

The Gospel Witness and Protestant Advocate

Authorized as Second Class Mail. Post Office Department, Ottawa

Vol. 27, No. 31

130 Gerrard St. E., TORONTO, NOVEMBER 25, 1948

Whole Number 1384

Shall We Live for Now, or By and By?

THE majority of pulpits have little to say about Heaven or Hell—in fact they have more to say about Time than about Eternity, and about things “visible” which are “temporal”, than about “the things which are not seen (which) are eternal”.

Even that which would pass as evangelical orthodoxy is often guilty of a misplaced emphasis. The Modernist talks about social service, and emphasizes the profitability of godliness in the life that now is. The Millennialist also places his emphasis upon the “visible” and the “material”; and exults in the prospect of an earthly Elysium soon after an “any moment” rapture. Paul’s emphasis about departing and being with Christ, “which is far better”, about being “absent from the body and present with the Lord”, is seldom heard but at funeral services. Modern preaching knows little about the emphasis of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The heroes memorialized there confessed that they were “pilgrims and strangers”; they “looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God”. They confessed plainly that they sought a city, “that is, an heavenly”.

The writer of Hebrews does not discourse on a geographical Mount Zion, nor an earthly Jerusalem: he says, “Ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels”; while John, in The Revelation tell us of seeing “the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven”.

Some may object that that emphasis upon the future dates the dividends of godliness as being payable at too remote a time. Not at all! Death is all about us, and anyone who has reached even middle life, knows how rapidly the calendar passes out of date, and necessitates a new one.

Nor do people argue thus foolishly in matters of insurance. They pay premiums on policies that can yield them no returns for twenty years. But they have the promise of protection now, and if death should be postponed, of a capital sum by and by. And in the last analysis that is about the only way we can live as

Christians. We are beset with difficulties. All the plans of life may go awry. The way of the wicked prospers; and sometimes it seems as though it did not pay to be godly. If the rewards of godliness must be paid daily, there is nothing in Christianity, for in any practical, tangible, way, such rewards are long delayed; and if we lose our sense of perspective, we shall become impatient waiting for pay-day, and shall cast away our confidence.

What Christians need in our day is not “the new look”, but the old look, and the long look: eyes that are able to see “the King in His beauty”, and “the land that is very far off”. We must be willing to sow, and await the harvest. We must be willing to work, and wait for pay-day. In the midst of what seems to be nothing but confusion, perhaps a confusion that makes for disappointment and pain, only the faith that looks beyond the veil, can enable us to say, “we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose.”

Prayer is not always answered with the speed of a telegraphic message. If we demand that the promises of God find immediate, visible, tangible, fulfilment, as a condition of our continuance as Christians, we shall be tempted to limit God to the rise and set of sun, and the passing of the tale of the years; and we shall count God to have been slack concerning His promises. He will always seem so until a perspective habit of outlook keeps in perpetual remembrance the principle that “one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day”.

God’s time is the best time for everything: and in His own time we shall see the finished pattern, which has been woven into the warp and woof of life, which the Divine Weaver has superintended with infinite skill, and wisdom.

“The threads our hands in blindness spin,
No self-determined plan weaves in;
The shuttle of the unseen powers
Marks out a pattern not as ours.”

IS FREEDOM A ROMAN CATHOLIC MONOPOLY?

If an inquiring reporter were to stop an American citizen on the street and ask him whether freedom of worship was a privilege extended only to Roman Catholics or whether freedom of worship was a privilege extended to all creatures of God, whether they be Roman Catholic, Protestant Christian, Jewish, Mohammedan, that American citizen would not hesitate one second before replying that the privilege was extended to all regardless of creed.

It would come, then, as a distinct shock to that American citizen to learn, from the horse's mouth, so to speak, that the Roman Catholic Church does not agree with him. Here, in these United States, we take freedom of worship as a matter of course. We know, generally, that there does exist religious persecution in other countries. We know that in Spain, Mexico, Argentina, etc., Protestants have a pretty rough time of it. We know that in the countries under Communist control, religion is discouraged. *But*, do we know that Rome, too, has plans for world domination and that those plans include the suppression of all religious theology other than the Roman Catholic?

We don't! So, Brother and Sister American citizen, prepare yourself for a shock!

Father F. Cavalli, in an article entitled, "The Conditions of the Protestants in Spain", printed in a recent issue of the official periodical of the Society of Jesus (Jesuits), *La Civiltà Cattolica*, has this to say about religious freedom:

"The Roman Catholic Church, convinced through its divine prerogatives, of being the only true church, must demand the right to freedom for herself alone, because such a right can only be possessed by truth, never by error. As to other religions, the church will certainly never draw the sword, but she will require that by legitimate means they shall not be allowed to propagate false doctrine. Consequently, in a state where the majority of the people are Catholic, the church will require that legal existence be denied to error, and that if religious minorities actually exist, they shall have only a *de facto* existence without opportunity to spread their beliefs.

"If, however, actual circumstances, either due to government hostility or the strength of the dissenting groups, makes the complete application of this principle impossible, then the (Catholic) church will require for herself all possible concessions, limiting herself to accept, as a minor evil, the *de jure* toleration of other forms of worship.

"In some countries, Catholics will be obliged to ask full religious freedom for all, resigned at being forced to co-inhabit where they alone should rightfully be allowed to live . . .

" . . . Hence arises the great scandal among Protestants, who tax the Catholics with refusing to others freedom and even *de jure* toleration, in all places where they are in the majority, while they lay claim to it as a right when they are in the minority . . . The church cannot blush for her own want of tolerance, as she asserts it in principle and applies it in practice."

And there you have it. *Read the foregoing excerpts again and again and again until you almost know them by heart.* And then, recall the last time you heard

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 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

one of the Roman hierarchy speak of freedom and liberty. It will teach you that Communism is not the only totalitarian ideology we must guard against. Equally menacing, is the totalitarian ideology of the Vatican.

So adept at double talk are the apologists of Rome, we would wager that not 5% of the Roman Catholic adherents know of this Roman policy.

From *The American Protest.*

WHAT DOES MR. ST. LAURENT THINK ABOUT A CANADIAN REPUBLIC?

THE Liberal Party organ in Quebec City, *Le Soleil*, a few weeks ago concluded an article on its editorial page in words which we translate as follows:

"In these circumstances, together with Ireland, while waiting for India and South Africa to follow their example, Canadians would do well to realize their desire for independence in proclaiming the Republic of Canada. Under this title, they would then be free to decide in what measure their interest would lie in making multilateral treaties with the greater and smaller democracies of the new world."

The real significance of the above editorial expression is not to be found in the idea expressed, for this dream of a French and Roman Catholic Republic on the banks of the St. Lawrence is nothing new in Quebec. Hitherto the dream has been represented as the brain-child of nationalistic extremists, but *Le Soleil* has been, and we presume still is, the Liberal Party organ in the City of Quebec. And Mr. St. Laurent, upon whom Mr. King's political mantle has fallen, sits for one of the ridings of this ancient city, and was supported by this very paper that now declares for a Canadian Republic. We cannot help but wonder whether *Le Soleil* has changed its opinion on this matter or whether Mr. St. Laurent has changed his.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

The Ground of the Full Assurance of Faith

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, November 21st, 1948
(Stenographically Reported)

"Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth.

"Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us."—Romans 8:33, 34.

I CAN conceive of nothing that could occasion greater anxiety than for one to be uncertain respecting his eternal destiny. We may be uncertain on many lesser matters. If a man feels that his position in life, his means of livelihood, is not secure, he would naturally be troubled. Sometimes considerations of health cause anxiety. Sometimes one's relation to his friends. Sometimes there are domestic cares which irritate and fret the soul. But all such considerations are relatively unimportant in comparison with the greater matter of the soul's acceptance before God. The all-important consideration should be, surely, whether all is right between the soul and its Maker.

I propose this evening to try, through the exposition of God's word, to minister somewhat to the comfort of such as believe; while at the same time I hope to make the way of salvation plain to those who may, at this moment be without the pale.

I.

To begin with, "GOD'S ELECT" HAVE MANY ACCUSERS. There are many who lay charges against "God's elect". Sometimes there is an *inner voice*, a conscience awakened, that stings almost like a serpent, and the man becomes aware of his own personal unworthiness in the sight of God. The sins which he has committed, and an inherent sinfulness, all cry out against him. Sometimes, perhaps, he is led to wonder whether it is possible for such dire offences as his, to be forgiven. It is true that we see less than we could desire, of such deep conviction of sin, and such contrition of heart as ought to accompany it. But still there are those who, though they may say nothing to anyone else, carry within their breasts an accusing monitor that sometimes disturbs their peace.

Sometimes the accusations of a guilty conscience are intensified by an *unbelieving heart*. How often we have struggled with people who seemed really desirous of being freed from sin's entanglements! And yet every passage from the word of God, quoted in their favour, was wrested by "an evil heart of unbelief" from its context, and used for their further condemnation, as though they were determined not to be comforted. This, I say, is very often so.

And then, of course, there is the great "accuser". One of the titles given him in Holy Writ, is "the accuser of the brethren". He is prosecutor before the throne, the one who accuses us before God day and night, pleading against our being forgiven, against any remission of our sins. What an adversary he is! How implacably hostile he is to the human soul, even in its most contrite moods.

Even when it would fain cast itself upon the divine mercy, he knows no mercy in his pleadings against its redemption. How often have we, ourselves, found that to be so? and perhaps never have we been more conscious of his accusations than when we, ourselves, have approached the Mercy Seat, and sought forgiveness. (This enemy of the souls of men would fain drive the seeking soul to despair by his vigorous assaults.

But there are other accusers of "God's elect". Even *the world* is not friendly to us, but sometimes very critical of our profession, and would fain undermine our faith by its mockeries, because we are not what we ought to be. You have had it said to you, I dare say: "A fine Christian you are! Surely you ought to be ashamed to make a profession of religion, living as you live!" Of course, they see through prejudiced eyes, and make us out to be far, far worse than we are exteriorly—no one could make us blacker than we are by nature in God's sight. Yes, many condemn "God's elect". I received a letter a few days ago telling me of some kind of campaign in Ottawa, and of their endeavours to secure meeting places. Among other places they applied to a theatre. The manager was willing to let the theatre on certain terms, but with one strict provision that "Dr. Shields should not be among the speakers"! I don't know the theatre, nor the manager's name, but somehow he had heard about me; and I am sure he would lay a good many charges against "God's elect". "If ye were of the world, the world, would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." I am speaking of "God's elect"; not of mere nominal Christians, hail-fellow-well-met with the world, the flesh, and the devil, one who goes to church on Sunday, and forgets all about it until next Sunday morning. That kind of religion will not be much assaulted. But if, with all our weaknesses and failures, we really, sincerely, endeavour to follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth, we shall not be without accusers, not without those who will seek to condemn God's elect. And I suppose just because we are so weak, frail, so supersensitive, such poor soldiers, I suppose these mosquito bites bother us sometimes. There are times when we don't mind. But there are other occasions when it is just a little bit troublesome, and one could almost wish that he could have a chance of meeting with someone who would say something nice about him. Did you ever feel like that? I have. A lady once said to me, "I really believe you would rather have people say nasty things about you than nice things." I said, "Not at all;

but I have become somewhat inured to the nasty things—I have to be, in order to live." "Concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against."

Let the case rest there. There are those who would speak in condemnation of "God's elect", and you need not expect that you will be exempt from their accusations.

II.

But what of it? AFTER ALL "IT IS GOD"—NOT THEY, BUT GOD—"THAT JUSTIFIETH". The meaning really is that, ultimately, in the court of final appeal God is the Judge; and the important thing is that you and I should stand well with Him. It will not matter very much what the devil says about us, nor what his servants say about us; we shall be able to survive their criticisms and their condemnations: but it is important that we should know what God thinks about us. You remember Paul's saying, "With me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment (or day). Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who will both bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts." The Apostle Paul said, in effect, "I expect to be misjudged." This is man's day. As our Lord said to His enemies, "This is your hour, and the power of darkness." So, said Paul, "I am indifferent; by God's grace I am enabled to be indifferent to the temporal judgments of man. I am living for another day when the Lord shall come, and will make manifest the secret counsels of the heart."

My dear friends, you and I must seek grace so to do—to live for by and by; and in the meantime to be sure that we have consciences void of offence toward God. After all, "It is God that justifieth". "Who is he that condemneth"—as though one would say, "As long as I have standing before God, as long as I am sure that God is on my side, I am measurably, so far as it is humanly possible to be so, indifferent to human criticism." It is a great achievement to rise above the babel voices that cry out against "God's elect". Ah, yes! only the grace of God can deliver us from the scorpion stings of those evil tongues, which make us to feel the wounds of "sharp arrows of the mighty, and coals of Jupiter". What of it? "It is God that justifieth." Are you 'justified' before God? Am I?

Do you find yourself interested in legal procedures? I confess I do. I am interested in reading the arguments presented, not all of them, but if there should be an able counsel, with a difficult case, I like to see what he makes of it. I like to follow the argument for the prosecution, and the defence. Sometimes after the counsel's submission, and his examination of witnesses, and then at last his summary of the evidence, and his presentation of the case to the court, you say to yourself, "That man will certainly be condemned." But if you were in the court, I expect you would be looking toward the Bench, carefully scrutinizing the countenance of the judge. If he is a good judge you would learn nothing at all. You would not have the remotest idea which side he was on, because, as a matter of fact, he is on the side of justice, and he is there to determine where the wrong lies, and how justice shall be administered. So he sits with impassive countenance, giving no indication at all of his response, either to the prosecution, or the defence, except as he may interrupt to ask the counsel a question, for the further elucidation of his argument.

The case goes on. Whatever may be said of the spectators in the court, the accused and the counsel for the

defence, and the prosecution, are supremely interested in what is going on in the mind of that man who sits on the Bench; and, in a jury case, what is going on in the minds of those men, who, on the basis of facts submitted, are to return their verdict. Therefore, how important it is to remember that "It is God that justifieth". His is the last word. He will pronounce the sentence.

But ours is not a jury case. It is He who will say whether the prisoner at the bar is "Guilty!" or "Not Guilty!" Then, "who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect. It is God that justifieth." More particularly I shall try to tell you in a moment how He justifieth. I merely emphasize now the principle that the final decision is with the Judge.

III.

WHAT IS THE ARGUMENT HERE? "It is Christ that died." What of it? Why did He die? "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures." "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." By whose decree? You will remember Peter said, "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." They were the wicked instruments of His-crucifixion; but His death had a far, far profounder significance than those who accomplished it ever dreamed. This was "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world"; "It pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand."

The death of Christ was no accident, He "verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you." Christ is set forth to be "a propitiation through faith in His blood." What for? "To declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." The cross of Christ proclaims the righteousness of God. If righteousness had come by the law, then Christ had died in vain. If there had been any other way by which a soul could be redeemed, Christ had never died. That is what the scripture says. Therefore we conclude that the death of Christ, the cross of Christ, the instrument of the curse, "Being made a curse for us", *the death of Christ is the divine appraisal of the extent of our indebtedness to the divine law.* The death of Incarnate Deity in our behalf, I say, represents the divine estimate of what you and I were due to pay.

Let me make it personal. Suppose I were heavily, almost incalculably, indebted to someone; and some rich friend should undertake to effect my redemption, my deliverance, by the payment of my debt. He comes to me, and says, "Now, how much do you owe?" "Well, so much." "Anything else?" At last I reach the end of my recollection, and I say, "So far as I know that is the whole sum. But I don't know whether my creditor will accept that, or not. I think perhaps you had better ask him how much I owe him. He knows." We go together, and my friend says to my creditor, "How much does this man owe?" He opens his books, and turns over page after page, balance after balance, until at last he comes to a colossal sum total. "He owes so much." My friend turns to me, and says, "That is a good deal more than you estimated." "Yes, I was afraid, sir, that it would

be, and that is why I thought the only safe procedure was to ask my creditor what he had against me in his books." Then my friend says, "Is that all? If that amount is paid, will this man be free? My creditor says, "Yes; that is the total amount. You pay that, and I shall have no claim against him."

How much do we owe? The cross of Christ is God's answer: "It is Christ that died." But is that an accurate appraisal of our indebtedness? Might there be something left over?

I wonder if there is any Roman Catholic friend here tonight. Let me speak to you most kindly. Do you know what your church teaches? It teaches that when Jesus Christ died for your sins He died to atone for all your natural sinfulness, for original sin, all sins inherent in you, or committed by you up to the time of your baptism, though you were baptized in infancy. But at baptism, and by baptism, the merit of Jesus Christ, the value of His death, was applied to you for the remission of your sins. What about the sins committed after baptism? Ah, you will have to pay for those yourself, by your prayers, your penances, your masses, your self-mortifications; and then at last, when you have been given extreme unction, and are dismissed into the other world, you will still have to pay what is left, in purgatory. You yourself must atone for all sins committed after baptism. Well, if that were so, when Christ died, the great Judge did not take full account of your sins. He turned some pages, and said, "That will atone for that. But here are pages, and pages, more that you will have to make atonement for yourself." There is no truth in that, my friends: "The blood of Jesus Christ (God's) Son cleanseth us from all sin"; "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." That is the gospel. One arm of that cross stretches back to the beginning of life, and the other forward to the Judgment Seat, and between, and beneath its atoning shadow every sin is forgiven and cancelled. That is God's appraisal of your debt. Therefore, saith the Apostle: "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died."

IV.

Is that all? No; "It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again." The grave is empty. The prisoner has served his sentence. The jailor has thrown wide the door. Now I am free. The debt is paid, and there is a path of light leading up through the gates of pearl to a place at the right hand of God, where my Substitute, Who bore my sin in His own body on the tree, and Who, knowing He had paid the last farthing of my indebtedness, cried, "It is finished!", and gave up the ghost. It was not possible that He should be holden of death. Why? Because He had paid the penalty. God had not been just had He suffered His Holy One to see corruption; hence He came forth in the power of His resurrection, still my Representative, still my Substitute, ascended to the right hand of God, and there I am in the Person of my Redeemer.

Now who is going to condemn me? "Who is he that condemneth?" Did you ever have a bill rendered to you the second time? You were certain you had paid that bill. There must be a mistake somewhere. You go to the place quite proudly with your receipt. "You rendered that account?" "Yes." "I am not going to pay it." "You are not?" "No, sir." "Why?" "Because I have already paid it, and here is the receipt you gave."

"I expect you are right. There must have been a clerical error somewhere. Sorry! We shall tear up this account. There is nothing against you." Listen: He blotted out "the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross"—putting the bill on file—paid!

"Whence, then, these fears and unbelief,
Since God the Father put to grief
His spotless Son for me?
Can He, the Righteous Judge of men
Condemn me for that load of sin
Which, Lord, was laid on Thee?"

"Since Thou hast my discharge procured,
And freely in my place endured
The whole of wrath divine,
Payment God will not twice demand,
First from my bleeding Surety's hand,
And then again at mine."

What have you to say about that? "It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again" Who is my Receipt. There are the marks of the nails in His hands and feet, the marks of the crown of thorns about His brow, and the mark of the spear thrust in His side, a "Lamb as it had been slain", but now living again—a heavenly proof that my sins are paid for, and all atoned for.

But that is not all. Let me tell you a personal story that illustrates my point:

Some years ago I had to do in what we now call "the Old Convention", Forward Movement. It was my lot to organize it in two Provinces. I will not go into the details. We set out to get three hundred thousand dollars, and instead we obtained about six hundred and seventeen thousand dollars, more than double our objective. Years later, because of our stand for this Book that same Old Convention put us out. They passed a resolution one morning saying that we were no longer eligible to send delegates to the Convention. That year we had not given what we had given before, but even that year our contributions were somewhere between ten and eleven thousand dollars. They had formerly been thirty thousand dollars, or so. But we had ceased our giving to certain objects because we could not support the Modernism of McMaster University, and some of the Boards. However, they passed their resolution, and it was declared carried by the Chair, just as the bells were ringing twelve o'clock. So we walked out—we had no right to go back. I was not greatly disturbed, in fact I told the Convention that I reckoned it the highest honour that I had ever received, or ever hoped to receive thus to be treated on the ground of our loyalty to the word of God. Some others who had stood with us, had not been excluded. They were content to exclude Jarvis Street. One man said, "Shoot the leader, and the rest of them will go home and behave themselves." So the others were permitted to remain in the Convention. I was not. After a later session of the Convention, a friend called me by telephone, and said, "This afternoon someone raised the question as to whether all subscriptions to The Forward Movement were paid." The Forward Movement Fund had been closed about seven years before. But the treasurer, or the man who had been treasurer, took two cards out of his pocket, and said, "There are two subscriptions not yet paid." "Whose are they?" "Dr. and Mrs. Shields." Some said, "We do not believe that is true." I said, "I know it is not true. My subscription, and that of my wife, were paid, but whether I can prove it or not, I do not know." I said to Miss Stoakley in the office, "Dig

into your archives, and see what you can find, while I go home to look." I got into my car, and went off home. In those days I was about eight hours out of the twenty-four on the train, travelling fifty thousand miles a year. We were not even settled in the house in which we lived. There was a study; and off the study an alcove, with a curtain drawn across it. I had not had time to unpack, and much of my stuff was just piled up in that alcove. As I went upstairs I asked the Lord to help me find those cancelled vouchers. I said, "I don't know, Lord, where to look. It is seven years ago." However, I went up to my study, and I said, "Let me see. What is behind that curtain?"—it was not an "iron curtain" fortunately. As I pulled the curtain aside, the first thing I came upon was a basket full of cancelled cheques. I said, "I wonder!" I picked out a bunch of cheques, and looked at the date. It was about the date I wanted. I leafed them over, and about the fifth cheque down, there was my cancelled cheque.

I hurried back to the office. Miss Stoakley said, "Here is the record, with a receipt bearing the signature of this accuser, the treasurer, that he had received the money." There was someone waiting to take my cancelled cheque to the Convention. They hurried off to the Convention. Mr. Urquhart, former Mayor of Toronto, was one of our friends. He rose to a question of privilege, and said, "I have a statement here, over the signature of this man, showing that this amount was paid, and here is the cancelled cheque bearing Dr. Shields' signature."

Someone expressed an apology. But in the Year Book for that day, there is an account of the accusation made in the morning, and the account of the afternoon session says that "Mr. Urquhart presented some cheques that were 'said' to prove that the debt had been paid." And there it stands.* Perhaps I may as well let it go into the record now to be read by a few thousand people, to show you how bitter, and how untrue Modernism and Modernists can be. But you see I could not present my cancelled cheque: I had to have an intercessor, an advocate; and when he presented my cheque it was satisfactory to everyone, except that the Secretary meanly misrepresented it in the record for the generations to come, stating it was "said to be proof"—It *did* prove! But I really did not care "tuppence" about it. I was rather amused about the whole affair. But I don't want to be misrepresented up there. I want Someone else to represent me there. When the books are opened, and we are judged out of the things written in the books, what then? The accuser will be there at the Great Assize. How shall I stand there? "It is Christ that died." He paid it all. May I reverently say there is the cancelled cheque? He,

*The above was quoted from memory. The actual minute in *The Baptist Year Book, 1927-28*, page 43, is as follows:

"In the discussion on the Forward Movement Report, reference was made to the pledges of Dr. and Mrs. T. T. Shields, which were said to have been unpaid, September, 1921.

"Later in the session Rev. B. W. Merrill rose to a question of privilege, and expressed regret that names had been mentioned in the discussion of the Forward Movement Report, and expressed deep appreciation of the service that Dr. T. T. Shields rendered in that campaign.

"At the afternoon session Mr. Urquhart, on a question of privilege, produced a cheque and receipt which were said to include the pledges referred to in the Forward Movement discussion in the morning. The explanation was accepted."

Incarnate Grace, stands before the throne to say, "Deliver him from going down to the pit: I have found a ransom." Here it is. And all the devils in hell could not effect my conviction then, could they? "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth." How does He justify? By the death of Christ, by the payment of my debt, by the shedding of that blood, by the imputation of His perfect righteousness. I have before said to you that the blood of Incarnate Deity was the wealth of the whole universe in solution. Nothing was left when He died, and rose again, to plead His own cause, and say, "That sinner's debt has been paid by Me." Thus the final verdict is given in the Supreme Court of the universe, from which there is no possibility of appeal.

Did you come in here this evening without the assurance of salvation, but perhaps, "hoping" that you might "see the end of a praying life"? May the hope be turned to faith in Jesus Christ! Behold Him working out your righteousness! As I said last Sunday night, Behold Him atoning for your sin upon the cross; delivered for your offences, behold Him raised again for your justification. And then remember that He is seated, as your Representative, already in heaven at God's right hand, making intercession for you. Does not that make salvation secure? Do you not feel a little better? Are you not a little bit surer? Do you see this tremendous truth? Then if you do, you will be able to follow on with what the Apostle said:

"Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long: we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, the last enemy—"nor life"—life is full of perils—"nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present"—things of to-day—"nor things to come"—experiences of our to-morrows—"nor height, nor depth"—Anything else?—"Nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Do you not feel like saying, "Hallelujah!", "Amen!" to that? I do.

Let us pray:

We thank Thee, O Lord, for this sure foundation of which we have been speaking, so much surer than we can say, more abiding than we can describe. Oh, how good Thou art; Thou great God, the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Thou hast had compassion upon such sinners as we are.

We thank Thee for the prospect of eternal residence in the celestial city. We thank Thee for the assurance that we shall be given all eternity in which to praise Thee; and we shall need it, for Oh, eternity's too short, to utter all Thy praise.

Help us, who are Thy children, this evening perhaps a little more strongly than ever before to rejoice in hope of the glory of God.

If there is anyone in this service who has been uncertain, we pray that such an one may have such light from heaven, and such help of the Spirit, as to be able, boldly, to step out into absolute eternal certitude, for Jesus' sake, Amen.

Now we shall sing a hymn that has the whole gospel in it:

"Come, ye sinners, poor and wretched,
Weak and wounded, sick and sore;
Jesus ready stands to save you,
Full of pity, joined with power:
He is able,
He is willing: doubt no more.

"Ho! ye needy, come and welcome,
God's free bounty glorify;
True belief, and true repentance,
Every grace that brings us nigh,
Without money,
Come to Jesus Christ and buy.

"Let not conscience make you linger,
Nor of fitness fondly dream;
All the fitness He requireth
Is to feel your need of Him:
This He gives you;
'Tis the Spirit's rising beam.

"Come, ye weary, heavy laden,
Bruised and broken by the fall;
If you tarry till you're better,
You will never come at all:
Not the righteous,
Sinners, Jesus came to call.

"Agonizing in the garden,
Lo! your Saviour prostrate lies!—
Bleeding on the tree behold Him!
Hear Him cry before He dies,
'It is finished!'
Sinner, will not this suffice?

"Lo! the incarnate God, ascended,
Pleads the merit of His blood;
Venture on Him, venture wholly,
Let no other trust intrude;
None but Jesus
Can do helpless sinners good.

"Saints and angels, joined in concert,
Sing the praises of the Lamb;
While the blissful seats of heaven
Sweetly echo with His name:
Hallelujah!
Sinners here may sing the same."

Amen.

JEALOUSY AS TO THE PREACHING ONE HEARS

I warn every one who loves his soul, to be very jealous as to the preaching he regularly hears, and the place of worship he regularly attends. He who deliberately settles down under any ministry which is positively unsound is a very unwise man. I will never hesitate to speak my mind on this point. I know well that many think it a shocking thing for a man to forsake his parish church. I cannot see with the eyes of such people. I draw a wide distinction between teaching which is *defective* and teaching which is thoroughly *false*, between teaching which errs on the negative side, and teaching which is positively unscriptural. But I do believe, if false doctrine is unmistakably preached in a parish church, a parishioner who loves his soul is quite right in not going to that parish church. To hear unscriptural teaching fifty-two days in every year is a serious thing. It is a continual dropping of slow poison into the mind. I think it almost impossible for a man wilfully to submit himself to it, and not take harm. I see in the New Testament we are plainly told to "prove all things", and "hold fast that which is good" (1 Thess., v. 21). I see in the Book of Proverbs that we are commanded to "cease to hear the instruction which causeth to err from the paths of knowledge" (Prov. xix, 27). If these words do not justify a man in ceasing to worship at a church, if positively false doctrine is preached in it, I know not what words can.

—Knots Untied by Bishop J. C. Ryle, p. 451.

SYDNEY PRESBYTERIANS DISAGREE WITH DOCTRINES

SYDNEY, N.S., Nov. 22 (CP).—The Westminster Church here severed connections with the Presbyterian Church of Canada tonight over alleged doctrinal differences, but a statement added that it "intends to remain Presbyterian."

A statement issued following a largely attended congregational meeting said:

"... it was unanimously resolved that the congregation sever its connection with the Presbyterian Church in Canada solely on the grounds that it permits teachings in its colleges that are at variance with the word of God and the Westminster Confession of Faith, and because it refuses to take disciplinary action against certain ministers who deny the Virgin birth of our Lord and His subsequent death on the cross as an atonement for sin.

"And further because it is a member of the World Council of Churches, a council headed and controlled by modernists, who disavow the historic Christian faith.

"And further because budget money, given expressly for the support of our historic faith and its work, is being diverted to help support projects that are permeated with modernism.

"Westminster Church intends to remain Presbyterian and will co-operate with all Christian bodies who hold the verbal plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, the virgin birth of our Lord, His full and proper Deity, His bloodshed on the cross as the only atonement for sin, His physical resurrection from the dead, and His personal return to this earth."

New name of the church, first organized in 1937 by Dr. Alexander Murray, its present pastor, will be Westminster Bible Presbyterian Church (Independent).

"It will prosecute evangelism with accelerated zeal as well as a vigorous foreign mission policy," the statement said.

This was the second such break in the Presbyterian Church in Nova Scotia in the last two years.

Rev. Perry F. Rockwood, former minister at St. James Presbyterian Church at Truro, made similar charges in a series of sermons and was disciplined by an ecclesiastical court.

Rev. Frank Lawson, then moderator of the Halifax-Lunenburg Presbytery, charged that Mr. Rockwood had "made a definite attempt to split the Presbyterian Church."

Mr. Rockwood was convicted by the ecclesiastical court of following a "divisive course" and later resigned from the Presbyterian Church to start the People's Church in Truro.

Rev. Gordon S. Vincent, minister of Halifax's west end Baptist Church, preached in defense of Mr. Rockwood when the Truro minister was reported to have accused Mr. Lawson of denying the virgin birth.

"WHY"

"The Canadian Protestant League"

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

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

130 Gerrard St. East

Toronto 2, Canada

OPEN LETTER TO THE HON. LESLIE BLACKWELL, ATTORNEY-GENERAL, ONTARIO

Dear Mr. Blackwell:

You don't know, doubtless never heard of "Roman Collar" — that, of course, is of little moment. But I was eager to see you once when a certain measure was pending in the Ontario Legislature. However, you were "too busy", or "not at home" or something. Anyway, we've met, shaken hands, and I've said to you that the address you had just delivered in the "Red Feather" campaign was mighty good. It was no sycophantic flattery on my part. In fact, that night I liked your frank open face; your grin was captivating. I rather think that you are a nice chap—apart from politics.

It was quite a jolting joke that Mr. Drew got—I wonder if it afforded you just a tiny smile of satisfaction—when you swept back into your seat in the Legislature and he had the door smartly banged in his face. It was quite a bang, and heard a long way from Queen's Park. By the way, "George" didn't think when he refused to see a deputation on a certain day—you'll remember it!—when a crowd of temperance "fanatics" stormed the sacred precincts of Queen's Park that the outcome would be so disastrous. I was there, and was, I confess, slated with others to interview him. All we wanted was to see if the proposed Bill (The Liquor Licence Act, 1946) which is prefaced by the significant signature, "Mr. Blackwell", could not be amended, discarded, or given a full chance for frank discussion in the Legislature and Province. That Bill, "Leslie", which gave us the Cocktail lounges, thus glamorizing liquor consumption, and other as bad or worse features, hasn't fulfilled the fair promises of less drinking and drunkenness! Look at the statistics from 1946. They cause the least sensitive among us to shiver. None can fully assess the additional alcoholics, murders, poverty, blighted lives, fatal accidents, and ruined businesses, caused by your lamentable Bill. Frankly, I often wonder if some of us, particularly those who make our laws and those who financially profit from them, have any conscience left. Have human beings, especially women and children no right to State protection? Is the income—really *blood money*—from this human wastage the only thing that matters in this mad time? It has just occurred to me also to ask: Should not the profiteers from the sale of alcoholic beverages be put in the same category as the profiteers from marijuana, opium, heroin, cocaine, etc.?

Now, give me a moment before you protest.

How, Brother Blackwell, do they differ in effect? The latter allay sensibility, lull, induce lethargy, profound sleep, convulsions, etc. (Webster's), depending, of course, on the dosage. Does beverage alcohol not have similar and additional effects—such as savagery at times, misjudgments at the wheel of an automobile, abjectness, lack of pride in one's self and appearance, tendencies to lust? One could stretch out the list almost indefinitely. We chase the "dope" sellers with persistence; why let the "booze" sellers go scot free? Worse—heaven help us!—why encourage them, protect them, make grand laws for them? Or, why be brow-beaten by them? Or, why let even \$35,000,000 State profits from the unholy, unclean, and unblushing traffic, blind and manacle us?

Perhaps, Mr. Blackwell, you are surprised at this Open Letter to you—why you should be singled out for such fame. Don't be. I've even had the temerity

to write one to "Joe" Stalin, the ex-divinity student from Georgia (not the U.S.A.). It can be seen now that Joe would not have been a howling success as a priest. Of course I could not say that loudly in Russia. He's quite a lad, pipe and all; in fact, he has stymied the other great powers for months, thinks nothing about bringing near to starvation some 2,000,000 Berliners. Yes, "uncle" Joe and his fourteen bosom pals in the Kremlin, who never "veto" vodka or mighty feasts, must have many a snicker as they raise their brimming cups to the "veto"—thirty-eight of them! My, what an accomplishment!

However, I write you for several reasons. One is that I think that you are going to be the next Premier of Ontario. Pshaw! don't be overly modest. But don't get cocky like Dewey! It won't be for long, that Premiership. I'll venture to tell you why. "George" wasn't good for you politically. You'll have to live down his (and your) liquor legislation, and his favouritism to the Roman Catholics. There are still thousands of Protestants who do not believe in paying for the teaching of Roman doctrines by taxes. And let me tell you quite frankly that when you as Premier try to put a crimp in disbursements for R.C. education (it's the adjective that jars), you'll be dropped like a hot potato. Our friends, on the other side of the ecclesiastical fence, will have no qualms about your political future. In fact, you won't have any, if a solid R.C. vote can beat you. Make no mistake there. Take a look at the Report on Separate School Education by the Council of Churches. It indicates more than you will want to see either in cold or warm print.

You would hardly believe it, Leslie, but I was actually incited to this letter by a policeman. Is that *lèse majesté*? I am not a lawyer, so I don't really know. Anyway, this policeman is really fed up. So are others, but this one quite frankly stated to me that members of a certain Church—need I name it?—were openly and constantly breaking the Lord's Day Act. A Church (rumoured for a considerable time) has been running Sunday evening dances, and charging so much per person, say 50 cents. A more profitable business than Church collections resulted, it is alleged. It is even rumoured that you could get "hard stuff" there if you had a keen sense of smell or . . .

Well, the business finally became too brazen to be ignored longer, and a charge was laid—not under the Lord's Day Act, but under a law that prohibits running a dance hall without a license! When I made inquiry as to why a charge was not made under the former act, the answer was made: "We couldn't get anywhere!" And why? I persisted. The reply was something along this line: The case is laid before the Crown Attorney. It is probably "too hot". It is then sent up to you, and likely as not dropped out of consideration for certain ecclesiastical friends—no "pressure", naturally. Now, I ask, Sir, what policemen ask: WHEN A LAW IS ALLEGEDLY BROKEN, AND CERTAIN EVIDENCE IS ON HAND, WHY SHOULD NOT LOCAL AUTHORITIES BE FREE FROM YOUR VETO? Maybe they are, but some don't seem to think so. Anyway, I suggest that some clarification on your part is necessary.

These, Mr. Blackwell, are perhaps small matters for big men, but for the little fellows—fellows who try to conserve what our fathers have bequeathed to us, these matters are of unquestionable importance. Further,

don't you think that "foreigners", who have found an asylum in this lovely land of ours, with God-fearing and Sabbath-keeping traditions, should either observe the law or be sent back home where they will either keep the law or find themselves facing a rifle squad or the rigours of a concentration camp? And should "religion" be considered at all when the law is broken? These appear reasonable questions, even if a wee bit involved.

You'll be glad to hear that the police made the charge of operating a dance hall without a license (on a Sunday on Church property) stick, and one was refreshed to hear that the Magistrate was firm, and the warning he gave, anent future offences, blunt and to the point. I confess that if I had been in the same position as the offenders (professed Christians), I'd have crawled into the proverbial hole and drawn the hole in after me. We'll see, no doubt, an effort made to get around the law.

I'm sure, Sir, that you are saying that in the last sentence I am not a trifle mean. I don't mean to be. I've learned something from experience. For example, a few years ago Bingo-playing for profit began, that is, profit to help out in charitable ways. It soon became not a little like Big Business. Scores of church halls and other places were hives of Bingo industry. I protested against this gambling mania in the pulpit, wrote letters to the press, went to the chief of the police, interviewed the then Mayor with a copy of the law in my hand. I was rather shocked when the Mayor told me that he had been visited by a R.C. delegation which insisted that law or no law they had rights in this matter. The Mayor obligingly, so he half-laughingly confessed, showed the visitors how they could get around the law and have Bingo! (I'm disposed to be generous; I'll whisper the "secret" to you if you want to make an extra dime or two for Christmas presents). So the law against gambling was/is given the "run around". And it was/is profitable. One who had to do with banking the proceeds from a Bingo joint in a R.C. School told me that it was a poor night when he did not bank from \$450 to \$500! Not bad at all, at all. And all for charity—I wonder. I'd be glad to pay an expert accountant to go over the books just to be sure. Besides, would an inquiry not be in order here? Could the law not be tightened up?

It is rather a long letter, Sir, and you are a busy man. But if it should stir your mental wheels along certain lines, I'd be happy.

I wish you and your family the blessing of God and a very happy Christmas season.

Yours,

ROMAN COLLAR.

GOSPEL WITNESS PUBLICATIONS

(Reprints)

"The Priest, the Woman, and the Confessional", by Father Chiniquy	\$0.75
"The Antichrist—His Portrait and History", By Baron Porcelli	.50
"The Greatest Fight in the World", by C. H. Spurgeon, 64 pages	.25
"Blakeney's Roman Catholic Doctrines Examined", 316 pages	1.00
"Blakeney's Popery in Its Social Aspect", 312 pages	1.00

The Gospel Witness

130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2 - Canada

THE PROBLEM OF QUEBEC

UNDER the title of "The Key to Power", a French-language paper of Montreal, *Le Devoir*, published a leading editorial under last Saturday's date in which it rings the changes on the well-worn theme that Quebec holds the balance of power in Canadian politics. The arrogant tone it employs in naming the price of Quebec's vote will fall with a grating sound on the ears of most voters outside of that province. It may be a matter of pride for Quebecers to feel that they are strong enough to dictate their terms to the political parties, but in the eyes of the rest of the provinces it is the badge of the servitude under which Quebec labours. English-Canadians are convinced that the political unity of Quebec is due to the servile obedience which French-Canadians yield to their priests. Eight provinces are of the opinion that if the people of the ninth province were free to think and to act according to their own lights they would not vote blindly in support of one party. And in truth the solid block which Quebec returns to the House of Commons with monotonous regularity is not the true friend of that province; it advances the interests of the Roman Church but not the true interests of the people of that province. The political strength of Quebec is the same sort of force as is acquired by a gang of boys who stick together through thick and thin and make themselves the terror of the neighbourhood. Inevitably that sort of unity achieves strength for the organization at the expense of the individuals composing it. We believe that the day is coming when Quebec will outgrow its period of adolescence and throw off the yoke of the gang which has exploited it, and when that day comes Quebec will take its place as a member of the Canadian family and no longer act as the bad boy who screams and kicks until he enforces his will on all the other members of the household. Even now there are a great many French-Canadians who exercise their franchise freely and will brook no interference on the part of the priests. If we had sufficiently courageous political leaders to appeal to the people of Quebec over the heads of their local dictators, we are sure that their courage would be rewarded. The priests are not nearly as influential in this "Catholic Province" as they would have us believe, but there are few politicians who are willing to appeal directly to the ordinary voters rather than to palter for power with the Hierarchy.

It will be noted that *Le Devoir* lays special emphasis on the cringing attitude of George Drew who never loses an opportunity of fawning on Quebec even at the expense of swallowing his previous strongly-worded criticisms. It seems to us that we detect a little bit of pride and also a good deal of disdain in the tone with which the Romanist paper notes Mr. Drew's servile appeasement of Québec.

We also note *Le Devoir's* observation that "ten or twenty per cent" of Quebec's voters are nationalists and hold the balance of power in Quebec. This small group, according to the French-language daily, dictates the policy of Quebec parties, which in turn dictate to the rest of Canada. If this is true, how long will English-Canadians stand idly by and allow a little handful of Quebec nationalists to control the Ottawa government? In our opinion, however, there is no such thing as a political party in Quebec, apart from the Roman Catholic Church. Liberals, Conservatives, Union Nationale, these are but tags, almost totally devoid of meaning. When a

crisis comes, there is only one question asked: "What is the interest of the Church? What is the mind of the Hierarchy?" And the priests have various ways of informing the voters what they are expected to do. Truly democratic leaders would dare to go directly to the people, to inform them of the issues, to appeal to their judgment and their sense of righteousness. And on this score French-Canadians would not be found wanting. We could not expect them overnight to throw off an age-long subjection to the voice of their ecclesiastical leaders, but in time they would respond to the reasonable arguments of fair-minded men whose disinterested zeal for truth and justice was proved by their willingness to lose an election for the sake of principle rather than gain it by sacrificing their convictions on the altar of expediency. In the political field the success of the Communists and of the C.C.F. in Quebec is surprising. We have no liking for either one of these parties, but they have at least had the courage to appeal directly to the voters of Quebec, and while they have not swept the country by any means they have gained much support.

It is already apparent that neither Mr. St. Laurent nor Mr. Drew dare to do anything else than follow meekly in the footsteps of Mr. King's policy of appeasement. They both give every indication of being the cheap sort of politician who desires a sure and easy victory by mollifying the Hierarchy in order to win a solid block from Quebec. The following editorial from the Romanist journal makes clear to both of them the conditions on which they may expect to win favour. We have translated part of this arrogant editorial in order to inform the rank and file of both Liberal and Conservative parties throughout the rest of Canada what price their leaders are expected to pay for Quebec's support.—W.S.W.

THE KEY TO POWER

Quebec Will Decide the Existence of the Next Government of Canada

Translated from *Le Devoir*, November 20, 1948
THE government of Canada against the will of the French element is an impossibility. It might succeed for a while by having recourse to force, as the Conservatives did it in 1917, but to-day we know where that has led them. French-Canadians hold a grudge tenaciously and for thirty years they have made the Conservatives pay dearly for the arbitrary acts of which they were the victims during the first war. For it was not so much conscription as the brutal manner in which it was decreed and applied which was so sovereignly displeasing to the French element during the first war. To-day experience has taught us that no party can take or keep the power at Ottawa for long without the consent of the French-Canadians.

This truth is even more important for the future.

Three parties will contend at the next federal election with reasonable chances of obtaining a goodly number of members, if not an absolute majority. It can be predicted with almost mathematical certitude that the party which wins will be the one that elects the greatest number of members in Quebec.

The strength of the Canadian Liberal Party since 1897 has been the solid support of Quebec. Twice, Quebec has left the Liberals in the lurch, in 1911 and 1930, and each time they lost the power.

If Mr. St. Laurent manages to hold fifty or sixty seats

in Quebec at the next election, he will have a very good chance of remaining Prime Minister.

But let him lose thirty to forty ridings to Mr. Drew, and the latter will probably take the government, for his position in Ontario seems to be very strong.

As to the C.C.F. it has never succeeded in penetrating Quebec, because it has rarely missed an opportunity of being disagreeable to French-Canadians. For example, its leader, Mr. Coldwell, was the only one to take an ill-tempered attitude in the matter of the French refugees, while Mr. Drew had the skill to hold his tongue and probably to make his followers be silent also.

The C.C.F. will never elect a sufficient number of candidates in the West and in the industrial centres of Ontario to command a majority in the House of Commons. As long as it does not take account of these matters and modify its policy as a result, it will continue to sit on the opposition side.

If Quebec holds the key to the next government, it must not stupidly surrender itself by pure sentiment. It is not a question of blackmail but of justice.

For Quebec has serious cause of complaint against Ottawa. It accuses it of practising a foreign policy too closely tied up with imperial and United States interests, of centralizing the fiscal revenues and social legislation to the detriment of the constitutional rights of the provinces, of adopting a slyly hostile attitude to French-Canadians in the federal civil service.

For some months past the Conservatives have shown an assiduity towards Québec that is almost disturbing. Mr. Drew gives every indication of being fully aware that he will never become Prime Minister of Canada if Quebec closes the door to him; he is prepared to put to sleep the grudge of French-Canadians under a heap of promises and compliments. He never misses an opportunity of saying something pleasant or winning, even if he has to contradict what he has already said. The leader of the opposition at Ottawa does not remember the quarrels of the Prime Minister of Ontario. He is now battling against the decreasing rate of family allowances, while only a few years ago he opposed the allowances, with or without the decreasing rate.

The political advisers of Mr. Drew ought, for the completion of his political education, to teach him that in Quebec there is something else besides the "Blues" and the "Reds" (Conservatives and Liberals). There exists an independent, nationalist element, or of nationalist tendency, which is in the habit of judging political problems apart from preoccupations of party, and which has made and unmade governments according as it has designs on one side or the other. It is this element, representing perhaps ten to twenty per cent. of the vote, which permitted Mr. Duplessis to crush the Liberals last July.

If the Conservatives manoeuvre in such a way as to capture this vote, they will have a chance to carry off an impressive number of ridings. If they fumble, they will repel the floating vote and Mr. Drew's chances in Quebec, and hence in Canada, will be reduced to zero.

Mr. St. Laurent, who has always lived in Quebec, knows all these things. He knows that the good fortune of the federal Liberals in Québec since 1921 is due to the almost constant support of the nationalist element. He also knows that the bad fortune of the provincial Liberals for about fifteen years is attributable, in large part, to the hostility of the nationalist element.

The fact that Mr. St. Laurent bears a French name

will not weigh as heavily as some think. Doubtless each one of us is proud to see a compatriot become the Prime Minister of Canada. But this legitimate pride will not prevent the majority from keeping cool and judging Mr. St. Laurent by his acts and not by his name.

If he gives us a policy that is completely Canadian, if he finds a remedy for the complaints that French-Canadians have against the federal government, he has a good chance of maintaining himself in power.

If he does the opposite, Mr. Drew will trick him out of Quebec and thus trick him out of power.

ROME'S POLITICAL ACTIVITY

ROMAN spokesmen on occasion represent their church as a purely religious institution, though all history and numerous papal statements are opposed to their perversion of the truth. Protestants ought to keep clearly in mind the claims of the pope in civil and political realms.

This sort of doctrine is not merely the dicta of Italian priests but of Canadian and American priests. In further illustration of this we quote the following statement made by that smiling-faced Toronto representative of the Italian pope, Cardinal James McGuigan, who, when speaking at Halifax recently, said the following, according to the report printed in *The Evening Times-Globe* of that city on September 20 last:

"The enemies of the church today would think they had succeeded in their main object if they could confine the church to the sanctuary, allowing her to say her prayers and administer the sacraments while they controlled education and government and all departments of public life. But this would be the defeat of Christ's purpose in setting up the church in this world. Man is a social being and his Christian beliefs must be expressed in his social relations if they are to be effective. There would never have been such a thing as Christian civilization if the church had not been able to make laws and institutions as well as sanctify individuals. Moreover, experience has proved that the confining of the church to the sanctuary is the beginning of the end of all religious liberty."

Do we need to remind our readers that the smiling Irish prelate who made the above assertion grovelled flat on his face before the pope, and that the so-called "Holy Father" took his fingers and shut the mouth of this Canadian citizen, and then opened it again, in token that he would say nothing but what he was commanded by the aforementioned Italian priest?

In English-speaking provinces, the members of the Hierarchy demand that they be given full religious liberty, saying, as did Cardinal McGuigan, that "the confining of the church to the sanctuary is the beginning of the end of all religious liberty." But in Roman Catholic Quebec where the priests have assumed a quasi-omnipotence, they use their power to pass such laws as that which put a Protestant pastor and his helpers in jail for the supposed "crime" of daring to go outside their church building to preach on the street-corner. In Spain the Roman Church will not grant to Protestants the liberty to preach with safety even within the walls of their church buildings. That is to say wherever Rome has sufficient influence to come out of its sanctuaries and control the making of laws and the institutions, she straightway represses all other religions and compels them to confine their activities to their buildings and in the end she denies them even this elemental right.

And yet smooth, oily-tongued advertisements now appearing in our press under Roman Catholic auspices, assure us that it is not true that Roman Catholicism denies to all others the liberty that she asks for herself!

THE NEW CHURCH IN PICTON, ONT.

By Rev. J. H. Watt

I WENT; I saw; I marvelled! How could I help but say, "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes"? Just three or four short years ago a small group of believers, mostly young people, took a definite stand against Modernism and met regularly on their own for fellowship and for the furtherance of the Gospel in the town of Picton. Today, a church composed of 31 members has erected a new church building, and although it is not entirely completed, they are worshipping in part of it.

The zeal of the original group has spread to each new convert and believer who has come into their midst, so that any who see them are amazed at the enthusiasm which permeates the entire body. Their fervour for the Lord, and their determination to do His will were not lessened when the only meeting place available to them was the market building, in reality just a barn, and the upstairs of it at that. Being forced from this place served to make them wait upon the Lord even more earnestly. It was not much encouragement to be refused the use of a number of quite suitable buildings because of their stand. Nor was it encouragement to try to carry on in a large double garage during the summer, which belonged to one of their own members. But if it was the will of God they were happy. The opening to them of a business man's display room was a little better, and for some months they were quite comfortably situated, and although in every way it was not ideal, it was a blessing for which they heartily praised God.

When it seemed definite that God was leading them forward into a building campaign, they looked only unto Him and moved onward. In a most remarkable way people gave, funds came in, building materials were supplied, and the work began. Never did a group of people work more faithfully.

God's man was there at the helm. Mr. E. C. Corbett, a young man with a gripping personality and a winning smile, saved by the grace of God and called and filled for service, is their pastor. He is a real general. At the head of the army he went, digging, hammering, laying blocks, and doing everything that seemed necessary. All this he did besides carrying on a faithful pastoral work of visitation and preparation of sermons. Now he is back in the Toronto Baptist Seminary to complete his course but still is continuing his work in Picton. Yes, he is God's man there. I had the privilege of preaching at the opening services of the new building on Sunday, November 7th, when the lower auditorium was readied for use. At both morning and evening services the place was full and God's presence was felt.

A handful of Bible-loving, zealous believers, led by the Spirit of God and shepherded by a chosen servant of the Lord have established a fine testimony in the town of Picton. Their church to date has cost nearly \$6,000 and when it is completed it will have cost no more than \$8,500. The auditorium will seat about 150 and there will be Sunday-school accommodation for about 150 more. May God so lead His people that this work may be duplicated in North Bay and in scores of other places in Ontario and Quebec.

READ THE GOSPEL WITNESS

WATCH THIS LIST IN NEXT WEEK'S ISSUE

Next week we shall report after the name of each church, the amount contributed for November toward the new building in North Bay

DIRECTORY OF UNION CHURCHES

Alton	Pastor J. W. McKay	Alton, Ont.
Baker Hill	Pastor Robert Mailey	Stouffville, Ont.
Belleville	Pastor Reginald Hussey	Toronto, Ont.
Bobcaygeon	Pastor Elton Britton	Toronto, Ont.
Brantford	Rev. A. C. Whitcombe, B.A.	35 North Park St., Brantford, Ont.
Brownsburg	Rev. G. B. Hicks, B.Th.	Box 198, Dalesville, Que.
Brownsville	Rev. J. K. Yalland	Box 65, Springfield, Ont.
Buckingham	Rev. R. Lawson	Buckingham, Que.
Cannington	Rev. W. W. Fleischer, B.A.	Uxbridge, Ont.
Chatham	Rev. H. Butler	
Churchill	Pastor R. B. Holmes	Toronto, Ont.
Courtland	Pastor Harold Kettle	Toronto, Ont.
Courtright	Pastor W. Midgley	Courtright, Ont.
Dalesville	Rev. G. B. Hicks, B.Th.	Box 198, Dalesville, Que.
Essex	Rev. Fred Wakeling	Essex, Ont.
Fenelon Falls	Rev. R. E. J. Brackstone, B.Th.	Fenelon Falls, Ont.
Fort William	Rev. W. C. Tompkins	213 Dease St., Fort William, Ont.
Green River	Rev. A. J. Heal, M.A.	Whitevale, Ont.
Guelph	Rev. Thos. Guthrie	491 York Rd., Guelph, Ont.
Hamilton		
Stanley Ave.	Rev. C. J. Loney	78 Mountain Ave., Hamilton, Ont.
Victoria Ave.	Rev. John Byers	31 Kensington Ave. S., Hamilton, Ont.
Harriston	Rev. G. H. Pace	Box 14, Harriston, Ont.
Hespeler	Rev. W. L. Hisey, L.Th.	Box 272, Hespeler, Ont.
Kapuskasing	Rev. Chas. McGrath	Box 582, Kapuskasing, Ont.
Kimberley	Pastor Kenneth Cairns	Toronto, Ont.
Kinmount	Rev. Ian MacIntyre	Norland, Ont.
Lachute	Rev. W. H. Britton	Lachute, Que.
Lanark	Rev. Kinsley Cutler	Lanark, Ont.
La Sarre	Mrs. Philippe Hamelin	B.P. 22, La Sarre, Que.
Lavigne	Rev. J. R. Boyd	Box 232, Sudbury, Ont.
Lindsay	Rev. G. W. Searle	43 Melbourne St. W., Lindsay, Ont.
London		
Briscoe St.	Rev. E. S. Kerr	38 Byron Ave., London, Ont.
Central	Rev. S. F. Logsdon	779 Queens Ave., London, Ont.
Malartic	Rev. W. J. Wellington, L.Th.	Box 689, Malartic, Que.
Maple Grove	Mr. Geo. Lanktree, clerk	R.R. 1, Feversham, Ont.
Maple Hill	Pastor William Large	Maple Hill, Ont.
1st Markham	Rev. J. K. Pequegnat, A.B., Th.B.	Box 245, Stouffville, Ont.
Medina	Rev. Melchi Henry	R. R. 6, Hagersville, Ont.
Mitchell Square	Rev. R. D. Guthrie	51 Colborne St. E., Orillia, Ont.
Montreal		
Snowdon	Rev. J. R. Armstrong	5237 Earncliffe Ave., Montreal, Que.
Verdun	Rev. D. C. Harry	1028 Valiquette St., Verdun, Que.
Napanee	Pastor R. C. Cornish	Napanee, Ont.
Niagara Falls	Rev. E. E. Shields	2818 Lundy's Lane, Niagara Falls, Ont.
Noranda	Rev. Murray A. Heron, B.Th.	Box 368, Noranda, Que.
Norland	Rev. Ian MacIntyre	Norland, Ont.
Orangeville	Rev. Harold Charlton	Orangeville, Ont.
Orillia	Rev. R. D. Guthrie	51 Colborne St. E., Orillia, Ont.
Oro West	Mr. Allan Johnson	Hawkestone, Ont.
Ottawa, Calvary	Rev. J. F. Dempster	105 Main St., Ottawa, Ont.
Otterville	Rev. Bruce Hisey	Otterville, Ont.
Picton	Pastor Ellard Corbett	Picton, Ont.
Queensville	Pastor K. R. Penny	Queensville, Ont.
Sarnia	Rev. W. H. MacBain, L.Th.	161 Cameron St., Sarnia, Ont.
Sault Ste. Marie	Rev. Duncan MacGregor, B.Th.	First Baptist Church, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
Sawyerille	Rev. Donald L. Day	Sawyerille, Que.
Scotch Line	Rev. G. W. Searle	43 Melbourne St. W., Lindsay, Ont.

Springfield	Rev. J. K. Yalland	Box 65, Springfield, Ont.
St. Amedee	Mr. McQuaig, clerk	R.R. 2, St. Andre Avallon, Que.
St. Catharines	Rev. P. B. Loney	193 Geneva St., St. Catharines, Ont.
Stouffville	Rev. J. K. Pequegnat, A.B., Th.B.	Box 245, Stouffville, Ont.
Sudbury	Rev. J. R. Boyd	Box 232, Sudbury, Ont.
The Gore	Mrs. H. Dent, clerk	R.R. 2, Thurso, Que.
Timmins	Rev. E. C. Wood, L.Th.	74 Second Ave., Timmins, Ont.
Toronto		
Calvin	Rev. R. F. Roblin, B.D.	26 Ashland Ave., Toronto 8, Ont.
Grace	Rev. W. S. Burke	248 Briar Hill Ave., Toronto 12, Ont.
Jarvis St.	Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D.	130 Gerrard St. E., Toronto 2, Ont.
Long Branch	Rev. Bernard Jeffery, B.A., B.Th.	50 Tamarac Ave., Long Branch, Ont.
Mt. Pleasant Rd.	Rev. W. N. Charlton	123 Belsize Dr., Toronto 12, Ont.
New Toronto	Rev. S. Wellington, L.Th.	101 Evans Ave., New Toronto, Ont.
Runnymede Rd.	Rev. W. Gordon Brown, M.A.	391 Sherbourne St., Toronto 5, Ont.
Waverley Rd.	Rev. J. Fullard, B.Th.	304 Lee Ave., Toronto 8, Ont.
Trenton	Pastor T. R. Delaney, B.Th.	Box 66, Trenton, Ont.
Val d'Or	Pastor Lorne Heron	Box 121, Bourlamaque, Que.
Westboro	Rev. H. G. Hindry, B.Th.	650 Churchill Ave., Westboro, Ont.
Westport	Pastor Wm. Piper	Toronto, Ont.
Whitevale First Baptist	Rev. A. J. Heal, M.A.	Whitevale, Ont.
Wilkesport	Pastor W. Midgley	Courtright, Ont.
Windsor, Campbell Ave.	Rev. J. H. Watt	837 Pelissier St., Windsor, Ont.

OTHER CONTRIBUTING CHURCHES AND MISSIONS

Babylon, N.Y.,

First Baptist		
Toronto Forward Baptist	Rev. J. Scott, B.Th.	1891 Gerrard St. E., Toronto 8, Ont.
Geraldton	Mr. Jas. Sullivan, clerk	Box 370, Geraldton, Ont.
Harrow	Rev. R. Dean Burns	Harrow, Ont.
Kitchener, Benton St.	Rev. Leander Roblin	
Sarnia		
All People's Mission	Rev. Frank Vaughan	420 S. Vidal St., Sarnia, Ont.
Blue Water Mission	Rev. Frank Vaughan	420 S. Vidal St., Sarnia, Ont.
Tilbury	Rev. C. J. Rogers	Box 265, Tilbury, Ont.

MR. J. V. McAREE ON "FREEDOM OF THE PRESS"

WE SELDOM fail to read Mr. J. V. McAree's column in *The Globe and Mail*; or, perhaps, more accurately we should say, we invariably look at it, and generally read it. Occasionally he deals with some things, perhaps of necessity, such as murder trials, for instance, which we feel it is not particularly edifying to examine. We like his style. We read his column more frequently than the rather innocuous editorials on the same page.

We print herewith an excerpt from last Saturday's column, in order that we may offer a few observations.

"In regard to your article of Saturday, November 6, where you raised the question of the press not being free," writes James H. Van Overbek, Owen Sound, "I think you might just as well have come out with the statement that it is not free. . . . I would invite any newspaper, including Canada's so-called 'national newspaper', to even report some of the outstanding instances that THE GOSPEL WITNESS reports as historical fact. . . ."

Freedom to Avoid Bankruptcy

"... As regards the free press, one of the first freedoms of a newspaper is to be free to remain in business. If we were to publish articles which had appeared in THE GOSPEL WITNESS we would lose most of our Roman Catholic readers in a year, and a third of our Protestant and Jewish readers in another year. All sensible daily newspapers steer clear of anything that could be represented as contentious religious subjects unless some great principle is at stake. They do

this for two reasons: One is the loss of circulation; the other is the conviction that such discussions never change religious opinions. There are so many religious journals and pulpits and forums that the newspapers in eschewing such subjects do so in the full knowledge that the truth, in so far as truth is discoverable and definable in these debates, will make its way through these sources. . . ."

"To be free to remain in business" is a freedom to safeguard; but Mr. McAree argues that if daily newspapers were to publish such articles as appear in this paper, it would soon put the daily newspapers out of business. We are not sure that Mr. McAree is right in this. If both sides of such subjects were presented, it would make a most interesting paper, and would be much more edifying than many things found in the daily press. If Mr. McAree's argument is sound, we may assume that the daily press fights shy of everything that might be unpalatable to some section of its readers, regardless of how true, or how important that matter might be. That would mean that the press is silent on any subject that would be likely to diminish its circulation. It puts business first, and important, but unpopular, news items, second. If that be the rule, it would mean that the public would have to look elsewhere for information on many vitally important subjects. Perhaps that is why, in its first report of the infamous action of the Dominion Government in affording asylum to the Vichy traitors, *The Globe and Mail* plainly stated that the Government had done it as a result of Roman Catholic pressure. Almost certainly

the Hierarchy rapped *The Globe and Mail* over the knuckles for that, and in subsequent discussions of the subject, the proverbial "Ethiopian, black as tar, though living in Quebec, was not mentioned.

Then Mr. McAree says, "All sensible daily newspapers steer clear of anything that could be represented as contentious religious subjects unless some great principle is at stake." Is there not always some "great principle at stake" in such discussions? But whether or no, the press' first reason for ignoring it is "the loss of circulation; the other is the conviction that such discussions never change religious opinions".

We once consulted a lawyer of distinction on a Protestant question, and he said, "We are not crusaders: our interest in our clients is always commercial". Apparently that applies to newspapers. But if discussions never change opinions, why do newspapers engage in them? What about the discussion as to where to place the blame for our present power shortage in Toronto? What is Mr. Drew doing in Carleton, but "discussing"? What does he hope to accomplish if it be not to change somebody's opinion? Or are religious opinions more difficult to change than the political variety?

Mr. McAree is quite complimentary when he says, "There are so many religious journals and pulpits and forums that the newspapers in eschewing such subjects do so in the full knowledge that the truth, in-so far as truth is discoverable and definable in these debates, will make its way through these sources." That would mean that someone else must bear the burden, and pay the cost of defending unpopular principles. Certainly THE GOSPEL WITNESS cannot qualify, by Mr. McAree's standard, as being "sensible"; and yet we are gratified, and highly complimented, to know that Mr. McAree classes THE GOSPEL WITNESS as among his favourite periodicals; perhaps because it is so unlike *The Globe and Mail*, and other papers.

We confess that THE GOSPEL WITNESS does compete, sometimes, we think, successfully with those who serve "sizzling" steaks. It is designed to be "hot stuff". We would make it as weighty as an atomic bomb if we could. In editing its pages we have never once stopped to consider whether a certain course would diminish our circulation or not: our question has been: First, "Is it true?" and secondly, "Is it a truth which ought to be proclaimed?" When these questions are affirmatively answered, we print it, no matter what the cost; and we are happy to say that our circulation is not diminishing, but increasing.

Mr. McAree in his column describes the conduct of newspapers in general; but in so doing he does not describe the character of his column. If he did, he would not even mention THE GOSPEL WITNESS, for we promise him even that will be a great offence to our Roman Catholic friends.

As to the general newspaper attitude toward vital but unpopular principles, which Mr. McAree so accurately describes, we can but say that their example is too much like that of the priest and the Levite, who left the poor, robbed, wounded, and half-murdered man without help, because they knew that the good Samaritan was somewhere behind them, and would be sure to lend a helping hand. For our part, we cast our vote for the good Samaritan, rather than for the priest, or the Levite.

THE CONVERSION OF FRENCH-CANADIANS

HOW shall we deal with the French-Canadian problem? This question gives great concern to all thoughtful Canadians. We may be considered an idle day-dreamer because we dare to suggest that the only final solution of the problem is evangelism, but all must perforce agree that it has the great advantage of being a radical solution in the literal sense of that word, which means: "that which goes to the root of the matter". Our solution is that French-Canadians be given an open Bible, that the Gospel of the saving power of Christ be preached to them. It was from this source that England drew her love of freedom. Our traditional British liberty, as we call it, is really the civil counterpart of the freedom wherewith Christ hath made us free. When men throw off the yoke of priests and prelates because they know the way to God through the ministration of the One Great High Priest, they soon refuse to bow the knee to any earthly tyrant. Liberty is not a commodity that is peculiar to English-speaking persons nor to the Anglo-Saxon race, it has ever flourished wherever the open Bible has gone with its message of spiritual enlightenment and spiritual liberation. For these reasons we are firmly convinced that the most radical solution to our Canadian problem is also the most effective one.

But will French-Canadians listen to the Gospel? It has too often been assumed that they will not, so often in fact, that there has been relatively small opportunity to decide the question in practice. Our experience in the matter, however, leaves no room for doubt: we know that French-Canadians will listen to the preaching of the Gospel of grace. We do not mean that there is no opposition from their priests or that the common people are not often stirred up by their blind shepherds to oppose those who seek to tell them the Gospel of free grace, but notwithstanding, French-Canadians are open to the appeal of the Gospel. We have given various accounts of how God has touched the hearts of some of our French-speaking fellow-citizens, but the following reports are of special interest because they come from the district of Rouyn-Noranda where several Gospel workers were jailed last year for daring to preach in French on the street corner. The writer of the following letter is a young lady graduate of Toronto Baptist Seminary who dared to defy the priests and the police of Rouyn when they informed her that she was forbidden by law to give out copies of the Gospel of John. Though threatened with a jail term, this resolute young woman persisted in being about her Master's business and covered the entire Town of Rouyn from door to door offering Gospels of John in French to all who would take them, and talking about spiritual things wherever an opportunity was given. As one result of her determination, the local council rescinded the by-law invoked against giving out the Word of God. Other fruits of her endeavours for Christ are to be seen in the conversion of a number of French-Canadians. We give the following excerpts from the letter which was written by Miss Eileen Veals:

Madame H— and her family used to come to our meetings last winter, but in the spring we were disappointed when they decided to move into the bush. But the Lord does not work in our ways, and Madame H— and her two young daughters were truly saved in their own home. This mother gave her testimony for the first time in our French meeting three weeks ago. She told how she was

much troubled about spiritual matters for a long time. One evening she went to bed but could not sleep because she was so unhappy concerning her salvation. Then about four or five o'clock in the morning, the Lord caused her to think about the verse, "Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out." She believed the promise and found peace. How she loves now to give her testimony!

Another young French-Canadian girl was also baptized last Sunday, and on Monday she lost her job at the French Roman Catholic hospital. The nun said that she was a bad influence, especially because she shared a room with three other young girls and they thought that was dangerous: She has found a better place where she has already commenced work.

We have a French meeting every Sunday at four o'clock in the afternoon and about twenty persons attend. Last Sunday we had three newcomers. More than half of those that come are saved and give a good testimony. On Monday evenings we have our French prayer-meetings, and I think that for the number of those who know the Lord it is better than the average prayer-meeting.

A young girl who comes regularly is the sister of a young woman who lost her life in a fire several years ago. The sister was saved before this terrible accident as was her husband. In the fire the young wife was burned to death, with her four brothers and sisters. Her husband was the only one who escaped and he was very severely burned. The doctors in the hospital gave up all hope for him and when the priest came to visit him, he said, "I had a dream the other night. I saw four little white birds and a great black bird. The good Lord gave me the interpretation of the dream: The four little white birds were souls of the four little Roman Catholic children who lost their lives in the fire and who are now in heaven; the big black bird is the soul of your wife who left the Roman Catholic Church and who is now burning in hell."

The priest did not expect that the suffering and bereaved young husband would recover, and he told his dream in the Roman Catholic Church on the following Sunday, adding that the young man in the hospital had returned to the fold of the true Church. But the young man did not die and he did not go back to the Roman Catholic Church.

Another French-Canadian woman told me how she and her family became disgusted with the Roman Church. They used to live in a little village not far from here and her husband was one of the four men in the parish who had something to do with the conduct of the business affairs of the local church. The priest held the money and did not give an account to the men. They had their own suspicions and the husband of this lady began to ask for an accounting. I do not know all the details but he soon found himself in prison where he was kept for two weeks, during which time he slept on the floor.

The people all left the Roman Church and they have no religion, though they listen to our Sunday evening meetings in the open air every week and they call that their church.

These pages have already carried detailed accounts of the opposition that Rev. Murray Heron and his associates have encountered in their endeavour to preach the Gospel in French in Rouyn. The above report from Miss Veals will serve to give some idea of the blessing that has rested upon their labours, and it will at the same time demonstrate why the local priests were so anxious to silence them and to restrain them from giving out the Word of God from door to door. They knew too well the power of the written and the spoken Word of God and they feared it. Let us who believe it, make sure that we exercise our privilege and our duty to make it known and to aid those who have undertaken the difficult missionary task of preaching it in the teeth of bitterly determined opposition.—W.S.W.

REAL BIBLE TEACHING

Biblical Theology, Old and New Testaments, by Veerhardus Vos, Ph.D., D.D., published by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 529 pages and indices, \$5.25.

A year ago last summer Toronto Baptist Seminary brought out in mimeographed form *Old and New Testament Biblical Theology* by an outstanding evangelical scholar who for forty years was a member of the faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary. The reason we produced this was that we could no longer get mimeographed copies from another school where Dr. Vos had also taught. It is now used as a textbook in the first three years of our school in the subject of Biblical Theology as it is taught by Professor A. C. Whitcombe. According to Professor Whitcombe himself, "The book is scholarly and orthodox. It has the advantage of covering both the Old and New Testament, which is a weighty point with students with whom the price of books is an important consideration. Naturally, because both of the Testaments are included, the book does not go into much of the details entered into by those that deal with only one Testament. However, it seems to us that he has escaped majoring in minors and succeeds in doing away with a little of that weariness of the flesh for which theological books are noted. There is a good index, and the introductory chapter, on the meaning, scope and need of the discipline of which the author treats, is instructive."

This work has now been printed by Eerdmans Publishing Company, after the material had "been thoroughly edited, annotated, and indexed by one of the author's sons, the Rev. Johannes Vos, who has simplified certain portions and enlarged others. In this work he has had access to the private files of his father, who is now in retirement."—B.

Among Ourselves

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

By W. Gordon Brown, Dean

Mr. E. A. McWilliams is now in Perron, B.Q., in mine work. There he has started a Sunday School which now has an attendance of about thirty. There is room for Christian service both in French and in English, he reports.

On Tuesday, the 16th of November, Rev. John Hall, M.A., veteran missionary of Nigeria, addressed chapel, strongly stressing the cry of the heathen world in its need. We who are believers hear the voice of the Son of God; they hear the voices of darkness. After lunch hour Mr. Hall addressed our Foreign Mission Fellowship and told its members how he was led out to service abroad.

The next day, Rev. Mr. Laurie, of Carubber's Close Mission, Edinburgh, addressed chapel, basing his remarks upon the experience of John who leaned on Jesus' bosom, as recorded in the 13th chapter of his Gospel. This was a message full of spiritual vitality and challenge to rest in the Lord, and with the discernment and power which He gives, serve our day and generation in its desperate need.

Mr. Donald Merrett, in his first year with us, supplied recently at Fenelon Falls Baptist Church, Rev. R. E. J. Brackstone pastor, and rejoiced to see three decisions and two others who had previously accepted Christ as Saviour make public confession.

The annual report of the Fundamental Baptist Church, Fort William, Rev. W. C. Tompkins pastor, shows that a total of \$5,056.42 was raised in all funds, of which \$780.28 was for missions. In addition to this there were total receipts for June 1st to September 30th to make possible Mr. Tompkins' mid-week meditations over a local radio station to the amount of \$416.00. Surely these are commendable reports.

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 12 Fourth Quarter Lesson 10 December 5, 1948

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

THE SUFFERING SAVIOUR

Lesson Text: John 19:17-30.

Golden Text: "When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished: and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost."—John 19:30.

I. His Crucifixion: verses 17-22.

After the ecclesiastical trial of Christ before Annas and Caiaphas (John 18:13, 14) came the civil trial before Herod and Pilate (Lk. 23:6-12; John 18:28-40; 19:1-15). The Roman court could be held any time after daybreak, and the impatient, relentless enemies of Christ repaired early to the hall of judgment. They would not enter the Praetorium, lest they should be defiled by entering a house from which all leaven had not been taken (Exod. 12:15), yet their scruples did not prevent them from defiling their hearts by the sin of participating in the plot to crucify the Lord Jesus (Matt. 15:11; 23:25-28; 27:24, 25).

The Jews were determined that Christ should be declared guilty of death. They showed no disposition to present evidence, and would not have gone to Pilate, if they had possessed the authority to carry out a sentence of death.

The merciless throng, roused to a high pitch of excitement and anger, unmoved by any appeal to their higher feelings, were insistent in their demands that Christ be crucified. Urged on by their leaders, they brought successive charges against the Saviour, saying that He was causing sedition, that He had broken their laws, and that He claimed to be the Son of God. When Pilate continued to hesitate, they finally obtained their will by appealing to his personal fears (v. 12). Christ was led away to be crucified (v. 16).

The Jewish priests had delivered Christ to Pilate, and Pilate in turn had delivered Him again to the Jewish authorities to carry out the crucifixion. The responsibility for this dreadful deed rests, therefore, upon the Romans, upon the Jews, and upon every individual, whose sins made necessary the death of the Lamb of God (Acts 2:23; 3:14, 15; 4:10; 7:52). And yet, Christ was ordained from all eternity to be the Saviour of the world (1 Pet. 1:20; Rev. 13:8). The wrath of men brought praise to God, and divine love changed history's greatest tragedy into earth's greatest triumph (Isa. 53:6; John 3:16; 2 Cor. 5:19; Col. 2:14, 15).

It was at Bethlehem that Christ began to bear His cross, the emblem of shame and death, for it was there that He first identified Himself with mortal man and was made in the likeness of sinful flesh (Rom. 8:3; Phil. 2:6-8; Heb.

2:9-16). There was a definite limit to that journey of condescension; it ended at Calvary. Once our Saviour had partaken of death, the crown of glory became His portion (Lk. 24:26; Rom. 6:10; Phil. 2:9-11; Heb. 1:1-4; 2:7, 8). Golgotha is the Hebrew name for "the place of the skull" which the Romans called Calvary (Lk. 23:33).

Three crosses were silhouetted against the Eastern sky, and that of Christ was "in the midst". Christ is ever pre-eminent; His cross represents the central fact of all history. It is indeed true that

"All the light of sacred story
Gathers round its head sublime."

The proximity of the other two crosses to the cross of Christ suggests some lessons. Christ died for sin; the repentant thief died to sin, and the unrepentant thief died in sin. One represents salvation revealed; another salvation received, and the third represents salvation rejected. "One dying thief was saved, that none might despair, but only one, that none might presume."

The inscription, written in Hebrew, Latin and Greek, sets forth the universality of Christ's death; He died for all mankind. These were the three great languages of the day: Hebrew—the language of religion, Latin—the language of government, and Greek—the language of culture. Christ was the High Priest, the King and Wisdom (1 Cor. 1:24, 30; Col. 2:3).

II. His Death: verses 23:30.

Many Scripture prophecies dealing with the intimate details were fulfilled during those last twenty-four hours of our Lord's earthly life, and they indicate that He was accomplishing the will of God for the redemption of the world; Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures (1 Cor. 15:3). John mentions four of these prophecies; the lots (Psa. 22:18), the vinegar (Psa. 69:21), the unbroken body (Exod. 12:46; Psa. 34:20), and the pierced side (Zech. 12:10; Rev. 1:7).

Tenderly our Saviour committed His mother to the care of John, the beloved disciple. Human relationships are ever sanctified, when Christ is given His rightful place. The home that is hallowed by the presence of Christ knows joy (John 2:2), peace (John 12:1, 2), restoration (Matt. 8:14, 15) and life (Lk. 8:51-56).

Christ shouted with a loud voice of triumph, "It is finished." He had completed the work given Him to do (John 17:4); He had paid the full price of redemption, and had borne the iniquity of the whole world (John 1:29). Still sovereign, He dismissed His Spirit (John 10:17, 18; 19:11). Behold your God! Our salvation was purchased with the blood of God (Acts 20:28)!

SUGGESTED HYMNS

There is a green hill far away. 'Twas Jesus my Saviour.
When I survey the wondrous cross. Rock of Ages. In the
cross of Christ I glory. O sacred Head, sore wounded!

THE GOSPEL WITNESS
130 Gerrard Street East,
Toronto 2, Ontario, Canada

ORDER FORM

\$2.00 per year

Enclosed find \$_____ to be applied as follows:—

- Subscription to THE GOSPEL WITNESS.
 Renewal of Subscription to THE GOSPEL WITNESS.

NAME _____

STREET _____

CITY OR TOWN _____

PROVINCE _____

The following books are offered as premiums to subscribers to THE GOSPEL WITNESS. Check the one you wish to receive:

1. *The Papacy, in the Light of Scripture*, by Dr. T. T. Shields.
 2. *The Greatest Fight in the World*, by Rev. Chas. H. Spurgeon.
 3. *Russellism, or Rutherfordism (Jehovah's Witnesses)*, by Dr. T. T. Shields.

NOTE:—If cheque is used other than drawn on a Toronto Bank, 15c exchange should be added.
U.S.A. subscribers kindly, do not use Postal Notes.