

PRESERVE THIS COPY FOR FUTURE REFERENCE

The Gospel Witness and Protestant Advocate

Authorized as Second Class Mail, Post Office Department, Ottawa

Vol. 30, No. 25

130 Gerrard St. E., TORONTO, OCTOBER 11, 1951

Whole Number 1533

SHALL KING GEORGE VI OR POPE PIUS XII RULE CANADA?

A Roman Catholic Priest Is Fined Only \$100 For Stealing and Destroying Mail!

An Address by the Pastor, Dr. T. T. Shields

Delivered in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, October 7th, 1951
(Electrically Recorded)

"A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land.

"The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so: and what will ye do in the end thereof?"

—Jeremiah 5:30, 31.

I HAVE not publicly spoken on the subject which will engage our thought tonight for some time; I thought I would be quiet for a little while and give somebody else a chance. My reason for speaking this evening is that apparently nobody else will do so, and that is a good reason for making protest against such iniquity as I have to discuss this evening. Part of what I have to say, I shall read. Those of you who come here know that that is not my practice, but when dealing with legal matters one is under the stern necessity of observing meticulous accuracy of statement. That is why every word that I utter, that is not written before me, will be recorded. Even some of the newspapers are reluctant to publish an advertisement which is adverse to the Roman Catholic church. Rome seems to have put her terror into the hearts of public men, and many there are who seem to be afraid almost of their shadow. That is one reason for my speaking as I do this evening. Another reason for reading it is that I have many legal quotations to make. There can, therefore, be no question whatever, in the future, about what has been said. Still another reason is that tomorrow is a holiday, and I have to be out of town to speak Monday evening. The sermons of

this place are printed week by week. They have to be transcribed, and put in the printer's hand on Monday, but if I have a part of it already done I shall be able to give it to the printer early Tuesday morning.

I may say that it is a very interesting, and somewhat arduous task, week by week to publish a sermon for thirty years, that goes to the ends of the earth. The reason for being particularly careful this evening is that a copy of this address will be sent to every member of the Dominion Parliament, Senate and House of Commons, and to every member of all the ten provincial legislatures in Canada, and to every editor of every daily and weekly newspaper, and every monthly magazine. And as well, so far as we can obtain it, to the entire Canadian judiciary, members of the Supreme Court of Canada, the high courts of all the provinces, the county courts, the magistrates' courts, and to all who sit in a place of judgment. I think you will recognize — for they do listen, and they do read — the importance of exercising the utmost care.

I have before referred to a visit from Lord Bennett, and to some things he said. The visit was of his own initiative, and I felt honoured by his call. I do not know

why he said it, but he did say to me — this sounds very egotistical, but this is what he said — "Until your voice was raised there was not a voice in the Dominion of Canada to which the Roman Catholic Hierarchy paid any heed, politically, religiously, educationally, or economically, but they listen to you." I hope he was correct; and I think he was, for they damn me uphill and down dale in all the French Canadian press. In the placards which the boys carry on the streets to advertise their papers they have spoken in three or four-inch black type of "the hanging of Pasteur Shields". But they have not succeeded yet.

The subject I shall discuss with you this evening is a matter of public knowledge, because it has been before the public conspicuously in the public press,—the trial of a priest and a postmistress,—who pleaded guilty, the latter to surrendering and the priest to destroying certain mail. The fine of \$100 imposed upon the priest was published in the morning paper; but I said to myself, "I am sure that will not appear in the evening papers." Nor did it, because the sleuths of the church of Rome are at the door of every editorial office threatening boycott, and all sorts of penalties, if they admit to their pages one word that is unfavourable to the Roman Catholic church. The absence of any mention of it in the evening papers, was an implied acknowledgment that it was recognized as an outrageous miscarriage of justice.

In any State nothing is more indispensable to the maintenance of order and good will among the people than the faithful, and impartial administration of justice. History is replete with accounts of turbulent uprisings and rebellions of all sorts, which have resulted from laxity in law enforcement on the one hand, or partiality and favouritism on the other.

It is axiomatic in British juridical thinking that all men are equal before the law. It is also fundamental to all British judicial processes that even though a man is caught red-handed in the crime of which he is accused, he must be presumed to be innocent until he has been proved guilty.

The civil and religious liberties involved in these considerations are inherent in *Magna Charta* and *Habeas Corpus*. Every man is entitled to his day in Court; hence the right, inherent in *habeas corpus*, which means "have the body". A man may not be secretly imprisoned, or held in duress, without opportunity, publicly, to defend himself.

A case came before the Ontario Courts but a week or so ago where a man had been confined in a mental institution against his will, having been drugged and consigned there on the authority of one doctor, and kept there for three or four years. A writ of *habeas corpus* brought him into Court, and gave him an opportunity to prove his sanity, with the result that the Court ordered his release, and he walked out a free man.

Such liberties have not been obtained by silent acceptance of the *status quo*. They have been wrenched from tyrants and tyrannical institutions and organizations and Governments at a cost of blood.

A Government Within a Government

Canadians are living in a country which is governed by their elected representatives only in so far as it suits the good pleasure of another government, which claims divine sanction, and insists that it is above the law of

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.

\$5.00 Per Year. Postpaid to any address. 10c Per Single Copy.

Editor

T. T. SHIELDS

Associate Editors

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

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

the State. The teaching of the Roman Catholic Church is not that the State exists to protect and insure the freedoms of the people; and to promote the welfare of its citizens regardless of race or colour or creed: the Roman Catholic Church teaches that the State exists only to serve the Church, that its authority is never to be exercised against the Church, but always for the Church. Pope Leo XIII's Doctrine of the Two Swords, the Spiritual and the Temporal, lays down the principle that the Roman Catholic Church is above the State, that Canon Law is above Civil Law; and the Roman Church, as an institution, or any hierarchical section of it, or any priests which may belong to it, are submissive, and subservient to the Civil Law only in so far as it suits their convenience and profit to be so.

But in principle, the whole teaching of the Church is that Civil Governors and Justices, and Magistrates, are incompetent to try, or to pass judgment upon, any priest of the Church. It is no wonder there is such confusion, and such injustices, when such principles are held as the supreme guide to conduct by so many people.

Events in Northern Quebec

Everybody knows what has happened in Northern Quebec. Young preachers have repeatedly been sent to jail for preaching the gospel on the streets, always on the pretext that their preaching will interfere with traffic, and will, therefore, violate a traffic by-law: a specious disguise for religious persecution.

Now within the last week or ten days a Deputy Postmistress, the daughter of the Postmaster, has confessed that for a period of three or four months at the demand of the local priest, she has intercepted mail, and delivered to him certain pieces of mail consigned to certain Baptists, with whose tenets the local priest does not agree. Therefore he laid his commands upon this young girl that she should intercept this mail week by week, and deliver it to him.

The priest acknowledges that he has demanded the mail addressed to certain Baptists in the town. He has stolen it, and destroyed it, because he did not think the matter of these pieces of mail was good for the people to read.

By virtue of the religious pretension of his office as a priest, he puts his terror into the heart of a Catholic girl, and leads her to violate, in the most glaring and wholesale fashion, the Postal Laws of this country.

The priest receives from this girl's hand week by week mail that is addressed to somebody else. In other words, he flagrantly steals it, and just as the robber puts a pistol to the head of the man whom he would compel to do his will, so the priest exercises his supposed authority in this world and the next, to compel this young girl to commit an unlawful act. The threat of punishment inheres in his office and its supposed authority.

The priest, on his part, having stolen the mail, as we shall show from the Act itself in a few moments, and possessed himself of something that did not belong to him, took it away and, by his own acknowledgment, week by week, over a period of three or four months, destroyed the property of other people, which had been consigned in confidence to His Majesty's-Mail.

Such publicity was given to the matter that the Postal authorities had to do something, and they summoned the priest and the Postmistress to Court. They both pleaded guilty. There is, therefore, no question about the guilt of the accused, they themselves being witnesses. The Postmaster's daughter, in violation of postal regulations, intercepted the mail on the priest's orders; and instead of having the mail delivered to the addressees, it was taken away by the Roman Catholic priest and destroyed. For such interference the young girl of sixteen is given "suspended sentence", and the priest, who robbed and destroyed the mail, is fined only One hundred dollars.

My question is this: *Is Canon Law, by which, of course, is meant the law of the Church, or Civil Law, the law of the State, to be supreme in Canada? Are priests of the Roman Catholic Church to be permitted to violate the laws of this land with impunity, and then to be visited only with a paltry "token" punishment of a \$100.00 fine?*

I want now to examine the law on this case.

We may use the word "mail" advisedly in this case, because, by the Post-Office Act, passed by the House of Commons, June 12th, 1951, which, of course is the Post Office Act revised to date and is the Postal Law now in force, in Section 2, sub-section (d), under the head of definitions, we read:

"Mail" means mailable matter from the time of its deposit at a post office to the time of its delivery.

A certain minister committed certain documents, mimeographed sermons, for which postage had been paid, to the care of His Majesty's Mail, and it was in the care of the Post Office from its deposit to the time of its delivery.

The question arises: *When that mail had been deposited in the Post Office, to whom did it belong? If the person who posted it had sought to recover it, he would have been told that it was beyond the authority of the Postmaster to give it to him. When once you have posted a letter, you cannot recall it.*

Then, to whom did that mail belong? Under the title,

"Property in Mails", Section 39, in the margin it is stated:

But here is the Section:

"Mail becomes property of addressee". "Subject to the provisions of this Act and the regulations respecting undeliverable mail, mailable matter becomes the property of the person to whom it is addressed when it is deposited in a post office." (Emphasis ours.)

Very well, then, that means that these mimeographed sermons were no longer the property of the preacher, nor were they the property of the Postmaster, or of the Government, unless it could have been shown that it was "undeliverable mail": these documents were the property of the persons to whom they were addressed, whose name they bore. No one else had any right to them whatsoever.

What happened? *The Postmaster's daughter was commanded by the priest to give up to him that which had been committed to the Post Office in trust; and so not once, but for a period of about four months, more or less, every week that mail, paid for by the person who posted it, owned by the person to whom it was addressed, was, in violation, not merely of the Post Office Act, but also of every principle of morals, of decency, and honesty, — that mail was surreptitiously taken by the priest, when he knew that he had no right to it, and was destroyed.* A priest of the Roman Catholic Church stands in a different relationship to the people he is supposed to serve, than any non-Roman Catholic minister of religion. And on this ground: the Roman Catholic priest alone claims that his authority over the souls of men may be projected into the life beyond the grave. The people are taught in Separate Schools, and in every other way that the priest has such authority, and can consign a soul to purgatory, (that is, if the people believe there is such a place,) or even to hell itself; and that when a priest exercises that authority over a person taught to believe it and subject to it, he is in the position of a man who, under threat of eternal damnation, compels another to do his will. And because such authority is claimed by the priest, and believed in by the people, and because that authority was exercised over the voters in a Federal election, the Supreme Court of Canada declared an election to be null and void on the ground that "undue influence" had been exercised.

The Priest Guilty of Stealing the Mail

The simple matter of fact is this, that this priest, Rev. J. Alfred Roy, was guilty of stealing, and then destroying His Majesty's Mail.

What penalty then does the Post Office Act prescribe for such a crime?

Sections 55 and 56 are as follows:

"Every person who unlawfully opens or wilfully keeps, secretes, delays or detains, or procures, or suffers to be unlawfully opened, kept, secreted, or detained, any mail bag, post letter, or other article of mail, or any receptacle authorized by the Postmaster General for the deposit of mail, whether the same came into the possession of the offender by finding or otherwise, is guilty of an indictable offence.

"Every person who abandons, obstructs or wilfully delays the passing or progress of any mail or mail conveyance is guilty of an indictable offence."

Once more, let us read Section 63:

"Every person who wilfully destroys, mutilates, obliterates, defaces, erases or changes any record or

account of any transaction pertaining to the business of the Canada Post Office, or refuses to produce or to deliver to any inspector or other authorized officer of the Canada Post Office on demand, anything containing or that ought to contain any such record or account is guilty of an indictable offence."

"An Offence" and "An Indictable Offence"

The Post Office Act sharply distinguishes between an "offence" and "an indictable offence". The person interfering with the mail, as stipulated in Sections 55 and 56 is guilty of "an indictable offence". Please mark that! And that has to do with merely delaying, but not destroying.

Then in Section 63:

"Every person who wilfully destroys, mutilates, obliterates, defaces, erases or changes any record or account of any transaction pertaining to the business of the Canada Post Office, or refuses to produce or to deliver to any inspector or other authorized officer of the Canada Post Office on demand, anything containing or that ought to contain any such record or account is guilty of an indictable offence."

Lesser violations are said to render one "guilty of an offence".

Penalties on Conviction

We come now to Section 73:

(1) Every person who is guilty of an indictable offence under this Act is liable, on conviction, to a fine not exceeding three thousand dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three years or to both fine and imprisonment.

(2) Every person who is guilty of an offence under this Act, *other than an indictable offence*, is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two months or to both fine and imprisonment."

(Above emphasis ours.)

It will be observed that the penalty for "an indictable offence" on conviction is "a fine not exceeding three thousand dollars or to imprisonment for a term, not exceeding three years, or to both fine and imprisonment".

Would anyone say that a systematic taking of mail from the Post Office, after commanding its surrender, its subsequent destruction, thus entirely thwarting the purpose of the Postal Service to deliver mail consigned by one person to another, whose address it bears, and for four months stealing from the addressee communications to which he was legally entitled, and defined in the Act itself (Section 73) as "an indictable offence", which offence may be punished by a fine of three thousand dollars, or three years in jail, or both — will anyone in his senses say that the imposition, for such a crime as that, of the paltry sum of one hundred dollars, is not a glaring, outrageous miscarriage of justice?

Had the priest been "guilty of an offence" only, on conviction he would have been subject to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars, or imprisonment for a term not exceeding two months, or to both fine and imprisonment.

Was there anything in the circumstances of this crime to warrant the reduction of its designation from "guilty of an indictable offence" to being merely "guilty of an offence"? Evidently the Magistrate thought there was. But before I comment on the Magistrate's observations, let us examine this matter a little more carefully.

In respect to the pieces of mail under consideration, the priest completely nullified His Majesty's Mail. In respect to that mail for four months he put the Postal Service out of business. Is that an ordinary offence?

Once again, that mail contained a religious message, and by the law of the land the Postal Service was a legitimate auxiliary to the distribution of religious matter. The action of the priest nullified the principle of religious freedom, freedom to declare the thing we believe. Had we mailed THE GOSPEL WITNESS through that Post Office, almost certainly the priest would have purloined that.

The mail under consideration was in printed form. Its passage through the mail was paid for. The priest, by his action, contravened the liberty of the press. Do these things, taken together, constitute a mere technical misdemeanour, or "an indictable offence", that is, a crime?

The Postal Service is a function of the State. The Post Office is a department of State. By stealing the mail, the priest effectually paralyzed a State function.

The Post Office Act defines what is "undeliverable mail". Of necessity the law must regulate the use of the mails. The mail may not be used for unlawful purposes. The act empowers the Postmaster General to issue a prohibitory order in respect to matter which may not, legally, pass through the mails. But there is a long and detailed provision for the examination of mail matter. Section 42 reads as follows:

"All undeliverable mail and all non-mailable matter found in the mails shall be sent to the section of the Department established by the Postmaster General for the receipt thereof and shall be dealt with as provided in the regulations."

Provision is made for investigations so that any matter put into the mail may be legally examined, duly appraised, and if it be "undeliverable mail", or "non-mailable matter", it is to be sent to a Department established by the Postmaster General. But no one has any right arbitrarily to decide what may or may not legitimately pass through the mails.

What did this priest do? He usurped all the functions of the legally-appointed officers of the Post Office, and constituted himself the examiner and appraiser, and destroyed the mail.

The Report of The Trial

Is this a mere misdemeanour? The report of the trial says:

"The magistrate said there was no indication the priest had criminal intentions and had committed a purely technical offence".

What did he mean by "criminal intentions"? The priest's action under the law was a crime, "an indictable offence", and the man who commits a crime, is a criminal. It is sheer nonsense to say that a man who continues in the commission of a particular crime for four months, had no "criminal intentions".

Of course, by the standards of Canon Law there was no crime. Gardiner and Bonner, and other infamous Roman Catholic bishops of Bloody Queen Mary's day, who usurped the functions of the State, and condemned men to death, and sent Ridley, and Latimer, and Hooper, and hundreds of others to the stake, had no "criminal intentions": all they intended to do was to exterminate heresy by murdering the heretics. In the view of Canon Law, and with the consent and approval of the Pope, these bloody murderers did God's service.

The Magistrate said the priest had committed "a purely technical offence". He is right in calling it an offence, but according to the Post Office Act, he should have

called it "an indictable offence" punishable by a fine of not more than three thousand dollars, or three years' imprisonment, or both.

And here is an extraordinary statement. The Magistrate said that —

"he was taking into account the fact that the mail was not first class matter but circulars enclosed in unsealed envelopes".

What an outrageously stupid and unjust appraisal of the case! The only difference between first and second class matter, committed to the mail, is a difference of time in delivery. First class matter, which pays a higher postal rate, is given priority. But circulars and newspapers and magazines, and the millions of dollars' worth of advertising passing through the mails of this country, as second class matter, is just as much a part of His Majesty's Mail as first class matter.

Suppose a merchant, who has something to sell, prints a circular, and sends it through the mail to people living in a given community! And suppose a merchant in that same town, or village, is selling similar articles. What if he should go to the Post Office, and say, "I want to examine all this advertising matter that is coming into our town." Suppose he is allowed to do so. And he says, "These circulars are advertising a certain product which I, myself, handle, but at a much lower price than I am asking. I do not think it would be wise to let the townspeople see this advertising. Let me have it, and I will destroy it."

If such conduct were permitted, it would jeopardize the effectiveness of all advertisements passing through the mails; and if it were carried on on a large scale, it might result in the destruction of millions of dollars' worth of property, and would amount, at the same time, to a restriction of trade.

This Baptist minister advertised the gospel, as he understood it. He sent it out in printed form to the village or town, whatever it is, of Sté Germaine, telling the people that the salvation of Christ is without money and without price; it is all of grace, and may be received for the asking. But the priest, in effect, says, "I deal in this same business. I talk to people about God, and the future life; but I tell them they have to pay for their salvation, pay in good works, and penances, and in money for the saying of masses and other things. So," he would reflect, "it is not well that the people of my village should know they may have salvation for nothing when I put upon it so high a price, I will destroy the advertisement, and they shall know nothing at all about it."

Is that a mere technical offence?

Furthermore, the Magistrate said:

"The priest acted in good faith since he believed the literature was Communist inspired."

Even had that been so, he was not an authorized judge of what is Communistic, and what is not. He had no right to take the law into his own hands. But, of course, the fact of the matter was, the mail matter was simple, gospel propaganda, as far removed from Communism as the East is from the West.

The Magistrate said also he was

"... taking into consideration the fact the case received much unfavourable publicity which was damaging to the priest prior to the trial."

He noted also that:

"The priest represented a poor parish and was of limited means."

Anyone who commits a crime is likely to receive a great deal of publicity, and it is likely to be exceedingly damaging to the criminal. But the newspapers who published the reports from this place were not to blame. If the priest had not committed the crime he would not have provided the newspapers with such matter for publicity.

If there was any truth at all in the Magistrate's saying that the priest supposed the literature was Communist inspired, he must have been a very dull and stupid man.

But for this "indictable offence" a nominal fine of one hundred dollars was imposed. All this because the priest represented a poor parish, and was of limited means. The law, however, provides that when a criminal cannot pay the fine imposed, he may expiate his guilt by a term in prison. The fine ought to have been 30 times what it was and if the poor priest could not pay, the alternative term in prison should have been imposed.

Unless we are mistaken, this was the same Magistrate who committed young Baptist preachers to prison again and again. Why the discrimination? The answer is simple: the young preachers were Protestants; the priest was a Roman Catholic.

The Magistrate's name was Felix Allard. Dealing with the girl, Geryaise Begin, the daughter of the former Postmaster, who was suspended, the Magistrate said:

"The girl was not old enough to realize the gravity of her acts".

Then surely His Majesty's Mail should never be placed in jeopardy by permitting it to be handled by one so incompetent! However, we would allow for some mitigation of the girl's culpability by the fact that she did what she did in obedience to the priest's commands, and she probably did it under the fear that disobedience would bring heavy spiritual penalties.

You have here also an illuminating event which shows *why the Roman Catholic Church so industriously, and persistently, secures the appointment of pronounced Roman Catholics to judicial positions: A large proportion of the judiciary of all ranks in the Dominion of Canada are Roman Catholics, and I make bold to say that where the interest of the Roman Catholic Church, as such, is at issue, as represented by its dogma, its tax exemptions, or the conduct of any member of the Hierarchy, it is impossible to obtain justice in the Province of Quebec, and in many other parts of the Dominion of Canada.*

My dear friends, this case is symptomatic of a trend in Canadian affairs. The Roman Catholic church has become in this country a privileged institution. Dare I call your attention once again to the exemption of all its priests from the payment of income tax? Do you know that no priest in the Dominion of Canada, from Cardinal McGuigan down, pays one cent of income tax? How could they? Poor men! They receive no salary! A few years ago the Bishop of London, Ontario, filled out the income tax papers for all the priests of his diocese, and they all received a nominal sum, I think at that time it was six hundred and fifty-nine dollars, just below the lowest income tax bracket, and having no income they were under no obligation to pay income tax! A Baptist minister was travelling from London to Toronto, and sat in the same seat in the train with a Roman Catholic priest who was one of the poor priests of the diocese of London. The priest said to him, "What salaries do you Baptist ministers receive?" Said the

Baptist preacher, "I suppose as an average almost any of our men, and particularly in small places, if they received as much as two thousand dollars a year, forty dollars a week, they would count themselves well off." And the priest said, "Mother of God! two thousand a year? That wouldn't keep me in wine and tobacco." Yet he paid no income tax!

I wrote the Minister of National Revenue — I have spoken about that before, but it is so long ago you have forgotten — and sent him registered letter after registered letter, and said, "I simply ask this question, I want an official answer to this question: Do Roman Catholic priests pay income tax?" He never answered me. I think it was four or five registered letters addressed personally to the Hon. Dr. J. J. McCann, a Roman Catholic, a Catholic Action man, and a member of the Knights of Columbus, who sees to it that you and I pay income tax. But he would not answer me. I received letters from ministers in little villages, here, there, and everywhere, and they wrote asking the same question. They got an answer by return mail over the minister's signature, in which he said, in effect, "Everybody pays income tax who is entitled by the law to do so." There you have it. They do not pay income tax. That I know for certain. But the Minister would not answer me.

Well, there is favouritism in Government positions. I wish you would take a copy of the September 27th GOSPEL WITNESS, in which is an article entitled, "Scandalous Manipulation of Canada's National Revenue Department." A month or so ago there was a purge, a re-constitution of many income tax offices in the Dominion of Canada. An income tax inspector told me the other day, "In my office I was let out, and all my clerks. All who were let out were Protestants but one, and he was a Roman Catholic who had been most out-spoken in criticism of the church. He too was let out." In another office a man who had long been superintendent of a large department, with the whole department was wiped out, and all over this country Protestants were dismissed from the income tax office, and Roman Catholics were retained. Why? You can answer that yourself, can't you? Immunity from prosecution of penalties of its priests, "undue influence", to use the technical legal term, exercised in political and other spheres of human action, is common to the church.

What Do We Accomplish?

Why protest? Somebody sits back and says, "What do you think you are going to do, fight the Papacy? You might as well shoot boiled peas at Gibraltar. What do you think you are going to do?" I shall at least do this: I will have a conscience void of offence before God and men, and when the red ruin is let loose upon this country — I do not mean Communistic red ruin — I mean the red ruin which will be unleashed by the Roman Catholic church, and for which they are preparing, I shall have the satisfaction of knowing that I sounded the alarm.— Again I quote Lord Bennett, who was Prime Minister of this country, and who knew the politics of this country; sitting in my office to which he had come of his own initiative. he said, "Dr. Shields, I can see absolutely nothing in prospect in the Dominion of Canada to avert ultimate civil war. A movement is on foot to convert Canada into a Roman Catholic republic."

You say, "It couldn't be done in our day." Look at Spain; look at Argentina. The reactionary forces from the pit itself are busy everywhere, and it can happen

here. I am far more afraid of the Roman Catholic menace than I am of Russia. Roman Catholicism is a religion of fear and force, and our religious freedom especially is menaced. I am allowed this evening to speak as I do, but if I paid for the privilege at the highest advertising rate, there is not one of our Toronto papers that would publish what I shall now say, even though I accepted full responsibility, and excused them from any responsibility in the matter. Why? Because the Roman Catholic church rules, that is why. "The priests bear rule by their means."

"THE PROPHETS PROPHECY FALSELY"

Why should I protest? Because "the prophets prophesy falsely." Roman Catholicism is a false religion; it is an anti-Christian religion. There is not anything Christian about it. It denies every essential doctrine of the faith; it is not Christian at all. Those who preach it and teach it, whoever they may be, prophesy falsely. I accuse them of it. Roman Catholicism is a tissue of lies; it is founded on the perversion of Scripture; it is founded upon a falsification of history: from top to bottom, and bottom to top, and through and through it is a "refuge of lies". The bloody record which is written in the lives of the nations is surely proof enough.

"THE PRIESTS BEAR RULE BY THEIR MEANS"

This was not written of Roman Catholic priests, but it is just as true of them. They are the rulers. I receive letters from Roman Catholics in French Canada, telling me I am the best friend they have. A man,—a Roman Catholic whose location I dare not indicate, a man of intelligence and education, sent me a directory of the Hierarchy of the whole Province of Quebec, and a mass of information which I could not find anywhere else. He said, "This will show you, that when this province has to support this colossal parasite, we have nothing left to educate and feed our families." That is Romanism in Quebec. And he said, "If any help is ever to come it will have to come from outside, for we are tied hand and foot, and it is as much as our lives are worth to utter a word."

Again, knowing the temper of that province, Lord Bennett said to me, "Do you ever go to Quebec?" I said, "I have been there a number of times." "Take my advice," he said, "and be very careful, for this I believe, there is a bullet in Quebec waiting for your heart." I said, "It may be, but I do not feel the slightest fear."

The saddest thing of all is that

"THE PEOPLE LOVE TO HAVE IT SO"

A man was here from Sweden last week, a Baptist, and he was getting information about religious conditions. He said, "I went over to the Secretary of the United Church of Canada, Dr. Sisco. Do you know him?" I said, "I have heard of him; I never met him." "Well," he said, "he was very proud of being one of the 'big shots' in the World Council of Churches." The World Council of Churches is the synthesis of every form of unbelief. The Greek Catholic church is in it, and they have invited the Roman Catholic church. Well, he can be a big shot in it, but I would like to fire a big shot at it. As a matter of fact, I flew around the world for that very purpose, and in every country I visited I tried to strip the disguise from the face of the World Council of Churches,

of which the United Church is an integral member, and the Presbyterian church, the Anglican church, and a lot of other churches. Of course, the individual members do not know what it is all about. It is not a world council of churches, but a "worldly" council of churches. "WHAT WILL YE DO IN THE END THEREOF?"

And "the people love to have it so." So they do. A United Church minister said to me one day, "I believe a lot of our ministers envy the Roman Catholic priests their authority. They would like to be bosses." I do not know whether that is so or not but that is what he told me.

So the great question is, "What will ye do in the end thereof?" This cannot go on; it will reach a climax one of these days. What are you going to do about it when it comes? We can at least deliver our souls by protesting, if we cannot do anything else. It is not kind to say, "I told you so," but I declare if I am still living when that crimson scourge comes I shall have to say it. These many years by travelling this continent I have been trying to awaken Canadians to a recognition of the menace of Rome.

There is a story in the Bible which serves me as an illustration as I close. You have read the story of Samson, and of what a champion he was of Israel. The enemies could not bind him; they could not imprison him. He walked away with the gates of the city. Then Delilah sought to entice him, and he said, "You can bind me with green withs," but he snapped them as though they were threads. They tried several things, but he showed that he was superior to them all. But she plagued him so much that at last he said, "Well, the secret of my strength is that no razor has come upon my head. I have been a Nazarite from birth, and that is where my strength lies."

So she said to the enemy, "I have found it out; he has opened all his heart to me." And so she put him to sleep on her knees, poor silly fool he was! Well is it said of the strange woman, "Many strong men have been slain by her." A man who can stand against men plays the fool before a woman's wiles, as Samson did. While he was asleep they came with their shears, and they cut off the seven locks of his hair. When they had done so, she said, "Samson, the Philistines be upon thee," and he awoke from his sleep, and said, "I will arise and shake myself, as I have done at other times," but he wist not that the Spirit of God had departed from him. And when he awakened his strength was gone, and the Philistines came upon him, gouged out his eyes, bound him with fetters of brass, and took him down to Gath, and made the champion of Israel to grind the Philistines' mill!

Protestantism was once strong; it was like Samson: Nothing could stand against it; it shook the world; it breached the walls of the Papacy, and it looked as though victory was coming. But in these modern days Protestantism has been shorn of its locks; it no longer has an infallible Bible, it no longer thunders the message as did Luther and the Reformers, "Thus saith the Lord." No, it sits in judgment upon God's word, instead of being judged by God's word. Poor Samson, organized Protestantism, has had its eyes put out. You talk to thousands of Protestant ministers, and the poor blind souls say, "Roman Catholicism is all right. I have a neighbour in my town, he is a priest, and we are good friends." Protestantism has lost its eyes; it has lost its freedom of action, and is bound with fetters of brass.

I found all over this country that it was the exception to find a minister who was free to declare the whole counsel of God. He had to have a meeting of his elders, and a meeting of this and that and the other thing. Who on earth would want to be like that? I wouldn't wear the yoke that the majority of ministers wear for ten million dollars a year. I would clean something if I had to get "white wings" and get a job cleaning the streets; but I would not be a pettifogging time serving ecclesiastic, drawing my salary, and from one year's end to the other not doing a thing to subdue the enemy. No wonder organized religion has fallen into disrepute. I do not wonder that tens of thousands of people never cross the threshold of a place of worship. Protestantism has lost its eyes, and its freedom of action. Now they have got it down to Gath, and the World Council of Protestants is grinding the Philistine's mill.

Oh, men and women, let us know Christ. Let us receive Him as our Saviour. Let us glory in the fact that He is the only Mediator between God and man. Let us repudiate, even to the cost of blood, these false religions, and insist that none but Jesus can do helpless sinners good.

I do not know how many of you agree with me; I know some of you do, and I am going to make bold to ask your help. I am going to print extra thousands of this address. Already for first-class mail the envelopes are addressed for all those categories I mentioned, and as soon as this address comes off the press it will go into the mail. It will cost a great sum of money, but many hands make light work. You have seen an American five-cent piece, haven't you? There is a buffalo on one side. I was in a place in the United States a little while ago, and I heard a man say that they had had a meeting the night before, and he said, "Last night you gave us a fine herd of buffaloes; tonight I want you to give us a good supply of green stuff to feed them." I thought it was very good. But anyway, a "retiring" collection tonight (a second collection) will go to THE GOSPEL WITNESS fund, to pay for the distribution of this message of protest against this gross miscarriage of justice. It is just as much your business as mine, isn't it? I do the best I can, and I cannot do any more. I wish I had a thousand voices; I wish I could speak all over this country at once, but I cannot. But I can speak through the printed page, and I want you to help me. If our Protestantism is not worth some sacrifice it is not worth very much, is it? Let us have a great collection tonight, and I promise you that every cent will be faithfully spent on this matter which I have been discussing with you this evening. Will you help me? I would like to see just the measure of our interest. Of course if you haven't very much in your pocket to-night, you know our address, Jarvis Street Baptist Church, and you can send your cheques along for a hundred or five hundred if you like. We will have that collection now please.

I think I may safely assume that my argument has proved the appositeness of my text, and the text has provided a vivid description of a condition my argument has exposed: "A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land;—one might well, indeed, adopt the marginal rendering:

"ASTONISHMENT AND FILTHINESS IS COMMITTED IN THE LAND; THE PROPHETS PROPHECY FALSELY, AND THE PRIESTS BEAR RULE BY THEIR MEANS; AND MY PEOPLE LOVE TO HAVE IT SO: AND WHAT WILL YE DO IN THE END THEREOF?"

(The "retiring" collection amounted to \$483.00.)

The Roman Catholic Church's Claim To Be Above All Civil Law

WE PRINT below extracts from a Judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada, delivered in 1878, in which the Court unanimously declared an election to the Federal House to be null and void on the ground that the Roman Catholic priests had, by their public and private threats, exercised "undue influence" over the voters, not leaving them free to vote as they willed.

The judgment is a long one, and contains extensive quotations from the sermons of the priests, and these, taken together with a pastoral letter from the Bishop, and the arguments for the defence, constitute an X-ray exposure of the true inwardness of the Roman Catholic Church's pretention to superiority over the law of the land.

The fact that the judgment voided an election which took place in January, 1876, is most significant. It is common for the Courts to follow precedents established in legal practice even centuries before, as they do, indeed, in this case, quoting laws enacted in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. And if what took place in Canada in 1876 is compared with the brazen effrontery of the Roman Catholic Church in Canada to-day, it will show how far this country has surrendered its affairs to the domination of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy.

Some time ago we had the Supreme Court Report photographically reproduced on plates, with the intention of publishing it in book or booklet form, for the information of the legal profession. By that we do not suggest that lawyers need to receive information from preachers, but in the nature of the case, it is impossible that any practicing lawyer could have before him, for ready reference, decisions delivered fifty or seventy-five years ago. Many lawyers, of course, with a large law library, would have immediate access to these reports, but they would not be likely to read them unless some particular case before them compelled them to conduct a research for precedents on the matter. We have thought, therefore, it would be well to print this single judgment separately, and if it were photographically produced there would be no possibility of any alteration having been made in it.

It is a judgment that would be well worth reading by all lawyers and preachers and laymen of this country, as a disclosure of the utter intolerance of the Roman Catholic Church toward all religions but its own, and at the same time of the grave danger involved in Protestantism's tolerance of such intolerance.

Each quotation we print below is identified, and we still have hope of being able to print this whole judgment. There would be no cost of typesetting, but only of putting the plates on the press and running it off and binding it. Perhaps we may hear from interested persons in respect to this matter.

The quotations from the Supreme Court Judgment follow:

"1. Extracts from pastoral letter of the Bishops of the Ecclesiastical Province, 22 September, 1875.

"Each priest, on receiving from his Bishop the mission to preach and administer spiritual help to a certain number of the faithful, has, likewise, a rigorous right to the respect, love and obedience of those whose spiritual interests are confided to his pastoral solicitude.

"This subordination does not prevent these societies from being distinct, because of their respective ends, and independent each in its proper sphere. But the moment a question touches faith, morals, or the divine constitution of the Church, her independence, or what is necessary for the fulfilment of her spiritual mission, she is the sole judge; for the Church alone Jesus Christ has said; "All power is given to me in heaven and on earth . . . As the Father hath sent me, I also send you . . . Going therefore teach ye all nations . . . He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me. And he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me . . . He who will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican, that is to say unworthy to be called her child." (Matt. XXVIII., 18, 19; Luke X. 16; John XX. 21; Matt. XVII. 17).

* * * *

"The Church is not only independent of civil society, but is superior to it by her origin, by her comprehensiveness and by her end.

"Undoubtedly, civil society originates in the will of God, who has ordained that men should live in society; but the forms of civil society vary with times and places; the Church was born on Calvary of the blood of a God, from His lips She has directly received her immutable constitution, and no power on earth can alter the form thereof.

* * * *

"Are there questions in which the Bishops and the priest may, and even sometimes should, interfere in the name of religion?

"Without hesitation we answer: Yes, there are political questions in which the clergy may, and even should, interfere in the name of religion. The rule of this right and of this duty is to be found in the distinction we have already pointed out between Church and State. Some political questions, in fact, touch the spiritual interests of souls, either because they may affect the liberty, the independence, or the existence of the Church, even in a temporal point of view.

"A candidate may present himself whose platform is hostile to the Church, or whose antecedents are such that his candidature is a menace for these same interests.

"A political party may likewise be judged dangerous, not only by its platform and by its antecedents, but also by the particular platforms and antecedents of its chiefs, its principal members, and its press; if this party does not disown them and definitely separate therefrom when, having been warned, they persist in their error.

"Can a Catholic, in these cases, without denying his faith, without proving himself hostile to the Church of which he is a member; can a Catholic, we repeat, refuse to the Church the right to defend herself, or rather to defend the spiritual interest of the souls confided to her? But the Church speaks, acts, and combats by her clergy, and to deny those rights to the clergy is to deny them to the Church.

"The priest and the Bishop may then, in all justice, and shall, in conscience, raise their voice, point out the danger, and authoritatively, declare that to vote on such a side is a sin, that to do such an act makes liable to the censures of the Church. They may and should speak, not only to the electors and candidates, but even to the constituted authorities, for the duty of every man who wishes to save his soul is marked out by the divine law, and the Church, like a good mother, owes to her children of every rank, love, and consequently spiritual vigilance. Therefore, to enlighten the conscience of the faithful, on all these questions which concern their salvation, is not converting the pulpit of truth into a political tribune.

"It may be objected that the priest is liable, like every other man, to exceed the limits assigned him, and that then the State has the right to recall him to the path of duty.

"To this we answer: Firstly, that it is offering a gratuitous insult to the whole Catholic Church, to suppose that in her hierarchy no remedy can be found to the injustice, or to the error of one of her ministers; in effect, the Church has her

regularly constituted tribunals, and whoever thinks he has grounds of complaint against a minister of the Church, should arraign him, not before the civil, but before the ecclesiastical tribunal, alone competent to judge the doctrine and the acts of the priest. Therefore, Pius IX in his Bull *Apostolicae Sedis*, October, 1869, declared struck with a major excommunication such as, directly or indirectly, oblige lay judges to arraign ecclesiastical persons before their tribunal, against the dispositions of canon law.

* * * *

EXTRACTS from circular letter to the Clergy, accompanying pastoral letter of September, 1875.

"These adversaries of religion, who however, pretend to the name of Catholics, are the same everywhere; they flatter those among her ministers whom they hope to gain their cause; they insult, they outrage the priests who denounce or fight their perverse designs. They accuse them of exercising an *undue influence*, of turning the pulpit of truth into a political tribune; they dare sometimes to drag them before the civil courts to give an account of certain functions of their ministry; they will, perhaps, endeavour even to force them to grant a Christian burial in spite of ecclesiastical authority.

"In view of such threatenings, several among you, gentlemen, have asked us to trace for them a line of conduct. It is clearly pointed out in the canonical rules.

"1. A priest, accused of having exercised an undue influence in an election, for having fulfilled some priestly office, or given advice as preacher, confessor or pastor, and being summoned before a court, should respectfully but firmly challenge the competency of the civil court, and plead an appeal to an ecclesiastical court.

"2. A priest who, having exactly followed the decrees of the Provincial Councils and the Orders of his Bishop, would, nevertheless, be condemned by a civil court for undue influence, should suffer patiently that prosecution for the sake of the holy Church."

26th January, 1877.

MR. J. BETHUNE, Q.C., of the Ontario Bar, and Mr. F. Langelier, of the Quebec Bar, for Appellants;

It may be said with perfect truth no more important consideration can be presented to a Court of Justice than that which is involved in this case, viz: the freedom of election. The principle upon which Mr. Justice Routhier has determined the case was to think himself incompetent, and that the law of the Church is superior to the law of the land. That being the case, whatever may be the result, the petitioners are entitled to have a judicial opinion on this point. Now, no such immunity as put forward in the Respondent's factum exists in the Province of Quebec. In support of this immunity, is cited the fourth article of the Treaty of 1763, by which

"His Britannic Majesty, on his side, agrees to grant the liberty of the Catholic religion to the inhabitants of Canada and will, consequently, give the most effectual orders that his new Roman Catholic subjects may profess the worship of their religion, according to the rites of the Romish Church, as far as the laws of Great Britain permit."

These last words indicate a limitation.

How far these pretensions are well founded will be ascertained by referring to Statutes at Large, (1) by which the free exercise of the religion of the Church of Rome was granted, subject to the king's supremacy, declared and established by an Act made in the first year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. By the form of oath, subjects were obliged to renounce all foreign allegiance even in matters of faith, and, consequently, a new oath was framed. The Quebec Act of 1791 was passed to show the desire to make our constitution similar in principle to that of England. Moreover, the first lines of the B.N.A. Act shew that desire; they are as follows:

"Whereas the Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have expressed a desire to be federally united into one Dominion under the crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom."

Now, the effect of these Acts must make the Province of Quebec subject to the English Constitutional system.

What are the facts in this case? In Quebec and specially

in Charlevoix the electors are Catholics. Before the election a document signed by all the bishops was read in all the churches of the County. It is important to see what this document, a pastoral letter, contains to connect it with what was said in the pulpit afterwards. It is declared the Church is not only independent of civil society but is superior to it. Now nearly all the *curés* have construed that in such a way as to believe they had the right to tell their parishioners how to vote, and to apply all that is said on Catholic Liberalism to the Liberal candidate, Mr. Tremblay. The pastoral claims for the priest all the rights of a citizen, but, moreover, it declares that the priest is not subject to the control of the tribunals of the land, and yet *authoritatively declares that to vote on such a side is a sin, that to do such an act makes liable to the censures of the Church*. What stronger language can be used? We do not deny the priest his right as a citizen, but we protest against his assuming the right of making a voter liable to the censures of the Church. In the evidence a great deal has been said about Garibaldi and Victor Emmanuel. It will be seen how the sermons were in accordance with the pastoral. Allusion is there made to what happens today in Italy, and Victor Emmanuel is known as having taken away the Pope's temporal power.

Besides this pastoral, a circular letter was sent to the clergy, and as petitioners argue that there was a union of priests to promote Respondent's candidature we refer to the following lines: "Before everything else, we must insist upon the union which should prevail among all the members of the sacerdotal order."

Objected to this evidence by the Defendant:

* * * *

"2. Because this tribunal is incompetent to judge an ecclesiastic's conduct in the exercise of the functions of his office, in as much as this ecclesiastic is answerable for his conduct only to his ecclesiastical superior and to the ecclesiastical tribunals:

"3. Because no ecclesiastic can be summoned before a civil tribunal either as plaintiff, either as defendant, or as a witness, without leave from his ecclesiastical superior, and that such leave is not fyled in this case;

We affirm, as an incontestable and uncontested fact, that the Church is perfectly free in this country.

* * * *

From the judgment written by Mr. Justice Ritchie, we quote in part as follows:

The Treaty of Paris (1763) declared "That his Britannic Majesty on his side agrees to grant the liberty of the Catholic Religion to the inhabitants of Canada; he will consequently give the most precise and the most effectual orders that his new Roman Catholic subjects may profess the worship of their religion according to the rites of the Romish Church as far as the laws of Great Britain permit;" and

By 14 Geo. III., cap 83, it is provided, sec 5: "And for the more perfect security and ease of the mind of the inhabitants of the said Province (Quebec) it is hereby declared that his Majesty's subjects, professing the religion of the Church of Rome, of and in the said Province of Quebec, may have, hold and enjoy the free exercise of the religion of the Church of Rome, subject to the King's supremacy, declared and established by an Act made in the first year of Queen Elizabeth over all the dominions and countries which then did or thereafter should belong to the Imperial Crown of this realm, and that the clergy of said Church may hold, receive and enjoy their accustomed dues and rights with respect to such persons only as shall profess the said religion." By 1 Elizabeth, cap. 1, sec 16, thus referred to, it is enacted "that, and to the intent that, all usurped and foreign power and authority, spiritual and temporal, may for ever be clearly extinguished, and never to be used or obeyed within this realm or any of your Majesty's dominions or countries; may it please your Highness: That it may be further enacted by the authority aforesaid that no foreign prince, persons, or prelate, state or potentate, spiritual or temporal, shall at any time after the last day of this Session of Parliament use, enjoy, or exercise any manner of power, jurisdiction, superiority, authority, pre-eminence or privilege, spiritual or ecclesiastical, within this realm, or within any other of your Majesty's dominions or countries that now be or hereafter shall be, but from thenceforth the same shall be clearly abolished out of this realm and all other your Highness's dominions for ever, any statute, ordinance, custom, constitutions, or any

other matters or cause whatsoever to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding.

"17. And also it may likewise please your Highness that it may be established and enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that such jurisdictions, privileges, superiorities, and pre-eminences—spiritual and ecclesiastical—as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority, hath heretofore been or may lawfully be exercised or used for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order, and correction of the same, and of all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, shall for ever, by authority of this present Parliament, be united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this realm."

Thus we see that under these Acts the free exercise of the religion of the Church of Rome is guaranteed to the inhabitants of Quebec as far as the laws of Great Britain permit, subject to the King's supremacy. But while the members of that Church thus have a perfect right to the full and free exercise of their religion in as full and ample a manner as any other Church or denomination in the Dominion, every member of that Church, like every member of every other Church, is subordinate to the law. There is no man in this Dominion so great as to be above the law, and none so humble as to be beneath its notice. So long as a man, whether clerical or lay, lives under the Queen's protection in the Queen's dominion, he must obey the laws of the land, and if he infringes them he is amenable to the legal tribunals of the country—the Queen's Courts of Justice. Upon a question of immunity somewhat analogous, though not exactly similar to this, raised in the Queen's Bench of Ireland, in the case of *O'Keefe v. Cardinal Cullen*, Fitzgerald, J., a Catholic, I believe—but that is wholly immaterial—uses language so apposite to the present case that I cannot refrain from quoting it at length. The case will be found reported in 7 Irish Law Reports (C.L.) 371. Fitzgerald, J., says: "The point emphatically relied on for the Plaintiff, and which we were confidently called on to decide in his favour, was that the rule or the supposed rule of the Roman Catholic Church which prohibits a priest from impleading another priest in the temporal courts in respect of matters relating to his office and character of priest, under pain or suspension from ecclesiastical functions or expulsion from membership in the Church is illegal and void as being against public policy. This question, which is of importance to the government of all voluntary churches, has been so fully and ably handled by my brother Barry that I have to say but little on it. There can be no doubt that if the rule in question or rule of any Church had for its object the exemption of the clergy from secular authority or their immunity from civil jurisdiction or civil punishment, it would be our duty at once to declare that such a rule was utterly illegal. Upon this there ought to be, as there is, no doubt. No church, no community, no public body, no individual in the realm, can be in the least above the law or exempted from the authority of its civil or criminal tribunals. The law of the land is supreme, and we recognize no authority as superior or equal to it. Such ever has been and is, and I hope will ever continue to be, a principle of our Constitution."

And near the conclusion of his judgment he adds:—

"And I may add for ourselves the general proposition that we do not profess to have jurisdiction over any church or religious association as such; we do not undertake to decide for them ecclesiastical questions or questions of discipline or internal government. All that we undertake to do is to enforce the law of the land, to protect civil rights and to uphold and preserve the public peace."

The 95th section of the Election Act being in force throughout the Dominion, we are bound to say it can be contravened by no man with impunity. The question then arises, was there any breach of the law by any of the parties charged in the petition? I regret to be compelled to answer this in the affirmative.

Clergymen, and I draw no distinction—my observations I wish distinctly to be understood as applying to all churches and denominations alike—Clergymen, I say, are citizens, and have all the freedom and liberty that can possibly belong to laymen, but no other or greater. The fullest and freest discussion of the fitness of the candidates, of the policy of the Government, of the merits of the Opposition, of any or all of the public questions of the day, can be denied to neither priest nor layman; but while there may be free and full discussion, solicitation, advice, persuasion, the law says,

in language not to be mistaken, and not to be disregarded; there shall be no undue influence or intimidation to force an elector to vote or to restrain him from voting in a particular manner. The layman cannot use undue influence or intimidation, neither can the priest; many things, in themselves perfectly legal, may become corrupt, using the word, as pointed out by Mr. Justice Blackburn, in the North Norfolk case (O.M. & H., 241) as meaning with the object and intention of doing that thing which the statute intended to forbid, not "corrupt" in the sense in which you may look upon a man as being a knave or a villain. As, for instance, in the case of a layman, as put by Justice Blackburn, "the landlord has a perfect right to choose his tenant and turn him out, but if the landlord threatens or does inflict that turning out of his tenant for his vote, that is inflicting harm and loss within the meaning of the Act," and he says, "I think that was intended to be struck at by the statute."

So a clergyman has no right, in the pulpit or out, by threatening any damage, temporal or spiritual, to restrain the liberty of a voter so as to compel or frighten him into voting or abstaining from voting otherwise than as he freely wills. If he does, in the eye of the law this is undue influence. But, as I intimated before, legitimate influence can be denied neither to the clergy nor to the laity. As Willes, J., said in the Litchfield case; "The law cannot strike at the existence of influence. It is the abuse of influence with which alone the law can deal."

If this, then, is the state of the law, let us see what was done in this case. On 23rd August, 1875, the election of Tremblay was declared void. On the 28th August, judgment was received by the Speaker, who issued his warrant for a new election. On the same day an inscription for review was filed, the Court sitting in review on the 18th December declared the election void, and judgment was received by the Speaker on the 3rd of January. On the 22nd day of September, 1875, the archbishop and bishops of the Province of Québec issued a pastoral letter to the clergy in Quebec, in which many matters were discussed, and Part V. was devoted to "the part of the clergy in politics." After declaring *inter alia* that "there are political questions in which the clergy may, and even should, interfere in the name of religion," and, after pointing out that political questions might affect the Church, and that a candidate might present himself hostile to the Church, and that a political party might likewise be judged dangerous, etc., in a subsequent paragraph, declared that "the priest and the bishop may then (under the circumstances previously recounted), in all justice, and should, in conscience, raise their voice, point out the danger, and authoritatively declare to vote on such side is a sin, that to do such an act makes liable to the censures of the Church."

This pastoral letter was directed to be read and published at the *prone* of all parochial churches or chapels of parishes, and missions where public service is performed, on the first Sunday after its reception, and in a circular of the same date, from the bishops to the clergy, was the following paragraph:—"A priest accused of having exercised undue influence in an election, for having fulfilled some priestly office, or given advice as preacher, confessor or pastor, and being summoned before a Court, should respectfully but firmly challenge the competency of the Civil Court, and plead an appeal to an Ecclesiastical Court."

With these documents in the hands of the *curés*, they read them as directed, and a number of them in their churches discussed the election then about to take place. And after most carefully analysing, sifting, comparing and considering every part of the great mass of evidence in this case, we are constrained to the conclusion that certain of these *curés*, exceeded the limits permitted by law, and that several persons were unquestionably acted on and hindered and prevented, by the threats, intimidation and undue influence of these reverend gentlemen, from voting for Mr. Tremblay, as they wished and had intended to do, and, but for such illegal interference, they would have done.

* * * *

It was an attempt to affect the whole population of the parishes, of the fact that the whole county was Roman Catholic, that a large proportion of the population were illiterate, and of the effect proved to have been produced on numerous witnesses, and the general feeling evidently produced by the pastoral, the sermons, and the

declarations of the curés, I cannot doubt that the combined effects of the bishop's pastoral and the dénonciations of the clergy so permeated the county as to make it impossible for me to say that there was a free election; and though I have no means of computing or ascertaining the exact extent of the terror or undue influence, it was still in my opinion such and so great an interference with the freedom of the elections as demands that the election should be annulled.

Rule 55, however, provides that "In election appeals a Judge in Chambers may, upon the application of the Appellant, make an order, dispensing with the whole or any part of the record, and may also dispense with the delivery of any factum or points for argument in appeal. Such order may be obtained *ex parte*, and the party obtaining it shall forthwith cause it to be served on the adverse party." The Appellant here, so far from seeking an order of that kind alleged that such would not be practicable. It is, therefore, through this default that unnecessary printing took place, and he ought not to reimburse himself out of the pocket of the Respondent. When awarding costs to the Appellant, I think the cost of the unnecessary printing should not be included.

I cannot, however, agree to any other deduction, and dissent from the decision not to reimburse the Appellant for the costs of the witnesses in the issues found against him. The witnesses examined were necessary, and there were reasonable grounds for inquiry on all the charges brought against the Respondent, and strong although not necessarily conclusive evidence given to sustain them.

The Respondent has been declared illegally elected, and his seat declared vacant. The law has been maintained, and a party illegally elected has been unseated, and the law vindicated. In election cases there are generally many charges of bribery and other undue influences, and if the petitioner succeeds in one or more of them, I know of no principle under which he would not be allowed the costs of witnesses on other charges attempted to be proved, but which, in the opinion of the Court, fell slightly short. The policy, in the administration of the Statute should be to encourage investigations into charges of undue influence, and I cannot help thinking that if a successful petitioner or prosecutor is left to pay the costs of his witnesses in all but the individual case in which he is successful, I cannot but feel that we are imposing conditions that will tend seriously to prevent that searching inquiry into cases of alleged bribery, and other undue influences, which is necessary to enforce obedience to the law when there are such incessant temptations during an election to violate it. I think, too, that on the general principles governing taxation in ordinary suits at law, the Appellant is entitled to the costs in question.

The following is a copy of the judgment and decision of the Supreme Court of Canada.

The appeal of the above-named Appellants from the judgment of the Superior Court for the Province of Quebec, rendered by the Hon. Mr. Justice Routhier on the 5th day of November, A.D. 1876, setting aside the petition of the said Appellants, complaining of the illegality of the election of the said Respondent as a member of the House of Commons of Canada for the Electoral District of Charlevoix, having come on to be heard before this Court on the 26th, 27th, 29th, 30th and 31st days of the month of January last past, and the 1st day of the month of February instant, in presence of Counsel as well for the Appellants as the Respondent, and this Court having heard what was alleged by Counsel aforesaid, was pleased to direct that the said appeal should stand over for judgment, and it having come on this day for judgment this Court did order and adjudge that the said appeal should be, and the same was allowed and that the said Judgment of the said Superior Court for the Province of Quebec be reversed, and this Court did further adjudge and determine as follows:—

1. That the said The Honorable Hector Louis Langevin was not duly elected a member to serve in the House of Commons for the Electoral District of Charlevoix, in the Province of Quebec, at the election held in the month of January, A.D. 1876, which election and return were published in the *Canada Gazette*, on the 5th day of February, A.D. 1876.

2. That the said election for the said Electoral District of Charlevoix is a void election.

3. That the said Hector Louis Langevin was by his agents guilty of the offence of undue influence at the said election:

4. That the said offence of undue influence was committed by the Reverend Joseph Sirois, curé of Baie St. Paul; the Reverend W. Tremblay, curé of St. Fidèle; the Reverend Ignace Langlais, curé of St. Hilarion; the Reverend François Cinq-Mars, curé of St. Siméon; and the Reverend N. Doucet, curé of St. Etienne of Malbaie, the agents of the said Hector Louis Langevin, without his actual knowledge and consent.

5. That the said Hector Louis Langevin do pay to the Petitioners the costs of this appeal, except the costs as to the 60 pages of the printed case in appeal relating to the subpoenas and to the bailiff's certificates as to the service thereof.

6. That the Prothonotary of the said Superior Court for the District of Saguenay to pay to the said petitioners the sum of one hundred dollars deposited in his hands on the 28th day of November last, as security for costs on their appeal to this Court.

7. That the said Hector Louis Langevin do pay to the said petitioners the costs of the said proceedings in the said Superior Court, except so much of the costs of the evidence and hearing as are incidental to those portions of the case in which the petitioners have failed, namely:—those relating to the bribery, threats and undue influence charged in the petition, and from which the Respondent remains exonerated. Their Lordships Mr. Justice Fournier and Mr. Justice Henry dissenting from the deduction of the costs of the Appellants as hereinbefore last mentioned.

WHERE THERE'S A WILL

An Editorial in *The Toronto Globe and Mail*

Of the 117,000 immigrants who entered Canada during the first eight months of this year, only 20,000 came from the United Kingdom. This, says Immigration Minister Harris, is causing his department some concern. But he puts the blame for it on the British Government which, allowing emigrants to take any amount of money to Australia, limits those going to Canada to £1,000, spread over four years; and thus places this country "under a definite disadvantage."

Mr. Harris is passing the buck. It is true that Britons moving to Canada can bring only \$3,000 with them—paid in four annual installments of \$750. But how many British emigrants and would-be emigrants have that much capital? Are we to suppose that all, or even most, of the Britons who have gone to Australia in the last few years were well-to-do? Australia's assisted-passage scheme does not suggest it.

Mr. Harris gives the show away when he talks about cost. Last year, Canada got about the same number of immigrants as Australia, but whereas they cost us \$6 million, they cost Australia \$40 million. It is evident from this that Australia is a good deal more anxious to get immigrants than we are. It is equally evident that the money factor is not important. Despite the fact that immigrants could bring all their savings with them, Australia found it necessary to spend \$40 million to get the types she needed.

But even if the money factor were important, there is a simple way around it, which this newspaper put forward years ago. Let the British emigrant leave his £1,000 in the bank at home. And let the Canadian Government give him its dollar equivalent when he arrives, collecting it back from the bank—in accordance with British regulations—in four annual installments. There would be no risk to the Canadian Government, and there would be no cost—save the trifling difference between the amount of interest paid to it on the pounds and the amount of interest paid by it on the dollars.

We might, in fact, go further than this. We could encourage the British Government to loosen up on this particular restriction, giving it dollar credits on this side in return. In other words, for every pound taken out of Britain by Canada-bound emigrants, we would give the British Government credit for \$3 here. These are just two methods of stimulating British emigration to Canada; no doubt, there are others. It is not for lack of ways that we are getting so few British immigrants; it is for lack of will.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

A Meagre Faith Answered by Measureless Grace

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Morning, July 22nd, 1923

(Stenographically Reported)

"And when Joseph's brethren saw that their father was dead, they said, Joseph will peradventure hate us, and will certainly requite us all the evil which we did unto him.

"And they sent a messenger unto Joseph, saying, Thy father did command before he died, saying,

"So shall ye say unto Joseph, Forgive, I pray thee now, the trespass of thy brethren, and their sin; for they did unto thee evil: and now, we pray thee, forgive the trespass of the servants of the God of thy father. And Joseph wept when they spake unto him.

"And his servants also went and fell down before his face; and they said, Behold, we be thy servants.

"And Joseph said unto them, Fear not: for am I in the place of God?

"But as for you, ye thought evil against me; but God meant it unto good, to bring to pass, as it is this day, to save much people alive.

"Now therefore fear ye not: I will nourish you, and your little ones. And he comforted them, and spake kindly unto them."—Genesis 50:15-21.

THERE was an old gentleman in this church a few years ago who was very deaf. He used to sit on this platform, and as near the preacher as he could get. When the service was over, frequently I said to him: "Well, Mr. So-and-So, did you hear this morning?" To which he would reply: "Well, I got the text; and when I get the text I have a pretty good idea of what you have said."

I have heard people say, "Oh, he preached on Joseph." Well, that is a big enough subject to keep a man going for several years. I have often preached to you of Joseph, especially of the earlier stages of his history; but the text this morning is from the very last chapter of his life-story; and I think we may perhaps find in it fresh comfort for to-day.

Somebody prayed in the prayer-meeting last night that the Lord would give us food for our souls this morning; and when the prayer-meeting was over, I met with one who had been in darkness, and in much doubt and discouragement; and that led me to take this subject. It may be there are others here this morning who need some one to comfort them, and to speak kindly to them, as Joseph spoke to his brethren.

Usually my subject comes out of the text; but this morning I have selected a text to illustrate a subject; for I have been thinking much of the divine goodness, of the depth of God's mercy, of the length of His patience, of the boundlessness of His love, of the inestimable wealth of His grace; and I wondered where I could find an illustration of all this. Of course, there is but one Book; but where in the Book should I find it? And as I thought of these things, this aspect of the story of Joseph's life came before my mind. As I examined it, I found it true to my own experience; and I want to use it for illustrative purposes this morning.

Many years have passed since Joseph left his father; not a few years, indeed, have fled since he made himself known to his brethren after the long silence; and Jacob's sons have been living on Joseph's bounty for a long time. He has spread their tables before them, he has loaded

them daily with benefits. A new experience has come; the old man has passed away, and they have carried him back to bury him beside those he loved so well. And now that their father is dead, as Joseph returns to Egypt, his brethren fear that he will remember the past, and that he will surely requite them for all the evil that they had done him. So they came into his presence once again, confessing their sin, begging forgiveness, and they receive the assurance that grace still abounds. Therefore, my subject this morning is: How a meagre faith is required by a boundless grace.

I.

Here is THE STORY THEN OF MEN OF MEAGRE FAITH. These sons of Jacob have long been dwelling in Egypt; but their daily receipt of Joseph's bounty has not availed to assure them of their security. Notwithstanding all that he has done for them, the food he has provided, the dwelling places which he has given them, the many tokens of his love which he has lavished upon them—in spite of all his long patience, and the multitude of his loving-kindnesses, fear grips their hearts, and they say, at last he will visit us in wrath; they have no abiding assurance of salvation.

What a picture that is of many a spiritual child of Abraham! Many years have passed since some here perhaps first made profession of faith in Christ. A long time has elapsed since first the promise of forgiveness of sins was spoken to your heart. You remember the day when the great Governor introduced Himself to you, saying, "I am Jesus"—just as He introduced Himself to Saul of Tarsus; you have walked in the light of His countenance for many a day; you have sat at His table; you have taken that word from the Song of songs and made it your own: "He brought me to the banqueting house, and his banner over me was love"; you may have had years of fellowship with the Father, and the Son; and yet in spite of it all fear lays hold upon you, and at last you wonder if it is possible in the end that there will be, in spite of all God's goodness, a remembrance of your sins: you have had this spirit of fear which expressed

itself in these words: "Joseph will peradventure hate us, and will certainly requite us all the evil which we did unto him."

I would point out to you that these men *seemed to have supposed that Joseph's attitude toward them was determined largely by circumstances.* As long as their father lived, they appeared to be quite comfortable in his presence; but the death of Jacob seemed to change everything, and they said among themselves: "Joseph will not be the same after this. We shall soon discover now that he has been cherishing vengeance in his heart these many years; and now that our father is removed, we shall feel the heavy hand without doubt."

Oh, how our little faith, how our doubting spirits, often imprison God in circumstances! Sometimes it seems quite easy to believe that all will be well, and we flatter ourselves that we are growing strong in faith. But it is not faith in Joseph at all; it is faith in Jacob; it is not faith in the Governor for what He is in Himself; but it is in faith in the circumstances in which we find ourselves. Such faith, my dear friends, will not give us true peace. It may be there is someone here this morning in whose life some great change has come. It may indeed be literally that a wife has been taken away, or a husband, or a father, or a mother—some stalwart in the faith upon whom you leaned, and for whose sake you believed God's mercy rested upon you. And now that this change has taken place, you begin to wonder if your religious life can go on as it did in the old days, or whether the Governor's attitude will be affected by your circumstances. I am not speaking in a foreign tongue. I believe I am speaking out of common Christian experience, and out of the testimony of multitudes of Christian people with whom I have dealt through the years, who seem, when the sun is shining, and the flowers are blooming, to be able to believe in the love of God; but when the sky is leaden, and the winds howl about the casement, and the thunders roar, and the lightnings flash, and the very earth seems to shake beneath your feet, then you begin to say, "And where is God now?" as though God were affected by our circumstances.

Do you see, dear friends, the difficulty with these men was that *they had not discerned the changeless character of the governor's grace;* their defect was, that they had not learned what they ought to have learned about Joseph himself. Perhaps they had been studying Egypt; perhaps they had been measuring the storehouses; perhaps they had dwelt much upon Joseph's authority as next in the throne to Pharaoh; they certainly had thought much of his affection for Jacob, and whatever of his goodness they had received, they imagined had come to them for their father's sake. But they had not learned that the grace which Joseph had shown, had flowed out of his own heart; they had not learned to trust Joseph himself; they had not learned what he was. And peace could be multiplied to them only through a more perfect knowledge of the governor himself.

So also we shall not find peace in mere subjective experiences, in the habit of self-analysis; we shall not find peace in circumstantial advantages; for these things will change. Nor shall we find abiding satisfaction in our reviews of divine providence merely, in interpretations of our own history, in recollections of former mercies. These are stimulants, but they are not the real food for faith. It is well to learn how to stimulate your faith when it languishes; but the important thing is to learn how to

feed your faith so that it will not languish. Every believer should get to know Jesus Christ better. There is no other foundation for peace than that "grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord." Do not make light of theology. You may call it by another name if you like; but theology is merely the word about God; it is the science of God. And these ecclesiastical fools—I do not know how else to designate them—who say, "Theology does not matter; we have not time to talk about such stuff!" are urgently in need of a little theology themselves. A preacher if he knows his business, will have no time to talk about anything else but God and the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. We must get to know God better. We must study His Son. That great scholar, that man of massive intellect, before whom even all the critics bow in recognition of his intellectual superiority, the pupil of Gamaliel—even he said: "What things were gain to me those I counted loss for Christ. Yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord." "That," said he, "is the supreme science; that is my master passion, that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection." And so, my friends, if we are to live in peace, and with a joy abounding, we must cultivate Jesus Christ. We must know Him, and get to know Him better still.

I would like to remind you that *it was their deepening consciousness of their guilt which made it difficult for them to believe in Joseph's grace.* When they sold him for silver, they envied him for his dreams, and they said, "Behold, this dreamer cometh." And when they had sold him, they said, "We shall see what will become of his dreams." And perhaps through the years, they tried to justify their act by saying to themselves, "Well, he wanted to lord it over us. In any case, he was a bit of an upstart. Perhaps we dealt somewhat harshly with him; but we are not sure that he did not get his deserts." But when the years were passed, and he had disclosed his identity to them as governor of Egypt, and when they fell at his feet fearing the hour of death had come, and he put his arms about them and kissed them, and when he brought them to his table, and gave them changes of raiment, and all the good of the land of Egypt, I can fancy their turning to each other and saying, "What strange spirit possessed us that we should ever have turned against such an one as this?"—And as the years passed, and they saw more and more of his grace, in contrast with it they felt ever more deeply the heinousness of their own sin, until at last their sin seemed to them so great that they found it impossible to believe that grace could "much more abound". Yet perhaps their fears were not evil, they were growing pains. Their very fearfulness was an evidence that they were getting a clearer view of Joseph's goodness, and getting to know themselves better; that his goodness was leading them to repentance.

I suppose very few of us understand what sin was when we were converted. A little child is converted, and all that is known is that he or she has been naughty. How little some of us knew about it! But as years have gone, we have come to see God more and more clearly, and to know something of His holiness, and in contrast with that, how black a thing sin is! Now give me your attention—mark this principle! You will need an apprehension of the reality of the atonement by blood more in Heaven than you need it here. Coming to know what

sin is, we see ever more clearly that nothing but the blood of Jesus can atone. John spoke of a great multitude that no man could number, and angels round about the Throne—the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands and thousands—and when the glory of His presence burst upon them, in one great shout of praise they exclaimed: "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing." They did not know until then what He had done for them. Oh, they make much of the Atonement in Heaven, and we had better make much of it here; for I am increasingly convinced that if ever we should lose sight of the Lamb in the Glory—if it were possible—we should lose Heaven itself. Heaven consists in that,—in knowing that sin has been for ever dealt with by God Himself in the Person of His Son.

Well, have you been troubled because you have had new discoveries of your own depravity? Have you been betrayed into saying something, or doing something, or thinking something of which you supposed yourself to be utterly incapable?; and in contrast with the white light of His holiness, perhaps you have said, "How can it be that God can forgive such a sinner as I?" and thus you have got into darkness. Such fears as these are only growing pains. I wish I could find some professing Christians a little more fearful, a little bit more concerned. The difficulty with so many is that they do not go on with God; and because they are not learning more about Jesus, they are not learning more of themselves. It is no miracle at all, in the view of some, that they should be forgiven, because they do not know how terrible a thing sin is.

Then I want you to note another thing coming out of this story. *These men had not yet learned absolutely to rely upon the governor's promise.* They had no doubt whatever that the promise spoken by Joseph's lips was his promise. Observe: there was no question about the authenticity of the word: "Behold, your eyes see, and the eyes of my brother Benjamin, that it is my mouth that speaketh unto you," said Joseph. There was no question about it when they got home. They were absolutely certain that the word they heard was the word of Joseph. Notwithstanding, after the years, they said: "Joseph will peradventure hate us. O yes, he promised, but will he fulfil his promise?" They had not learned to rely unquestioningly upon the promise of Joseph.

What I want to make clear to you is this: it is one thing to have a theoretical knowledge of the Word of God; and to have correct opinions about the divine inspiration of Scripture—that is very good; it is extremely important as far as it goes. As a matter of theory, one may boast that he believes the Bible from cover to cover, as I have heard people say, and yet he may not have learned to rely upon a single promise in it. Theoretically, we may subscribe to the doctrine of the inspiration and authority of Scripture, while, practically, we may not have learned to sustain our lives by resting upon what God says. Do you see the difference? It is extremely important that we should believe that this is the Word of God. But, my dear brother, it is what you use of the Word of God, it is the promise upon which you stay your soul, that makes you to grow up into Christ. And I ask you this morning just how far you believe the Word of God—not theoretically, but what use do you make of it? Have you learned to find a promise in this Book and let

it speak to you as the very voice of God, and to say, "That is an end of all argument. Here I rest, Hallelujah"? Can you say that? If so, that is believing the Word of God. That is how you are saved in the beginning: "He that hath the Son hath life." "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." Can you say: "I do believe the Son; I have His promise that I have passed from death unto life; I am saved and saved for ever?" If that be so in the beginning, it will be so all the way through: "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee: because he trusteth in thee."

I went into a hospital one day with a minister of many years' experience, and we stopped at the bed of a patient who was tossing about apparently in much weariness. It was a warm day, and as he stood at the bedside he touched the pillow, and asked, "Is it soft?" "Oh," she said, "I suppose it is, sir, but it does not feel very soft to me. I have been here so long. Sometimes it feels very hard." "Then," he said, "let me give you another one: 'Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee: because he trusteth in thee.'" And he said, "Just lie down upon that." And it did seem that the Spirit of God enabled her to recline upon the promise, and to find rest.

You see where these sons of Jacob had made their mistake. They had the promise; they knew it was Joseph's promise; but they had not learned to use that promise to dismiss their fears, to feed their faith upon, and to find in it the peace which passeth understanding.

But there is one thing for which I must commend them. *They took their fears to Joseph.* You know they might have stayed away; they might have talked among themselves; they might have made each other more and more miserable, and more and more bitter in spirit. But they did not do that: they came to Joseph as they were, weary and worn and sad; they found in him a resting place; and then he made them glad. Don't you see, it was in their hearts, and it was well that they should tell him about it? Do you know why I read that Psalm this morning? Because it shows us how to pray: "Hide not thy face from me in the day when I am in trouble." Oh, what a wretched man he was! He was like a sparrow upon the house top; he was like a pelican of the wilderness; he was like an owl of the desert; his enemies reproached him all the day. He multiplies metaphors to describe his own miserable condition; but as he prayed and told the Lord all about it, at last he was constrained to cry, "But thou, O Lord . . . shalt arise, and have mercy upon Zion."

You cannot live in the presence of God without sounding that triumphant note at last. Somebody says, "I do not pray because I do not feel like praying." That is just when you ought to pray, my brother. "But I have no faith." Then come with your fears—fightings within, and fears without, or whatever it may be—come as those men did, just as we have seen little children come. You mothers,—when do they generally come? Well, sometimes when they have a little joy to share with you, and say, "Look, Mamma, what I have got." But not generally: It is when they have cut their finger, or when they have fallen down and have a hole in their stocking, or when that new dress has been torn, or something of that sort: it is then they run with tears streaming down their faces. And then, by mother's tender reassurance, the tears are dried, and the sun shines again: "Like as a

father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him. For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust." And He wants us to come just like that. There are men and women here this morning who have found deliverance a hundred times at the Mercy-Seat when they came in that spirit, with clouded vision; something had happened and they could not see clearly, but they came to the throne of grace, and they poured out their complaints before God — I say their complaints. What was the title of that Psalm—the one hundred and second Psalm? Let me read it to you: "A prayer of the afflicted, when he is overwhelmed, and poureth out his complaint before the Lord" — they poured out their complaints before the Lord as Joseph's brethren poured out their complaint before Him.

II.

Now, you see, I have time only to mention the other half of my sermon, HOW THEIR MEAGRE FAITH WAS ANSWERED BY A MEASURELESS GRACE. When they prayed thus to Joseph, what happened? "Joseph wept when they spake unto him." I think there must have been tears in the eyes of Jesus, when He said: "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?" And when these men came to Joseph and said, "We are afraid. We have no peace. We are afraid that thy wrath will rest upon us," Joseph could not answer for the tears that flowed, and his heart was overwhelmed, "Joseph wept when they spake unto him": "O my brothers, don't you know me yet? still doubting, still fearing, instead of rejoicing in the fulness that I have provided for you?" So I think our fears sometimes bring tears to the eyes of our Beloved instead of inspiring Him with our faith.

But you will observe he said, "Fear not." And then what did he say? Did he say, "Go down to the storehouses and you will find they are still pretty full. Go and talk to Pharaoh and you will find I still wear the ring, and still have authority. Measure my wealth; I am equal to all your demands"? O no, Joseph had learned a great lesson through the years! He had learned for himself that no man is at rest until he finds his way to God.

How did Joseph allay their fears? He said: "Fear not, I am in God's stead. God speaks through me. Rest upon my word as upon God's Word." We must carry our case to the highest Court, my brethren. We must secure a judgment that can never be annulled. We must hear from the Judge of all the earth that we are acquitted. We must get the word from Somebody who stands in God's stead: Who is He? There is no other Word to us from God but that which comes through Jesus Christ. "In the beginning was the Word." Jesus is the only God we know, the only God we shall ever know: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." He is not in God's stead, He is God, and His Word is final. As we have His promise let us rest upon it, and put an end to all our fears. And he said: "Your sin has been dealt with by the Sovereign God of all."

I should like to begin now to preach to you on this text, and all that I have said would serve as an introduction. But do not be alarmed! I know my time is gone. "But as for you, ye thought evil against me—ye thought evil against me down on that low plane of human thinking and planning—but God meant it unto good, to bring to pass, as it is this day, to save much people alive." And so

Joseph said: "Even your sin, my brethren, has been made to praise God. God's grace is so wonderful, His power is so infinite, His wisdom surpassing all, that even your evil thoughts He has taken hold of, and sovereignly made them to fulfil His holy purpose, and to save much people alive." I love to think that the Lord—dare I say it?—is not vanquished by my sin. He is Sovereign over all, and that which I thought for evil, He, in the boundlessness of His grace, has made to work out for good. The apostle Peter enunciated the same principle: "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." The two principles—man's evil intention overruled, and God's gracious purpose, sovereignly disposing all things to the glory of His Name in the salvation of men.

When Joseph had dealt with their sin, and showed them it was all settled, he comforted them and spake kindly to them. My brethren, that is always the result of coming to the Mercy-Seat; no matter where you begin, no matter what your tale of woe, He will speak comfortably to you, He will speak kindly to you, for He is our Kinsman. This, indeed, is His promise: "For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee."

"I hear the words of love,
I gaze upon the blood,
I see the mighty Sacrifice,
And I have peace with God:

"'Tis everlasting peace,
Sure as Jehovah's Name;
'Tis steadfast as His stable Throne,
For evermore the same:

"The clouds may go and come,
And storms may sweep my sky,
This blood-sealed friendship changes not,
The cross is ever nigh.

"My love is oftentimes cold,
My joy still ebbs and flows;
But peace with Him remains the same;
No change Jehovah knows.

"I change; He changes not;
The Christ can never die;
His love, not mine, the resting place;
His truth, not mine, the tie."

BIBLE MISSIONARY CONFERENCE

Under auspices of

Emergency Missionary and Educational
Committee of Union of Regular
Baptist Churches

JARVIS STREET BAPTIST CHURCH

October 23-25, 1951

Special Speakers:

Rev. A. R. W. Murray, B.A. Dr. Robert McCaul
Dr. T. T. Shields Rev. John Cunningham

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 16 Fourth Quarter Lesson 3 October 21, 1951

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

JESUS DISCUSSES FORGIVENESS

Lesson Text: Matthew 18:21-35.

Golden Text: "Forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye."—Col. 3:13.

I. The Extent of Forgiveness: verses 21, 22.

The Master had been instructing His disciples as to methods of procedure to be followed when a brother sinned against them (vv. 15-20). They were to make every effort to win him back (Gal. 6:1-5). When the sinner made humble confession of his sin and showed signs of repentance, he was to be restored to the fellowship and confidence of his brethren. This would be possible only when the brother against whom he had sinned accepted the confession and apology.

Peter, the spokesman for the Twelve, voiced a practical difficulty. If the reclaimed brother repeatedly committed offenses against his fellow-believers and each time repented, how many times should he be forgiven? Would not seven times be about the limit (Lk. 17:3, 4)? Peter probably thought that the one who would forgive seven times would be most generous.

But the Master replied, in effect, that there was no limit to the bestowal of forgiving grace. The principle that "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound" (Rom. 5:20) holds true not merely in regard to salvation from sin, but also in regard to the forgiveness of sin. As often as the offender truly repents, he should be sincerely forgiven (Rom. 12:8). Christian love is not limited by numbers, times or seasons.

II. The Ground of Forgiveness: verses 23-25.

The spirit of forgiveness, as exercised toward one who has trespassed against us repeatedly, is possible only to the Christian. The unbeliever would soon demand justice, rather than mercy. Our Saviour illustrated the ground and value of mercy by the parable of the king and his debtors.

In ancient, as in modern times, the officials of the king's court, called "servants," administered the financial affairs of the land. Sometimes one of these officials would embezzle the public funds. The king in the parable demanded an accounting, and discovered that one of his officials was in arrears by about ten thousand talents, or approximately twelve million dollars in our money. This was a tremendous obligation. The king gave sentence that full restitution be made. The offending servant, his family and his possessions were to be sold and the proceeds applied to the debt. This was not an uncommon practice among the Jews (Lev. 25:39; 2 Kings 4:7; Neh. 5:5). When the offender, while humbly recognizing the justice of the claim, pleaded only for time to repay the debt, the king graciously forgave him the whole debt.

Another servant, presumably a minor official of the king, stood in a similar position of indebtedness toward the one who had been forgiven. This servant owed his brother a very small amount, about seventeen dollars in our money. One would imagine that the superior officer would treat his debtor generously, and would forgive, even as he had been forgiven. But ingratitude is all too common; it is easy to forget benefits received (Gen. 40:23). The superior officer refused to be merciful and demanded strict justice (Matt. 9:13; 12:7).

The cruelty of this man was reported to the Master and punishment was exacted, for one who will not show mercy has no right to receive mercy (Psa. 18:25).

The teaching of the parable is obvious. As Christians we have received great forgiveness at the hands of our Saviour for our many sins against Him (Isa. 55:7; Lk. 7:47). On that account we ourselves are ever to be ready to forgive others for the sins which they have committed against us (Matt. 6:12; 2 Cor. 2:7, 10; Eph. 4:32; Col. 3:12, 13). Had the Lord dealt with us in justice only, no one could have been saved (Psa. 103:8-11; 130:3; Mic. 7:18, 19).

An unforgiving spirit will injure our brethren (Prov. 10:12; Matt. 5:22-24; Heb. 12:15), but it will also do infinite harm

to our own lives. It is an indication that we are living in the realm of the flesh (Gal. 5:20). A spirit of bitterness, if harboured, will disrupt our fellowship with the Lord, so that we do not recognize or realize our own sins, and hence we cannot obtain forgiveness (Matt. 6:14, 15; Mk. 11:25, 26; Jas. 2:13; 1 John 1:9). The Holy Spirit must not be quenched or grieved (Eph. 4:30; 1 Thess. 5:19).

On the other hand, there is a weak tolerance of sin which sometimes goes by the name of forgiveness. To gloss over iniquity is not according to the Scriptures: love rejoices not in iniquity, but only in the truth (1 Cor. 13:6). Our Saviour set us the example of loving the sinner, but hating his sin (Psa. 45:7; Prov. 8:13; John 8:11). So long as a believer clings to his sin forgiveness and restoration are impossible (Prov. 12:1; 28:13), not merely in the Divine realm, but also in the human realm. "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men" (Rom. 12:18). We must do our part to live at peace with others, but we are called upon to separate ourselves from those who walk disorderly, and trample upon truth, righteousness and other principles of the word of God (Rom. 16:17; 1 Cor. 5:11; 2 Cor. 6:14; 2 Thess. 3:6, 14).

BAPTIST RALLY AT COURTLAND

MERELY to say that the Courtland Rally was a success is certainly an understatement. As to numbers there was a great gathering. Roundabout the Town Hall it looked like a section of a parking lot in The Canadian National Exhibition. There were cars galore, and two great T.T.C. buses seating forty-five each. There were about 150 from Jarvis Street alone. They were there also from Essex, Tilbury, Springfield, London, Stratford, Guelph, Harriston, and doubtless many other places.

How the Courtland people did it we don't know, but between the afternoon and evening meetings they provided a hot meal, and served 400 people. This was a necessity because no restaurant provision for such a number was available. The tables were arranged in advance in the basement of the Town Hall. As soon as the afternoon meeting was over, people were asked to immediately vacate the Hall, and it was re-arranged with tables, which were spread as if by magic, and even with the upstairs and the downstairs crowded with tables, there had to be a second sitting. Four hundred in all were actually fed.

Greetings were brought from many places. The Jarvis Street choir sang both afternoon and evening, and in the evening there was a solo also from Mr. Marsden of Delhi, and a well-rendered selection from a Jarvis Street male quartette.

In the afternoon we were treated to a magnificent address. All that we can say of it is that it was after the usual manner of Dr. Robert McCaul. The Pastor of Jarvis Street spoke in the evening.

We believe that it was a day that will be long remembered, and we have little doubt that it was an inspiration and encouragement to the Courtland and Delhi friends, as well as to a great company which came from without.

One of the joys of the day was to see Rev. Samuel Dempster at home among his own people. He was a perfect master of ceremonies, equal to every emergency, and we are sure that with equal ease he could have presided over as many thousands as he had hundreds. We were happy to see him so well, and in his own workshop.

Among the ministers present were Rev. Bert Oatley-Willis, Rev. Geoffrey Adams, Rev. Clifford Rogers, Rev. H. C. Slade, and others. We have little doubt that great good was accomplished: Praise God from Whom all blessings flow!