

## The Gospel Witness and Protestant Advocate

Vol. 26, No. 8

130 Gerrard Street East, TORONTO, JUNE 19, 1947

Whole Number 1309

### A Kindergarten Mis-named University McMaster "University" Inanities

WE do not recall ever having heard or read of a discussion in a deliberative assembly of people of supposed intelligence to equal, for sheer vacuousness, a discussion at the recent Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, reported in the press as held in McMaster University, when the annual report of McMaster University was before the Convention.

The discussion was precipitated by an amendment to the report moved by the Rev. Carl Farmer of Castlefield Baptist Church, who is the son of the late Dean J. H. Farmer of McMaster. The amendment expressed disapproval of McMaster's sponsorship of dances at the University. According to the Press report, the amendment was defeated "by only a slender margin," and it says the debate and vote "left no possibility of doubt that a large body of Canadian Baptist opinion is still strongly opposed to dancing."

We are sure that the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, whether it knows it or not, is greatly indebted to Mr. Farmer for introducing his amendment; and it is altogether encouraging to note that such vigorous protest was made against the sponsorship of dancing in the University by McMaster authorities. Evidently there is still a vital Baptist conscience left in what we now call "The Old Convention".

Thirty years ago such a motion as Mr. Farmer's would have been superfluous, for such practices were foreign to McMaster University; but had such a proposal been submitted in the form of a resolution to the Convention of Ontario and Quebec thirty years ago we believe it would have passed unanimously and without discussion. The fact that Mr. Farmer's motion was defeated, even though "by only a slender margin" is evidence of the distance "down grade" McMaster has descended from historic Baptist standards. Although Mr. Farmer's amendment was defeated in the Convention we cherish with some confidence the belief that if it could be submitted to the membership of Baptist churches throughout the Old Convention, while here and there churches might be rather neutral, we believe the total Baptist vote even at this late date would probably condemn the McMaster practice. We venture to suggest that the churches of the Old Convention might clear themselves of any complicity in this form of worldliness by a clear pronouncement on the exact text of Mr. Farmer's amendment.

We are sorry to observe that the seconder of the Amendment, a Mr. D. M. Smythe, is reported to have

grounded his objection chiefly upon the allegation that McMaster's practice was " 'splitting the churches' and giving opponents of Convention Baptists, chiefly those of a rival Fundamentalist Baptist organization which condemns McMaster as a hotbed of modernism, a lever with which to divide local congregations. The case was cited of the Pembroke Baptist Church, reported to have been rent this year on the issue of dancing at McMaster." If the rival Baptist organization referred to is the Union of Regular Baptist Churches we have only to say that the Union as such has had nothing to say on the subject. THE GOSPEL WITNESS has reported the matter, and since large numbers of Old Convention Baptists are included among our subscribers it may be that this paper has had some part in stimulating protests against McMaster's sponsorship of dancing in general, and even of what the press described as "an exotic dance."

(A reproduction of the chief dancer in scanty fairy-like clothing challenging Sally Rand's example, was sent us by a McMaster graduate for use in this paper, but it was too "exotic" for our pages.)

#### Chancellor Gilmour's Inanities

This article is written, however, to call special attention to Chancellor George Gilmour's inanities. Though we have no connection with the Old Convention we are ashamed of the piffling nonsense uttered by Chancellor Gilmour. McMaster is supposed to be a University, but if the speech of Dr. Gilmour is any indication of the intellectual quality of the teaching of McMaster University, to say nothing of the utter lack of religious principle which his speech betrays, it is no hyperbole to say that McMaster University has dropped to the level of a low-grade kindergarten. How shall we describe the Chancellor's drivel? Can anyone justify any man in a position of responsibility, and especially the head of an educational institution, delivering a speech so utterly devoid of all intellectual, ethical and religious quality? What may be expected of a "University" the head of which debates a serious question with the intelligence of a prattling baby with an infant's rattle? And what shall be said of the standards of those delegates who responded to Chancellor Gilmour's prattling twaddle? Do we write strongly? The fact is, like "Andy" we are "regusted."

#### Senator McMaster's Christian Purpose

McMaster University was made possible by the munificence of a member of Jarvis Street Baptist Church. McMaster University began theologically, doctrinally, and in

# 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: Jarwitsem, Canada

practice, exactly where Jarvis Street Church still stands. McMaster University was organized as a Christian school of higher learning by its founders, who believed there was a distinctive Christian view of life; and that whatever subject was taught, whether the Bible, or languages, or literature, or philosophy, or history, or economics, or art, or science, there was a distinctive Christian way of teaching; and it was believed that men preparing for the Ministry or for any of the learned professions, would be likely to be graduated with a finer Christian character, and with a truer appreciation of spiritual values, if their academic training were taken under Christian auspices, rather than in a purely secular educational institution. But, as one of the graduates of the institution told us a few years ago,—McMaster refuses to be ruled "by a dead hand". That would not be so serious did she not refuse to be ruled by the hand of the living Christ. It is obvious that McMaster University is exploring the remote reaches of the "far country".

### Chancellor "Forever Blowing Bubbles"

But let us examine Chancellor Gilmour's speech. We admit there is not much to examine. His words resemble the soap bubbles at which a little boy claps his hands as he blows them from a clay pipe. We can at least prick his bubbles and show their vacuity.

*Here is the first reported bubble:*

"The important thing is not to repress the students but to guide them, and in so doing to guard them. If you are dealing with the threatening breakdown of moral discipline in our generation, for God's sake don't send our students downtown to the hotels and taverns."

The important thing, says the Chancellor, is not to "repress" the students, but to "guide, and in so doing to guard them". What a confession, that McMaster University can find no other counter attraction to keep its students from the "hotels and taverns" than dancing! In all this discussion there was not a word from the Chancellor to indicate that he had the remotest conception of the power of Christian principles, as enunciated

in the Gospels to "guide and guard" either students or Chancellors.

*Bubble Number Two:*

"When the decision was made five years ago to sponsor student dances, it was to stop the very thing it has been suggested we have started," Chancellor Gilmour told the convention. "I verily believe we have done a great deal more to stop the abuses complained of than to foster them."

So the Chancellor says this "Christian" University five years ago sponsored dancing to keep students from greater evils. There is no word here to indicate that the Chancellor knew anything about introducing to students the higher values of the Christian life, the dynamic of the gospel, the "spiritual blessings" wherewith believers are blessed "in heavenly places in Christ." We cannot believe the Chancellor knows anything about these things:

*Gilmour soap bubble Number Three:*

"All I can say is this, if you want to increase the drinking problem, and promote unsound opinions on the relation of courtship to the religion of the Lord Jesus, you have only to pass this amendment," he said. "I was not brought up, and I cannot bring other people up, to regard wholesome Christian life as divorced from wholesome recreation and from other experiences of life."

To pass Mr. Farmer's amendment, according to the Chancellor, would be to "increase the drinking problem and promote unsound opinions on the relation of courtship to the religion of the Lord Jesus." What illogic! What ignorance of dancing records! What silly nonsense! What utter rubbish! The Chancellor seems unaware that his remarks were an insult to ordinary intelligence. It would seem to us that many of the students of McMaster University,—if indeed those who attend an educational institution under such leadership could ever correctly be designated as "students",—must regard the Chancellor's remarks as an affront to their intelligence.

Notwithstanding, the Convention by "a slender margin" voted approval of Chancellor Gilmour's soap-opera bubble-bath "for the skin you love to touch".

### "The Christian Attitude Toward Amusements"

We have never taken the ground that the practice of dancing is necessarily always pursued from evil motives, or that such practice always issues in immorality. We have no doubt whatever that in a great many instances these are its concomitants, if not its consequences. Twenty-six years ago we preached a sermon on this question, which, because of its appositeness, we reprint in this issue. We had not the least idea that the sermon would have any application to Jarvis Street, at that time, but alas, we found that it did, and it was "the last straw" that precipitated the Jarvis Street revolution. Jarvis Street Church did not divide on the question of doctrinal modernism, but on a matter of practical worldliness, which we believe resulted from failure in the application of Christian principles.

During the summer of 1921 the late Dr. John Roach Straton, then pastor of Calvary Baptist Church, New York, assisted us in evangelistic services, and delivered a lecture entitled "The Dance of Death". We have never dealt with dancing as Dr. Straton did, but always on principles laid down in the sermon appearing in this issue; and for twenty-six years it has ceased to be a problem with us in Jarvis Street Church. Following Dr. Straton's lecture, however, and the report of it in the paper, and confirming the wisdom of its argument, we were invited by telephone by the Matron of a Presby-

terian Hostel for girls, then situated on Yorkville Avenue, to visit the place with Dr. Straton. We went together; and the Matron brought in twenty-one or twenty-two young girls; the youngest was sixteen and the oldest no more than twenty-one or twenty-two, and every one of them was pregnant. The Matron asked these poor girls in the kindest way possible to tell the visitors what had led to that condition, and without exception every one of them said it was the result of dancing, and two of them of dancing conducted in a Church Hall. We sincerely hope that the stories told by these young girls were altogether exceptional; but even so, dancing is among those things which are at least questionable, and which therefore Christians should avoid.

But now having dealt with the Chancellor, let us see something of the implications of this matter.

**What sort of ministers may such an institution be expected to produce?**

We have the answer in the press report.

#### Miss Muriel Spurgeon

A 1947 graduate, Miss Muriel Spurgeon, is reported as follows:

"You talk about young people going wrong because they dance. I believe many more young people go wrong because their parents will not let them go to dances," spoke up Miss Muriel Spurgeon, a 1947 graduate of McMaster. "All they can do then is park and pet. We are not allowed to have liquor at the dances here."

We need not answer such illogic. We are familiar with such excuses. If such reasoning had any sound basis the giving of the Ten Commandments and the whole Moral Law was a mistake. Not only so but the entire legal system of any civilized country is a mistake; and, according to Miss Spurgeon, any sort of legal regulation or restriction is likely to drive people into wrong-doing. Once more we use the convenient term—"rubbish", sheer "rubbish". Miss Spurgeon's observation is a striking confirmation of the scripture which says, "Sin is lawlessness."

### THE EVENING TELEGRAM ON McMASTER'S DANCING

#### Editorial

HAVING touched upon the reasons given for sponsoring dances, *The Telegram* says editorially, "None of these reasons does credit to those who offered them; none of them does justice to the students of McMaster." The last paragraph of *The Telegram's* editorial reads, "It is indeed remarkable that a subject such as dancing should evoke opinions and expressions which cannot be always described as judicious, reasonable, and appropriate."

Thus it will be seen that *The Telegram*, while remarking that such a pastime "may be innocent, wholesome, and proper" treats the whole discussion with amused contempt.

#### The Convention's President's Opinion

Elsewhere in this issue we reproduce the *Toronto Star's* report of the McMaster debate. It is to be observed that Rev. W. K. Roberts, later elected to the Presidency of the Convention, said he had come to approve of dancing, remarking, "If we drive our young people off the campus to dance halls and other places where liquor is sold, God help our young people". Here is more nonsense. Are we to assume that the young people do not need God's help so long as they stay on

the campus? Is dancing a kind of substitute for the grace of God? This comment of ours we admit is intentionally facetious. We quote Mr. Roberts to show that the Convention is for this year to be led by a man who approves McMaster's worldliness.

#### Convention Approves of Ordination of Women

The Baptist Convention also approved of the ordination of women for the Gospel Ministry. The Rev. Carl Farmer, of Castlefield Baptist Church, Toronto, in the discussion of this subject, is reported to have expressed wonder that no one had gone to the Scriptures. Mr. Farmer may remember the debate at Ottawa in 1919. We are glad Mr. Farmer quoted Scripture. We can answer his question. When the Convention endorsed Professor Marshall in 1926 and '27, when it later excluded Jarvis St. and other churches from its fellowship because they stood for the divine inspiration and supreme authority of Holy Scripture, both McMaster and the Convention set Holy Scripture aside. The teaching of Scripture has no more influence on the conduct of McMaster University than the biblically doctrinal statement written into the trust deed of that institution.

#### No Debating Strength Left in The Old Convention

Surely there is no debating strength left in the Baptist Convention. We think it was rather stupid to argue that a woman should not be ordained as a Minister because she would not be able to baptize. There are plenty of women who are strong enough to compel their husband's obedience by physical means if it were necessary! Once when preaching in Los Angeles we went *incognito*, and after the lights were turned down so that we could not be recognized and called to the platform, to Amy McPherson's temple on a Thursday night. We saw her baptize between 40 and 50 men and women with an ease and grace which few men have learned. That is an utterly insufficient reason for refusing to ordain women to the Baptist ministry.

#### What of Women Preachers?

No one has a higher respect for womanhood than this Editor. We disclaim any anti-feminist attitude, but we do not believe a woman's place is in the pulpit. That, by the way. In a very able sermon last Sunday evening, the Rev. John Wilmot paid tribute to noble women upon whom God had laid His Hand when a nation had become so apostate that no worthy man was available. Mr. Wilmot especially mentioned Deborah, and Huldah the prophetess, but in doing so he stated that when women were forced to take the place of men, it was always an indication of a generally apostate condition.

#### Who Is Miss Muriel Spurgeon?

Be that as it may, who is this Miss Spurgeon who spoke in support of McMaster's sponsorship of dancing? It would appear she is to be one of the candidates for ordination. We sincerely hope she is not even remotely related to the great Spurgeon. But this is what is said of her in a report of the Baptist Convention in the *Toronto Star* of June 14:

#### Miss Spurgeon Described

"A slight little girl known to her friends as 'Moo' will be the first woman preacher ordained by the Canadian Baptist Church. She is Miss Muriel Spurgeon, of Kitchener, a 1947 graduate in divinity from McMaster University.

"A devout young woman and wrapped up in her mis-

sionary plans, Miss Spurgeon is nevertheless far from the popular misconception of the lady missionary. Tolerant and less conservative than many of her fellow Baptists, she was one of the active leaders of the student dances at McMaster University which aroused the opposition of a large section of the denomination. Her spirited plea before the convention on behalf of dancing was an important factor in winning its toleration of that social activity. She was given her nickname of 'Moo' at summer camp, where she was a girls' leader."

### Coming! A Generation of Dancing Preachers and Missionaries

We have here an answer to the question as to the kind of ministers and missionaries McMaster will produce. Read again the description of the first woman candidate for ordination. Will Baptists continue to contribute money to support missionaries of this sort? This young lady is no doubt a young woman of fine character and perhaps of somewhat lofty aims. Notwithstanding, we should say it is a great pity that she affords proof that McMaster is likely to produce generations of dancing ministers and missionaries.

### An Article Written With Sorrow

We have written this article with genuine sorrow. For years we greatly loved the Baptist Convention, and we loved McMaster University. Once when this Editor was under criticism by the Senate of McMaster University, years ago, the then Chairman of the Board of Governors, the late D. E. Thompson, K.C., LL.D., said, "Keep your hands off my Pastor. He has done more since he has become Pastor of Jarvis Street for Christian education than any Pastor we ever had." We confess with grief that we have since lost all respect for McMaster University.

### A Remnant In "Old Convention"

We rejoice that in the Old Convention there remains "a remnant according to the election of grace". We suggest that the Rev. Carl Farmer, of Castlefield Ave., would do well to afford that remnant leadership. We sharply differed with the late Dean Farmer on matters of policy respecting McMaster University. We were absolutely certain twenty-six years ago that McMaster was headed for the "far country", of her establishment in which she now so proudly but impudently boasts. But we never for a moment doubted Dr. Farmer's personal loyalty to evangelical principles. We thought, and still think, he was mistaken in judgment; but we believe, were he living today, he would heartily approve of the stand taken by his son. It is the only stand for one who would be loyal to the Word of God to take.

### Chancellor Gilmour Repudiates Historic Baptist Position

One other thing we have to say. Chancellor Gilmour gave further evidence of his complete departure from all Baptist principles when he referred to the proposed college of science saying, "our daughter is grown up and is about to be married to a wealthy bridegroom". In answer to that, the report says that "Dr. Farmer demanded",—we presume Rev. Carl Farmer is referred to again—this was Mr. Farmer's demand:

"To whom are we marrying our daughter? To the government? The government today derives a large proportion of its income from businesses we would not like to be engaged in. Everyone knows that a large share of its income comes from the liquor business."

"But," he conceded, "perhaps the whole matter has been settled, and we have come to the place where we say, 'That is not practical, it is too much for men of

simple faith, this dream of a university run by a Christian church, and we have to let George do it!'" There was general laughter at this.

### The Late Dean Farmer Quoted

It may be comforting to Mr. Farmer to tell him what perhaps may never have been reported to him, that at a meeting of the Senate of McMaster University, when this Editor was a member of the Board of Governors and which was held in McMaster University, the question of the transfer of the university to Hamilton was under discussion, and one McMaster official informed the Senate that there was hope of receiving financial aid from Hamilton. Whereupon, Dean Farmer took the floor and in the strongest possible terms declared that the acceptance of state aid was obnoxious and would be ruinous, and for his part he would never consent to it. Whereupon one of the Governors, commenting on the divulgence of some of the consequences of the negotiations for the transfer, turned to us and whispered, "The chickens are coming home to roost".

In his opposition to McMaster's sponsorship of dancing; and to the unequal yoke involved in the so-called marriage of one of McMaster's daughters, the college of science, to the State, and his rather ironical rejoinder to the Chancellor's specious attempt at justification, Mr. Farmer was treading the path of historic Baptist tradition. The worldly marriage of which the Chancellor boasted, will be deplored by all believing Baptists.

### We Reply to Many Enquiries

We have written thus because we have frequent enquiries as to the present soundness of McMaster University. With Chancellor Gilmour at its head and Dr. Stewart as its Dean in Theology, and with Professor Kirkconnel, the Roman Catholics' pet, on its Faculty, we can say of McMaster only what was said of Judah and Jerusalem:

"Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth: for the Lord hath spoken, I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me.

The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib: but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider.

Ah sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evildoers, children that are corrupters: they have forsaken the Lord, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger, they are gone away backward.

Why should ye be stricken any more? ye will revolt more and more: the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint.

From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores: they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment.

Your country is desolate, your cities are burned with fire: your land, strangers devour it in your presence, and it is desolate, as overthrown by strangers.

And the daughter of Zion is left as a cottage in a vineyard, as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, as a besieged city.

Except the Lord of hosts had left unto us a very small remnant, we should have been as Sodom, and we should have been like unto Gomorrah."—Isa. 1:2-9.

Let us add: The devout Senator William McMaster did not leave his fortune to establish and endow a dancing academy. McMaster authorities have looted a legacy.

**SUBSCRIBE FOR  
THE GOSPEL WITNESS  
\$2.00 per year**

## SAY McMASTER DANCING IS SPLITTING CHURCHES

By ROSS HARKNESS  
Star Staff Correspondent

Hamilton, June 11.—Students at McMaster university may dance. A motion that would have forbidden all dances at the university was defeated by the Baptist convention of Ontario and Quebec here yesterday, but by only a slender margin, and in the face of a vigorous attack led by Rev. Carl Farmer of Castlefield Baptist church, Toronto. The debate and vote left no possibility of doubt that a large body of Canadian Baptist opinion is still strongly opposed to dancing.

The debate came after Chancellor G. P. Gilmour had presented his annual report on affairs at McMaster, and had moved its adoption. Mr. Farmer promptly moved an amendment "that this convention request the university authorities to stop allowing social dances on the premises of McMaster university." It was seconded by D. M. (Mac) Smythe, a graduate student at the University of Toronto, who described unfortunate events that have followed university dances at Toronto. The amendment was lost by a slender margin.

### Good Or Bad?

Strongest argument against dancing was that it is "splitting the churches" and giving opponents of convention Baptists, chiefly those of a rival fundamentalist Baptist organization which condemns McMaster as a hotbed of modernism, a lever with which to divide local congregations. The case was cited of the Pembroke Baptist church, reported to have been rent this year on the issue of dancing at McMaster.

"This practice of having dances at the university is dangerous to the moral life of the students," Mr. Farmer contended. "If dancing is a good thing I'd like to see it in my church, but I am not convinced that it is a good thing. While McMaster is not a church, it is supervised by churches, and they are responsible for what it does."

He felt dancing at McMaster "is embarrassing to our churches," because people ask, "If they have it at McMaster why shouldn't we have it, too?" He said he has had young people in his congregation, to whom he has recommended McMaster for their university course, object that it cannot be a Christian school because it allows dancing.

### Guide, Not Repress

Chancellor Gilmour declared: "The important thing is not to repress the students but to guide them, and in so doing to guard them. If you are dealing with the threatening breakdown of moral discipline in our generation, for God's sake don't send our students downtown to the hotels and taverns."

A young woman delegate, a former student of McMaster, said: "Our dances are not like those at the University of Toronto. Liquor is not allowed here."

Mr. Farmer said the university should adhere to the principle on which it was founded, to "carry on the Lord's work," and this should be the rule in all departments.

Chancellor Gilmour mentioned that 425 ex-service men attended in the past term and said "these veterans have had a steady and maturing influence, and all instructors have enjoyed working with them."

Mr. Smythe said that the evil from student dances, according to his observation at University of Toronto, was that they made up parties at the dances to go to downtown hotels after the dances were over.

"When the decision was made five years ago to sponsor student dances, it was to stop the very thing it has been suggested we have started," Chancellor Gilmour told the convention. "I verily believe we have done a great deal more to stop the abuses complained of than to foster them."

There is no question of social behaviour on which everyone agrees, he said, and so in certain circumstances the wisdom of those responsible must be the guide.

### Wholesome Recreation

"All I can say is this, if you want to increase the drinking problem, and promote unsound opinions on the relation of courtship to the religion of the Lord Jesus, you have only to pass this amendment," he said. "I was not brought up, and I cannot bring other people up, to regard wholesome Christian life as divorced from wholesome recreation and from other experiences of life."

Rev. W. B. Fisher of New Hamburg begged the convention not to be blinded by "the specious arguments of the chancellor."

"I know somebody who went astray through dances," he said.

Rev. P. C. Reade opposed dancing at McMaster "because of its threat to our denomination, not because of its social implications."

"You talk about young people going wrong because they dance. I believe many more young people go wrong because their parents will not let them go to dances," spoke up Miss Muriel Spurgeon, a 1947 graduate of McMaster. "All they can do then is park and pet. We are not allowed to have liquor at the dances here."

Rev. A. S. Imrie, of Annette Street church, Toronto, suggested that the reason the Y.M. and Y.W.C.A.'s failed to reach their campaign objectives was because people recognized that the Y's have introduced certain unchristian things such as dancing. "It is not so much the effect on McMaster that worries me as the effect on our churches," he said.

"Nine-tenths of the curse of dancing grows out of liquor," said Rev. W. K. Roberts, a former R.C.A.F. chaplain. He said he had been opposed to dancing, but found himself favoring supervised dances for the armed forces.

### Recalls 20 Years Ago

"Twenty years ago when I went to McMaster dances were held, but they were held unlawfully," he declared. "They were held downtown, at a hotel or some such place. A great drive is now being put on by the liquor traffic, and if we drive our young people off the campus to dance halls and other places where liquor is sold, God help our young people."

Closing the debate, Mr. Farmer deplored those who had inferred that a ban on dancing would send young people to their downfall elsewhere.

"We wouldn't be sending them to their downfall, they would be going of their own accord," he maintained.

Another issue that had caused spirited debate at previous conventions passed almost without discussion. That was a reference in Dr. Gilmour's report to the proposal to establish a science department supervised by McMaster, but supported by government funds. Hitherto it has been a fundamental principle of the Baptist denom-

ination and McMaster university to refuse all state aid.

Dr. Gilmour referred to the proposed college of science as "our daughter who has grown up and is about to be married to a wealthy bridegroom."

"To whom are we marrying our daughter?" Dr. Farmer demanded. "To the government? The government today derives a large proportion of its income from businesses we would not like to be engaged in. Everyone knows that a large share of its income comes from the liquor business."

"But," he conceded, "perhaps the whole matter has been settled, and we have come to the place where we say 'That is not practical, it is too much for men of simple faith, this dream of a university run by a Christian church, and we have to let George do it.'"

There was general laughter at this.

#### Need \$5,000,000 Now

"If anyone knows where we can get \$5,000,000 cash on the nose I'll take it, but otherwise we'll go broke," Dr. Gilmour replied.

He pointed out that with income taxes as they are, the wealthy are not left with large fortunes to distribute to universities, and that had income taxes been as high 60 years ago as they are today McMaster university would never have been founded.

"If we do not take assistance where we find it, in another 20 years McMaster will have become nothing but a beautiful, but finished, episode in history. It will have ceased to exist," he said.

### TORONTO STAR'S INTERVIEW WITH DR. SHIELDS

Below we print a report of an interview in Toronto Star June 11.

#### "I'd Sue McMaster If I Had The Cash"—Dr. Shields

Dr. T. T. Shields, minister of Jarvis Street Baptist church, said today that if he had the funds he would institute legal proceedings against McMaster university and that he was "confident we could take away from McMaster university every dollar of the McMaster fund".

"The people who now run McMaster university have ceased to be the people to whom Senator McMaster left his fortune for the establishment of the university," Dr. Shields declared. His comments were aroused by the defeat of a motion before the Baptist convention of Ontario and Quebec which would have banned dancing at the Baptist university in Hamilton.

"There is a graduate of McMaster, now a judge, who told me: 'You know, we all admitted you were right. There is no doubt Senator McMaster left his money to preach and teach such as you are now preaching and teaching at Jarvis Street church.' The doctrinal statements of McMaster university and Jarvis Street Baptist church are identical. They were both written by Senator McMaster and it was he who gave the largest portion of the money that built Jarvis Street church.

"McMaster university has long ceased to be an evangelical institution," Dr. Shields declared, "and it has violated the McMaster trust because the McMaster trust made certain stipulations as to the quality of the professors. In the theological department every professor was to be a member in good standing of a regular Baptist church. I don't think that is now so.

"Chancellor Gilmour is less than nothing religiously,"

Dr. Shields charged. "His opinion on any subject would be worth nothing to men of conviction. Just as the prodigal son, having received his portion of goods, took his journey to a far country and ended up in poverty and at the swine troughs, so McMaster university long ago set out for the far country. And when an individual or an institution does that, anything may happen."

#### Says Protest Justified

"It is nonsense to talk of splitting the churches," he declared. "We are so occupied with our own aggressive missionary programme we are not dealing with other churches. I took my stand against McMaster university 25 years ago. I used to be on the board of governors and I saw then how it was going. Every new development in the life of the university justifies the protest I made 25 years ago."

"In my opinion Rev. Carl Farmer expressed what Baptists generally used to believe and practise and no doubt what a great many Baptists still believe and practise," said Dr. Shields, referring to statements made by the minister of Castlefield Avenue Baptist church, Toronto.

### DR. SHIELDS AND REV. H. C. SLADE GO TO THE MARITIMES

FOLLOWING services in Ottawa, Thursday and Friday of this week, Dr. Shields and Mr. Slade will fly to Halifax to begin a tour of the Maritime Provinces, addressing meetings on the following subject:

*"Shall Canada Continue a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations or Become a Separate Roman Catholic Republic? and The Relation of the Ottawa Marian Congress to the Separatist Movement."*

#### THE DATES AND PLACES OF MEETINGS, AS SO FAR ARRANGED, ARE AS FOLLOWS:

**Sunday, June 22nd, the Halifax Arena—  
Afternoon, 3.00 o'clock; Evening, 8.30.**

**Monday, June 23rd, Halifax West End Baptist  
Church.**

**Tuesday, June 24th, Amherst, in the Orange Hall.**

**Wednesday, June 25th, Pugwash, in the Baptist  
Church.**

**Thursday, June 26th, Kentville, in the Arena.**

**Friday, June 27th, Windsor, in the Armoury Annex.**

#### SUNDAY, JUNE 29th

**Sydney Mines: Presbyterian Church—11.00 A.M.**

**Sydney: Westminster Presbyterian Church—  
7.00 P.M.**

**Monday, June 30th, Sydney, St. Andrews United  
Church, 8.00 o'clock.**

#### FURTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS LATER

Announcements of other places and dates will be made through the public press, in next week's WITNESS, and in other ways. The itinerary will include Saint John, Moncton, Sackville, Fredericton, N.B., New Glasgow, N.S., and, we expect, Charlottetown, P.E.I. The particular dates and places and the buildings in which these meetings will be held will be announced as soon as arrangements are completed. All friends of the cause of evangelical Protestantism who recognize how seriously this Dominion is menaced by Roman Catholic aggression are earnestly requested to be much in prayer for all these meetings. Reports of the tour will appear in THE GOSPEL WITNESS in due course.

## The Jarvis Street Pulpit

# The Christian Attitude Toward Amusements

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto

(Stenographically Reported)

(See note at the end of the sermon)

"And through thy knowledge shall thy weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?"—I Corinthians 8:11.

**T**HE Christian attitude towards amusement is a subject of great importance. While belonging in some respects, to the category of minor questions, to the "childish things" which we may be expected to "put away" as we attain to some degree of maturity in the Christian life: yet because, as Christians, we can never be unrelated to anything which affects in the slightest degree the spiritual welfare of the least of God's children, we cannot be either indifferent or superior to this matter.

It is a fact, moreover, which even the most liberally and charitably minded find themselves compelled to acknowledge, that vast numbers of professed Christians are now being carried away by an ever-growing love of pleasure, which, like a mighty tide, is sweeping over the world. It cannot be denied that many church members go oftener to the theatre than to church, and pay more for their amusement than for their religion; that there is reason to fear that many such are better versed in rules "according to Hoyle," than in the principles of the Gospel according to Matthew, and Mark, and Luke, and John; and are bolder and more expert in dealing cards than in disseminating the Word of God. Some, too, there are, who are most punctilious in their observance of religious decorum; who would be offended by a colloquialism from the pulpit, or an inartistic performance by the choir; but who see no impropriety in the presence of professing Christians at the dance.

Nor is this condition of things peculiar to any one denomination, nor to any one country. It is a matter of general observation that vast multitudes of the professed disciples of Christ, by their addiction to these and other forms of amusement, openly advertise themselves to be "lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God."

Candid minds, I think, will acquit me of the charge of exaggeration, when I say that this has had, and now has a deadening and almost paralyzing effect upon the life of the churches. The public worship of the sanctuary, the preaching of the gospel, the study of Scripture, the exercise of prayer, the spiritual service of the Christian life, and all the pure spiritual joys flowing therefrom, are esteemed dull and uninteresting.

And I venture the assertion that this inordinate love of sensuous pleasure vitiates not only the public taste, but the taste of that part of the public which professes to be Christian. This has resulted in many deplorable reactions upon the life and activity of the churches. Standards have been lowered to suit the popular taste. Standards may not always, however, be vulgarized. They may only be reduced to fit the diminishing capacities of the people. The man who becomes addicted to the use of stimulants soon loses his appetite for wholesome food, and what food is forced upon him must be adminis-

tered in tabloid form. And it seems to be the policy of "the god of this world" to vitiate the appetites of God's children for all healthy spiritual enjoyments, by treating them with stimulants.

Respecting the particular form of amusement provided in the moving picture theatres, it ought frankly to be said that, independently of the character of the picture, the habitué of the "movies" is certain to find the habit mentally demoralizing. Even now there are many who refrain from reading certain books, preferring to await their production on the screen. Quite apart from the moral quality of the pictures, this aspect of the influence of the craze for the "movies" should give educators, and all concerned in the cultivation of the mind, the most serious concern.

The great question, however, which faces us is this: What is the Christian Church to do? What is the truly Christian attitude toward these things? If people will have nothing but pleasure, is the Christian Church to provide it? If the multitudes insist upon being entertained, must those who serve in the church, in the pulpit, and elsewhere, learn the entertainer's art? If young people refuse to engage in religious exercises designed to develop both the mind and the spirit, unless such exercises are diluted with some sort of entertainment or pleasurable element, is it the duty of the church to accommodate her ministry to the popular demand? Or is there higher and safer ground which we may take?

### I.

Let us examine THE PRINCIPLE of the text for our answer.

It appears to have been common in pagan Corinth, as in other places, to offer for sale in the market places, meat which was the residue of sacrifices which had been offered to idols in heathen temples. Some of the Corinthian believers seem to have made a practice of using such meat for food. They argued that as an idol was nothing in the world, meat which had been presented to the idol in worship was neither the better nor the worse for having been so used. Therefore they saw no reason why they, as Christians, should not eat it.

But there were others who viewed the matter differently. Lacking the clear intelligence of their more enlightened brethren, they appear to have felt that since the meat had been used in idol-worship, the eating of it would involve some recognition of the idol. Therefore when they saw their fellow-Christians eating such meat, notwithstanding their unenlightened consciences felt the practice involved a recognition of the idol, they claimed the liberty their fellow-Christians exercised, and in the doing of it were caused to stumble.

It is probable that this matter had been submitted

to the Apostle Paul for judgment, as the first verse of this chapter seems to imply—"Now as touching things offered unto idols"—and this chapter is his answer. Many a pastor in our day is asked similar questions by members of his flock, who are sincerely desirous of knowing and doing the will of God in all things.

The apostle begins by telling them that they are right in the assumption that "an idol is nothing in the world," and that, therefore, meat is unaffected by the fact that it had been used in sacrifice. He tells them that in the eating of such meat in itself there is no wrong. He lays down the principle that *there is a spiritual knowledge which affords liberty*: "As concerning therefore the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be gods many, and lords many), but to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." That is to say, when a man knows God as He is revealed in Jesus Christ, he knows there is no other god; and that God is a Spirit Who requires of His creatures a spiritual service; and that, therefore, we are not to judge ourselves nor others by outward forms, by the mere externals of life, such as eating and drinking. On the contrary, we know that it is spirit, and motive, and intention with which God is concerned. Or, as the same apostle says elsewhere (Rom. 14:17): "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost."

The argument, therefore, is that knowing an idol to be nothing in the world; so far as the act itself was concerned, and by itself considered, a Christian, knowing this, might eat meat which had been used in idol-worship without offence either to God or to his own conscience.

On the other hand, the Corinthians are reminded, there are some who lack the spiritual discernment to perceive that the nothingness of the idol leaves the sacrifice unpolluted: "Howbeit there is not in every man that knowledge: for some with conscience of the idol unto this hour eat it as a thing offered unto an idol; and their conscience being weak is defiled."

And herein another principle is enunciated to this effect: that while the believer's relationship to God is unaffected by his eating or refraining, and his own conscience, therefore, is also undefiled thereby, *there is still another relationship to be considered, and that is, the believer's relationship to his neighbour.*

Here let me pause to interject a more general observation: in respect to its own desires, the human mind is marvellously resourceful in discriminative judgments. When it suits us, sin and righteousness are defined in terms of our human relationships, and men go so far as to measure a man's fitness for the presence of God by the service he appears to have rendered to his fellows. But how swiftly we can swing to the other extreme: "As long as I have a clear conscience toward God, whose business is it what I eat or drink, or where I find my pleasures or my recreations?" Thus we choose to magnify the one or the other of the tables of the law as comprehending our whole moral obligation, as the inclination of the moment suits us. One day we are sure that if our consciences are at peace with God, nothing else matters. The next day we are equally certain that so long as we busy ourselves with some particular bit of human service—usually something we rather like to do—it really does not

matter whether we pray or otherwise recognize God or not.

The underlying principle of Paul's teaching, however, is this, that the gospel provides a way whereby "the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit"; and that the principles of the gospel applied to life and conduct will relate the believer in self-denying services to both God and his neighbour.

But now, to return to the specific matter more immediately before us. I have said the Corinthians are here reminded of their further obligation to their neighbour: "Howbeit there is not in every man that knowledge." "But," someone will object, "am I to be brought into bondage to another man's ignorance? Because he is so ignorantly superstitious stupidly to suppose that the idol pollutes the meat, or that the idol and the sacrifice are inseparable, am I therefore to be deprived of the liberty which my clearer knowledge gives me?" So secure did they feel themselves to be in their spiritual knowledge, they felt they could actually "sit at meat in the idols' temple" without violating their own consciences, knowing the idol to be nothing, and God to be all in all.

But our apostle lays down a further principle: *that while there is a liberty in knowledge, there is a still larger liberty in love.* "But meat commendeth us not to God: for neither, if we eat, are we the better; neither if we eat not, are we the worse" — which means that, knowing our relationship to God is not affected by such matters, we may do as we like. Thus the truth of God makes us free. "But take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling block to them that are weak."

"But why should I allow the absurd prejudices of my ignorant brother to deprive me of legitimate enjoyment?" Because, my friend, you may cause your weaker brother to stumble if you insist on the exercise of your liberty. "But why should I be held responsible for his stumbling? If I may legitimately do without injury to myself, that which, to him, becomes an occasion of stumbling only and wholly because of his ignorance, why should not his stumbling be charged to his ignorance, and I be left in the enjoyment of my Christian liberty? Is there any sound reason why my freedom should be restricted, why I should be required continually to deny myself for fear of offending the ignorant, old-fashioned and superstitious?"

In effect, you really ask, Why should I care if the ignorant, and weak, stumble?

There is a reason why you should care, and why you should deny yourself for the sake of the most benighted human being. Hear the tremendous answer! *He is a soul "for whom Christ died"!* This man Paul has but one answer for every question: it is always the Cross! Everything is referred to the Cross. He sees everything and everybody through the medium of the Cross. He measures and values everybody, by the Cross. Nor is this a solitary note in his teachings. He wrote the same to the Romans: "Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died." Thus he measures and values all that is in this world and cries: "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." And that is no more than our Lord Himself said: "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. Whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it."



Thus our text, and the gospel generally, puts love before knowledge as the guiding principle of life, and as the foundation of the largest liberty. Knowledge afforded liberty conscientiously to eat meat: love gave liberty to refrain from eating for the sake of the interests of a soul for whom Christ died.

## II.

Let us consider SOME MODERN ILLUSTRATIONS OF THIS PRINCIPLE.

There are certain forms of amusement which are only evil. There are plays which cannot be defended before the bar of an enlightened conscience; there are uses of playing cards which lead inevitably to ruin; there are kinds of dances which are flagrantly immoral, and which no reputable person will attempt to justify. To these propositions no one in this audience will object. But with these things we have nothing to do in our present discussion. Every true Christian will instantly, and instinctively, recognize that the thing which is evil in itself should have no place in the Christian life. Participation in such amusements as I have just named, I feel sure every one here this morning will readily acknowledge, would be as unworthy of a professed Christian as lying or stealing.

*The case before us is that of a matter which is not evil in itself, but which some uninstructed people, here called "weak", think to be evil. It is with the Christian attitude toward these we are now concerned.*

For the sake of argument let us assume that the theatre is an institution of great educational possibilities. Lest I be misunderstood, I give it as my personal conviction that the theatre, as an institution, is immoral; that its influence, on the whole, is not good but evil. But I speak of the theatre in this way as an institution. I shall not argue the point here, for that is beside my purpose this morning. There may be exceptions, and I am willing to assume the exception, to assume that there may be individual theatres whose management keep their stage clean and pure and wholesome. And this involves the further assumption that there may be good plays. Doubtless many are not good; but we will assume that some are, and that their teaching is morally sound, and their influence morally uplifting — or at least not degrading.

We may assume further that the conscientious Christian—and who can be a Christian without being conscientious? — will exercise the utmost discrimination, and will go only to the best theatres and the best plays, in which there can be nothing that is in any degree harmful.

And we may make the same assumption respecting the playing of cards. Surely no one will insist there is any evil in the cards themselves; they are neither moral nor immoral: but unmoral. That, to the discerning, is self-evident. But I am aware of the strong prejudice conceived by many against the cards themselves, as though the pieces of pasteboard so marked were essentially evil. Personally I know nothing of cards; but I suppose there is something peculiarly fascinating about the various games they are used to play. It is not difficult for me to imagine a game of cards to be a very pleasant diversion, nor indeed to believe that such a game may be mentally refreshing. I am not now speaking of the use of cards for gambling purposes. No one questions that cards are frequently put to evil uses; that even in private drawing-rooms men and women have been inspired by a simple, friendly

game with a passion for gambling which has led to their ruin, and even to suicide. No one whose knowledge is at all extensive, will deny that cards have been the latch-key to the penitentiary for many—to let them in, however, not to let them out. I say it is not to be wondered at that so many should look upon a pack of cards as having been printed in hell, in view of the terrible havoc they have wrought.

But it must surely be assumed that no true disciple of Christ would permit himself to have part in a game in which any of these things could find a place. He would play cards only in such a way as there could be "no harm" in it.

But what shall we say of the dance? I confess to having had no personal experience. There are those who insist that the modern dance in any and all its forms is always and only evil. I have no doubt it is often so. Indeed I feel sure that certain dances can work only evil to those who engage in them. But I have no time to-day to discuss that aspect of the question. I would take ground, for the sake of argument at least, that many censors of the dance who are better informed and more experienced than I, would not take, I would assume that there may be perfectly innocent and harmless dances. For I am compelled to assume that no Christian would deliberately and persistently participate in any sort of dance associated with the probability of evil. I assume, therefore, (I say again, for the sake of argument, for the testimony of the more experienced makes me cautious), that under right auspices some pure-minded people may dance without injury to themselves.

*Thus I have assumed that it is only with the good play, the innocent card game, the harmless dance, if such there be, the Christian will have anything to do.*

Can you, however, be sure that others will be equally discriminating? It is admitted that these things are not always good, but sometimes decidedly evil. What if others fail to exercise your carefully discriminating judgment? Perhaps someone will say that their failure to do so is their own responsibility. Beyond question, to great multitudes the theatre is the theatre, the dance is the dance, and cards are cards. They do not discriminate, and they will not. Some fail for want of capacity to discern between the good and the bad, and some from want of inclination. "But that," I have heard even professed Christians say, "is their concern and not mine."

But remember, the text lays down a principle for the government of the relationship of a person of a very high degree of religious intelligence to one who is densely ignorant and superstitious. You must draw the picture for yourself. At one end of the scale you have a religiously enlightened mind, plus education, culture, refinement, wealth; all these cooperating to discern between the precious and the vile. At the other end you have one steeped in prejudice, restricted in capacity, weak in character, and sheep-like in his imitative propensities. Between these two extremes there may be many varying degrees, of intelligence on the one hand or ignorance on the other. But I take the extremes. What principle can possibly bridge that gulf or span that difference of spiritual enlightenment and moral vigour? *Only the principle of the Cross!* And that is the principle by which all truly Christian conduct is determined, and on which all Christian character is founded: "For whom Christ died"! Let me take the highest possible ground. I anticipate your argument as to your taste for literature and the drama, your love of music and the aesthetic, your passion for cultivated society and mental recreation,

and your superiority to the degrading influences to which the less favoured are subject. I will take your argument, at par—"Howbeit there is not in every man that knowledge"! Do you hear it? "Howbeit there is not in every man that knowledge." Let me thunder it in your ears: "*Howbeit there is not in every man that knowledge!*" What then? "*Through thy knowledge shall thy weak brother perish for whom Christ died?*" Oh, my brother, do you care for the soul for whom Christ died? What? Does this question of amusements affect the business of soul-saving? Yes it does. Most emphatically it does! The passion for pleasure, for society, for worldly amusement has made barren churches as it has made childless homes! *And we shall never accomplish our God-given task nor glorify Him in the salvation of men, until by the power of the Holy Spirit we learn to relate ourselves to men everywhere as to souls for whom Christ died.*

### III.

#### May I venture now to offer A WORD OF EXHORTATION AND APPLICATION?

For the sake of clearness I repeat I have nothing now to say about indulgence in that which is known to be sinful. Nor have I any word of denunciation to utter respecting that which is not evil in itself. It would be as wrong to belie your moral intelligence by assuming there is evil where there is none, as it would be to ignore the ignorant conscientiousness of another, who, where there is no evil, thinks there is.

The supreme question is, Can any one of us afford to be indifferent to the fate of one "for whom Christ died"? That is the highest and strongest appeal which even God can make. From eternity He has estimated everything by the Cross! Have we learned to estimate men by the Cross? The man is poor, and ignorant, and obscure, and unattractive, I know; but he is a soul "for whom Christ died." For his own sake he is worth much; and he is one for whom an inestimable price has been paid.

*For Christ's sake we cannot afford to be indifferent towards such an one.* Can you not remember the thrill of satisfaction you experienced when you first realized that Christ died for you? And in that hour you realized His own satisfaction in some measure. Dare any of us consent to permit anything which might defeat the purpose of the Cross in another's life? Shall we have done once for all with all worldly standards, and henceforth measure all men by the Cross?

Do you realize that *some may be perishing through your act of selfish indulgence?* "It is only an innocent pleasure," you say. But the moment your pleasure becomes an occasion of stumbling it ceases to be innocent: "When ye sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ."

Do you see *what estimate they put upon the weak brother, who selfishly insists upon doing their own pleasure irrespective of its influence upon others?* They put their own passing pleasure before the salvation of the soul. That is the text's teaching. That is the consideration it forces upon us: "*Through thy knowledge shall thy weak brother perish for whom Christ died?*" Is there a professed Christian here who will refuse to forego an evening at the theatre that another soul may have an eternity in glory? On one particular evening the weaker brother saw you there, and he found sanction for his course in yours. I know he is "weak," and "ignorant," and "prejudiced," and "narrow-minded," and all that is contemptible in the eyes of some: But for him Christ died! Can it be that any one of us will deliberately

sacrifice the interests of a soul for whom Christ died, for a few hours' pleasure? Even to save a soul from death can we refuse to deny ourselves? I must be faithful. The spiritual requirements of the hour are insistent. The testimony of the Scripture is most urgent: "Destroy not him with thy theatre-going or with thy card-playing, or with thy dancing, or with the pursuit of any other kind of pleasure—destroy not him for whom Christ died!"

Does someone contend that such teaching is extravagant and impracticable? That it involves the erection of impossible standards? That such self-denial requires an unreasonable service? I remind you that the difference between the very greatest and the very humblest of earth, is infinitesimal in comparison with the gracious and infinite stoop of the Lord of glory when He died for your sinful soul. And for one for whom He died will you do nothing? For one for whom He sacrificed everything, will you sacrifice nothing?

No, my standard is not impossible. It is the simple standard of the New Testament. To be a "living sacrifice," to "be not conformed to this world," is our "reasonable service". It is for this we are here. For this we have been sent. I should be unworthy of my office were I to preach anything less. I must apply the principle to myself; and I say frankly, that if there be any pleasure upon which my heart is so set that it is more to me than the interests of a soul for whom Christ died, I am unworthy of my office, and I ought immediately either to resign that pleasure, or resign my office. And I say the same to the office bearers in this church; I say it to the deacons: If there be a deacon of this church who thinks more of an evening at the theatre, of the diversion of a game of cards, or of the pleasure of the dance than of the interests of a soul for whom Christ died, he is unworthy of his office. And the same may be said of Sunday school teachers and officers, and also of every member of the church. The teaching of Scripture requires that every interest in life should be subordinated to the purpose of the Cross—which is, that they should be saved for whom Christ died. For any of us who call ourselves disciples of Christ, there is but one course compatible with love and loyalty to Christ, and that is to resolve that by His grace, and by the might of His Spirit in the inner man, we will put Him always and everywhere first; that we will live to realize the purpose of the Cross in our own lives, and in the lives of others; that we will lose our lives for Christ's sake, that thus we may find them.

As I thus closed my meditation, a thought occurred to me, it may have been a day-dream—I said to myself: "What if some young man should rise in his pew before all the congregation and say, 'I have here and now resolved that henceforth at all costs, I will in all things put Christ first'—If such a thing should occur, who knows how many would follow his example, and perhaps the revival we have longed and prayed for would come today." Shall we not all resolve to rededicate ourselves to the Lord Jesus Christ as our Saviour and Lord, and from this forward, put Him always first?

(As the conclusion of the sermon was reached a young man under the gallery rose and said, "I would like to say, Pastor, that I have resolved to put Christ first," and in a few moments a large number of men and women rose signifying the same decision.)

NOTE: This sermon was published in August, 1922, since which date we have had constant applications for copies. We republish it now that we may be able to grant the scores of requests that have reached us.

## AN OTTAWA PROTEST

The Right Honourable William Lyon Mackenzie King,  
Prime Minister,  
Ottawa, Canada.

### A Protest Concerning the Marian Congress

While recognizing and respecting the democratic rights of every religion to exercise freedom of worship, we, the undersigned Protestant Pastors and people, hereby record and present our most solemn Christian protest against the official governmental recognition being given to the Roman Catholic Marian Congress as set forth in the official Marian Congress programme, as follows:

"At the Chateau Laurier: Dinner tendered to His Eminence the Cardinal Legate by His Excellency Most Rev. Alexandre Vachon, Archbishop of Ottawa, and HONOURED BY THE PRESENCE of His Excellency Viscount Alexander of Tunis, GOVERNOR GENERAL OF CANADA. Present at this dinner will be: The visiting Cardinals, THE PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA, CABINET MEMBERS, the LIEUTENANT-GOVERNORS of the Provinces, the Apostolic Delegate, the Diplomatic Corps, Archbishops, and Bishops, THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF CANADA, MEMBERS OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL not of the Cabinet, prelates, SPEAKERS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS, PRIME MINISTERS OF THE PROVINCES, judges, members of the Senate, members of the House of Commons, representatives of the armed services, federal officials, provincial officials, municipal authorities, clergy, and other officials."

### WE THEREFORE PROTEST BECAUSE:

1. The above quotation characterizes the attempts of the Roman Catholic hierarchy to make it appear that this congress is being officially recognized by the Canadian Government.
2. To call Mary the "Queen of Canada" is to insult the intelligence and convictions of Canadian Protestants.
3. To call Mary the "Queen of Heaven" and to accord to her exaltation and adoration is an insult to the Lord Jesus Christ, the Eternal Son of God.
4. The idolatry associated with this Congress is in direct violation of the Commandment of God: "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor serve them." Exodus 20:4-5.
5. In view of the vital religious principles involved, no Protestant official can afford to violate the trust that has been placed in him by the Protestant people of our great Dominion.
6. We owe the democratic and religious liberty of Canada to the great principles of the Protestant Reformation as based on the Holy Word of God, and the true Christian faith.

SIGNED:—

### RUSSELLISM or RUTHERFORDISM

By Dr. T. T. Shields

Fourth Edition—25c a copy.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS

130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2, Canada

## A LETTER FROM REV. JOHN DEMPSTER, OTTAWA

Dear Dr. Shields:

This protest was read in a number of Evangelical churches in Ottawa this morning and a few thousand signatures will be signed to copies of this — some singly, some in groups, and one by the ministers themselves, — and then mailed individually to Mr. King.

The down-right paganism revealed by the parading through Ottawa streets of the idol of Notre Dame du Cap has done more to arouse folk than anything else that has preceded this. Rome is showing up in her true colours of unchristian paganism.

The Metropolitan Tabernacle will seat 1,200 with a few hundred more in the basement. Expect huge crowd.

Three pastors preached strong sermons this morning and evening on the idolatrous Congress. Our "ads", very strongly worded, were accepted by both papers.

Yours in Christ Jesus,

JOHN DEMPSTER.

## FROM DOVERCOURT ROAD BAPTIST CHURCH

Toronto, Canada

Wm. H. Dynes, Pastor

June 16th, 1947.

Dr. T. T. Shields,  
130 Gerrard Street East,  
Toronto 2.

Dear Dr. Shields:

For a number of years individual members of this Church have supported the Protestant League. We have been amazed as we have seen the extent to which our politicians have given way to the increased demands of the Church of Rome, especially as this has been revealed and interpreted in the pages of THE GOSPEL WITNESS. We have thanked God for the way you have exposed these evils and we have prayed that you might long be spared to carry on in this work.

We have been increasingly alarmed of late, as we have read reports of the Marian Congress which is to be held in Ottawa, and I have now been instructed to write to you on behalf of this Church to let you know that we are following you with our Prayers as you go to Ottawa this week. We are praying that you will be given the necessary physical strength and that God will reward your efforts. We are also praying that Protestants in general, and our own number in particular may see the menace that is presented by Romanism, and that the wisdom and courage necessary to defend our heritage may be granted to us.

Sincerely,

H. McILDOON, Clerk.

## THOUSANDS OF BAPTISTS' NAMES WANTED

A copy of this issue of THE GOSPEL WITNESS will be mailed to every Baptist minister, and to every other Baptist whose name and address we can obtain. If any of the believing remnant in the Baptist churches of the Old Convention desire further copies of this paper they will be forwarded at a price of two cents a copy postpaid. We would send them free of charge only we do not want to receive applications from people who would put us to the expense of mailing them only to destroy them, hence the charge of two cents per copy, which covers the cost of printing.

## ULSTER AND EIRE

### Mr. de Valera's Broadcast

#### Reply By Sir Basil Brooke, Bart.

**T**HE Prime Minister of Northern Ireland (Rt. Hon. Sir Basil Brooke, Bart., C.B.E., M.C., D.L., M.P.), speaking at a meeting of the Fermanagh Unionist Association in Enniskillen on 21st March, 1947, replied to the broadcast made by Mr. de Valera to the United States on St. Patrick's Day. He said:

Since returning from London I have had an opportunity of reading Mr. de Valera's broadcast to the United States. No doubt his words were "lapped up" eagerly by the Southern Irish over there, but I doubt whether they created much impression on other American citizens.

There was much superficial sentiment about the supposed historic unity of Ireland—a notion which will not stand the test of critical analysis—but a minimum of fact about the actual state of affairs. Mr. de Valera's version of the reason for the division between North and South was a caricature.

#### Essence of Unity

According to Mr. de Valera "Ireland has been one since the dawn of history." That is not true. For long centuries the country was a congeries of warring elements which, even when they were not fighting, never coalesced. The fact that geographical Ireland has the sea as its boundary does not make it one. The essence of unity is something far more important: it is oneness of aim and outlook.

Let me illustrate. Great Britain, with which Northern Ireland is linked as part of the United Kingdom, has its various political parties which, though they differ on many points of policy, have this in common—that they share an outlook distinctively British. British ideals and the British way of life are fundamental to their thinking and their aspirations. For this reason their party loyalties are merged in a wider loyalty symbolized by the British Crown and the British flag.

#### Clash of Ideals

In Ireland, considered as a geographical unit, the opposite is the case. It was a basic clash of ideals which found its expression in the constitutional division between North and South a quarter of a century ago. No "vandal hand" (Mr. de Valera's phrase, picturesque, but false) tore Ulster away from Eire. What happened was that Southern Irish rebels, by methods of armed violence, set out to cleave the United Kingdom in two, but the loyal people of Ulster refused to fall in with the plan. It was their resistance to the separatist movement, not any external Power, that kept Ulster within the United Kingdom. There Ulster is to-day, and there she intends to remain.

#### Hatred of Britain

If the anti-British forces in the South had cared a rap for the so-called "unity of Ireland" they would have said, "Unless North and South break away from Great Britain together we will not break away at all." But they hated Britain so much that they preferred a-partitioned country to the maintenance of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. **THEY** were the real "vandals."

Mr. de Valera is completely wrong in asserting that Northern Ireland, the constitutional entity we know to-day, is "an artificial political unit maintained solely by the pressure of an outside Power." That is the sort of pabulum on which he is trying to feed public opinion in

America and elsewhere. Northern Ireland is maintained not by outside "coercion" but by the resolute will of its own people, expressed over and over again at the ballot box. Mr. de Valera's misrepresentation of the position is an attempt to create sympathy for the South, prejudice against the North, and indignation against the Government of the United Kingdom.

#### American Servicemen

But those 300,000 American Servicemen who came to Ulster during the war and received such a hospitable welcome here will not be deceived. They know the truth. How those men resented Mr. de Valera's intolerable protest against their landing in Ulster to take part in the Allies' struggle against German might! How they chafed when they learned that they were not permitted to visit Eire in uniform!

If they wanted to go they must disguise themselves as civilians and masquerade in someone else's clothes. Could anything be more humiliating? And how angry they were when they thought of the loss of so many lives—American lives among them—through Eire's refusal to allow the Allies the use of their ports in fighting the Battle of the Atlantic.

#### U.S.A. Memories

The winning of that Battle—no thanks to Mr. de Valera—helped to save Eire in spite of her stubbornly-maintained neutrality. American memories are not so short that these things are forgotten.

Once again Mr. de Valera has harped on the theme that if Ulster were sacrificed to his ambitions, Ireland and Britain would "live happy ever after." That tune has often been heard before—and we are still hearing it on the same old gramophone record. Every demand made by the Southern Irish on Great Britain has been accompanied by soft and soothing words of this kind. When the blarney has succeeded and the demand has been met, a new claim has been put forward, with the same honeyed words to sweeten it.

#### Hitler Comparison

Mr. de Valera's attitude to-day is that once he has "bagged" Ulster he will have no more claims to make on Britain. Hitler used to say the same thing when he overran one country after another. Each demand was always his last. Ulster, as part of the United Kingdom, defied the threat that came from Berlin. Likewise Ulster is determined not to be the victim of a policy of aggression emanating from Dublin. Our unalterable resolve is to remain under the British Crown, which Eire has banished from its Constitution, and the British flag, which Eire scorns. With such a conflict of loyalties unity between Ulster and Eire is impossible.

Ulster and Eire can be good neighbours, but they cannot live in the same house.

## "THE CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TOWARD AMUSEMENTS"

The sermon appearing in this issue in response to many requests was published in pamphlet form. This will be supplied at the rate of .05c per single copy post-paid, or fifty for \$1.00, or, one hundred for \$1.50. If you think, after perusing the sermon, its teaching is sound, we suggest you send for a number of copies that you may have them for distribution to young people who need such instruction.

## PERSECUTION IN SPAIN

**W**HILE Rome demands, and receives, special consideration and extraordinary privileges in Protestant lands, she represses and persecutes all other religions in countries where she holds supreme control. One more of many such examples has just come to hand with a report from an evangelist in Spain which we reprint herewith:

On the 30th of March the Roman Catholic Church in P. returned our hall, commandeered since May, 1939. I have been able to pay several visits there and there is considerable blessing among the believers, though there is still much fear of reprisals. Let me give one example of our difficulties:—

Recently the mother of one of the young evangelists died and the relatives wanted an evangelical burial. It was not safe for me to interview the authorities as it was they who had compelled me to leave the town, but one of the evangelical leaders from Madrid was in the neighbourhood and kindly came to the rescue.

The official permit was obtained, subject to the priest's approval. He granted permission to hold a funeral service in the house but would not allow more than three persons to follow the coffin in the streets, threatening us severely if we made any public manifestation. In spite of the secret police posted at the corners, the room and courtyard were full. It was a fine expression of sympathy and afforded a great opportunity to preach the Gospel.

Then the coffin was driven off to the cemetery at a great rate, making it impossible for anyone to follow it. The friend from Madrid got a taxi and arrived at the cemetery only to be stopped by the secret police from praying at the graveside, so that the body was interred without the usual rites.

Please pray for us.

—The Spanish Gospel Mission, Percy J. Buffard,  
Founder and Director.

## GUELPH AND BRANTFORD

### Two Protestant Meetings

An eye-witness report on the Marian Congress at Ottawa will be given by Rev. W. S. Whitcombe, M.A., at the places noted below. He will also speak on the following subject:

**THE MARIAN CONGRESS — ROME'S  
BIGGEST FAILURE IN PUBLICITY  
AND PROPAGANDA**

**Has Mr. King Resigned the Premiership  
in Favour of Mary?**

## BRANTFORD

in the

**Y.M.C.A., KING STREET**

**THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 8 p.m.**

## GUELPH

in the

**CITY HALL**

**FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 8 p.m.**

**Come and bring your friends.**

## ITALIAN ROMANISTS AND COMMUNISTS HEAR THE GOSPEL

**A**N ITALIAN pastor labouring in the Gospel among the mountains of Northern Italy writes a circular letter to the Swiss Churches which have had fellowship with him and his work. We take the following information from these circulars:

"Baptist Churches in Italy of the 'Italian Evangelical Baptist Work' number about fifty-five churches scattered throughout Italy and Sicily and Sardinia. There are about twenty-eight pastors. Churches are found in all the large cities such as Turin, Milan, Genoa, Florence, Rome, Naples and also in the countryside and in little mountain villages. All of them are working for the evangelization of the Italian people and meet with the opposition of Roman Catholicism, which feels that it is on its home soil and master in its domain.

"I was born in Turin in 1909 in a Roman Catholic family, though my parents were not zealous Romanists. I was converted in Turin in 1929 where I heard, for the first time, the message of the Gospel in the Baptist Church of that city. Two years after I became an evangelist-helper to one of the pastors at Turin and in the neighbourhood. At the end of 1934 I became pastor of six little churches in the mountains, without a salary. But my needs have always been met by the Lord.

"Last winter was long and cold and there was much snow, but the Lord has given me good health, and we have been kept busy in His work. We have an average of eight meetings a week in the various centres. It is necessary to stir up the Christians, especially the young people, for whom there are many temptations. And then there are visits and conversations in private houses and even in stables in order to reach in a direct way those who have never been under the sound of the gospel. Against the families that receive us and listen to the Gospel message, persecution arises at once. Romanism raises its head and seeks to hinder the diffusion of the Bible and its message. It is disgusting to see the ignorance which rules among these people respecting the Word of God and salvation by grace. Superstition, fear and unbelief make our task difficult, but when the light penetrates into sincere hearts, we have great consolation and our weariness and patience are recompensed.

"On several occasions I have had the opportunity of visiting among communists and of speaking with them at some length. I have told them of the weakness and the poverty of their political doctrine, that is without power, without foundation, and without hope. And I have presented to them the Christ of the Gospel, the power and foundation of our faith and our doctrine, and I have told them of the glorious and eternal hope we have in Him. They listened with respect when I read several passages of the Holy Scriptures. Thus I have been able to place here and there seven Bibles and seven New Testaments in as many families, together with a number of Gospel tracts."

The newspapers would lead us to believe that Italy is the exclusive pasture of Roman Catholics and Communists. Let us not forget that there are also in that spiritually darkened land faithful servants of God who do not fear the faces of men and who are not afraid to venture their lives for the sake of the Gospel.—W.S.W.

**READ THE GOSPEL WITNESS**

## NEWS OF UNION CHURCHES

### Montreal—Snowdon

In a letter received from the pastor, Rev. J. R. Armstrong, he states: "Mortgage Funds are, of course, always in the news around here. After the final payment was made to our contractor early in the year we were rather sadly in the red. It was necessary to make a special drive for Easter Sunday, and set as our objective \$500.00. To our great delight when everything came in at the end of the day our treasurer reported that we had received \$852.00. We praise the Lord for another obstacle surmounted."

This new work at Snowdon carries a very heavy financial load, and they are to be commended for the manner in which they unite in getting under it.

### Calvary Baptist Church, Belleville

MR. DONALD REED, *summer student pastor*

The Regular Baptists of Belleville have moved into much better quarters. It was my privilege to be with them Sunday morning, June 1, and minister the Word to the largest Sunday morning congregation I have known in that work for the past three years. Under the leadership of student pastor, Donald Reed, the recent move has been completed. As well as changing their abode, they have changed their name to Calvary Baptist Church. After years of discouragements they are now away to a fresh start and under their present set-up their future looks much brighter and more hopeful.

### Sawyerville, Quebec

REV. DONALD DAY, *pastor*

This work has been without a pastor since Rev. G. Reeve went to Mt. Albert and Maple Hill last December. One of their deacons, Dr. T. G. Moller, writes a brief news item as follows:

"Just a note regarding the work here in Sawyerville. Mr. Day arrived last evening. It is an event to which we have been looking forward for some time and for which we are very thankful. The Lord has certainly been blessing the work here, and I am sure had it not been for His gracious undertaking on our behalf, we would have very little here. However, as it is, the numbers have been maintained surprisingly well, our attendance at the Sunday afternoon gospel services has ranged between forty and seventy. We have been very fortunate in having several good speakers who have brought timely and inspiring messages. From time to time we have had a few new people come out, which always has been a source of encouragement.

"About two months ago we had the joy of seeing one lady accept the Lord, following a service. However, there have been many things to be desired in the work here and I feel that the arrival of Mr. Day will help in achieving some of these goals. There is a vast opportunity in children's work, as well as a great deal of visitation work to be done."

M. R. H.

## REV. D. C. McLELLAND, M.A., SECRETARY OF THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE, TOURING THE WESTERN PROVINCES.

Our very able Protestant League Secretary, Rev. D. C. McLelland, began a tour of the West at Winnipeg on June 9th. Several people came from Brandon to Winnipeg to attend the meeting, and to request that a Protestant League branch be organized in Brandon. At this writing (Tuesday evening), we have heard of Mr. McLelland's visits to Moose Jaw, Regina, Saskatoon and Edmonton, in each of which places there was a great response to the message. Mr. McLelland will visit Calgary, Red Deer, Vancouver, and New Westminster, and returning will speak at the Regular Baptist Church in Fort William on Sunday, June 22nd.

Reports of these meetings will be given in THE WITNESS at a later date.

## WHEN A MOUSE EATS THE SACRAMENT!

By Dr. J. B. Rowell

5c a copy—25 copies \$1.00

### THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE

130 Gerrard Street E., Toronto 2, Canada

## Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 11 Second Quarter Lesson 26 June 29, 1947

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

### THE LAW OF LOVE

(Temperance Lesson)

Lesson Text: 1 Corinthians 8:4-13.

Golden Text: "Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend."—1 Cor. 8:13.

Primary Text: "We will drink no wine."—Jer. 35:6.

Supplementary Reading: Rom. 12; 14:1-15:7; 1 Cor. 9, 10, 12, 13.

In modern times the increase in the consumption of intoxicating drinks is such that young people everywhere must be warned against this sinful and devastating practice (Prov. 21:7; 23:31; Eph. 5:18). Teachers should take every opportunity to point out the harmful effects of the drink habit upon the individual, the home, society and the nation (Isa. 5:11-14; 28:7). It destroys a man physically, mentally, morally and spiritually.

Some may think that they can partake of wines and spirits in moderation without suffering evil results. These should understand that drink creates an appetite for itself, and although in the initial stages a man may be master of his desires, yet in the end he may be mastered by them (John 8:34; Rom. 6:13-16; 1 Cor. 6:12).

The word of God clearly teaches the results of living on the fleshly plane. To be governed by fleshly appetite means to live in such a way as will result in corruption and death (Rom. 8:5-8; 1 Cor. 6:13-20; Gal. 6:7, 8). The body is to be kept in subjection, while the mental and spiritual elements of personality are to be strengthened (1 Cor. 9:27). All that we do is to be done to the glory of God (1 Cor. 10:31).

The strength of influence has a bearing upon this subject; we are responsible to God, not merely for our own actions, but also to a certain extent for the actions of those who follow our example. The strong man may be able to do something without harm to himself, but if his example would put a stumbling-block in the way of a brother who may perhaps have an inherited weakness, the strong man must curb his own desires, for the sake of his brother. By precept and example we are to help others, but never to harm, discourage or ensnare them (Rom. 14:13-23). Even some Christians are selfish and self-centred, seeking their own advancement, rather than the blessing of others. Anything which we might do without harm to ourselves, but which would hinder another's progress, cause him to stumble, or wound his conscience, must be avoided.

In enunciating the principle that Christian liberty is determined by the law of love toward the brethren, the Apostle Paul mentions the practice of eating meat obtained from animals which had been slain in heathen sacrifices to idols (1 Cor. 10:23-33).

The Corinthians, like other ancient Greeks, were idolaters (Acts 17:16; 1 Cor. 6:10, 14), but when the Gospel was preached in their city, many turned from their idols to serve the living and true God (Acts 18:8; 1 Thess. 1:9). These Christians were convinced that there were not many gods, but one God (Eph. 4:5, 6), and that an idol had no power, being but an image made by a mortal man (Isa. 40:19, 20; 41:24; 45:20; 46:6). Among them, however, might be some who were not proof against the associations of the old life. To them, meat obtained from an animal slaughtered in the heathen sacrifices was not ordinary meat (1 Tim. 4:4, 5), and to partake of it would mean complicity

with idolatry, from which they had been redeemed. If by the example of one brother, another brother would be encouraged to eat the meat, to the detriment of his Christian testimony, the stronger brother must refrain from eating it. To sin against a brother is to sin against Christ.

Teachers of younger scholars might like to illustrate the principle of this passage by a story such as the following. In far-away Africa there lived a boy, John, whose father was a missionary. John's chum was a little black boy, Sammy, who had formerly worshipped idols, but hearing of Christ, had believed on Him, become a Christian, and given up his idols. One day some natives brought the carcass of a sheep to the missionary, and Sammy stayed to supper that evening with his chum to partake of some of the mutton. As the meat was brought to the table, the native servant told the family that this was one of many sheep which had been offered in sacrifice to the heathen gods the previous day. Sammy shivered. If he ate that meat, it would seem to him as though he were again in the power of those gods, and that he was once more bowing down to the images. He looked at John to see what his friend would do. John knew that there was only one God, and that he would be able to eat the meat without any such distressed feeling about it as was manifest in Sammy's face.

But he also knew how terrible it would be if Sammy should be tempted to worship idols again; so he said, "Mother, for Sammy's sake I do not want to eat this mutton. Will you please let us have some of that cold beef which is in the cupboard?"

The conduct of the Christian is to be governed by the law of love — love toward God and love toward his fellow-men. Since we are one with Christ, we must seek in all things to glorify Him (Matt. 5:16; John 15:8; 1 Cor. 6:20; Col. 3:17; 1 Pet. 4:11). Since we are united by spiritual ties to other believers, we must seek their good (Rom. 15:1-3).

#### DAILY BIBLE READINGS

June 23—Drinking no wine .....	Jer. 35
June 24—Wine is a mocker .....	Prov. 20
June 25—Wine biting like a serpent .....	Prov. 23:23-35
June 26—Following strong drink .....	Isa. 5:8-24
June 27—Daniel's abstinence .....	Dan. 1
June 28—The royal law .....	Jas. 2
June 29—The law of love .....	Gal. 6

#### SUGGESTED HYMNS

Standing by a purpose firm. Onward, Christian soldiers!  
Yield not to temptation. Christian, seek not yet repose.  
Sound the battle-cry! Oft in sorrow, oft in woe.

## 2 VOLUMES OF AUTHORITATIVE INFORMATION

(642 pages) of the Doctrines and Practices of the Roman Catholic Church from Official Documents—  
Canon Law, Papal Encyclicals, Decrees of Councils, Teachings of Cardinals, Bishops, and "Saints".

### ALL FOR TWO DOLLARS

THESE ARE 2 AUTHORITATIVE DESK-BOOKS OF READY REFERENCE

for Ministers, Lawyers, Teachers, Public Men in general, and all Protestants who desire to be able readily to answer any question relating to the Papacy.

Many-volume encyclopaedias would require weeks or months of research to dig out the Papacy's official Decrees, which these thoroughly documented and indexed volumes enable you to find in a few minutes.

**W**E have received hundreds of letters from all parts of Canada, asking questions on various aspects of Roman Catholicism. Many have enquired what books they should buy, by which to inform themselves. Our shelves are well supplied with authoritative works on the question of Romanism. But to answer some questions authoritatively in the words of the Roman Church itself, might require hours of research in historical works and encyclopaedias. Few people have time for such investigations, and not a very large number, perhaps, would know how to go about it. We have, for years, used two books which are practically always on the Editor's desk. One is entitled:

#### "A Manual of Romish Controversy"

by Rev. R. P. Blakeney, D.D., LL.D., Rector and Rural Dean of Bridlington, and Canon of York. The other, by the same author, is entitled,

#### "Popery in Its Social Aspect; Being a Complete Exposure of the Immorality and Intolerance of Romanism"

We have long desired to be able to put these two books in the hands of Protestant ministers, and, indeed, of Protestants generally, and, were it possible, into the hands of Roman Catholics as well. Were we rich, we would publish them in such numbers as would enable us to give them away by the millions. Lacking such resources, we could only obtain them at the lowest possible price. But, alas, during the war they were completely out of print, nor could they be republished in England for want of paper. We, therefore, obtained special permission from The Hope

Trust, Edinburgh, to republish these books in Canada. This we have done. They are well bound in cloth boards, the volumes being different in colour so as to be easily distinguishable on the bookshelf.

Almost every important question relating to the doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church may be answered from one of these books. They are well indexed, and thoroughly documented. There is nothing like letting the Roman Catholic Church speak for itself.

These books would be invaluable as a Bibliography, the seeing authorities cited would afford some guidance in the purchase of some books, that is, of course, if the books quoted could be obtained. But for the busy man, the pastor, or teacher, or other earnest Protestant, faced with an important question relating to any one of the seven sacraments, the decisions of the Councils, notably the Council of Trent, the writings of the Fathers, and the encyclicals of the Popes, it is of great advantage to have a condensed encyclopaedia on one's desk, books, by the way, which are small enough to be conveniently dropped in one's bag when going away from home.

We are anxious to see these books circulated by the tens of thousands. We have had plates made, and our first edition of each volume is somewhat limited. We hope to be obliged to publish many editions. We suggest these two volumes should be in every Protestant home, in the desk of every Protestant teacher, and in the desk of every Protestant of every sort, who has an office. This Editor has two libraries, one in his office, and one in his home. They are not duplicates of each other, and it happens, not infrequently, when we want a certain book at home, we learn that it is on a shelf in the office; and when one is

wanted in the office, it is often on the shelf at home. For that reason we have obtained duplicates wherever we can. For instance, we have two sets of the Catholic Encyclopaedia of sixteen large volumes, one set in the office, and one set at home.

We suggest that parents should present their children each with these two books, that they may be informed as to what Roman Catholicism is. We suggest that, where possible, the head of a family should buy one for his home, and another for his office, or the teacher, one for his home, and one for his school-desk, so as to have it always available whenever any question is asked. To be able to turn in a moment to an authoritative Roman Catholic pronouncement on these various subjects is of great advantage to anyone.

**Only One Dollar Each Volume**

Now as to the cost: it is difficult to obtain material in these days. But we believe the Lord made it providentially possible, so that we were able to bind these books in good cloth boards so that they will last, and to offer them at the small price of \$1.00 per volume. If we were in the book business, to make money, we should charge at least \$2.00 each; but we would far rather sell two books to two people for \$2.00, than one book to one person for \$2.00.

We invite all our readers to help us circulate this book by buying a copy. All the labour, in its reproduction, outside of the printing, is the Editor's contribution to the cause of Protestant education. We suggest that ministers having procured a copy for themselves, should urge their people to buy copies.

In the course of a week or ten days we propose to send an announcement of this book to all the members of THE

PROTESTANT LEAGUE in Canada, but in the meantime we ask such readers of THE GOSPEL WITNESS as may also belong to the PROTESTANT LEAGUE, to order immediately. We suggest that every Branch of THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE also should endeavour to get these two books into the hands of every member of the LEAGUE. If this is done, there will be no excuse for any LEAGUE Member, who is able to speak at all, refusing to prepare addresses on the Romish question. These books might be made text-books for classes under the supervision of PROTESTANT LEAGUE Branches.

Some of our readers may be able to think of other means whereby this book can be circulated. We solicit the co-operation of everyone in this great enterprise.

If, as we confidently expect, this venture should prove a complete success, so as to enable us to pay for the cost of reproducing the book, we shall endeavour to do the same with other books of importance.

On this page of THE GOSPEL WITNESS there will be found, in addition to THE GOSPEL WITNESS subscription form, an order form for these two books. You may order one or both. We should like you to order both, and we will send either, or both, postpaid for \$1.00 each. Let us hear from you immediately.

In order that you may not feel that you are being asked to buy the proverbial "Pig in a poke", something you have not seen, we are publishing in this issue facsimiles of three pages from each of these books—one page of the index, to give an idea of how completely it is indexed, and two pages of the subject matter of each book. We confidently expect that the present edition will be exhausted in a few weeks. If it is, we shall publish another; but if you delay, you might have to wait until a second edition comes off the press. Therefore we advise that you order at once.

**ORDER FORM**

THE GOSPEL WITNESS,  
130 Gerrard St. E., Toronto 2.

1. Please send to address below postpaid for one dollar, which find enclosed, one copy of "Blakeney's Manual of Romish Controversy", bound in cloth boards.
2. Also, one copy of "Popery in Its Social Aspect; Being a Complete Exposure of the Immorality and Intolerance of Romanism" in similar binding for one dollar, which find enclosed.

(If you want only one of the above, cross out the one not wanted, and enclose \$1.00; if you want both, let both stand, and enclose \$2.00.)

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

**THE GOSPEL WITNESS**

**"The Gospel Witness" with copy of "The Priest, The Woman and The Confessional" by Father Chiniquy, to any address postpaid—\$2.00**

**ORDER FORM**

THE GOSPEL WITNESS,  
130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto 2, Canada.

Please find enclosed \$\_\_\_\_\_ for which send

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_