

The Gospel Witness and Protestant Advocate

Vol. 24, No. 24

130 Gerrard Street East, TORONTO, OCTOBER 11, 1945

Whole Number 1221

EMOTIONALISM IN RELIGION

NOR is it soul-winning merely to create excitement. Excitement will accompany every great movement. We might justly question whether the movement was earnest and powerful if it was quite as serene as a drawing-room Bible-reading. You cannot very well blast great rocks without the sound of explosions, nor fight a battle and keep everybody as quiet as a mouse. On a dry day, a carriage is not moving much along the roads unless there is some noise and dust; friction and stir are the natural result of force in motion. So, when the Spirit of God is abroad, and men's minds are stirred, there must and will be certain visible signs of movement, although these must never be confounded with the movement itself. If people imagine that to make a dust is the object aimed at by the rolling of a carriage, they can take a broom, and very soon raise as much dust as fifty coaches; but they will be committing a nuisance rather than conferring a benefit. Excitement is as incidental as the dust, but it is not for one moment to be aimed at. When the woman swept her house, she did it to find her money, and not for the sake of raising a cloud.

Do not aim at sensation and "effect". Flowing tears and streaming eyes, sobs and outcries, crowded after-meetings and all kinds of confusion may occur, and may be borne with as concomitants of genuine feeling, but pray do not plan their production.

It very often happens that the converts that are born in excitement die when the excitement is over. They are like certain insects which are the product of an exceedingly warm day, and die when the sun goes down. Certain converts live like salamanders, in the fire; but they expire at a reasonable temperature. I delight not in the religion which needs or creates a hot head. Give me the Godliness which flourishes upon Calvary rather than upon Vesuvius. The utmost zeal for Christ is consistent with common-sense and reason: raving, ranting, and fanaticism are products of another zeal which is not according to knowledge. We would prepare men for the chamber of communion, and not for the padded room at Bedlam. No one is more sorry than I that such a caution as this should be needful; but remembering the vagaries of certain wild revivalists, I cannot say less, and I might say a great deal more.

What is the real winning of a soul for God? So far as

this is done by instrumentality, what are the processes by which a soul is led to God and to salvation? I take it that one of its main operations consists in instructing a man that he may know the truth of God. Instruction by the gospel is the commencement of all real work upon men's minds. "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Teaching begins the work, and crowns it, too.

The gospel, according to Isaiah, is, "Incline your ear, and come unto Me: hear, and your soul shall live." It is ours, then, to give men something worth their hearing, in fact, to instruct them. We are sent to evangelize, or to preach the gospel to every creature; and that is not done unless we teach them the great truths of revelation. The gospel is good news. To listen to some preachers, you would imagine that the gospel was a pinch of sacred snuff to make them wake up, or a bottle of ardent spirits to excite their brains. It is nothing of the kind: it is news, there is information in it, there is instruction in it concerning matters which men need to know, and statements in it calculated to bless those who hear it. It is not a magical incantation, or a charm whose force consists in a collection of sounds; it is a revelation of facts and truths which require knowledge and belief. The gospel is a reasonable system, and it appeals to men's understanding; it is a matter for thought and consideration, and it appeals to the conscience and the reflecting powers. Hence, if we do not teach men something, we may shout "Believe! Believe! Believe!" but what are they to believe? Each exhortation requires a corresponding instruction, or it will mean nothing. "Escape!" From what? This requires for its answer the doctrine of the punishment of sin. "Fly!" But whither? Then must you preach Christ, and His wounds; yea, and the clear doctrine of atonement by sacrifice. "Repent!" Of what? Here you must answer such questions as, What is sin? What is the evil of sin? What are the consequences of sin? "Be converted!" But what is it to be converted? By what power can we be converted? What from? What to? The field of instruction is wide if men are to be made to know the truth which saves. "That the soul be without knowledge, it is not good", and it is ours as

The Gospel Witness

and

Protestant Advocate

Published every Thursday for the propagation of the Evangelical principles of the Protestant Reformation 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

Associate Editors

W. S. WHITCOMBE, M.A. (Tor.)

W. GORDON BROWN, M.A. (Tor.)

Contributing Editor

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

S. S. Lesson and Exchanges

"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 RAndolph 7415

Registered Cable Address: Jarwitzsem, Canada.

the Lord's instruments to make men so to know the truth that they may believe it, and feel its power. We are not to try and save men in the dark, but in the power of the Holy Ghost we are to seek to turn them from darkness to light.

—C. H. Spurgeon.

A MESSAGE FROM DR. SHIELDS

The following wire from the Editor received Sunday morning is the latest news we have from him:

"Longshoremen strike delaying sailing toward end of week at the earliest. Meantime continuing services in Brooklyn Baptist Tabernacle until sailing. We have been experiencing much blessing here. I eagerly welcome every item of news of you all. My suggestion to the School is that they set a November objective of at least fifteen hundred, leaving only five hundred for their December objective of two thousand. Love to all and to Mr. Robertson.

T. T. Shields"

In reply to this message large congregations on Sunday authorized the following telegram to Dr. Shields:

"Your welcome telegram received. Morning school and congregation responded by asking me to convey warmest affection together with renewed pledge to do utmost to reach our objective. Good attendance this evening and warm-hearted, effective message. Communion Service also asked me send assurance of continued prayer for safe trip and much blessing. Mr. Robertson joins me in sending sincerest good wishes and Christian love.

W. S. Whitcombe"

We understand that the longshoremen strike has at last terminated, and Dr. Shields is hoping that he will soon be starting on his long trip to New Zealand. In Jarvis St. we rejoice in the blessing granted our Pastor in other spheres of labour, and pray that abundant fruit may also be his in the Antipodes. The preacher last Sunday was Rev. W. M. Robertson, of Metropolitan Tabernacle, Vancouver, who has already established himself in the affections of our church family that never fails to rejoice in the proclamation of the glorious gospel of the grace of God.—W.S.W.

THE SEMINARY BEGINS ANOTHER YEAR

THE Seminary opened its doors a week ago last Monday after the "long summer vacation" to one of the largest classes in its history. So large indeed is this year's enrolment that all classes are now being held in the capacious halls of the Jarvis Street Church building, though when alterations are completed in the Seminary building, some of the smaller classes will return there. At the present time carpenters, plumbers, and painters are vying with each other in creating dust and noise, though the fruits of their efforts are beginning to take shape in the form of office accommodation for all members of the staff, a greatly needed improvement.

Our former students have come back from their summer fields rejoicing in their experiences, and further confirmed in their calling to the ministry of the Word. It is one of the best features of Seminary life that we are able to combine the practical and theoretical by sending out men and women in the twenty weeks of "summer vacation" to put into practice what they have learned in Seminary classes. Some thirty or more of them exercised themselves in the preaching of the gospel in various parts of the two provinces. Reports of their activities have appeared in these pages from time to time, and we are glad to learn that the blessing of the Lord rested on their labours. The students have also benefitted greatly by thus developing their gifts, and are in a position to profit all the more from the lectures.

The students of the incoming year also show signs of great promise. A number of them have already had considerable experience in preaching and pastoral work, while a number of others are veterans of the Armed Services, where they have proved themselves good soldiers of Christ by a consistent testimony in word and deed before their fellows. Such men will bring a wealth of valuable experience to their class room work, and later on to the ministry. The government recognizes the great value of training these young veterans of this war, and therefore pays them a living allowance while they are at school, together with the school fees. This applies to the Seminary as it does to any other recognized seat of learning. We wish that all our churches and missionary-minded people could have the same foresight as the Government has in its field and undertake in a more adequate fashion to provide for the formation of future leaders of Christian work at home and abroad.

A French School

One chapel service a week, that of Thursday morning at half past ten, is devoted to French. We sing hymns in French, read the Scriptures in French, pray in French, and preach in French. As in previous years the novelty of a strange tongue soon wears off, and students who at first were sure they could never learn French, sing as brightly as the rest after a few weeks. At the first French chapel service of the year, thirteen of our present students told how they had employed their knowledge of "la belle langue" to preach the gospel during the summer. Two of our young ladies, both qualified teachers, taught in French. This practical demonstration of the usefulness of language study as a means of winning souls, reinforced by the presence of French-Canadians in the school, is a great incentive to hard work in the French classes. The student body sang a hymn in French at the Fall Convocation. Many

favourable comments were heard both on the singing and on the French. It was a most impressive demonstration to all of the work of our French classes in the Seminary.

Our Monthly French Gospel Service

On the last Sunday in September we resumed our monthly French services, with a good company. Mr. Yvon Hurtubise, a student of the Seminary who was converted through the French Testament Campaign, gave us a fine message in his mother tongue. There was a good attendance. Our next gospel service in this language will be held in Greenway Hall at 3 o'clock on the last Sunday of October, and thereafter on the last Sunday of each month.—W.S.W.

MISS BOUCHARD AND CANADIAN UNITY

By Our Special French-Canadian Correspondent

MISS BOUCHARD, the daughter of Senator Bouchard, is going West in an effort to secure more unity between the two racial elements in Canada. I am sure she will get more English and Protestant subscribers to that idea than she expects. In fact the unity idea is preached much more effectively among the English than among the French-Canadians. I have great confidence that Miss Bouchard has the right comprehension of the word unity and of the means to bring it about. I hope she will show her appreciation of what has already been done by the Anglo-Canadians in view of that unity. I hope she knows fully the duties of minorities as well as their rights before she starts exhorting the population of Western Canada on what they should do. I hope she understands fully our shortcomings as French-Canadians in that matter until now, and apologizes for them before she asks those Anglo-Canadians to do more for unity's sake.

She knows, I suppose, that we need a little more human geography taught in our schools so that the growing generation may know something outside their own parish and province. They need more social studies so that they may acquire an appreciation of the other people's culture also. They must become aware that other nations outside Quebec have also acquired a culture worthy of that name, and that we must take it into account. They must have the opportunity to compare their own with these other cultures and acquire a desire to improve their own standing in this matter. They must cure their detestable mania of separation in everything if they are to get some first-hand understanding of the other race. They must come to understand that this mania is destroying every possibility of unity and understanding between the two races.

There must be serious study of history as well as of current events in our schools. The French-Canadian ignorance of both is really shameful. Here is a fact that will illustrate what I mean: Three or four months ago a visitor from France was received by a group of journalists. This French person had been in France during the German occupation. He deplored all the sufferings they had gone through during this time. One of his French-Canadian listeners wanted to make clear the fact that he was in a position to sympathize fully with him but that the French people in France had been in no way worse than the French here in Canada. He assured his surprised visitor that he in France had been only five years under the yoke, and this seemed a very slight

matter as compared to the French in Canada who had been under the conqueror's yoke for more than a hundred years. We have seen the workers taking the same attitude towards England: "If England keeps her meat for her own population, why would it be worse for us to do the same?"

It is an aggravation of this attitude that will result from the insanities blared out by the Roman Catholic Church in the projected four radio broadcasting stations for the 150,000 French-Canadians of Western Canada. The French-Canadians must be taught to act on their own and not on the advice of these fanatical priests, if there is going to be any unity in Canada. The Gospel of Christ must replace the *Little Catechism of Quebec* in the separate schools. That Gospel of love and true charity and unity must replace the gospel of that Pharisaic temporal power called the Roman Catholic Church if we are going to have unity.

Miss Bouchard, I sincerely wish you success in your undertaking. But I do wish also that when you come back from this trip you will understand still more the necessity of a campaign of unity preached right among the French-Canadians themselves, for they need it more than anybody else. We, as a minority, must be something else than a "clamouring minority", clamouring for the rights of the Roman church while we perish from mental and spiritual starvation. We must start co-operating with the other element of our nation, our true ally, and stop filling selfish clerical stomachs, already too full. No well meaning Anglo-Saxon would deprive us of our French language if we ourselves had behaved normally, not even Dr. T. T. Shields, whom it is their interest to slander and to misrepresent as the enemy of the nation. As a proof of this, may I state that French is taught as an important subject in the Seminary of which he is the President. The real cause of the trouble is that we have been neglecting our French language as well as the other subjects of school study such as history and geography, etc. The result is our ignorance, our misunderstanding, and our reluctant co-operation. Is it a wonder that the Anglo-Saxons are seeking a remedy to the problem, and do not always strike the note that harmonizes with our tune?

ANNUAL CONVENTION OF CHURCHES

AS we go to press, the Eighteenth Annual Convention of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec is in session in Jarvis Street Church. A full report of our fellowship in the Word and work of the Lord will appear in these pages next week, but we should like now to inform the many friends of our Union cause that this Convention is surpassing all previous records in point of attendance and statistical reports, and there is also a manifest joy in the common task to which all our churches are committed, both as we review past blessings and as we anticipate future opportunities.

—W.S.W.

THREE GREAT BOOKS

"BEHIND THE DICTATORS"—66 Pages

"SHALL THE POPE BE SUPREME ARBITER?"—60 Pages

"THE ANTICHRIST: HIS PORTRAIT AND HISTORY"—128 Pages

A BISHOP SPEAKS OUT

AMERICAN army chaplains are greatly disturbed about Roman Catholic intolerance which has been forced upon their attention in the European countries where they have served. So says Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam who has returned from a visit to the American Army in the field, during which he met some five hundred Army chaplains, among whom, he says, "No single subject was discussed at greater length." We reprint herewith the report of the bishop's statement from *The Montreal Star* for the further information of our readers.

It is interesting to observe how men of the most varied theological views are being compelled by the logic of events to take the same position with respect to the intolerance of the fascist-minded Roman Church that THE GOSPEL WITNESS has long taken. Bishop Oxnam is president of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, an organization that regards itself as the mouthpiece of the Protestant Churches in United States and Canada. It is distinctly "modernistic" in its theological utterances and for that reason its general attitude to Romanism is one that might best be described as "appeasement." But even "appeasers" are at last constrained to confess, like Mr. Chamberlain, that an umbrella offers no protection at all against bombs. We are glad that the President of the Federal Council of Churches had the opportunity of listening to five hundred American Army chaplains and that he also had the courage and good sense to make a public report of their feelings on "this sorely-troubling factor in Europe", the Papacy.

Bishop Oxnam's Report

NEW YORK.—(*Star Special*)—Although Protestants will fight for the right of Roman Catholics to worship in their own way, the Roman Catholic Church is intolerant to Protestants in the countries where it is dominant, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, president of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and Bishop of the New York area of the Methodist Church, said last night in reporting his findings of an extended tour abroad.

Bishop Oxnam, who visited the armed forces in Europe and the Mediterranean theatres on an official tour sponsored by the War Department, told an audience at Christ Methodist Church here last night that although individual chaplains of the opposing faiths have incurred the greatest respect for one another, church policies themselves are a sorely-troubling factor in Europe.

Greater Understanding

"It is earnestly hoped that chaplains serving together would become a force for greater understanding when the war is over," he said. "Unfortunately, the policy of the Roman Catholic Church in the matter of religious liberty seriously hindered the co-operation that should characterize religious groups in the United States.

"Individual chaplains of different faiths have come to respect one another, and the respect has deepened into affection. But church policies, if unwise, may destroy this fellowship. It is a Protestant principle that religious liberty should be maintained. The Protestant will fight for the liberty of the Roman Catholic to worship, to educate, and to serve in accordance with the dictates of his conscience.

"But the Protestant chaplain who has faced the fact that, in countries in which the Roman Catholic Church has a strong majority, full religious liberty is denied to minority groups, finds himself sorely troubled. He has experienced disabilities in the political field his fellow Protestants face. I have met five hundred chaplains, and no single subject was discussed at greater length."

THE BABY BONUS AND ORPHANAGES

Another Aspect of the Baby Bonus

A pastor in Quebec writes the following interesting query regarding the Family Allowances:

Have you given consideration to this aspect of the Baby Bonus: Do the vast institutions that garner in the orphans and unwanted children to give them a Romanist training—I saw many such huge places on my last trip to Montreal—do these places receive the bonus? This would be interesting to know, especially when these institutions are conducted by an organization that pays no taxes. Just how much would they receive? And just how would it be spent?

Before commenting on the above query, we wrote to the Department of Health and Welfare at Ottawa, and received the following reply from the National Director of Family Allowances:

"Under the provisions of the Family Allowances Act, an institution cannot be made the payee of Family Allowances, and in the Regulations under this Act 'institution' is defined to include an orphanage."

This official statement would calm the fears our Quebec correspondent has of the many Romanist orphanages and other institutions feeding fat at the expense of the public purse. It would be utterly unjust to pour hundreds of thousands of additional dollars into the coffers of the Romanist institutions that are subject to no governmental control or supervision of any sort. It is well known that the great Roman Catholic institutions are regarded by the clergy as sacred precincts, enjoying all the privileges of "extra-territoriality" accorded to a foreign embassy on another nation's soil. They are exempt from governmental inspection or supervision, even when spending government money. We are glad to receive the above assurance from the National Director of Family Allowances, but we are puzzled to read the following dispatch that appeared in *The Globe and Mail* several days before the date of his letter. *The Globe and Mail* reported:

"Health Minister Claxton tabled a return showing that family allowances bonuses would be paid to wards of the Children's Aid Society."

The question at once arises in our minds, what is the precise difference, in the eyes of the law, between an "orphanage" and a "Children's Aid Society"? If "baby bonuses" are to be paid to the one, would they not inevitably be paid to the other also? This is a question involving large sums of money, for in the course of years, millions of dollars would be paid by the government to Romanist institutions once the way is opened up. It would be indeed surprising if the priests who were so active in fostering the "Baby Bonus" and rushing its passage through the House in such unseemly haste, did not have their eyes upon the large income to be derived by means of it from the many babies in their institutions.—W.S.W.

“WHY

The Canadian Protestant League”

By Dr. J. B. Rowell, Rev. W. S. Whitcombe
and Dr. T. T. Shields

40 pages, designed for circulation by League Members.
Send for sample copy. If convenient enclose 3-cent
stamp for postage.

ROME AND THE MARRIAGE MARKET

An Examination of the Claims and Practices of the Roman Catholic Church in Respect of Marriage; the "Mixed Marriage" Scandals; Annulments as Equivalent to Divorces, and a Final Summation of the Matter.

By Roman Collar, Author of *The Parson Hits Back, This Warfare, etc.*

IT may have escaped my attention, but in the Old and New Testaments I have not found clear instruction as to the person, ecclesiastical or civil, to be set apart, or authorized, to perform marriage ceremonies. But I find consent by both parties to live together as man and wife—a practice still legal in Scotland. I believe—as binding as the most sacred of oaths. That is a marriage of minds and bodies as indissoluble as any performed by Rabbi or other priestly functionary. It was regarded as a "God-joined" contract.

This should be made clear—no particular individual by Divine proclamation is given authority to perform the act of marriage, an act, which in its final issue, is mutual consent before Almighty God, of the parties involved. But when consummated by mutual consent, consent makes law (*consensus facit legem*), or by one of the many methods, according to the country in which one lives, we are securely bound, all things being equal, before God and man:

It is natural that this ancient institution (perhaps the oldest) should be girt about by laws and inhibitions, securing for the contracted protection and each other's society, and defining their obligations to each other and their offspring. **But nowhere within society should any high clerical dignitary, or a group of ecclesiastics, or any other, be permitted through Courts or otherwise, to dissolve, annul, or declare as a non-marriage, the union of two people, irrespective of religious affiliation or lack of it, who by mutual consent, by declaration before proper parties, that is before a rabbi, parson, priest, Salvation Army officer, Quaker brother, registrar, or other lawfully recognized to perform marriage, were joined as man and wife.** There is, of course, the one New Testament exception. Nevertheless, we stress, that in the grave matter of marriage none should be permitted to play God.

I have been incited to these cogitations by the action of Mr. Justice Forest, a Roman Catholic, of the Canadian Bench, in ruling that, according to the Quebec law, the marriage in Scotland of John Marc Hamelin of Hull, Quebec, and Elizabeth Sharp Wren of Beith, Scotland, "was illegal, because the parties were minors (20 and 19 respectively) and the husband's parents did not give consent, and because the *Roman Catholic law* forbids the marriage of a Catholic with a heretic, that is to say with a non-baptized person." On the action of Justice Forest in giving the child of the union, which I should naturally conclude was thus made illegitimate, into the custody of his father, a Catholic, we need hardly comment other than to ask, Why claim the child when you have disclaimed the marriage? The parties have been remarried again by a Presbyterian Minister, under what terms I don't know; but there are interesting possibilities, indeed serious probabilities, should the case of the second marriage ever come up in a French-Canadian court!

The Romanist Attitude to Marriage

This, I say, has led me to inquire more fully into the Roman Catholic attitude toward marriage. Is it as sacred to Roman Catholics as they persist in trying to make the world believe? Have they never tampered with it? Do they tamper still? Find the answers in what follows.

At the present time there are seven Sacraments in the Roman Catholic Church. But it was not always so. Up nearly to the fifth century, there were but two accepted, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Historians point to Peter Lombard, who died in 1164, as the first to say that there were seven. Two Councils, Lyons (1274) and Florence (1339), accepted seven, as the correct number, and the famous Council of Trent decreed: "If any one shall say that the Sacraments of the new Law were not all instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, or that there are more or less than seven, namely, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Marriage, or that any of these seven is not truly a Sacrament, let him be anathema." That is to say, 'We Roman Catholics say that there are seven, that Christ instituted seven, so no matter what the Bible says there *are* seven, no more, no less; if you don't believe it you are accursed!' No proof is offered, and I could quite sincerely offer \$1,000—any amount—to charity for proof, knowing that for all of the seven proof is impossible. Several are not institutions of Christ at all. Matrimony is *certainly not* one of them! the Council of Trent, notwithstanding. And one or two *He never heard of*. For example, when and where did our Lord institute Supreme Unction as a Sacrament? That's a puzzle to me, at least.

Let us face two relevant questions.

What is a Sacrament?

The Council of Trent answers: "A Sacrament is a sign of a sacred thing . . . a visible sign of an invisible grace instituted for our justification." *De sacramentis*, Can. 1.

Father B. L. Conway answers: "A Sacrament is a visible sign permanently instituted by Jesus Christ to signify and confer grace upon men." *Question Box*, p. 243.

Fathers Rumble and Carty answer: "A visible rite or ceremony which signifies and confers grace." *Radio Replies*, p. 166.

But for the words, "instituted by Jesus Christ," in the sentences above we have a fair definition, for the word *Sacramentum* means a sacred thing. In the old Roman world that was the word used when speaking of the oath of fidelity taken by soldiers. The time arrived when it became associated in the ecclesiastical world with certain Christian rites such as the Lord's Supper and Baptism, and given the deeper content of "an outward sign of an inward grace."

Is the word itself in the New Testament?

No. In the Douai translation, however, Eph. 5:32, "To mysterion touto mega estin" is translated, "This is a great sacrament." (Our English word "mystery"

is a descendant of "*mysterion*" or the Latin *mysterium*). It was quite in keeping with the original for the translators of the King James version to render the text: "This is a great mystery." What is a great *mystery*? "But I speak concerning Christ and the Church," so the verse ends. The symbol of marriage was used to typify the close union of Christ and His people. And the close bond of Jesus and the Church will always remain, while we are in the flesh at least, a great mystery.

I trust that the above is clear. Now why Roman Catholic students should in the Douai New Testament, prepared at Rheims in 1582, use the word "Sacrament" in Eph. 5:32, instead of the original "mystery", is another mystery and I am not making a pun! By this time, the sixteenth century, if we may seek for an explanation, the "Seven Sacraments" had become solidly accepted by the Roman Catholic communion. It is not ungracious of me, I trust, to suggest that since marriage was one of the seven, Scriptural support had to be managed somehow. The most careful scrutiny of the New Testament does not uncover the word "Sacrament"; certainly from Eph. 5:32 it is absent. The same word "mysterion" is found translated "Mystery" in half a dozen other places. The most charitable pronouncement, then, we can make is, it was a mistranslation. As such it should be corrected.

But marriage is none-the-less a sacred institution, and is so taught by Christ and the Apostles. While we deny that it is a "Sacrament", that is, according to the Roman definition, no man or woman, or ecclesiastical body, or court, dare hold lightly the marriage tie. The New Testament forbids it. The thunder of Jesus in this matter ought never to cease to sound from our pulpits. The nation's moral welfare and its very superstructure depend on how warmly we adhere to the New Testament standard.

In the main I never have had any difficulty with the teaching of Jesus on Marriage and Divorce.

1. Marriage was to Him a monogamous relationship.
2. He gave no directions as to how and by whom the contracting parties were to be bound.
3. He regarded it as a holy relationship.
4. He taught that man should not break it, since God took a hand in "joining" the married.
5. He recognized one cause for divorce—adultery.
6. He condemns the remarriage of the guilty party after divorce.

I don't think that the above is an over-simplification of the teaching of Jesus. In time, however, there have grown up conflicting views. For example the State in many lands has seriously and actively differed from No. 5 and allows Divorce on the most trivial of grounds. The situation is shocking in certain States in the U.S.A. There is, and, perhaps, this is the most condemnatory feature, in the Protestant Church a growth of "liberal" tendencies in respect of Divorce and remarriage. For generations the Roman Catholic Church *in theory* has held *that*—I quote a Roman Catholic authority—"marriage is a contract made before God and man which is totally binding 'till death do us part.'"

Rome Claims the Monopoly

It is no exaggeration to say that the Roman Catholic Church is gradually assuming the sole right to perform the act of marriage. That church will admit that our marriages are "legal," that is according to the law of the State, but if Fr. Richardson be right "marriage by

the Anglican Church or other denomination of the Protestant Church is no marriage at all in the sight of God." (*The Advertiser*, London, Ont., Dec. 1916). The plain deduction from that position is that the Protestant world lives in inexcusable sin! That conclusion, of course, is ridiculous, actually libellous, and, I am certain, not believed in by other than the Roman Catholic hierarchy. The New Testament flatly opposes it.

However, the situation got so bad in New Zealand a few years ago that the Government had to pass certain Amendments to the Marriage Act. They are:

"1. Every person commits an offence against this Act, and is liable on summary conviction to a fine of one hundred pounds who

"(a) Alleges, expressly or by implication, that any persons lawfully married are not truly and sufficiently married; or

"(b) Alleges, expressly or by implication, that the issue of any lawful marriage is illegitimate or born out of true wedlock."

That carried in the House of Representatives by a vote of 44 to 25. This action, everyone knows, was taken to protect Protestants who were married to Roman Catholics by Protestant ministers, for in use in Roman Catholic dioceses was a "Catechism of Christian Doctrine" (No. 11) which said:

"313. A Catholic and a non-Catholic who presume to go through a form of marriage before a non-Catholic minister, or before a civil registrar, do not contract a valid marriage; that is to say, *they are not married at all.*" (Italics ours).

I do not wrong the Roman Church in Canada, I trust, when I say that in the above we have substantially their position here. How they act in regard to Roman Catholic individuals who have been married to Protestants proves it. I could give several instances of both men and women who have come to me protesting against priestly interference, even tears have been shed in my presence by women who have been told that they live in sin until their marriage has been "blessed" by the Church!

As a digression I may add that since I perform many marriages of Romans to Protestants, and of Romans to Romans, I now exact a pledge that has two parts to it:

1. That they will not under any circumstance, no matter the pressure, submit to a "blessing", or a remarriage, by a Roman Catholic priest.

2. That all children born of the marriage be brought up in the Protestant faith.

I also take time to instruct the contracting parties on the New Testament attitude to marriage. The result has been that I never have had a refusal to sign or to accept the pledge. Perhaps other ministers might follow suit.

A Romanist Divorce Mill

All Canada has seen sad situations resulting from dis-solutions of marriages in Quebec. One of the chief actors has been Mr. Justice Forest. He has been a good servant of his church whatever may have been said about the legality or morality of several of his decisions on "mixed marriages." In 1943 Mr. Justice Forest annulled the marriage of William Hood to Letitia McCawley on the application of Mrs. Hood. The ground was—"her husband did not intend to raise a family . . . to bring (up) any children that might result from the

(Continued on page 10)

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

"HOLD FAST!"

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

Preached in Jarvis St. Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Morning, August 6th, 1944

(Stenographically Reported)

"Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; (for he is faithful that promised;)"

"And let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works:

"Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another: and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching."

—Heb. 10:23-25.

THIS chapter, and, indeed, of course, the entire epistle, sets forth the value of the completed work of our Lord Jesus Christ. Its special emphasis is upon the fact that salvation is finished, that it is something that is already done, and not something we must do for ourselves.

That is a good starting point always for any appeal for Christian testimony and service. We may afford to be uncertain about some things, but this is one matter about which there must be no "perhaps" or "peradventure". We must be SURE of salvation.

Some time ago I reprinted a letter written by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Winnipeg, a letter addressed to Catholic parents, exhorting them to pay forty dollars in behalf of their sons in the services in order to guarantee them, in the event of death, direct passage to their Maker—a ticket to heaven for forty dollars. I published it twice in THE GOSPEL WITNESS, and then published an edition of 100,000 that soon was exhausted. (Later it ran to 300,000 copies.)

Some people wondered if it were possible that any sane man would set his signature to such an offer, and so a letter was addressed to the Archbishop asking him if it was authentic. In his reply he said, he did not guarantee anybody's passage to heaven—he only proposed the "better way"—of engaging in good works.

I refer to that now because the Archbishop said he did not guarantee it, for nobody could guarantee it, because they could not be sure. What a pity! If you get on a train to go to a certain destination, you hope to get there. Even the hitchhiker wants to know where you are going before he accepts a lift. So we ought to be sure that we are on our way to heaven, and that our safe arrival is guaranteed. And that is what the epistle to the Hebrews engages to supply for us. And there is nothing that will inspire people to serve the Lord and their fellows like a deepening assurance that so far as their own soul's salvation is concerned, it is forever settled. We must have our feet on the rock, and then we may be sure of where we are going, and we shall be glad to give attention to the service of others.

To be assured that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin is the great desideratum. I trust we are sure this morning. That is my question to you: Are you sure beyond all possibility of doubt that your sins are forgiven, and that you have eternal life? The verses I have read speak, among other things, of three considerations: first of all, of *the personal faith of the believer*; secondly, of *his social obligation*; thirdly, of *his public duties*.

I.

Well, first WE MUST HAVE FAITH: "Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering." Have you faith? It is not a question of much or little faith, faith that is weak or strong. The supreme question is, Have we faith at all? Faith may be increased. A mere acquaintance with Him in Whom our trust is reposed inspires our faith, and the more we know Him, the more experience we have of His grace, the easier it will be to believe. But there must be a place of beginning; and that is my first question. Have you faith toward God—a deep underlying trust in Him? Are you perfectly sure that God really cares, and will continue to care for you? When all material interests and possessions shall have faded away, when the fogs of life are at last dispelled, and we come to stand face to face with God, are you now perfectly sure that in that hour all will be well? If you are not, then that is the matter that should engage your attention above all other considerations in life. What is it to believe? What is it really to trust? I think it is to be sure that you were remembered at the cross, that the interests of your soul were imputed and cared for in that great transaction; that it was not for somebody else: it was for you that Jesus Christ died.

And then to be sure that as we were remembered at the cross so now we are remembered before the Throne! Oh, to rest in that assurance is to have comfort indeed.

Now there is good ground for such confidence, for here we are told: "He is faithful that promised". Have you any promissory notes in your desk anywhere? I have—a good many of them; at least I suppose I have. They do not interest me sufficiently to lead me to look them up, but I think I could find them in my archives somewhere. A man came to see me quite recently. He started immediately to look for some papers in his pocket. I knew what was coming. He wanted a loan. He said, "Oh, I shall repay you!" I said: "Yes; so many have told me, and had they fulfilled their promises I could have taken a long vacation, and but for the war could go around the world in comfort." Promises sometimes amount to very little. At the close of the last war I remember going to Mons, and from there to Brussels. I got up early in the morning, and went out without breakfast of any kind. I went into a place in Brussels, and they had some black stuff that they called coffee—it looked like ink. They had it simmering on the back of a stove. I don't drink coffee, but I drank some of that stuff because it was hot, and I was cold. Then I took out a French note. I think it was a fifty franc note, to pay for it. They opened a drawer and began counting out German scrip, a pile of it. I said, "Is that

all the change you have?" They said, "Yes." "Well", I said, "I don't want that." They were promises to pay, but they had a defeated and bankrupt Government back of the promises. Those notes were worth nothing then, and they will be worth less when this war is over.

What are the promises of God? They are notes from Heaven's exchequer, Victory Bonds. And some of them have great value: as "exceeding great and precious promises" they are described. They guarantee everything for this life, and the life that is to come. And my text says that behind every one of these promises there is a faithful covenant-keeping God. "Hold fast the profession of (your) faith". Do not throw away your bonds. Do not say: "Only so much paper!" Why? "He is faithful that promised". God stands ready to implement His every word, and to fulfil to His servants the word upon which He has caused us to hope.

I venture to think that if we could properly appreciate that principle, we should turn to the promises of God as we do when we take bills from our pocket. What is the difference in them? Well, one promises you one dollar, another, ten dollars, another twenty, another fifty, and while the paper upon which it is written is worth the same, the face of it gives it value, because all the resources of the Government are behind it.

And so we turn to our Bibles, and look at these promises just as you did when you took out your purse, to see what value you had there. "Oh, that is great, that is precious!" No; it is more than that: "Exceeding great and precious promises." God says so, and behind it is the faithfulness of God Who has never yet failed to keep His word. How rich we all are! And we ought to know it.

I read somewhere of a woman in Scotland who was a widow. She had one son, who came to America. She was a very reserved woman. After the son had been long absent a friend called on her and asked her how she was getting on. By rather diligent and careful cross-examination she managed to elicit the information that the woman was in hard circumstances, barely able to keep body and soul together. "But", said her friend, "John was a fine dutiful son when he was home?" "Yes". "And do you never hear from him?" "Oh, yes; I hear from him regularly." "Well, does he do nothing for you?" "No; he sends me some rather nice pictures sometimes with men's faces on them, some of the great men of America." "And what do you do with these pictures?" "Oh, I have saved them up. They are piled up there in the clock." "Let me look at them". She brought out a big pile of bills, American currency, of large denominations. To that poor woman they were merely pictures. Her friend said, "Why, you are rich, and you don't know it. Take these to the bank and they will give you real money for them." "Do you mean to say that is money?" "Yes." And so the poor woman discovered that the treasury of the United States was behind every bill.

Some people look upon the promises of God as but pretty pictures. But the man of faith rests his all upon what God has said. Why? Because He is faithful Who promised. God stands behind them. There is not an emergency of life that will not find full and complete relief if we simply cash these cheques of ours at heaven's bank.

Well now we are to "hold fast" not only our faith, but "the profession" of it. There is a great advantage

in profession. It tends to the confirmation of our own faith. Take every possible opportunity to tell people what you believe, and every time you tell it, your faith will be strengthened. I find the letters from our men overseas a source of constant comfort and inspiration. So many of our boys, quiet believers, from whom we heard but little when they were here, have found themselves in camps where they have been associated with men, many of whom did not believe in God, and they found, for their own souls' sake, that they had to declare themselves.

Last night just before going into the prayer meeting I read a letter from Irvine McKee. He was a lad full of life, but he was not an aggressive Christian when he was here. He was, however, a good boy, who trusted the Lord. He wrote me a long letter. He is out at Cape St. James, an Island in the Pacific. He said there was nothing but sea everywhere—a most isolated spot. And he said, "We have no padre, no one to hold a service at all. But I found another Christian soldier." Irvine had been reading THE GOSPEL WITNESS, and this boy saw him, and they found they had something in common, and they got into conversation, and he found this lad from a Roman Catholic family had been soundly converted, as had all his family, but his father. And so he chummed up with this other fellow. They said: "We must do something", and so as there was no padre they said, "We shall have to have our own religious service." They planned a service, and ten men came, including the commanding officer. And young Irvine McKee led the meeting.

It is a great advantage to find ourselves in a position where we have to assert ourselves, and make profession, and tell to all around what a dear Saviour we have found. Do not complain if you find yourself in a difficult place. God put you there so that you would have to sink or swim. There is only one way to learn to swim that I know of. You cannot learn to swim by hearing lectures on it. You have to swim. And we become strong in faith as we go out, among those who are not Christians, and hold fast the profession of our faith.

"Without wavering". There are many temptations to waver in our profession of faith. Perhaps a sense of our own unworthiness causes it, some sort of inconsistency on our part. You say, "If I were to say, 'I am a Christian, what would they say of me?'" But when we profess our faith, we don't profess faith in ourselves, but in Another, and we are recommending Someone else, and magnifying Him. And we can afford to say that no matter how unworthy we may be, we have a great Saviour, and we are His, and we may hold fast our profession, notwithstanding our sense of shortcoming.

There are many people who don't like religion. They have a lot of unkind things to say, but we are not to be deterred by that. Some young people find it too costly to be members of Jarvis St. Church. I cannot tell you how many have come to me, and said, "The moment people among whom I work know that I belong to Jarvis St., their darts are aimed at me." Well, we may be tempted, perhaps, to keep the flag concealed, and not to be so bold in our profession. But we are admonished to hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering, and never to let the old flag fall. Always keep it at the top of the mast.

Sometimes one is tempted by a respectable unbelief. "Oh," says somebody, "Of course I am religious. I go

to church. But what my religion is is my own business; it is a personal matter, and I resent anyone's asking me about it." Do not be dissuaded from a profession of your faith by that. The man who boasts of the privacy of his faith, has really not much of it. Our only safety is in letting people know where we stand. Wear the uniform, and let everyone know what you stand for.

In our controversy against Rome I receive hundreds of letters from ministers and others all over the country, saying, "I thank God for you every day. I pray for you every day. You are doing a great work—but please don't mention my name." I wrote a Presbyterian minister in Montreal last week. I said, "I thank you for your letter, but I thank you more especially for your signature. I am glad you are so willing to put your name to what you believe." Hold fast the profession of your faith. There never was a day when it was more necessary. If so-called Protestants in this country were publicly to stand for the things which privately they profess to believe, we could bring about revival in this country, and stem the tide of evil that is now so strongly flowing. But for business and other reasons they say, "You know I am in a difficult position." What do these people mean? We are all in the same position, and if there is anyone here like that, I tell you, you are an arrant coward. You have reason to be ashamed of yourself. If you are really a Christian, stand up for Him Who died for you; everywhere hold fast the profession of your faith without wavering.

Do you suppose our men in France, or in Italy, some isolated soldiers, perhaps, covered with mud, and every mark of identification concealed, should they be discovered by the enemy, do you suppose they would try to pass themselves off as belonging to the enemy camp? —I don't think so.

Let me tell you this: If your business or social interests, or family concerns lead you to conceal your faith, then you are not worthy of Jesus Christ. We read it this morning, that if we deny Him, He will deny us before His Father. Let us stand up and be men, not mice, in the service of the Lord.

A couple of men came to me the other day. They were elders of a Presbyterian Church. One said, "If I were to declare my convictions in my business, I would lose half my customers." I wondered what was coming. He continued, "But I have decided that I will lose my customers if that must be, but I will let people know where I stand." Do not let anyone terrify you. Hold fast the profession of your faith.

I think it means another thing: *We must not abandon our profession as Christians.* I have talked with people, and I have said, "Are you a Christian?" "I used to be." "Oh, no; if ever you knew Jesus Christ, you were His, and you still are." "But I am so unworthy." "I know; we all are that." "But I am specially unworthy." "Perhaps so; but even so if once you have committed your soul to the safekeeping of Jesus, do not dare insult Him by withholding your profession. Hold it fast. "Yes; I am a Christian, unworthy, ashamed; but I still declare that I have put my trust in Him. He has received me, and I am going on with Him."

II.

That is the important thing, but it implies certain obligations. Salvation is an individual matter, but it has ITS SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS. The saved man does not live

to himself. It is his business to live for other people. The Christian is a man or woman of consideration. We are to consider one another, to be thoughtful of other people. Somebody, perhaps a daughter, says, "Oh, mother, I did not think!" No; but you ought to have thought. The religion of Christ ought to make us easy to live with.

I remember Doctor Stockley's once saying he heard a man pray: "O Lord, give us grace that we may be easy to live with." There are some people who are like a porcupine. Some are like a wire-haired terrier. You cannot look at them but they snap at you. "Consider one another". And the proper place to do that is at home. If we are not considerate of other people at home, there is something wrong. The husband ought to be considerate of his wife, the wife of her husband, parents of their children, and children of parents. The Bible is full of that. Faith in Christ established a new order for everyone. We must be always thinking about somebody else—not about ourselves. "Consider one another." What for? "To provoke" them. "Oh," you say, "some people are so provoking!" So they are, in an evil sense. It requires a good deal of grace to get along with some people. But we are to provoke people in a good sense—provoke them to love. "Consider one another to provoke unto love." Somebody does not like me, I ought to say, "All right; you have thrown down the gauntlet. I will pick it up. I will make you like me. I will provoke you to love me." A man came to me one day and said, "I have just talked to a man about you, and he said he could not stand you. I said to him, 'Did you ever meet him?' 'No.' 'Ever hear him?' 'No.' 'Ever see him?' 'No.' 'Well, what makes you so hostile?' " This man said to me, "I wish you would take a run in there, and just talk to him for a few moments." I said, "What for?" "Oh, just go and talk to him. Show him that you have no horns and hoofs." Well, I was not in particularly good mood that day, and I said, "If he finds satisfaction in disliking me, I don't think I should bother myself about it. I have no time to rid his mind of an unjust prejudice." I think now I should have gone to see him, to try to provoke him to love.

I have known some people—I have in mind now a woman who always seemed to me to be like a Greek goddess, and most people called her a most beautiful woman. But she was as icy as a piece of marble, and as repellant as could be. Whenever you came where she was you felt like putting up your collar. Chilly! Ough! But you know it is possible to be lovely when one is not beautiful, with a "loveliness of perfect deeds", as Tennyson has it—"More strong than all poetic thought". Have you not known people like that? They were like magnets. Somehow or another people gravitated to them. And you have said, "What do they see in that one? She is not particularly attractive." No; not till you knew her, then you found how "provoking" she was. You could not help loving her. You love such people in spite of yourself, because they are so loving, and so lovely, because the love of God is shed abroad in their hearts.

Well, how are we going to provoke people to good works? By exhorting them? laying down the law to them? No; that is not the way. The way to get people to do good is to do it yourself. You do it. You say, "I do my share." You don't. "But I do." No; you don't. No one has ever done his or her share until he or she has done everything of which he or she is capable.

They are talking now about a forty-eight hour week. One says, "That is all right." But it is not all right. I don't believe any man or any woman can get life's work done in forty-eight hours a week. Our business is to be always at it, provoking unto love and good works. And it is the only way we can get others to follow.

III.

And "not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together." THAT IS A PUBLIC DUTY. Individual religion is good, home religion is better. But if there be real faith in the soul, it will inevitably seek expression among the saints of God. It will make us want to be where other Christians are. David honoured the assembly of the saints. Our Lord began His public ministry by going into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and putting His imprimatur upon the institution of public worship. The apostles did the same thing. And there has never been a revival that has not been preceded by attendance at public worship. When people have been revived they don't go off and live by themselves: they assemble with others. The Bible gives no warrant for monasticism in any form. "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together." I do not understand Christian people who stop to say: "Let me see, shall I go to church to-morrow?" Dinner time comes: "Shall I go and have something to eat?" If you do not, you had better consult your doctor. Healthy people must eat, and healthy Christians will be where other Christians are. They will want to be where others are: Do not get the habit of forsaking the assembly of the saints. It is very easy to contract that habit. There are some people who come here, who, if they are not in their places, I should immediately conclude are sick or out of town, because if they are in town, and on their feet they will be here. Others will come once a month, and who in the world can keep track of you? And it is easy to get the habit of going to the Lord's house only once a day. One says, "We can go to meetings too often." Yes; but you are not in much danger of it. "Well, I think I do pretty well by coming to church on Sunday morning." You do that. You do not do well until you heed the exhortation, "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves as the manner of some is." We are not to follow the example of other people.

I did not select this text because it was a holiday Sunday when more people are out of town than at home. It just happened. Perhaps someone needs it, I don't know. But we are to "exhort" one another. We had a good time at prayer meeting last night. And we had more people in attendance than some of these great churches have in their Sunday services. But "exhorting one another"—"one another!"—not a one-man ministry.

I went to a little church years ago, where there was a lady who prayed like an archangel. How she prayed for me! I was a composite of all the excellencies, and she prayed that I might increase more and more. I said, "My, she will be a great helper, a mother in Israel." I don't know whether she was at the next prayer meeting or not. But it was not very long before she was missing. And then I discovered that other people were not so impressed with her praying as I was, and I found out why.

Sometime later I discovered a poor woman who was never absent from services, a godly woman. One morning I was down at the door, and my eloquent petitioner,

fashionably dressed, came down the aisle. And just as they got to the door, she and this poor woman met. "Oh," she said, with a touch of condescension, "I am SO glad to see you this morning. I hope you will come again." The other woman said, "I am always here. Where are you most of the time?"

The only way to exhort other people is to go and do the job yourself. We had a great time last night. "Heaven came down our souls to meet, and they crowned the mercy-seat." By the way, I did not see you. "Exhorting one another". That means that we should go everywhere preaching the word. Then we shall find people assembling themselves together, not forsaking the divine institution of public worship. We cannot complain in this place, but prevention is better than cure, and perhaps this is a timely word for a holiday Sunday morning.

So let us "hold fast the profession of our faith", "consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works"; and never, unless absolutely prevented, neglect to assemble with others for the worship of the Lord.

ROME AND THE MARRIAGE MARKET

(Continued from page 6)

marriage as Roman Catholics." Other decisions of his have caused hot argument, the latest of which was the Hamelin-Wren case. Mrs. Hamelin apparently had not been baptized as a child so she was a "heretic." Their marriage therefore was invalid though performed legally in Scotland by a minister. Doubtless in Scotland that marriage still holds good. What a tangle when one runs against "the power of the Pope to legislate on marriage!"

But one mustn't condemn Mr. Justice Forest too hastily. He has the laws of Quebec to consider in matters of marriage, and Quebec's laws are bound up with the Roman See's promulgations. So if he tears a marriage asunder, it is not wantonness on his part. He has his allegiances, ecclesiastical and legal, and, I am certain, though I have not the full data at hand, that never has one of his legal judgments run contrary to Roman ecclesiastical pronouncements. I do know, however, that the *Ne Temere* decree of Pius X, April 19, 1908,—still the subject of acutest controversy—declared: "Only such marriages (mixed) are valid, which are contracted before the parish priest or the ordinary of the place, or a priest delegated by either of these,—and at least before two witnesses." But as Father Conway adds: "Prior to this law such marriages were valid if no diriment impediment existed. Thus, for example, the marriage of a Catholic to a party *unbaptized was invalid* on account of the diriment impediment of disparity of worship." I have italicized three words that the reader might form his own conclusions after he has made a comparison with Justice Forest's deliverance on the Hamelin-Wren marriage. The Justice has exactly quoted the Roman Catholic position and a position *prior* to the *Ne Temere* decree! See again Conway.

However, something ought to be done about this horrid situation. The Hamilton *Spectator* suggested new legislation to control all matrimonial affairs. (How can the Dominion Government control Rome?) But E. J. Hetherington wrote the *Spectator*:

"There is no need whatever of the suggested legislation, for the existing machinery is adequate to the situation that undoubtedly calls aloud for a remedy. It is

indeed neither lawful nor expedient that Canadian judges should denounce valid and proper marriages as no marriages, while at the same time thinking and declaring themselves upholders of the sanctity and inviolateness of marriage. This is too much. Further, it is a sheer outrage for a party to a lawsuit to be in open court designated a heretic, and if that be deemed right, then the person thus contumeliously designated has an equal right courageously to retort in kind. That way lie bear gardens. Again, it is the height of folly to cite the canon law as binding in a British court, so tacitly denying the existence of the act of supremacy which settled that question rightly, and settled it forever for every thinking mind.

Yes, under our constitution there already exists machinery for dealing with such serious situations: A judge can be impeached and dealt with; and impeachment is the existent, lawful, and powerful remedy, whose use would make short work of jurists who exceed or abuse the austere authority that was to them entrusted."

(Oct. 5, 1945.)

"Married or Not Married?"

You would not believe that the following took place in old London, but it did, and was reported under the above cross heading. In the issue of Jan. 23, 1943, of *Picture Post*, London, appeared pictures of the wedding of Carol Landis, a so-called film star. On Feb. 6, two letters concerning that marriage were printed in the *Picture Post*. A Murray (address given) wrote: "It is a disgrace in war-time to indulge in an orgy of satin, orchids and wine as these people are doing at the film star's wedding. And an even greater disgrace that your *Picture Post* should give publicity to it." The other letter concerns us more particularly for the purposes of this writing: ". . . How comes it that she can be married in a Roman Catholic Church by a Roman Catholic priest if she has been married before?" (Italics ours).

The editor of the *Picture Post* sent the letter to the priest who married "Miss" Landis and his reply follows: "As I have already made it quite clear to some reporters of the Press, it has been well established that Miss Landis' (a Catholic) previous marriage or marriages were never contracted before the Church, nor constituted by a Catholic priest, and as such were and must be considered by the Church as invalid, therefore Miss Landis was free to marry."

Shocked? Of course, you are. Who wouldn't be who believed in the fundamental decencies of life? Here was a woman who, according to the priest's admission, went through more than one wedding ceremony, but she was not married since no priest had a hand in them! On the basis of Roman Catholic teaching, she had lived in adultery (her marriages were no marriages!), but she can have, and did have, a spectacular wedding in the R. C. Church, and the guests can indulge in an "orgy of satin, orchids and wine," still there's no rebuke, no hesitation about performing the ceremony. If the Roman Catholic attitude above admitted is the correct one, then our only conclusion is the teachings of Jesus Christ are a farce.

Rome Another Reno?

That, remember, was in 1943! In 1941, *The Globe and Mail*, I hope not inadvertently, printed a news item from Vatican City. It was an A.P. dispatch: "The Holy Roman Rota reported today that it had heard seventy-six pleas during 1940 for annulment of Catholic mar-

riages and had granted twenty-six." Is Rome becoming another Reno?

But cap this one! In the *Review of the Churches*, Oct. 1925, there was quoted an annulment bearing a Rome date-line:

"A declaration of annulment of the attempted marriage of John Morrison and Mary Dudley Sanderson, both of whom are non-Catholics, has been decreed by the Apostolic Segnatura, acting under special direction of the Pope. Proceedings for the annulment were brought by Morrison who wishes to marry a Catholic. The prior alleged marriage was declared null because Morrison, before contracting it, had made a formal declaration to a Protestant Minister to the effect that he had no intention of entering an indissoluble union." (Italics ours).

Personally, I don't believe that there is a single Protestant parson alive would marry any man who made such a declaration. But even were it true, it proved him (Morrison) a lecherous character, and the more Christ-like thing would have been to confirm the former marriage. But Morrison wanted "to marry a Catholic!"

In the same journal, the *Review of the Churches*, is another illustration of Rome's unworthy practices. Briefly, a man went to a distinguished priest in Rome and asked for an annulment of his marriage. "If," he said, "If I give a contribution to your orphanage, can you arrange for my marriage to be annulled?" The priest replied, "You are an unbeliever." "I am," said the applicant. The priest said: "Then I shall go to the College and get the marriage declared null and void on the ground of *mixta cultus*." The wife was a Catholic. It was done. The writer of the incident concluded: "The parties in this case are so well known that the story is not likely to be contradicted." It hasn't been to my knowledge.

Divorces For Sale at Rome

Rome's hands, we are sorry to say, do not appear free from the taint of money. It seems a necessary factor in arranging certain divorces. (I call them *divorces* for their is no difference between Rome's annulments and our State divorces. The same is true about "making null and void", or declaring marriages "invalid.") It would seem that even Conway had to defend the Church in taking money. In discussing "mixed marriages" he says that "Dispensations cannot be bought, but the stipends paid are simply fines imposed only on those who can readily pay them for the exception to the ordinary law of the Church." You pay for Dispensation to marry if a "mixed marriage"; you pay for the Divorce—at least, it has been so revealed in many cases.

On my desk is an article dated 1921 by Ernest Philipps. Mr. Philipps points out that Rome's Canon Law properly forbids marriage within certain degrees of consanguinity, but Dispensations have been obtained giving permission to break not only the Canon Law but the law of God. He reports that the Duke of Aosta paid the Pope £4000 for a Dispensation to marry his niece.

Lord Acton, a very learned Roman Catholic, and somewhat of a thorn in the side of the Church, so the same source reveals, says that Ladislaus of Hungary obtained a divorce by paying the Pope 25,000 ducats! (A ducat is, or was, worth nine shillings and fourpence). And Lord Acton records the fact that Louis XII wished to marry the widow of his predecessor whose dowry was the Duchy of Brittany. As the King was already married he sought and obtained a Dispensation (Divorce) from the Pope for the marriage.

Instances are almost legion of Roman annulments. There was the much-discussed case of the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough who lived together for thirty years. The "Sacred Rota at Rome annulled their marriage on the ground that the Duchess was *forced into the marriage.*" After thirty years, *forced!* The Marconi case was as revolting. That same Rota made null and void the marriage "because Signor Marconi said that *he and his wife agreed when married that their marriage might be terminated at any time.*" (*The Sentinel*, June 19, 1930). These appear trumped-up excuses.

But one of the worst instances of Roman vacillation and final consent was recorded in the *Winnipeg Free Press*, Feb. 1, 1922. It seems that Miss Anna Gould, an American, went to Paris with the reputation of being the richest girl in the world. She married Count Boni de Castellane.

"Ten years later," so the *F.P.* said, "amid a whirlwind of scandal a divorce was begun, and no sooner was it settled in the Paris courts than the engagement was announced of the millionairess to the Duc de Talleyrand, a cousin of De Castellane . . . The Vatican refused to countenance it." A fight followed between the two cousins. Six months later the duke married his cousin's former wife in London in spite of the Papal objection. And the conclusion, as the *F.P.* records it: "That was in 1908, and it was not until 1914 that Rome pronounced the *dissolution of the former marriage*, and not until 1916 that the *second marriage was declared legal.* By her first marriage the duchess had three sons, and by her second a son and a daughter." (Italics ours).

I have also the newspaper clipping of the remarriage, reported by the *UP*, Vienna, of the dissolute Prince Ernst von Starhemberg, the swaggering chief of Austria's Fascist Heimwehr. He was married in a R.C. Church overlooking the Danube to Nora Gregor the Viennese actress who was the mother of his four-year old son. The *UP* says: "It required the intercession of the Arch-Episcopal Court of Salzburg to pave the way for the marriage, after the Vatican curtly refused the Prince's plea for annulment of his first marriage to the former Countess Marie-Elizabeth of Salm Reifferscheidt." Prince Starhemberg pled that he and his former wife *had agreed that their marriage would be childless*, which automatically nullified it in the eyes of the Church. "A prelate from Graz conducted the ceremony." It is astounding!

I have on file several other annulments by Rome, but surely in those given we have proved not only that "mixed marriages" but even those performed by Roman priests themselves in certain circumstances are not "till death" do the parties part. The very reasons given, and accepted, for many of the dissolutions by Rome cause one to blush. In the marriage market, the Roman Church has a sorry history.

Several things are clear:

1. The Roman Church has no authority from Holy Scripture for assuming magisterial functions in respect of marriage, or the sole rights to perform marriages.
2. The Roman Church has broken the commandment—"Whom God hath joined let no man put asunder."
3. The Roman Church in spite of her strong protestations that she won't marry divorced persons, guilty or innocent, has done that self-same thing on the flimsiest pretexts.
4. The Roman Church has accommodated herself—see

the instances given—to power and wealth in the matter of annulments.

5. The Roman Church's claim that it is a "Sacrament", in the sense that the Lord's Supper is, is not supported by Holy Scripture. It was not instituted by Christ.

6. The Roman Church cannot be permitted to play God much longer in Canada

Conclusion

We regret having to write of these things, and our only reason for doing so is that we of the Protestant Church are so often put in a bad light in the particular matter of marriage. It is the claims of the hierarchy, so unwarranted and so unbiblical, but made so dogmatically and persistently, that irk. They claim power over the individual from birth till death, even until after death. They claim not only the "keys" of heaven, but the keys of each man's heart and home. History has shown in many instances that they finally overreach themselves, then there is rebellion of their own followers, and ultimately reformation. So it will be again, and I look for it on the American Continent: Who knows it may begin in French Quebec! There are certain ominous signs there.

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 9 Fourth Quarter Lesson 42 October 21, 1945

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

THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL

Lesson Text: Galatians 3.

Golden Text: "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith."—Gal. 3:24.

I. Justification is not Secured through the Law—verses 1-14.

The true preacher or teacher speaking in the power of the Holy Spirit will present Christ to his hearers so earnestly that it will seem to them as though they were actually present when the Son of God died and rose again on their behalf. It is not the truth in a book, but the truth in the heart that transforms lives. In spite of the fact that the Galatians had responded to the gospel message as vividly presented by Paul, they had turned aside from its implications, and had refused to allow the gospel the right of way in their thinking and in their conduct. They had been bewitched, fascinated and troubled by those who would insist upon their obedience to the commandments of the law, forcing them to go back to the ceremonies of Judaism (Gal. 4:9;5:6).

If our experience does not tally with the word of God, we must conclude that our experience is at fault. In his endeavour to bring the Galatians back to the right path, the Apostle reviewed their experience in the things of God at the time of their conversion and subsequent to that time. The soul-winner will frequently find that when the backslider is encouraged to review his personal dealings with the Lord the flame of devotion will be rekindled.

The works of the law are contrasted with the hearing of faith. The law said in effect, "Do good and you will be blessed" (Deut. 28:1,2,15), whereas the gospel said, "The Lord will bless you and you will then do good." The law might say "DO" and the gospel would say "DONE." Salvation through the law would have been possible, had men been able to yield perfect obedience to its commands, but salvation through the gospel was possible for all who would hear and believe the Christ Who completely obeyed the law

on their behalf (Matt. 5:17; Rom. 10:11). We are saved by His work, not by our own works (Tit. 3:8); by His goodness, not ours.

The Apostle reminds the Galatians that the commencement and continuance of their Christian life had been on the principle of faith in Christ, not on the basis of the works of the law. We are saved by grace through faith (Eph. 2:4-10), and we are likewise sanctified by grace through faith (Gal. 5:25; Heb. 10:10,14). On the ground of faith the Galatians had received the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:33, 38, 39; Eph. 1:13), had begun their spiritual life (Phil. 1:6), had received grace to endure suffering and persecution (Heb. 10:32-36), and had perceived God's ministry to them and among them, as He poured out His Spirit upon them and wrought miracles in the lives of men (Gal. 2:8).

Abraham was reckoned to be righteous before God when he believed God and took Him at His word (Gen. 15:6; Rom. 4:3-9, 16-22; Jas. 2:23). All Abraham's descendants must likewise believe God (Heb. 6:11-20). The scriptures confirm the teaching that salvation is by faith, for they record the gospel preached in Abraham's day as being effective for all who believe: namely, the promise that in him all nations of the earth would be blessed (Gen. 12:1-3). Blessing does come to all men through Christ, the Seed of Abraham (John 1:9; Rom. 3:28, 29; 4:16, 17).

The scriptures also clearly state that men are justified by the hearing of faith, rather than by the works of the law (Hab. 2:4; Rom. 1:17; Heb. 10:38). Justification is by faith alone (Rom. 3:24-31), and since the law is not of faith (Lev. 18:5), therefore justification does not come through the law (Gal. 2:16; Heb. 10:1-4). Justification through the law was not possible because of the weakness of human flesh (Rom. 8:3), for men could not keep the law in its entirety, and partial obedience to the law brought only a curse (Deut. 27:26; Jer. 11:3; Rom. 2:25; Gal. 5:3; Jas. 3:10). Christ has redeemed us from the curse and from the bondage of the law (Rom. 8:2; 1 Cor. 15:56, 57; Gal. 4:5; Col. 2:14). It is surprising how many people believe that if their good works outweigh their sins, they will be saved (Rom. 11:3).

II. The Promise is not Abrogated by the Law—verses 15-29.

The promise of blessing which God gave to Abraham on the ground of faith in Him still held good for the descendants of Abraham who would fulfil the same indispensable condition of faith (Rom. 4:14). By inspiration Paul enumerated the reasons why that promise was not abrogated by the law.

In the first place, the promise had been given in the form of a binding covenant. Again, the promises were made to Abraham and to his Seed, namely, to Christ, and to those who were united with Him (Gen. 13:15 17:8). In other words, the inheritance was transmitted through the Messianic line and culminated in Christ (Acts 13:32, 33). Hence the law could not interfere with the transmission of the sacred promise of God. Thirdly, the law was not given till 430 years after God had ratified the covenant to Abraham (Gen. 15:13, 16; Exod. 12:40, 41; Acts 7:6).

It is important to understand the nature and the purpose of the law. The law was temporary in its application, not eternal (2 Cor. 3:7-11); it would be in effect only until the coming of Christ, Who would fulfil the promises made to Abraham. However, the law had solemnity, being enacted through the ministration of angels (Acts 7:53; Heb. 2:2), and at the hand of Moses, the servant of God (Acts 7:37,38).

The law differs from the promises in that the law was given through Moses, the mediator between the two parties, God and the people (Deut. 5:5; Exod. 20:21), whereas the promises to Abraham were made by the one God (1 Tim. 2:5; Heb. 6:13,14). But the law was not against the promises, because it was established for a different purpose.

The law prepared the way for the coming of Christ. It was not the function of the law to give life or bestow righteousness, but to prove to men that their disobedience to God would result in death and condemnation (Rom. 3:19,20; 4:15; 1 Tim. 1:9). It revealed the universal need of a Saviour,

and men cannot be saved until they realize their lost condition. Physicians sometimes give medicines designed to bring the poison to the surface, in order that it may be treated. Just as all men were included in the sentence of condemnation because of sin, so all are included in the promise of mercy through Christ (Rom. 11:32). Also, under law we were safely kept in ward, God's counsel of grace not yet being revealed. The law was like the pedagogue, the slave entrusted with the care of children of tender years, to keep them from evil and accompany them to school.

In Christ we are not under guard or in the care of a pedagogue, but we are gloriously free (Gal. 4:1-5; 5:1). Through faith we are indeed grown-up sons of God (John 1:12; Gal. 4:7). As many as have been baptized into Christ have clothed themselves with Christ (Rom. 6:3; 1 Cor. 12:13; Col. 2:12); they have become one with Him. The spiritual unity of all who share this sonship is irrespective of all natural or earthly distinctions such as those of birth, sex or position (Rom. 1:16; Gal. 5:6; 6:15; Col. 3:11). All are one in Christ (1 Cor. 10:17; 12:13; Eph. 2:14-16), and all who are in Christ are heirs of the spiritual inheritance promised to Abraham (Rom. 8:16,17; 9:6-8; Gal. 4:7; Tit. 3:7).

DAILY BIBLE READINGS

Oct. 15	The faith of Abraham	Rom. 4.
Oct. 16	The sin of all	Psa. 14.
Oct. 17	Mercy for all	Isa. 55.
Oct. 18	The function of law	1 Tim. 1.
Oct. 19	The sovereignty of grace	Rom. 11:25-36.
Oct. 20	Children of God	John 1:1-18.
Oct. 21	Oneness in Christ	1 Cor. 12.

SUGGESTED HYMNS

Come, let us sing of a wonderful love.
God loved the world of sinners lost.
Only a sinner, saved by grace.
There is no love like the love of Jesus.
Not all the blood of beasts.

THE CARDINAL GOES TO MEXICO BY C.P.R.

The Romanist press of Quebec has given a good deal of prominence to Cardinal Villeneuve's trip to Mexico where he will take part in the celebration in honour of "Our Lady of Guadalupe". The following free advertisement for one of Canada's railway systems forms part of the publicity given to the Cardinal-Archbishop's journeyings:

"The Canadian Pacific Railway Company has put at the disposition of the Cardinal-legate the luxurious private car of the Vice-president, *The Thorold*. A representative of the company, M. P. E. Gingras, the passenger traffic agent, will accompany His Eminence to Mexico.

We were not aware that the C.P.R. had a line to Mexico. This company has a tradition of public service of which it may well be proud; it is a shame that it mars that fine tradition by catering to the sectarian interests and pride of the Roman Hierarchy. That is a poor return to the tax-paying public of this entire Dominion from which the company has received so many signal favours. We do not know whether the company official who is to accompany the Cardinal is going to Mexico for religious or commercial reasons. We hope it is the latter, for in our opinion the kind of gross superstition connected with "Our Lady of Guadalupe" is not likely to be more uplifting for a C.P.R. official than it has proved to be through the centuries for the backward, ignorant, and priest-ridden people of Mexico, who have finally thrown off the political yoke of Rome without yet being fully successful in casting out the demon of superstition.—W.S.W.

THE POPE vs. FOUR FREEDOMS

By Lon Hitchcock

SUBTLE propaganda through the press, movies, radio, and the pulpit, is being circulated throughout the United States to make the American public believe that the Vatican is for democratic institutions and the freedoms for which they stand. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The Vatican is the strictest dictatorship this world has ever known. The official doctrine of the Roman Church claims for the Pontiff absolute power, not only in the spiritual realm, but also over civil authority whenever the two may be at variance.

Missionaries of the Protestant Church the world over, in the jungles of the Congo, in the jungles of the Amazon, and in rural America are discovering that the hierarchy of the Roman Church is gaining in power, and as they gain in power the liberties for which democratic countries stand are disappearing. This is particularly true in Latin America. In those countries where the hierarchy has had sufficient power, they have forced national governments to celebrate concordats (treaties) with the Papacy. This has led to increased government subvention for the Roman Catholic Church and a decrease in freedom of speech, press, and worship.

All of this is but the outgrowth of the doctrinal development of the last century in the Roman Church. It will be a surprise to many that the official doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church condemns the very freedoms which are at the heart of our American Republic and at the heart of all democratic countries the world over. Our Constitution provides:

"CONGRESS shall make no law respecting any establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

Compare this with what the official doctrine of the Roman Church says:

"They do not fear to foster that erroneous opinion, most fatal in its effects on the Catholic Church and the salvation of souls, called by Our Predecessor, Gregory XVI., an insanity, viz. that 'liberty of conscience and worship is each man's personal right, which ought to be legally proclaimed and asserted in every rightly-constituted society; and that a right resides in citizens to an absolute liberty, which should be restrained by no authority, whether ecclesiastical or civil, whereby they may be able openly and publicly to manifest and declare any of their ideas whatever, either by word of mouth, by the press, or in any other way. But while they rashly affirm this they do not consider that they are preaching the liberty of perdition.'"

Romanists, therefore, according to the official doctrine of their church, are of the opinion that liberty of conscience and worship are an "insanity" and that the liberty of speech and press are the "liberty of perdition." It is out of this doctrine that they have acted in recent years to strangle Protestant missions in Latin America, and through political intrigue and pressure-group politics, to control government not only in Latin America but also in the United States of America.

Freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom from speech, and freedom of worship have always suffered where the hierarchy has gained the upper hand; and America is losing these essential freedoms in direct proportion to the growing ascendancy of the hierarchy

in the U.S.A.

It is time that civil authorities return to study and learn what W. E. Gladstone and Bismarck well knew and declared to their parliaments 70 years ago. Gladstone, thrice minister of England and one of the greatest English statesmen of the last century, said:

"The Pope demands for himself the right to determine the province of his own rights, and has so defined it in formal documents as to warrant any and every invasion of the civil sphere. . . . Rome requires a convert who joins her, to forfeit his moral and mental freedom, and to place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another."

No European diplomat was ever so well acquainted with Romanism and its pretensions as the Marquis de la Fayette. He was likewise closely connected with the American Revolution and the formulation of the liberties for which our soldiers today die. Said la Fayette:

"If the liberties of the American people are ever destroyed, it will be by the hands of the Roman clergy" (Ibid., p. 36).

Our duty to God and country in these days demands that we as born-again, Bible-believing Christians should work to the preservation of our liberties received as a glorious heritage from our fathers, and that we should resist every encroachment being made by that tyrannous Papal bishop whose one desire at the moment is to win America and bend her political and economic power to his designs for world rule. Apostate Protestantism moves back towards his scepter under the cloak of ecumenical church union movements, and it must be the lot of the Bible-believing minority of true Protestants today to lift their voice in protest and so prove themselves true sons of the Puritans who left home and kindred for these shores that liberty might not perish from the earth.

"From 'The Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius IX,' Dec. 8, 1864. English translation from Roman Catholic source: 'A Reply to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone's 'Political Expostulation.'" Right Rev. Monsignor Capel, D.D. Appendix, pp. 81, 86.

"Romanism and the Republic," Rev. Isaac J. Lansing, M.A., Boston, 1890, p. 37.

—From *The Christian Beacon*

BOOKS AND BOOKLETS

By DR. T. T. SHIELDS

"Other Little Ships" (New edition) . . .	\$1.00
"The Plot That Failed" (New edition) . . .	1.00
"The Adventures of a Modern Young Man"	1.00
"The Oxford Group Movement Analyzed"05
"Does Killed in Action Mean Gone to Heaven?"05
"The Christian Attitude Toward Amusements"05
"The God of All Comfort"05

Address:

THE GOSPEL WITNESS

130 Gerrard St. East

Toronto 2, Canada

Among Ourselves

Devoted to Activities and Interests of Former Students of
TORONTO BAPTIST SEMINARY

By Dean W. Gordon Brown

The big Seminary event of last week was the 16th Fall Convocation. A large assembly graced the occasion in Jarvis Street Church. In the absence of the President, the Dean presided. After the opening exercises the trustees and teachers signed the statement of faith of the Seminary, which is definitely Protestant, thoroughly evangelical, and soundly Baptist. This is a plan by which donors to the Seminary are guaranteed that their money will be used only for the spread of the principles of the gospel as held by Evangelical Baptists. Rev. H. C. Slade, as director of practical work, gave a fine word concerning the good work done by Seminary students this past summer, during which more were engaged in full-time service than in any previous year. We look forward, however, as we see the fine and large first year class, to an increase in activity next summer. Of course during the school year all Seminary students do some definite Christian service, such as Sunday School teaching.

The following wire was received from Dr. Shields: "Warmest greetings to faculty, trustees, students, alumni, and all friends of the Seminary at the Convocation. I most deeply regret my absence. Had I known sailing was to be delayed until ninth, I could have been with you. I am praying that this may be our very best Seminary year by all standards. Have given since my arrival in New York seven addresses so far, and expect to give six more up to Sunday evening. Much love to all."

To this the assembly voted to send the following reply: "On this Sixteenth Fall Convocation of the Seminary your presiding genius is much missed. The trustees, faculty, students and many friends present unite in expressing loyal affection to you as Founder and President of a school whose influence for the gospel is widening rapidly. We pray that your present journey abroad may be owned of God to the good of your own soul, the upbuilding of our brethren under the southern cross, and the salvation of many."

Highlight of the evening was the address by H/Capt. Rev. E. C. Wood, himself a graduate of the Seminary, who has done splendid work as pastor and latterly as chaplain in the Canadian Army. If we were to mix our metaphors, we should say the message was straight from the shoulder and right from the heart! He showed the need of the Gospel, particularly among the men returning from the forces, who have found by experience that there are no atheists in slit trenches. Then he showed the sufficiency of the gospel alone for the spiritual requirements of our age. There could be no finer justification of the work of the Seminary than the address by Captain Wood last Thursday evening.

On Wednesday, October 3rd, Miss Mabel Bourne gave her home church (Forward Baptist) a report of her work at Timmins and Kapuskasing last summer as deaconess and Daily Vacation Bible School teacher, and on the same evening Student Reg. Snell addressed Forward's Teen-Age boys.

We acknowledge with thanks a gift to the library by Mrs. J. Gardiner.

Seminary mornings begin with prayer meeting at eight o'clock and end at ten minutes to one. To relieve the strain of such a long period, arrangements have now been made for the students to have milk before chapel. This arrangement, however, reminds us once again of the Seminary's need of a large residence. We ask our friends to pray that the Lord may provide this for our student body. Those who have lived in rooms in downtown Toronto and eaten in nearby restaurants over a considerable period, will

best sympathize with the needs of our men and women in this regard. Had we an adequate building, we are convinced that that which the students spend on rooms and meals would, with proper organization, be sufficient to maintain the residence.

A fine instance of real initiative on the part of our students has come to our attention. The other night one of them was visiting at a certain home when the man of the house said that the children of such and such a new district were on his heart for the Bible School. Said the student, "Let us pray about it". So they had prayer. Then they went forth together and visited these homes. The following Sunday there were nine new boys in the Sunday School, and more have promised to come next Sunday.

First year students have elected as their representatives on the student council P/O Kenneth Cairns and Miss F. E. Hincks.

Because of our increased student body the Seminary must purchase twenty-five new copies of *The Hymnary* at \$2.15 each. We feel, you see, that it is part of the students' education to get used to a hymn book with music in it, and hence must have the large edition. We are hoping that someone will come to our aid in this regard and pay for the purchase of these books, an amount of \$53.75.

Mr. Norris Cain supplied at Baker Hill Baptist Church last Sunday.

The annual school dinner was held in the Jarvis Street Church basement on Monday evening, and proved to be an exceedingly happy affair. Over two hundred sat down to a dinner provided by our friend Mr. William Reucassel, of Jarvis Street Church. The Young ladies of Jarvis Street Church were waitresses. The hall had been tastefully decorated by girls of the alumnae in a Thanksgiving motif. (Vegetables for display were furnished by Rev. S. Willington, of New Toronto, who got a first for his victory garden.) When the dishes were cleared, the programme of song and speech mingled devotion and humour in a delightful way. Greetings were sent to our men still in the forces, and especially to the President in his absence. The ideals and experiences of the Seminary were set forth afresh on behalf of the trustees by Mr. S. C. McKee; of the pastors at home by Rev. J. R. Armstrong, of Montreal; of the pastors abroad by Rev. S. A. Black, of Jamaica; of the student body by Head Boy Murray Heron and Head Girl Alice Moore, and Freshman Stuart Phoenix; and on behalf of the faculty by the Dean. It is quite impossible to put on paper the happy combination of exuberance and spirituality which the gathering showed. A fine offering was also received for the work of the school, expressing again the enthusiasm of the graduates and friends for the great task before us.

THE PRIEST, THE WOMAN, AND THE CONFESSIONAL

The following book review appeared in the periodical *Revelation* of October 5:

"One of the most noted converts from the Roman Catholic Church during the last century was the famous Canadian, Father Chiniquy. His *Fifty Years in The Church of Rome* is a classic. His other work, *The Priest, The Woman and The Confessional*, caused a sensation upon its appearance. Forty-three editions were printed through the years. Perhaps no book was more hated, nor more sought after for destruction. It has long been out of print. THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2, Canada, has printed a forty-fourth edition of *The Priest, The Woman and The Confessional*. It is on sale at that address for seventy-five cents, or it may be ordered through the Revelation Book Service.

IMPORTANT!!

"The Priest, the Woman, the Confessional"

PUBLISHER'S EXPLANATORY NOTE:—This book was first published from fifty to sixty years ago. As it is now out of print in Canada, in response to many requests THE GOSPEL WITNESS has republished it.

It is the boast of the Roman Catholic Church, according to its motto, *semper eadem*, that it is always the same. It is bound by the decretals of its Councils, and the encyclicals of its Popes, even those issued centuries ago. The Roman Church is just as great an enemy of the home, the church, and the state and of the liberties of mankind, as it ever was. Smallpox, yellow fever, typhus, tuberculosis, cancer, are the same in nature as they were hundreds of years ago. If some of them are now less generally fatal, it is because their malignancy has been recognized, and antitoxins provided.

We republish this book in order that the deadly virus of Romanism may be recognized for what it is, and that people may be put on guard against its insidious operations.

ALL ROMAN CATHOLIC HUSBANDS AND PARENTS—

**ALL NON-ROMANISTS WHO THINK ROMAN
CATHOLICISM IS "JUST ANOTHER RELIGION"**

ALL PROTESTANT MINISTERS OF EVERY NAME—

INDEED, EVERYBODY SHOULD READ THIS BOOK.

**PARENTS and YOUNG PEOPLE worried about the Mixed
Marriage problem,**

All Intelligent Protestants who would understand why the Bible calls the Church of Rome "THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH"—
Should read this book.

This book (144 pages, price 75c) being out of print on this Continent, has been republished in response to many requests, by THE GOSPEL WITNESS AND PROTESTANT ADVOCATE, 130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto.

ORDER FORM

THE GOSPEL WITNESS,
130 Gerrard St. East,
TORONTO 2, CANADA.

Find enclosed seventy-five cents (75c), for which please send one copy of "The Priest, the Woman, and the Confessional", by Father Chiniqy, Author of "Fifty Years in the Church of Rome", to:

Name:

Address:

City:

Prov.
State