a religious editorial each Wednesday, but never fails to avail itself of any opportunity to laud the Roman Catholic Church. Such editorials as the one we have before us dealing with Roman Catholic matters are most probably written by the Roman Catholic member of the editorial staff; and, as the paper editorially is so generally indifferent to religious questions, we suppose the Roman Catholic editorial mouth-piece is given the larger license.

This editorial must have been written either by one whose Roman Catholic prejudices render his mind impervious to factual truth, or otherwise, by one who is profoundly ignorant of the genius of Roman Catholicism. The editorial says:

"Tied impartially to all the people' entangled in this war Pope Pius occupies an unusual position."

We should like to know in what respect the Pope is "tied impartially to all the people"? When he gave his blessing to the Italian soldiers who rained deadly gas upon the unarmed Ethiopians, he gave no evidence of impartiality! When he gave his blessing to Italian soldiers who had helped Franco in his merciless murder of the supporters of the legitimate Government of Spain, there was no evidence of impartiality! The Pope was partial to Franco and his Jesuits, and was the enemy of the overwhelming majority of the Spanish people who supported their legitimately elected Government. When the Pope gave his blessing to the régime of Pétain, expressing his confidence that he and Laval would govern France in harmony with the Church's best interests, he was certainly not "impartial" as between the treacherous Vichyites and the loyal de Gaulrites; nor was he impartial as between Britain and Pétain and Laval. At that point, the Pope did not hesitate to take sides.

In his peace message so-called, the Pope is reported to have said "he could not conceal his deep impartial love for the Italian people." Earlier in the speech he had said his speech would be devoted to "the internal policy of all nations and peoples without taking sides." But he especially expressed his love for the Italian people, including; we presume, Mussolini. But he expressed no love for the people of the United States, or the people of Great Britain, or of the British Empire!

Again *The Globe and Mail* says:

"He does not, in the very nature of that position he cannot, speak as a political leader, nor as a martial leader of one host against the other. Yet as a spiritual leader he did not hesitate to judge the issues, and the impartiality of his position lends mightily to the authority of his judgment."

But does not *The Globe and Mail* know that the Pope is fundamentally a political leader? Does it not know that the Vatican State claims recognition as a sovereign state? Is it unaware that the Vatican has its representatives, as representing a political state, in many of the capitals of the world? That, indeed, is the ground of our quarrel with the Papacy. We entirely disagree with it religiously; but recognize its right to think as it likes. The Roman Catholic Church has the same rights, as a religious institution, in the nature of the case, as all other religious bodies, Christian and pagan.

It is the fact that the Roman Church claims possession of an inherent right of political sovereignty, against which we contend. The Roman Catholic Church would join with all democratic peoples in denying the doctrine of the divine right of kings—that is, of all kings but the one king, the Pope of Rome, who claims to be the king of kings. He is still the only king on earth which the church recognizes to be a king by divine right.

Is *The Globe and Mail* ignorant of the fact that less than a year ago the Roman Hierarchy of the United States in solemn assembly re-affirmed its adherence to the Leonine doctrine of the two swords, which had long been the doctrine of the Papacy? How is it possible for citizens of a free state, who have any intelligence, to be tolerant of Rome's assertion of its political authoritarianism within the state of which they are citizens? The exercise of that principle on the part of the Hierarchy of Canada is the thing that is bedevilling Canadian life, and making national unity impossible.

Again *The Globe and Mail* refers to the Pope as condemning "the fateful economy of the past decades, during which the lives of all citizens were subordinated to the stimulus of gain." This is a striking case of the pot calling the kettle black. It is an indisputable fact of history that wherever the Roman Church has gained the ascendancy, it has reduced the people, as individuals, to a state of direst poverty, with the exception of its few favourites; and the nation as a whole, to economic, moral, and political bankruptcy. The history of Spain and of the Spanish Empire, of itself, is sufficient absolutely to prove our contention.

The Pope complains of economic systems by which the lives of citizens "were subordinated to the stimulus of gain"! The Roman Catholic Church is the richest corporation on earth; and we make no apology for saying that it has acquired its wealth by exactly the same principles as have animated its notorious disciples, the leading Italian gangsters of America. Put in the language of the street, it is, "You pay or else!"

The Roman Catholic fee system for everything is for what, if it be not for someone's "gain"? Purgatory is a cruel, diabolical invention of the Church of Rome that is without a vestige of divine warrant. But it is made the source of the Church's greatest income. Roman Catholic people are kept poor paying for the fancied liberation of the souls of the departed, from a purgatory created for the enrichment of the Papacy. There are no words in the English language sufficiently strong appropriately to express a rational man's abhorrence of that damnable invention.

The Globe and Mail states that the Pope speaks "as a spiritual leader". He and the Church under him, through their clergy, exercise their spiritual lordship over the people through the sacraments; and the sacraments are used as a rack or a thumb-screw, to squeeze the last penny practicable out of the people, especially in countries or districts where there are no moderating Protestant influences.

Again *The Globe and Mail* says:

"He condemned the persecution of human beings for no reason other than race or political opinion."

The Pope did not condemn persecution *per se*. The Church has ever justified—and still justifies—persecution on religious grounds. Rome is a persecuting church

(Continued on page 7)

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

HOW THE CROSS JUSTIFIES GOD

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Morning, July 23rd, 1911

"Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God;

"To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."—Romans 3:24-26.

In religious and theological thought we are familiar with the term "justification". And the word has in it the implication of blame, of a fault imputed and then removed; and that involves the weighing of evidence, and the forming of a judgment. But generally the word has to do with a man's standing before God, when he is first charged with sin, and then justified by grace.

But there is another sense in which the word is used in Scripture. God's judgment of man implies man's judgment of God. As moral beings we must judge of the judgments of God. We are not as brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed. If there be in us any moral consciousness at all, we must judge of the moral quality of the divine government, and of the divine character of which it is the expression. I think I shall have no difficulty in convincing you that as surely as we are subject to the judgment of God, by putting within us that monitor which we call conscience, God has voluntarily put Himself within the purview of human judgment. Hence His economy is so ordered that it is written, "That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged." That is to say, God holds Himself responsible to that law which is the articulation of the divine righteousness, even as we are responsible to that law by which righteousness of us is demanded. God will be true to Himself, and to our consciences, as He requires that we be true to Him, and to the divine witness within us. As we may be saved only as we are justified in the court of divine judgment, so He can be satisfied only as He is justified in the court of human judgment.

I propose therefore to shew you that the cross which is necessary to justify man before God, is equally necessary to justify God before men.

Our text suggests, *How the moral constitution of things challenges the morality of the forbearance of God, and how the Cross declares the righteousness of that forbearance.*

I.

To begin, then, the implication of the text is, THAT THE MORAL ORDER CHALLENGES THE MORALITY OF THE DIVINE FORBEARANCE. The Authorized Version speaks of "declaring God's righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God" but the word "remission" there is rather unfortunate, for the idea is not that of forgiveness—not a sending away of sin, but a passing over of sin. The implication of the text is that the universal conscience demands some explanation of the apparent failure of the divine government to mete out justice in the world. Sins have been com-

mitted, sinners have multiplied, and there has been no divine visitation. Transgressors have flourished and God has not visited them for their sin. Sins done aforetime have been passed over, until the moral order is assumed to ask, Where is the righteousness of the Ruler of the universe to permit such things to continue? That is the question of the text, How is God to be justified for permitting in plain view to His omniscience, the wrong, the sin, the crime of the world from the Deluge to the Cross! That is the direction of my first enquiry, whether the moral order does really challenge the morality of the divine forbearance.

We are accustomed to regard forbearance as an aspect of goodness, and, one will say, Surely goodness needs no justification. But what is goodness? The elders of the Jews said of the centurion who sought the healing of his servant "that he was worthy for whom he should do this. For he loveth our nation, and he hath built us a synagogue." And that is the general view of what constitutes goodness—that which is good to me. A certain man had a reputation for benevolence. He was good to the poor, he was kind to the widow, he was generous to all. By and by he was convicted as an embezzler, and sent to the penitentiary for five years. It was found that he was more than one hundred thousand dollars short in his accounts. He had been generous with others' money. But in the locality to which he belonged they said his downfall was a great pity because he had been such a good man. Those who had profited by his pilfering called him good: those who had lost said he was a thief. There is always another side to what selfish humanity calls goodness.

A prosperous man says he believes in the goodness of God. I ask him why, and he says, "Because he has been good to me". I ask him in what way, and he says, "He has preserved me from sickness, and prospered me in my business, and given me richly all things to enjoy". I go to that man's neighbour and he says that that man's prosperity is a standing contradiction of the theory that God is good, for if He were good He would never allow such a man to prosper, that he is always profiting by someone else's loss, getting the better of every man he deals with.

That is the principle with which our text deals, that what one man calls forbearance another calls the sheerest injustice; what seems goodness to one works only ill to another.

Let us see *how this principle applies historically.* Here is a man who declares his belief in the goodness of God. He is sure that God is love, but he is not quite sure what he means by love, but if you study the interpreta-

tion which his conception of the love of God puts upon the acts of God, and upon the reputed acts of God, you will see at once that at bottom his conception of love is that it is that thing which ministers to what he conceives to be his personal interest.

Very well, then, he believes in the love of God, and for that reason he does not believe in the divine inspiration of certain historical records of the Old Testament. Now please to observe I am keeping to my text, for that speaks of "the passing over of sins done aforetime." And in the Old Testament we have the record of the "sins done aforetime." But this believer in the divine goodness tells us that the story of the wars of the Lord, a record red with blood, cannot be true because it is incompatible with his theory of the divine goodness. He cannot believe that God ever commanded, or sanctioned, the extermination of Israel's enemies, and the record which says He did, cannot be true.

But there was a time when the divine attitude toward these nations was one of forbearance. Abram was told that not until "the fourth generation" should his children possess the land of promise, and the reason for the delay is given, "For the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full" and not until then could the judgment fall. A careful study of the philosophy, as well as of the simple facts of this history, will show that the principle of justice and judgment which lay behind the Deluge, and the destruction of Sodom, determined the time and measure of the visitation of the nations of Canaan. In the first two instances the elements were the messengers of vengeance; and in the case of the Amorites and the nations associated with them in the possession of Canaan, the judgment was meted out by human hands under divine direction. But until the iniquity of the Amorites was "full" their sins were passed over in the forbearance of God.

But our admirer of the divine goodness objects that the people of God were no better than the Canaanites, or, if better, very little better, and that they were equally deserving of punishment. I am prepared to admit that there is something in the objection, although it must be said that Israel were not without some chastisement. But that is very different from the judgment of national and racial extinction. So that Israel's immunity from withering judgment, is one of the wonders of history.

But in this historical purview, consider the forbearance of God, not in its bearing upon nations, but *in its still deeper significance, its bearing upon the spiritual life of the individual.* And that perhaps is more especially the aspect of truth the text presents.

The truth is, that in the ages before Christ, while there were occasional flashes of the corrective judgments of God, in the main sin was passed over, the times of that ignorance God winked at, and through all the post-diluvian ages there was no general universal visitation for sin.

Then, too, some were permitted even to come into the presence of God. Enoch was translated, so was Elijah, and multitudes of others bore testimony to the fact that they had access to God. And yet sin was as real then as now, and no means had yet availed for its removal.

Now the text asks in view of God's apparent leniency, His long-forbearance, His seeming laxity in the enforcement of law, How can it be said that God is righteous?

The same principle had play in the experience of every Christian before conversion. Wherever there is a real

moral awakening, wherever there is a real consciousness of sin, it brings with it a sense of wonder, of amazement, at the forbearance of God in passing over the sins done aforetime. The awakened soul cries out, "If sin be all that I now feel it to be, why have I been permitted to live? Why have I not fallen long ere now, before the stroke of the Almighty, and all-righteous Judge?"

If you have never felt that wonder, if conscience has never been so quickened as to challenge God's right to pass over your sin, or to postpone its judgment, your spiritual vision cannot be clear enough to make you to see more than men as trees walking. It is not the Deluge; nor the fire of Sodom, nor the smoke of Sinai; nor the occasional flashings over the plains of history of the sword of divine judgment; nor yet those strange providences which seem to have a penal aspect and purpose—I say these flashes, these forked flames from the firmament that is over the head of the Sitter on the Great White Throne, present no problem to the truly awakened conscience. It is the slowness of the divine judgments, the sinner pursuing his sin while the sword is unsheathed, in a word, the forbearance of God, that is the problem whose solution conscience demands.

II.

Our text teaches that that solution is found in the Cross, THAT THE CROSS DECLARES THE RIGHTEOUSNESS, AND JUSTIFIES THE FORBEARANCE OF GOD.

Believers are said to be justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth, or purposed, or preordained to be a propitiation through faith in His blood to declare, to show His righteousness because of the passing over of sins done aforetime in the forbearance of God. That is to say, God points to the Cross and says, "That is the justification for what has seemed to be My slackness. The Lamb was slain before the foundation of the world. Jesus was appointed to be a propitiation, and in view of His covenant engagement, I could afford to be patient, hence I passed over their sins, and did not visit them in judgment, because I knew that when Jesus should die as the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, His death would declare the righteousness of My forbearance."

Will you please specially *note the principle involved:* it is extremely important. It is said that the death of Jesus justifies the forbearance of God. He could afford to pass over sins because He knew that the penalty would be paid by Another in the fulness of the appointed time. And will you put beside that teaching this other parallel passage: "For 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? And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." There it is expressly said that Christ died FOR THE REDEMPTION OF THE TRANSGRESSIONS THAT WERE UNDER THE FIRST TESTAMENT; which means that the Old Testament believers were saved on the ground of the promised propitiation of which the Cross was the fulfilment.

That throws great light upon the nature of the atone-

ment. It is popular in some quarters to make light of theories of the atonement. It is said that the fact is the vital thing, not our theory of it. But few things are more subtle or misleading than epigrammatic half truths. One will find some difficulty in knowing a thing to be a fact without having some theory of the fact; indeed, it is often the theory of it which assures one that it is a fact. Moreover, I have observed that those who belittle the value of theories of the atonement immediately proceed to expound a theory of their own; just as those who decry dogmatism decry it dogmatically, and those who belittle theology and say we need less theology and more Christianity, proceed at once to attempt to prove it theologically. Now what such disputants really object to is not a theory, *per se*, it is the other man's theory, the other man's dogmatism, the other man's theology—these are the valueless things which are to be cast aside for the new brand.

My point is that *you must have some theory of the meaning and purpose of the death of Christ, or it is impossible that you should profit by it.* It is of vital importance that we should seek to understand as much as may be known of the death of Christ, and your understanding will give you some theory of the atonement. It is a cheap and easy but superficial avoidance of a difficulty to brush aside a so-called theory of the atonement by a grotesque caricature. It is better reasoning to bring all theories into the light of clear, sane exegesis, and discard those which are found faulty.

The popular theory of the death of Christ is what is known as the moral influence theory. It lays emphasis upon the Incarnation—it emphasizes Bethlehem rather than Calvary. The cross is little more than an incident in Christ's identification with men. It speaks much of the condescension of Christ, of His pity and compassion, of His essential goodness and love. And the purpose of it all, it is alleged is to make men ashamed of sin, to lure to brighter worlds, and lead the way.

Now there is much of truth in that theory, and its defect is rather of a negative order—it is what it does not teach rather than its positive teaching which constitutes its danger. That view of the death of Christ does not recognize the heinousness of sin, and sees no need of expiation. It ignores the claims of conscience, and of the moral law. While it makes much of the birth of the divine in the form of the human, and of the birth of the human in the nature of the divine, it makes no provision for that which is deepest in man, and highest in God. In a word, it fails to recognize that the real world is the ethical world, that the deepest in man and the highest in God is ethical, that there can be no absolute goodness which is not in perfect consonance with the eternal principle of right.

According to our text *there is infinitely more in the death of Christ than identification of God with man.* This moral influence theory takes no account of the pre-Christian era. Its sphere is prospective. According to this view the cross could have no value to Old Testament worthies. They had already sinned, and been tempted, they had suffered and died. But my text says that the death of Jesus had to do with those whose sins were passed over in the forbearance of God. It teaches that Jesus died for Enoch, and Noah, and Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and Moses, and David. And how could He die "for the redemption of the transgressions which were under the first testament, that they which were called might receive the promise of eternal inheri-

tance", in any other sense than that of dying instead of them, as their divinely appointed and foreordained Substitute, as the Lamb of God slain before the foundation of the world, and Who taketh away, as the scape-goat into the wilderness, the sins of the world?

At all events that is my theory of the atonement, and if I did not hold that I could have no gospel for fellow-sinners. I would leave this pulpit this morning if I did not believe the substitutionary work of Christ to be the very essence of the Gospel. Your moral influence theory, your so-called "ethical" Gospel, which is ethical only in an exemplary sense, an ethic without a dynamic; and is of no use to poor sinners who know the plague of their own heart, and the moral impotence of their own wills. In view of the infinite perfection and absolute holiness of God; in view of the immutability of His moral character reflected in the inexorability of His moral laws; in view of the demands of an awakened conscience which is the first human element to become partaker of the divine nature; in view of these things, there can be no restoration of the balance, no peace in the conscience, no agreement with the moral universe, no communion with God over all, unless the death of Christ was penal, unless He did really bear my sins in His own body on the tree, as my Substitute and sin-offering.

And that is the teaching of this text, that Calvary justifies the divine government, declares the righteousness of the divine forbearance, by showing the penalty of all sins passed over to be fully paid by the precious blood of Christ. In this let us greatly rejoice.

Toronto's Papal Protagonist

(Continued from page 4)

that knows nothing of toleration of any other than its own creed, except where it finds itself in the minority. The recent action of the Hierarchy through the Council of Quebec City was a case in point. Cardinal Villeneuve himself, as recently as 1938, declared:

"It is never permitted . . . to grant freedom of thought, writing, or teaching, and the undifferentiated freedom of religions, as so many rights which nature has given to man."

The Pope in this war is doing as one of his predecessors did in the last Great War: he is doing everything to pave the way to secure for himself a seat at the peace-table. It is not hyperbole to say it would be no more disastrous to the future of the world to reserve a seat at the conference for Adolf Hitler himself.

We have called attention to this editorial in *The Globe and Mail* in order that our readers may see the true character of that paper. The value of its opinion on moral and religious questions, to any one of biblical intelligence, is practically nil.

BOOKS BY DR. T. T. SHIELDS

"The Adventures of a Modern Young Man"	\$1.00
"Other Little Ships"	1.00
"The Plot That Failed" (The story of Jarvis St. Church)	1.00
"The Oxford Group Movement Analyzed"05
25 copies	1.00
Russellism or Rutherfordism (103 pages)35

SERMONS ON THE WAR

Sermons on the War preached in Jarvis St. Five cents each single sermon or any 25 for \$1.00 post paid from THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard St. E., Toronto, 2, Canada.

THE ROMAN CHURCH AND THE CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Years ago, when our services were being broadcast over CKGW, we received a visit from a member of Parliament, and in the discussion of our Sunday evening broadcast, this M.P. said: "You will not be allowed to broadcast your service for many more years. It may be some time before pressure is applied, but the time will come when, on one pretext or another, the Government will put all Protestant services off the air." We asked his reason, to which he replied, "There is now talk of appointing a Radio Commission. Radio will be made a department of Government; and when it is, like all other Government matters in Canada, it will be controlled by the Roman Catholic Church."

To this we replied, "But the Roman Catholic Church uses the radio very extensively, and it would be a pretty bold venture to silence all Protestant services, and continue their own." But our friend replied, "You know that Roman Catholics are forbidden by the Church to attend non-Catholic services. There are a few Roman Catholics, whom they would scarcely call 'faithful', who disobey the Church's order, and occasionally drop into a Protestant service. But they are relatively few in number: the majority obey. Thus the Church segregates its people, and debars them from all contact with Protestantism. Roman Catholics are subjected to all sorts of penalties if it becomes known that they attend Protestant services; and in parts of the country where they are in the majority, notably in Quebec, but in some parts of Ontario also, the news soon gets back to the priest—and the Roman Catholic has to pay pretty dearly for his visit to a Protestant church."

"Now," continued this Member of the Federal Parliament, "the Church can keep its people pretty generally out of Protestant services, but it is not possible to keep Protestant services, broadcast by radio, out of Roman Catholic homes; and unless and until they so completely control the Government that they can do as they like, the Roman Catholic Church would be willing to forego its own broadcasting in order to prevent any Protestant service going on the air. Try to remember what I have told you. It may be some years before you see it in operation; but see it you will sooner or later."

My friend was then a member of the House of Commons at Ottawa. He knew how any Government, Liberal or Conservative, was hounded day and night by this political horseleach; and we suppose he knew that comparatively few politicians have the principle to stand against it.

He Was a True Prophet

That Member of Parliament was certainly a true prophet. Even in Ontario, the radio has become very largely an organ of Roman Catholic propaganda. Directly or indirectly you can pick up a bit of Roman Catholic propaganda almost every hour of the day. It is true that in Ontario some Protestant services are still broadcast, but the preachers are strictly limited. If they are not told what they must say, they are told what they must not say; and while Romanism explicitly and implicitly attacks Protestantism over the air continuously, no Protestant is allowed a word in reply.

The outrageous decision of the Broadcasting Corporation, in forbidding the broadcast of the speech of the Right Honourable Arthur Meighen at the Conservative

Convention, ought to awaken people to the perils of the hour. We are surfeited with the dreary speeches of the Prime Minister, and of the other Ministers. We have a Liberal Government at Ottawa which is synonymous with the Roman Catholic Church. It is completely dominated by the Roman Catholic Church; and dare not oppose the Church at any point.

And now we have an article from the Presbyterian magazine of Montreal, called, *Bible Christianity*. We publish the entire article, as it speaks for itself. It says what we have been trying to say for a long time. We think it is a complete justification of our predictions.

The recent regulation, that a religious service is allowed to make only three appeals a year for financial support, is, of course, designed to make Protestant broadcasting impossible. Why advertising of every kind should be permitted over the radio which, though it makes no appeals for money, is as everyone knows purely a business matter—why this should be permitted, and a Protestant minister should not be permitted to ask for contributions, can be explained only in one way. When Hitler began his persecution of the Protestant churches in the Reich, he began by forbidding them to take collections. He cut off all source of revenue, and made it impossible for many to continue.

But the Roman Church goes on its way. What will the Protestants of Montreal do about this matter? Will they sit down supinely and accept this decision? Surely if there is any part of the country which needs Protestant ministrations over the air, it must be in Quebec Province where Protestants are so decidedly in the minority. But it is just where they are in the minority that pressure is brought to bear upon them; and unless and until Protestants wake up, and join hands, this intolerant tyranny, still dripping with blood—and thirsting for more—will completely dominate the Government of Canada.

It is well to remember that this is a day of Jesuit ascendancy in the Roman Catholic Church throughout the world; and that the head of the Roman Hierarchy in Canada, the subtle, scheming, casuist, Villeneuve, is a Jesuit. O Protestants, awake! Awake before it is too late!

JACK BENNY OR CHRIST?

BY REV. W. STANFORD REID

At the present time in the districts of Montreal and Ottawa there is no inconsiderable storm of opposition arising against the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. In these two cities, after some fifteen years of continuous operation, the Sunday evening broadcast of Protestant church services has been put off the air. As a substitute for the churches, the hour has been devoted to that not-very-funny man, Jack Benny. When one now turns on the radio at 7.30 p.m. Sunday, instead of hearing hymns, prayers and a sermon, one receives instead, songs and "wise-cracks"—a poor substitute for the Gospel.

Against this action of the CBC there have been many protests. The ministers affected by the change have personally made representations to the corporation. Dr. Thompson, the new chairman of the Board of Governors, was sympathetic but apparently unable to do anything. Multifarious protests have been heard from other quarters. Letters to the press and direct representations to the government and the corporation have been sent by various religious groups as well as church courts, but to

no avail. Jack Benny is apparently on to stay, and the Gospel of Christ must take second place!

What does this indicate? What idea does it give us of the present Canadian government's attitude towards Christianity and religious freedom?

In the first place it shows a lamentable indifference to Christianity and its place in our nation today. We have heard many of the leaders of the United Nations, including our own prime minister, declare that Christianity is today fighting for its life in the person of the United Nations. Then our Canadian Broadcasting Corporation takes the Gospel off the air in order to give breakfast foods publicity. Apparently cold cereals are of more importance to our nation than Christianity. We can now stop talking about "Christian civilization," and say that we are fighting for a "bran-flake civilization". Our broadcasting authorities have decided that since the proclamation of the Gospel is entirely of minor importance, any substitute, even a comedian, is welcome. Could they show their indifference more clearly?

But what is more, this action seems to betoken an inclination to curtail our religious liberties. The Sunday evening service broadcast has been in operation for fifteen years, paying its way fully. Now, it has been removed for another programme. If it had been merely another commercial, it would probably have remained unmolested. But it is a Protestant programme broadcast from Montreal and Ottawa, therefore it must come off the air! We can see the reason behind it all. A definite attempt is being made to restrict Protestant broadcasting in this part of the country, a direct infringement of our religious liberties.

Some may say, at this point, that we are being unfair. The CBC is neither indifferent to Christianity nor desirous of curtailing religious freedom. To such an attitude, however, there is a double-barreled reply. If the corporation is so innocent of ulterior motives, why has it put the broadcast off the air in two districts only? In the second place, this is not an isolated instance but is one among a number of indications of the present government's attitude.

Sunday parades are a rather good example of the religious indifference of our authorities. They are not content with demanding military training on the Sabbath, which may or may not be necessary. They put on all kinds of exhibition parades on that day also. Although Canada is supposed to be a Christian country, its Christianity apparently is not such that the government considers it necessary to preserve the sanctity of the Lord's Day. Nor does it feel that holding parades at times when they tend to take people from church and Sunday School is contrary to the best interests of the country. The government simply does not care. Protest after protest has been entered, but the authorities are not interested. Christianity is of little consequence to them, so we shall continue to see parades being held on the Lord's Day at the times of the services of worship. Is not this a clear indication of indifference to the Word of God and the teachings of Christianity?

"Perhaps," someone says, "they are indifferent to Christianity, but there is no attempt being made to curtail religious liberty." But wait! Let us look again at the CBC. A regulation has recently been made that no religious programmes broadcast over any Canadian station in one year can make more than three appeals for financial support, unless it first receives the permission of the corporation. This means that a government

agency, for all practical purposes, is attempting to control all religious utterances on the Canadian air-waves. It is the same as putting a religious censorship on the press. No longer can the Gospel go freely to hungry souls. The Canadian government is now the body which determines what the message is to be. If a few men in Ottawa are opposed to the message given, they can practically kill it by refusing permission to make appeals for funds. Is not this a dangerous infringement of the very basis of our British rights to freedom of worship and religious liberty?

Another example of the same type of thing was seen in a recent broadcast from Quebec City. On Sunday afternoon at 4.30 o'clock religious broadcasts are made from coast to coast. During the past summer a certain Ontario minister preaching in Quebec City during August, spoke on the broadcast. The City of Quebec and district heard nothing of the service. Over every other English speaking station in the country, the sermon was heard, but not in the city from which it came. This seems to be again another infringement of the religious freedom guaranteed by the basic laws of our constitution.

A part of the same picture is the Quebec City Council's recent by-law concerning building in certain sections of the city. A regulation has been enacted which forbids the erection of any more non-residential buildings in the specified area. The district is growing rapidly and the only churches now in it are Roman Catholic. Therefore, the city council has virtually forbidden freedom of worship within this section of the city. Protests have been made by the Protestant and other non-Catholic members of the community but with no effect. At least in one part of Quebec City, freedom of worship is non-existent.

This is a situation which is growing worse all the time. A small, a very small group in our land, but one which holds certain positions of power seems determined to undermine one of our most basic liberties. Under the guise of war-needs, etc., the government is continually interfering in the sphere of the church, and without regard either to Christian beliefs or to religious freedom is damaging its work. The Jack Benny affair is simply one of the more widely known incidents.

But what can we do? This is a question frequently asked. How is it possible to meet this situation? Criticism is not enough, nor does it settle the question by writing to the papers. Since this is a democratic country, we must bring pressure to bear upon the men in Ottawa who represent us. They were chosen by our votes, and should therefore follow our wishes. As electors we should flood our parliamentary representatives with letters demanding a change. Newspapers and letters to the editor can accomplish little without the support of the electorate. What we are asking for does not infringe the rights of anyone, but simply demands that our rights and wishes should be respected. For this reason we must call upon our members of parliament to see that these rights are maintained. If they will not act as our representatives, but prefer to play politics with our liberties, then let us warn them that at the next elections we will do our utmost to keep them from even claiming to be our representatives.

This, however, is but a temporary measure. True freedom will never be known in this or any other country until there is a genuine return to the Lord. Democracy was originally founded on a Christian basis; but today with our wandering from that basis democratic

freedom is being attacked from within. Winning the war will not guarantee freedom. Our only hope is a true revival of Christianity which will bring us back to the sovereign and saving grace of God in Christ Jesus. When men's hearts have been truly changed, and Christian love has entered in, then and then alone shall we have real freedom, in its best and truest sense.

Yet even a revival will not be enough. Christianity must be put into practical and effective action. In the sphere of the state and politics this can be done only if a definitely Christian political party comes into existence. By this is meant neither a socialist party with a misplaced Christian tag, nor a denominational party, dominated by some particular ecclesiastical group. It should be an interdenominational party which, accepting the Kingship of Christ over the nation as its foundation, desires to put a Christian policy into effect. It would not put up one church as a state church, but would allow all equal liberty, and would try also to provide a Christian solution to the other problems of the nation. In a day of political aridity this was done very successfully in the Netherlands. We are in a similar situation in Canada today. It may be the time for truly Christian forces to unite politically to show that the nation whose God is the Lord is indeed blessed.

We, therefore, who are Christians and who see the dangers which are closing around us must pray more earnestly than ever before: "Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven." We should pray that God in His grace will revive us again. But we should also pray that He will open the way for the establishment of a truly Christian government within our beloved dominion. Not until this has been done can we have true freedom, nor will Christ be honoured as He should in deed as well as in word.

—From *Bible Christianity*, Montreal, December, 1942.

QUEBEC AND THE WAR

We have incurred the displeasure of not a few because we have laid the responsibility for Quebec's relatively small contribution to Canada's war effort where, we are convinced, it properly belongs, on the shoulders of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. Scores of times we have said it, we must repeat it hundreds of times more: we do not blame Roman Catholics as individuals, nor have we any quarrel with the French-Canadian race. The responsibility for Quebec's defection rests upon the Roman Catholic Church.

While it is now pretty generally recognized that Quebec is not pulling its weight, those who acknowledge it, blame everything and everybody but the Roman Catholic Church. The Roman Church in this country, in its official political attitude, is just as anti-British as in France or in Spain. We publish on page 11 a table of figures issued officially by the Ministry of Defense at Ottawa. We ask our readers to study it.

In the first table, outside of Quebec, the lowest percentage of enlistments to the population is in Regina Military District. But in that district there is a very large non-English population; and nearly all the non-English population is Roman Catholic. Montreal is overwhelmingly French-Canadian and Catholic, but in Montreal there is a considerable English-speaking, Protestant population. Yet making no distinction between Protestants and Catholics, Montreal, out of a possible 423,000 has enlisted only 67,188; or 15.9 per cent. That is less

than half the percentage of the enlistments of the lowest military district with the exception of Regina to which we have already referred, and Montreal shows only five-ninths of the next lowest district in percentage.

A fairer indication of Quebec's attitude will be found in the Quebec Military District. Out of a total male population of 214,300, Quebec has enlisted 20,654. While the English-speaking, Protestant population of Quebec District is small, yet it must be taken account of; and if we were dealing with the French-Canadian, Roman Catholic figures alone, we should have something less than the percentage shown, 9.6.

That, it will be observed, is just about one-third of the second lowest military district in Canada, Regina; while it is only 25 per cent of the showing of Halifax, which is 37.9. All the other military districts in Canada, in that first table, put Montreal, and Quebec, and Quebec Province, utterly to shame—if they have any shame. All honour to the number of English-speaking men who have enlisted in Quebec Province. It would be interesting, could we have a further breakdown as between different religious affiliations, but the government dare not give us those figures. We have asked for them and have been refused—it would reveal the Italian Church in its true light.

This we know, that on two occasions, when a certain Montreal regiment, could not by any means secure enlistments enough to make up its complement, it sent recruiting officers to Toronto. In Toronto there were hundreds of men clamouring for admission to the army; and more than two hundred were taken from Toronto to Montreal for one regiment alone. We are not sure of the proportion in the other case, but the same principle applied to a Quebec City regiment, which sent to Toronto to make up its complement. Let it be borne in mind therefore that included in the 15.9 of Montreal, and the 9.6 of Quebec, there is a considerable proportion of men taken from Toronto or other Ontario points, to enlist in Quebec.

The second table is no better, which includes the "call-up" enrolments. One of two things must be true: either the French-Canadians are physically a lot of weaklings who cannot conform to the military standards physically; or, the conscription law for home defense is not being impartially administered in Quebec. Either they are not called up at all, or, being called up, they are conveniently disqualified by the medical examiners.

Only Tuesday night we heard an enthusiastic speaker laud the composer of the music to, "O Canada", a majestic air, we frankly admit. But he quoted with great eclat the line, "O Canada, we stand on guard for thee." Do they? We have been told in the French-language press that French-Canadians are willing to fight for Canada, but not for the Empire. Apparently they are unwilling even to defend our own shores. The fact is, they are willing to do just exactly what their clerical masters command them to do. They stay at home to breed a population for the church; and many of them, as serfs, to till the soil for their ecclesiastical masters.

The figures given in the table on page 11, we repeat, are official Government figures. There is no prejudice against French Canada, or against the Roman Catholic Church, in these figures—but they speak most eloquently for themselves.

OFFICIAL GOVERNMENT TABLE OF ENLISTMENTS AND ENROLMENTS

Ottawa, Dec. 24—(CP)—Following is a breakdown of enlistments in the three armed services from the start of the war to last Oct. 31, as made public today by Hon. J. L. Ralston, minister of national defence:

ENLISTMENTS TO OCT. 31

Military District—	Total Male Population Ages 19-45	R.C.N.	C. (A.) A.	R.C.A.F.	Total	Percent of Total Male Pop.
London	147,800	3,581	30,485	10,413	44,480	30.1
Toronto	408,700	7,550	89,189	37,503	134,242	32.8
Kingston	150,000	3,477	40,198	9,912	53,587	35.7
Montreal	423,800	4,920	48,069	14,199	67,188	15.9
Quebec	214,300	918	17,166	2,620	20,654	9.6
Halifax	118,200	6,632	32,939	5,261	44,832	37.9
Saint John	50,300	1,222	22,629	5,120	28,971	35.3
Winnipeg	179,700	4,831	35,061	15,756	55,648	30.9
Vancouver	155,100	6,689	33,604	15,697	53,990	34.8
Regina	177,200	2,954	29,606	15,543	48,103	27.1
Calgary	160,700	3,574	33,852	14,297	50,993	31.7
Unallotted		26	523	14,021	14,570	—
Total	2,215,800	45,374	411,382	158,342	616,598	27.8

The second table shows the number of drafted in each military district, the number of these who went active, the net total of recruits and draftees, and the percentage of the available men which this net total represents:

Military District—	Call-up Enrolments	Total of Enlistments and Enrolments	"R" Recruits Enlisted	Percentage Net Total to Total Male Pop.
London	7,179	51,659	1,947	49,712 33.6
Toronto	14,261	148,503	3,385	145,118 35.5
Kingston	5,788	59,375	1,937	57,438 38.3
Montreal	20,231	87,419	5,453	81,966 19.3
Quebec	8,191	28,845	2,564	26,281 12.3
Halifax	6,336	51,168	2,137	49,031 41.5
St. John	4,411	32,782	1,429	31,353 39.0
Winnipeg	7,541	63,189	2,284	60,905 33.9
Vancouver	5,749	59,739	3,289	56,450 36.4
Regina	7,987	56,090	2,658	53,432 30.2
Calgary	6,475	57,408	2,049	55,359 34.4
Unallotted		14,570		14,570 —
Total	94,149	710,747	29,132	681,615 30.8

Two Letters About The Gospel Witness

In our English mail to-day we had two letters from which we make the following excerpts. Following is the first:

"If copies of THE WITNESS should not have been sent during November would you be good enough to let me have the missing numbers so that my files may be complete. It may be of interest to you to know that during the war period I do not think that I have lost more than five copies through enemy action—this is surely a remarkable record."

We agree with our correspondent that this is a remarkable record, not to have lost more than five copies through enemy action during the war—and they go out week by week. Here let us say to all our subscribers: if any of your copies fail to reach you, will you please note the missing dates and numbers, and send us word, and we will supply them to you free of charge.

The next excerpt is from a letter from Rev. E. S. Gray, Chingford, London. Mr. Gray will be remembered by many as a Pastor in the Old Convention, before the disruption, about twenty years ago. His son Clifford we remember as a magnificent specimen of six feet of manhood. We shall hope and pray that his parents may yet receive word that he is living. Mr. Gray writes:

"To come briefly to the important news—sad news—you will be grieved to learn that our dear son, Clifford, is reported 'missing'. R.A.F. Malta. He is one of the noblest of fellows.

"Three or four cheery letters from him from Malta, have reached us since we had the telegram stating that he is missing. In one of them he says, 'THE GOSPEL WITNESS is reaching me again regularly O.K.'"

And so THE GOSPEL WITNESS was finding its way regularly to Malta! Where does it not go? This Editor has still another link with Malta—Percy McKee, Clifford Gray.

THE PASTOR'S COLUMN

ON WEDNESDAY morning last Mrs. George Climpson, a member of this church since 1923, passed quietly into the immediate presence of the Lord. Her last words were, "Jesus, I'm coming up". The funeral was taken by Mr. Brown. Jarvis Street Church extends its sincerest sympathy to Mr. Climpson in his bereavement.

JARVIS STREET CHURCH is proud of all of its boys in the armed services, on land, on the sea and in the air, and we have been happy to have a number of them home on Christmas leave. For instance, MR. IRWIN MCKEE who is on active service on our west coast. Sunday night we bade farewell and God-speed to SGT. PERCY HOLLYER, who was on his last leave before going overseas.

REGINALD SNELL, now in the R.C.A.F., called at the office to say good-bye before leaving for the East coast. He has been trying to "get in" from the beginning, and succeeded only six weeks ago. He will (D.V.) be home again before going overseas.

TO EVERY JARVIS STREET MEMBER. If any member, reading this word, did not receive a certain letter bearing the Pastor's signature, before last Sunday; or if, having received it, you were away from home or otherwise prevented from attending either service on Sunday, this is just a little note to say that it will not be too late for you to return that pretty envelope with something in it next Sunday, or any time between.

COMMUNION SERVICE SUNDAY EVENING. Next Sunday evening, we shall hold our Monthly Communion Service. We had a large attendance last month: we are hoping for a still larger attendance this first Communion of the year. The public service will be so shortened as to leave no one with any reason for not remaining for the Communion Service. Plan to be there Sunday evening.

WATCHNIGHT AND NEW-YEAR'S MORNING MEETING. For many years now we have held these services at the year's end. Both services will be held in Greenway Hall. The Watchnight Service will begin Thursday night at eleven o'clock (there will be no service at the usual eight o'clock hour), and close at shortly past the midnight hour. The New Year's Morning meeting will begin at 10.30. This is a meeting of fellowship, prayer, and testimony, where there is always a large family gathering of Jarvis Street people and friends. Let us have a great meeting Friday morning.

OUR ABSENT BOYS will be glad to hear that our faithful Laddie is as well as usual, and seems to have been pretty well treated by Santa Claus, particularly in the matter of "eats". Laddie sends you all a Happy New —WOOF! WOOF!

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 7 First Quarter Lesson 2 January 10, 1943

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

DAVID'S CHARGE TO SOLOMON

Lesson Text: 1 Kings 2:1-25.

Golden Text: "Be thou strong therefore, and shew thyself a man"—1 Kings 2:2.

Reading: 1 Kings 2:26-46.

I. King David's Last Words—verses 1 to 11.

King David had previously addressed a farewell message publicly to the people (1 Sam. 12:20-25; 2 Sam. 23:1-7; 1 Chron. 28, 29). Now, at the close of his life, he gives a private charge to Solomon. He speaks as the elderly father to his younger son (1 Cor. 4:14; 1 Thess. 2:11); as the departing king to the newly-crowned monarch; as God's representative who has completed his mission to the one who is assuming the heavy responsibilities of office (Deut. 3:27, 28; 2 Tim. 2:14; 4:1). He speaks solemnly, and the wisdom of his long experience of walking with God is seen in his words (Josh. 23:14). Wise, indeed, are they who are willing to profit by the experiences of those who have gone before them.

David exhorted the new king to be strong and courageous (Josh. 1:6-9; 23:6-10; 1 Chron. 28:20; 1 Cor. 16:13; Eph. 3:16; 6:10), for only those who have strength of heart and mind are qualified to be leaders.

God had made a covenant with His people to prosper them so long as they remained obedient to His commands (Deut. 4:6; 29:10-21; 1 Sam. 12:13-15; 2 Sam. 7:25). To a large extent the spiritual and material progress of the people depended upon the faithfulness of their king (Deut. 17:14-20), and also upon his obedience depended the fulfillment of God's promise as to the perpetuity of David's house (2 Sam. 7:11-16; 1 Kings 9:3-5).

Solomon was given the solemn task of executing judgment upon some of David's enemies, and bestowing rewards upon some of the former king's friends. Joab had acted cruelly in slaying Abner and Amasa (2 Sam. 3:27; 20:10), and so far his crimes had been unpunished. But the time of vengeance was at hand. Sin is a moral disease which may continue for a while, but will at length bring its own punishment of death (2 Sam. 3:39; Psa. 28:4).

David had not forgotten the kindness of Barzillai the Gileadite (2 Sam. 19:31-39), and also that of his sons, when the king was forced to flee from Absalom (2 Sam. 17:27-29). The Lord will surely reward those who are faithful to Him (Psa. 62:12; Matt. 16:27). Even as the sons of Barzillai were called to eat at the king's table, so also will Christians enjoy unending fellowship with their Lord; they shall dwell in His house for ever (Psa. 23:6; Song of Sol. 2:4; Rev. 3:20; 19:7, 9).

On the ground of his later kindness, Shimei had been pardoned for his offence of cursing the king (2 Sam. 16:5-13; 19:18-23), but possibly David saw that the plague in his nature was likely to break out again, and that Shimei was not to be trusted. It may be, however, that David had not entirely forgiven Shimei for his former conduct. What a contrast to the full and free pardon which God grants to believers who will trust in the finished work of Christ (Rom. 3:23-26; 8:1; Eph. 4:32)! All our sins are cast behind His back, to be remembered against us no more for ever (Psa. 79:8; Isa. 64:9; Mic. 7:19).

And so King David fell on sleep. The death of the Christian is described in Scripture as sleep (2 Sam. 7:12; Matt. 27:52; John 11:11-14; 1 Thess. 4:13-15). But it is only the body which rests as in sleep, not the spirit, for the spirit goes immediately to the Father's presence (Eccl. 12:7; 2 Cor. 5:1, 8).

As a rule, no sepulchres were permitted within the cities of Palestine, but Jerusalem was an exception to this rule, although the privilege of burial was reserved largely for members of the royal house (Neh. 3:16; Acts 2:29). David was buried in the city of Jerusalem, called the city of David (2 Sam. 5:7, 9). He had reigned over Judah in Hebron for

seven years (2 Sam. 2:1-4), and over all Israel in Jerusalem for thirty-three years (2 Sam. 5:1-5; 1 Chron. 29:26, 27). David had been a wise and good king, a man after God's heart (1 Kings 11:4; 1 Chron. 29:28).

II. Solomon's First Acts—verses 12 to 25.

Adonijah, who had been guilty of rebellion (1 Kings 1:5-9), did not dare approach Solomon directly, but made his request through Bath-sheba, the mother of Solomon (2 Sam. 12:24). Sinful men may not enjoy access to the holy presence of God, except through the Mediator Jesus Christ the Son, Himself both Man and God (Rom. 5:2; Eph. 2:18; 3:12; 1 Tim. 2:5; Heb. 8:6; 9:15; 12:24).

Adonijah had been pardoned on condition that he should live quietly and peaceably, and presumably not interfere with affairs of state (1 Kings 1:50-53). He requested that Abishag the Shunammite, who had ministered to David (1 Kings 1:3, 4), should be given to him as his wife. But, according to the ideas of the people of the Orient, the people of David's household would be regarded as his possessions, and hence part and parcel of the inheritance which he had transferred to Solomon his son. For Adonijah to ask for Abishag was counted equivalent to a bold request for the kingdom itself. The mention of Abiathar and Joab, former fellow-conspirators with Adonijah (1 Kings 1:7), lends support to the thought that Adonijah was plotting a new scheme of revolt. This time he was not pardoned, but punished.

Thus did the Lord establish King Solomon on the throne according to His own will and word (2 Sam. 7:11-13; 1 Chron. 22:9, 10; 28:5-7).

THE AFTERMATH OF CHRISTMAS

Such a heading as the above might well awaken lugubrious thoughts in the minds of those who are faced with the necessity of paying the bills for Christmas now that the jolly old gentleman in the red suit has departed with all his retinue into the polar regions whence he came.

The after-Christmas season is a somewhat lean time for everyone, especially for missionary treasuries, as we have discovered. And to make matters worse even Santa Claus, in his anxiety to provide gifts for the children and everyone else, appears partly to have overlooked the needs of our Union which go on at this season at the usual rate, though the income is considerably smaller.

But this is not a dirge upon Christmas. We know that our friends have not forgotten either our needs or their responsibility to the work. We merely mention the matter so as to give them an opportunity once more of demonstrating their continuing interest.

We have just consulted our dictionary regarding the root-meaning of that somewhat sinister sounding word that appears in the above heading and have discovered to our surprise that it really suggests a very lovely picture. "Aftermath" says our dictionary means "after grass", the grass that springs up after mowing (math in old English). The lesson we draw from this delightful word picture is that though Christmas may leave us, "shorn" if it has been celebrated in the true spirit of the season, it will serve to produce a still more abundant growth. We take this opportunity of expressing the compliments of the holiday season to the many friends of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches by wishing them a bountiful harvest of good things as the "aftermath" of a well-spent Christmas.—W.

Subscribe for
The Gospel Witness