

The Gospel Witness

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF EVANGELICAL PRINCIPLES
AND IN DEFENCE OF THE FAITH ONCE FOR ALL DELIVERED TO THE SAINTS.
\$2.00 Per Year, Postpaid, to any address. 5c Per Single Copy.

Editor: T. T. SHIELDS

Associate Editor: ALEXANDER THOMSON

"I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ."—Romans 1:16.

Address Correspondence: THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2, Canada.
Registered Cable Address: Jarwitsem, Canada.

Vol. 14, No. 49

TORONTO, APRIL 16, 1936

Whole Number 726

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

"IN THE TWINKLING OF AN EYE"

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, April 12th, 1936.
(Stenographically Reported)

"Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.

"Behold, I shew you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed,

"In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.

"For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.

"So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory.

"O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"

"The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law.

"But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."—I. Corinthians 15:50-57.

In this familiar chapter, dealing so fully with the doctrine of last things, the Apostle Paul, by inspiration, lays for his great argument a solid, historical, foundation. He begins his argument in the realm of the visible and ponderable. He discusses things which may be measured and appraised and certified, even by sensuous human nature. He declares that Jesus Christ is risen. He calls witnesses into court, and proves to a demonstration that the actual resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead is an historic fact indisputably attested.

From that historic foundation he proceeds to reason respecting the implication of that fact. He declares that the resurrection of Christ is absolutely indispensable to saving faith; for he says, "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised: and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins." Then follows the triumphant declaration, "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept."

In our day there is a new emphasis, that of the value of Christianity to the present life, without respect to the future. Men are exhorted to live well, to do their best, to take care of the present, and the future will take care of itself. But this preacher says that "if in this

life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable", most to be pitied. By which he does not mean that "the earnest of our inheritance" which believers receive here and now, the first instalment of the inheritance of the Christian, is of little worth; but rather that the future life, of necessity, must be the complement of the present, and that if there be no future life, no resurrection, no completion of this segmentary, fractional life that we live here, in a realm beyond, then this life itself is but a disappointment, a delusion; and we who have tried to relate this life to the next, and have viewed the things of time in the perspective of eternity, and have made such sacrifices, and voluntarily and cheerfully surrendered the things of time in order that we might be more fully prepared for eternity, then we have been entirely mistaken. We are out of centre, we are "of all men most miserable".

But here we are told that "Christ is risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept". I like to watch Brother Hutchinson when these children are singing. I thought it was a fine gesture, and had a world of significance in it, the way he made these little ones to say, "No, never part again"! No, never! There is a real emphasis to be placed on that fact only if it be indisputably established that Jesus Christ is risen.

That is my theme this evening, an old one, I know; but let us go to the well again. We have nothing with which to draw, and the well is deep. Let us therefore

pray that the Spirit of God may teach us some of the deep things of God.

I.

WHAT, THEN, IS THE RELATION OF THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST TO HIS QUALIFICATIONS AS A REDEEMER? Just now we heard the ladies sing, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." We need a Redeemer, and He must be a living Redeemer. But how do we know that we have such a Redeemer?

His resurrection was *the culmination of His testimony to God*, and therefore a certification of His supreme authority as the Revealer of God. Jesus Christ came into the world to tell us who God is, and what God is. He said even to Nicodemus, "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness. If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things? And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." Jesus Christ said in effect, "I come from another realm, from another world into which no man has ever entered and returned to earth. I come to tell you of things that are not demonstrable to the senses. They are not susceptible of proof on the ordinary plane. Notwithstanding I come with an authoritative message from another world, to you." Jesus Christ came to tell us of another world, of that other land of which the children have been singing, primarily, and of our relation thereto, and of how we may find our way happily thither.

All that Christ taught differs from that which men ordinarily believe. Sin has inverted the laws of order. There was more truth than they themselves knew in the saying of the opponents of Christianity, "These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also." That is why the teaching of Jesus Christ is directly contrary to everything that men of themselves think. He said the way to be exalted is to humble ourselves; the way to get rich is to become poor; the way to be mighty is to acknowledge our weakness; the way to possess all the treasures of eternity is to count the things of time of little worth. He inverted the thoughts of men, turned things upsidedown—and men could not understand Him. It was not merely of His eloquence, not of the music of His language, that men spoke when they said, "Never man spake like this man." His testimony was different: "He taught then as one having authority, and not as the scribes." He did not say, "I think", or, "It may be so", "It is probably true". Nay! He said, "Verily, verily, I say unto you."

Who was He that He should be qualified thus to set at naught all human reasoning, all human philosophies, and set up His own dictum as the standard by which human life is to be judged? What right had He, if He were only a man? The life that began in miracle ended in miracle, so far as his earthly career was concerned. His miraculous resurrection was the complement of His miraculous birth, and the attestation of His whole miraculous career. He was the embodiment of supernaturalism. He breathed supernaturalism. He wrought by supernatural power. He was man, but He was clothed with powers divine, and He dared to say, "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father." What end would you expect to such a life as that? He died, and they thought that was the end. But, behold, the

grave is empty: "He is not here, but is risen." He was declared "to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." His resurrection attested the genuineness of every word that He had uttered, and put upon the whole testimony of the Word that "was made flesh, and dwelt among us" the divine imprimatur as being the divine ultimatum to a sinful world.

The resurrection of Christ was *the culmination of His atoning work*. What value had the atonement? Granting the sinlessness of His character, and the holiness of His nature, assuming Him to be all that He said He was in that respect, and standing silent in the face of His challenge, "Which of you convinceth me of sin?"—admitting, not merely His moral excellence, but His moral perfection, the unity of His nature, His absolute conformity to the law of God everywhere, admitting that He is one element at least in the universe that is in perfect accord with the will of the Creator—what then? He died! Yea; but He rises again. Now what value has His life? Do you not see that it attests the truth later spoken that He Who is our High Priest was not made "after the power of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless (indissoluble) life"? It was a life that could not be dissolved. It was a life that was everlasting in its very nature and essence; not merely endless, but indissoluble. "No man taketh (my life) from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father."

But how could He prove it? How is it to be proved? Often have I said to you that, granting His moral perfections, yet subjecting Him to human limitations, if He died as a substitute for someone, then a perfect life might have atoned for your imperfect life, or for mine, but not for both of us. He could have died for you, but not for you and me; for not less than that did the law of God require, absolute perfection. When God made man He said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." That was the divine intent. If you admit that fullest realization of the divine likeness in human form, and nothing more than that, then His death on Calvary ceases to be an atoning death; it has no value. But when by His resurrection He lives again, then it is proved that it was not possible that He should be holden of death. It proves that He "only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see". Jesus Christ is the life as truly as He is the light of men, and His resurrection proves the immortality of His life. He was not subject unto death. He lives, and therefore His death for you and for me, and for all others, is of value. "He is the propitiation of our sins"—and blessed be God—"not for our's only, but also for the sins of the whole world."

His resurrection was indispensable to the exercise of His mediatorial office. Who is to take this blood into the heavenly places? Where shall we find an high priest who is "an high priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek", without beginning of days, or end of life, "abiding a priest continually", to take the blood of infinite value into the holy of holies, and to present it as an atonement for the sins of the world? Who can do it? Only the risen Son of God. But, rising through the rent veil of His own flesh, He entered into the presence of the Holy One, "not with the blood of others"—Himself the Victim, the Sacrifice, the Priest, the Apostle and High

Priest of our profession—He carried His own blood into the presence of God, “there to appear in the presence of God for us.” And that is where He is to-night.

Do you not see how the resurrection of Christ is an absolutely indispensable element in the Christian revelation?

II.

Once again, the resurrection of Christ is **INDISPENSABLE TO THE COMPLETE REDEMPTION OF THE INDIVIDUAL**. What are we? What have we to say? Did you ever try to analyze yourself, to find out what elements there are in that something which, for want of a better word, we call personality? What do you mean by human personality? Is it body—hands and feet, eyes and ears? No! There is the body, for we all have seen a body from which the Spirit has departed, just an inanimate piece of flesh, no value to anyone. The outward form was the same, but even the smallest child feels, “When I speak of my father and mother, I do not mean their body: I mean something more than that.” What do you mean? That is difficult to answer, but there is more than the physical in each of us.

Theologians sometimes use big words, and they talk about a *trichotomy*, the theory that we are made up of three parts. Some hold what is called the *dichotomous* theory, that we are composed of two parts. I have known many people who lend credence to the theory that we are made up of two parts, double-minded, two-faced people.

Some people seem to have two faces literally. Someone said to me the other day, “Sometimes when you walk into the pulpit and look over the congregation with such a stern expression, we wonder what we have done. Then sometimes you smile at us, and everything seems different.” I suppose we are all like that. We all have countenances of many expressions. What makes the difference? There is something within looking out. This body is only the outward tabernacle, but we have a psychic nature, the soulish nature, the soul of a man; by which we do not mean the immortal spirit, but that element in his nature by which he thinks—his memory, his reason, his will, his affection, all the constituents of the human mind. Some people are better furnished mentally than others, some have stronger, keener faculties than others; but normally we all have minds.

What is your mind? It is that something that is within you that makes you what you are. The unconverted man, so far as his spiritual nature is concerned, is dead in trespasses and sins; his spiritual nature makes no response to things spiritual. But his mental nature may be active; he is what the Bible calls a sensuous man, one who is governed by his senses—sight, hearing, taste, smell, touch; and his correspondence with all life is confined to those senses. If he loses his sight, one sense is cut off, one door is barred. If he loses his hearing, another door is barred. If he loses his sense of smell, another avenue is closed. If he loses his taste, another avenue is closed. By and by the man becomes paralyzed—He holds no commerce with the world about him. Yet, when the doctor comes, he says, “He is still living.” The lungs are corresponding with his environment without, supplying certain vital forces to his nature, and he lives; but so far as the man himself is concerned he is gone. You cannot reach him. We say he is in a state of coma;

he is unconscious. Every door is barred; only the physical nature lives.

But there is a spiritual nature. The Bible says that sin has brought that down to death: we are “dead in trespasses and sins”. But when the Spirit of God comes to a man, He quickens that spiritual nature; a vital spark is put within. That is what conversion is, a new life from God. We are quickened by the Spirit, and with that quickening comes the illumination of the mind, the engagement of the affections, the revivifying of the memory, the energizing of the will; and by and by the spirit and the mind begin to work in harmony. Then, as the spiritual nature grows, it brings both the mind and the body into subjection, and we say of the man thus changed, He is a spiritually-minded man. Without the spirit, he may be a very learned man, but he is a carnally-minded man. All his thinking is according to fleshly standards.

That spiritual nature has correspondence with another world. That is what the Bible means when it says, “Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.” The man who is a Christian has a sixth sense; he has another means of communication with the outside world because his spiritual nature is made alive, and brought into correspondence with God. But the physical nature carries with it the disabilities and limitations of a material creation that “groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now”.

I have known a great many really spiritual men who had to limp around. “What is wrong, brother?” “Oh, these poor old feet of mine.” We all feel like that sometimes. Say what you will about the body, we cannot do without it. The psychical nature and the spiritual nature are both imprisoned within this mortal flesh, so that we cannot do the things that we would. You tell me that the blood of Jesus Christ has washed away my sins? Praise the Lord! I am thankful for that. He has given me the Holy Spirit to illuminate my understanding, so that in the reading of God’s Word I may understand something of my inheritance as a Christian. Thank God for that! But is this physical nature foreign to me? Must I slough it off entirely? No!

There is nothing in the Bible to teach us to make light of the body. The Bible says that even our bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost. Wonder of wonders, that God Himself should come and dwell in these imperfect bodies. But He does. I look over this congregation, and see many vacant seats. Oh yes, I know someone is sitting there, but not the person I used to know. I have been in this pulpit twenty-six years, and as the Easter occasion comes around, I look over the congregation and say to myself, He is in glory. She has passed over the river. We carried their bodies out to God’s acre, and buried them out of our sight—and how soon we shall be carried out and buried, none of us know. “If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable.” If there is no continuity, if there is no complement in the life beyond, surely we have been misinformed and deceived.

The Bible says, “The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now . . . waiting for the adoption”—what does that mean?—“to wit, the redemption of our body.” And when the whole creation

is delivered out of the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God, then indeed the work of redemption will be complete.

III.

May I call your attention also to the fact that THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST IS INDISPENSABLE TO THE FUTURE FELICITY OF THE REDEEMED. I know that young people, looking forward to life, seem to think that a year is a long time. I used to feel the day after Christmas that the next Christmas was an eternity away. Sometimes I wish now it were! But it comes rapidly enough year after year. I suppose the longer we live, the more rapidly time seems to fly. As we look back twenty or thirty years, it seems only yesterday. You who have gray hairs—you cannot tell whether I have or not; I have the advantage of you—know the truth of what I am saying. When men get toward the eveningtime, they are inclined to say, "Was it worth while coming at all? Was it worth while having been born into this world? Is there nothing better?"

Yes, there is. The Bible says this is only a brief probation, that the real life for which we were made when God created us, is beyond; and that we can afford to discount the things of time in order that we may rightly appraise the things of eternity.

This chapter tells of a time when *the bodies of the saints shall rise again*. Do you believe that? I do. The Bible says so. And their resurrection synchronizes with the coming of the Lord Jesus. Some day He is coming: "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

Nobody can explain the resurrection. If it were susceptible of scientific explanation I would not believe it; I would class it with a great many other scientific deductions that turn out to be untrue. All I can say is that the Word of God says the dead shall rise. Paul asks, "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?" I would not believe it were it anywhere else than in the Bible. It is not possible apart from the mighty power of God. But as Jesus Christ was raised, so shall we be raised: "Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." We shall be raised "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump." "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed."

We all need to be changed. Even the best looking among us could be improved upon! Even the healthiest of us, could be healthier still. If with our quickened faculties, we were in the future to have no better bodies, life would not be worth living over yonder. There never was but one perfect man in all the world's history. Language struggles to describe Him in that Song of Songs which is Solomon's, as the One Whose head "is as the most fine gold, his locks are bushy, and black as a raven. His eyes are as the eyes of doves by the rivers of waters, washed with milk, and fitly set. His cheeks are as a bed of spices, as sweet flowers: his lips like lilies, dropping sweet smelling myrrh . . . his mouth is most sweet: yea, he is altogether lovely. This is my beloved, and this is my friend, O daughters of Jerusalem."

What a glorious man Jesus was—no wrinkles on His brow, no marks of disease upon His perfect body. He

was the physical embodiment, exemplification, of the ideal which was formed in the mind of the Eternal when God planned to climax the creative work of the universe, saying, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." At last He made Him: "Made of a woman, made under the law." Begotten of the Holy Ghost, He came, the express image of the Father's person. What a glorious man Jesus Christ was in the days of His flesh, if only the eyes of men had been open to recognize His beauty!

When He descended into the grave, He did not see corruption: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." He came forth from the grave in a spiritual body. Corporal, literal, physical? Of course; yet spiritualized in some mysterious way. When Jesus Christ showed Himself to His disciples He said, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." He did not say flesh and blood. I like to think that our new bodies will be animated, not by blood, but by spirit. I will not be dogmatic about it, but physicians will tell you that most of our ailments come from the blood. If we had purer blood we should be healthier. Our Lord, after His resurrection, had flesh and bones, but His blood had been poured out for the salvation of the world; he had none left; His was now a spiritual body.

"Our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body"—the body of our humiliation. What pattern shall He use?—"that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." So that even the angels will say, "How he reminds us of Jesus Christ!" His image shall be in us, even as to our bodies.

You say of the friends you have laid away, "I want them to come back in the same body." I do not want my loved to come back with bodies subject to infirmities: but with bodies like unto His glorious body; with some distinguishing marks by which I may recognize them.

What shall be the change? I have time only to refer you to the Scripture. Paul says it is like sowing seed. You put some tulip bulbs in the earth last fall and said, "This is a red tulip, this is a yellow tulip, this is a white one." Had the bulbs not been separated, you could not have told them apart. But in the springtime they began to grow, by and by to send up shoots, and presently beautiful flowers, purple, scarlet, yellow, and white. There is not a chemist living, nor horticulturist—no scientist of any description—that could turn his microscope on those bulbs, and tell you why they produced flowers of different colours. Nobody knows. Yes; God knows. "He hath made everything beautiful in his time: also he hath set the world in their heart, so that no man can find out the work that God maketh from the beginning to the end."

And the biggest job He ever had is to make us beautiful. But He is going to do that, and fashion our bodies like unto the body of His glory. This body is sown in corruption. Martha and Mary were afraid to have the stone taken away from their brother's sepulchre, when he had been dead but four days. We are going down to decay; the marks of decay are upon every one of us. We have to go to the dentist oftener now. "The keepers of the house shall tremble, and the strong men shall bow

themselves, and the grinders cease because they are few, and those that look out of the windows be darkened, and the doors shall be shut in the streets, when the sound of the grinding is low, and he shall rise up at the voice of the bird, and all the daughters of musick shall be brought low; also when they shall be afraid of that which is high, and fears shall be in the way, and the almond tree shall flourish, and the grasshopper shall be a burden, and desire shall fail: because man goeth to his long home, and the mourners go about the streets: or ever the silver cord be loosed, or the golden bowl be broken, or the pitcher be broken at the fountain, or the wheel broken at the cistern. Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

"It is sown in dishonour"? Yes. You see a man proud of his strength, an athletic figure. Some people are tired—he never is. Other people must be careful—he is never careful; he is strong. He "rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race." But after a while he finds he is not running as fast as he used to. He slows down a bit. By and by the strong man bows himself. That magnificent body is laid aside, and men say, "He is gone."

Death is cruel. He has never been anything but an enemy to any one of us. What have you to say when you lay that strong man at last in the grave? "He is beaten. He is vanquished. Death, the conqueror of us all, has put his heel upon him." But, hallelujah, "it is raised in glory." "It is sown in weakness; it is raised in power." "So then", says our text, "this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality"—in every respect that new body will be like unto the body of Jesus Christ—"Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." He extracted the sting of death when He put His conquering heel upon it, and robbed it of its victory, for "the sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

THE WEEK END IN JARVIS STREET

Another happy Good Friday and Easter Sunday have come and gone. Friday evening the church was crowded for the service of praise, and again Sunday morning and evening there were great congregations. On all three occasions the choir was augmented to the number of about one hundred and fifty, including the junior choir. Mr. W. J. Hutchinson was master of them all, and the children were the star singers. We have said it before but it does us good to repeat it, that we have never known Mr. Hutchinson's equal as a leader of children—whether in singing—or teaching—or playing—at a picnic. Space limits our speech, we can only say that the choir was better than ever and Mr. Hutchinson was superb.

NEWS OF UNION CHURCHES

Brantford

Easter Sunday was a good day at the Shenstone Memorial Baptist Church, Brantford, where Rev. A. C. Whitcombe is pastor. The Children's Choir assisted at both morning and evening services and added much to the enjoyment of the services. At the Sunday school in the afternoon there were over two hundred present, and the Children's Choir assisted in the afternoon broadcast.

On Monday evening a number of Young People from the Shenstone Church travelled by bus to join with the Galt Baptist Church Young People. Rev. A. C. Whitcombe gave the address of the evening, and a very happy and profitable time was spent in this way.

THE ADDRESS ON SEPARATE SCHOOLS

We publish in this issue an address on the Separate School question in Ontario, delivered by the Editor Tuesday evening, April 14th, in Jarvis Street Church. We publish it for the sake of our Canadian readers, and also because certain matters contained therein have a much wider interest and application than the Province of Ontario, or even the Dominion of Canada.

Our out-of-town readers may be interested in knowing something about the meeting. It was announced in the papers Saturday, Monday, and Tuesday. There was no organization, and no other effort to secure a congregation; but there were somewhere between fifteen hundred and two thousand people. The church was packed in every part.

The first edition of five thousand copies of the address in booklet form has already been published, and may be obtained at THE GOSPEL WITNESS office. (See advertisement on last page.)

For the information of our readers we report that *The Evening Telegram* gave two and a third columns to a report of the address, under large headlines. We give the reporter's impression of the service in the opening paragraphs below. As the address is printed in full on page seven it is not necessary to give more.

Our readers will not be surprised to learn that *The Toronto Globe* failed to report that a meeting had been held. Other Toronto papers reported the meeting and *The Telegram* printed the section of the address relating to *The Globe* entire.

The Evening Telegram's Report

"If I hadn't a bigger job in hand I'd stand for the Legislature myself and I would delight in having the honour of meeting on the public platform the Hon. 'Midget' F. Hepburn himself. We have got to awaken public opinion on this question. You know governments with huge majorities such as that of the Hepburn Administration are short-lived—they lose their heads.

"If I were Premier of this province I would not in the present state of public opinion interfere with the Liquor Control Act, inasmuch as it is on the statute books by popular vote. I would repeal the beverage room law and I would repeal this iniquitous measure of last week, and I would move immediately for the abolition of separate schools in Ontario."

"Amid vociferous applause from an immense audience that packed the auditorium of Jarvis Street Baptist Church, overflowed the galleries, packed extra seats brought to the front and even crowded on to the platform, Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D., pastor of Jarvis Street Baptist Church thus concluded an impassioned address last night, in which he condemned the Hepburn Government's amendments to the school tax laws of the province.

Applause and Cheers

"He gave his address the title, 'The Hepburn Government's Betrayal of Its Public Trust by Diverting Public School Revenue to the Support of Roman Catholic Separate Schools.'

"He was frequently interrupted by outbursts of applause and his reference to the possibility of his entering the political arena brought cheers from the immense throng.

"When referring to the beverage rooms law he remarked, 'I voted for Roebuck, you know', the crowd roared. After the laughter had subsided somewhat he added mournfully, 'But never again—never again.' The audience went wild with cheering at this statement.

"The meeting opened with prayer and the singing of several hymns."

Whole Bible Course Lesson Leaf

REV. ALEX. THOMSON, EDITOR

Vol. 11 Second Quarter Lesson 17 April 26th, 1936

ZION COMFORTED

Lesson Text: Isaiah, chapter 40.

Golden Text: "He giveth power to the faint; and to them that have no might he increaseth strength. Even the youths shall faint and be weary, and the young men shall utterly fall: but they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk, and not faint."—Isaiah 40:29-31.

Bible School Reading: Isaiah 40:1-17.

DAILY BIBLE READINGS: Monday—Deut. 5:1-10; Tuesday—Ps. 19:1-6; Wednesday—Ps. 40:1-5; Thursday—Mal. 4:1-6; Friday—Luke 8:1-9; Saturday—Acts 4:13-22.

COMFORTABLE SPEECH (vs. 1, 2)—With this chapter the second part of the book begins. In the former part there is much of judgment affecting Israel, and certain Gentile nations. In this part there is much of blessing, extending into post-exilic and future Messianic times. In the previous chapter prediction is made of the Babylonian captivity. In the chapter of this lesson comfort is given respecting the blessing which would follow the restoration of the people to their own land. The command is given to speak comfortably to Jerusalem, and inform her of the cessation of her warfare, and the pardoning of her iniquity, "for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins". The message of these verses seems to point to a yet future complete fulfilment. Note the fact of divine comfort, and its application to the people of God in these days (2 Cor. 1:3, 4). There is a need for such comfort in the midst of the world's troubles. Fellowship with God is a possibility now (1 John 1:3), and a bright prospect is before each child of God (1 Pet. 1:3-5).

THE FORERUNNER (vs. 3-5)—In this section there is an intimation of the coming of the Messiah, and, as heralds preceded an eastern monarch, and prepared the way for their royal master on his journey, so it is promised that one would come before Him who would act similarly in the spiritual sphere. The Holy Spirit applies this scripture to John the Baptist who prepared the way of the Lord by leading many to repentance (Matt. 3:3). Note the necessity for repentance at the present time (Acts 17:30), the purpose of the Lord's coming to this earth (Luke 19:10), and the prediction of His return (John 14:3). Observe also the character of the forerunner, and the mission of each child of God to lead others to repentance.

MAN'S FRAILTY (vs. 6-8)—A contrast is instituted here between the frailty and short duration of man's existence on this earth, and the steadfastness and eternal continuity of the word of God. Peter, referring to this scripture, says, "And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you" (1 Pet. 1:25). The word of God is powerful (Heb. 4:12), true, wise, good, and gracious. Obedience to it brings blessing (Deut. 28:1, 2), while disobedience thereto involves judgment and loss (Deut. 28:15). It is needed by men, and is recorded in the Bible. Note also the uncertainty of man's life, and the necessity for preparation for eternity. The life of man is as a vapour (Jas. 4:14).

GOOD TIDINGS—(vs. 9-11)—In this section those who publish the good tidings respecting the return of the exiles to their own land are enjoined to do so with boldness. They are directed to lift up the voice boldly and be not afraid; and to "say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God." His strength is referred to, together with His reward, and His care over His own. His power would be manifest against His enemies, and in favour of His own. The messengers of God have no cause for fear at any time (Heb. 13:6). In Old Testament times they were fearless, as Samuel (1 Sam. 15), and Amos (Amos 7:10-17); and in the days succeeding Pentecost the members of the church were characterized by boldness (Acts 4:31). The divine message of this era, as in the past, relates to the manifestation of the power of God—a message of salvation (Rom. 1:16). Note the description of the work of the Lord. He shall

rule, reward, feed, gather, carry, and lead. He is referred to as the Ruler, the Rewarder, and the Shepherd (Rev. 1:5; 22:12; John 10:11). It was a message of cheer unto His own people; and the gospel of Jesus Christ is also good tidings, for it tells of salvation from the power, penalty, and presence of sin.

DIVINE WISDOM (vs. 12-17)—The messengers were directed to proclaim the message of God, and tell of His work; and in these verses the great wisdom and power of God are set forth in relation to the realm of nature. Due to divine wisdom the heavens and the earth are rightly proportioned in reference to their various properties. God created the same directly, and not by evolution (Gen. 1:1). In contrast with Him, men are insignificant and helpless: "They are counted to him less than nothing, and vanity." How foolish then to rebel against Him! They are dependent on Him for life, and for all that makes life worth living. He is also the source of knowledge, wisdom, and understanding. Note the greatness of His wisdom and power in His creation, manifest in the wonders of the heavens and the earth (Ps. 88:4; 19:1-6). His works bring glory to His name, and man is meant to do likewise.

THE GRAVEN IMAGE (vs. 19-20)—The greatness of God having been set forth, the foolishness of making an image of Him is emphasized. Two kinds of images are indicated, the elaborate and the simple; and both give evidence of the sinfulness of men. Observe in the first place the impossibility of making a suitable image of God. No one on earth has ever seen Him. He is Spirit (John 4:24), and He is too great for man to liken Him to anything on this earth. It may further be noted that the making of images is forbidden by God (Ex. 20:4-6). Images used in worship generally receive the adoration which ought alone to be given to God; and corruption of some kind always accompanies such an exercise, as well as false views of God. Images are not required in worship. To please God in this respect, we must worship Him in spirit and in truth (John 4:24). When the heart is right with God, it will desire nothing between it and its Lord. The ritualism and use of material objects in so many religious services of the present time give evidence of a backward and backslidden state of heart, if not, in many cases, of a heart at enmity against God.

THE GREATNESS OF GOD (vs. 21-27)—The folly of idolatry is again shown in these verses, and the fact is emphasized that God attends to the needs of His people. It is intimated the people should have known this, and there is no doubt they were in possession of such knowledge; but knowledge alone will not keep people in the right way. Many persons in the present day know what to do, but do it not. There must be willingness to accept of the help of God to give strength in life and service. Note the exalted position of God, the form of the earth, the smallness of man, the judgment of the leaders who had led the people astray, the power and knowledge of God, and the assurance of God's care over His own. It is blessed indeed when we can say, "This God is our God." And it is encouraging to meditate on, and experience, His almighty power. In general, we are sadly lacking in faith in such a God. Think of what He can do, of what He is willing to do, and of what He has done; and then let us see to it that we are in the place where He can use us.

THE EVERLASTING GOD (vs. 28-31)—In these closing verses of the chapter further encouragement is given to trust in God, by a statement concerning His nature and work. He is the Everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth. He fainteth not, neither is weary, and there is no searching of His understanding. He is the All-sufficient One, ever ready to aid those who come unto Him. The help given such persons is then indicated. "He giveth power to the faint, and to them that have no might he increaseth strength." Without Him, we can do nothing (John 15:5), but in His strength we can do all things (Phil. 4:13). They that wait on Him "shall renew their strength". They shall find His grace sufficient for every circumstance of life (2 Cor. 12:9). "They shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk, and not faint." Every duty is taken care of; every obstacle is overcome. Every phase of activity is provided for. Note these phases of activity as soaring, running, and walking. It is God's intention that we should live victoriously, and for this He has provided the power; but we must wait on Him for the receiving of the same.

The Hepburn Government's Betrayal of Its Public Trust by Diverting Public School Revenue to the Support of Roman Catholic Separate Schools

An Address Delivered in Jarvis St. Baptist Church, Toronto,
Tuesday Evening, April 14th, 1936

By DR. T. T. SHIELDS

We live in a day when, in matters of religion or morals, in questions of right as against wrong, and truth as against error, it seems to be popular to follow the line of least resistance, and to drift with the tide. Society generally, whether considered within the narrow compass of a small community, or as a nation, or in relationships that are international, is in a state of flux. Because this is so, it seems that anyone who ventures a protest against anything is put on the defensive, and must justify his protest.

I believe that principles of righteousness, of truth, of equity, are more than expressions of the opinion of the majority. I am old-fashioned enough to believe that the Decalogue still stands, and that the moral law is as invariable as the laws which regulate the vicissitudes of day and night, the ebb and flow of tides, and all the phenomena of nature. We shall not be disturbed therefore if tomorrow *The Mail and Empire* should print another editorial entitled, "Dr. Shields on the rampage again".

The police—that is, when they do their duty—always go "on the rampage" when criminals are about. Whenever a fire alarm is sounded, the fire brigade goes "on a rampage". And whenever wrong is perpetrated, honest men should go "on the rampage", at least to this extent: they should protest with all their might, and do their utmost to right the wrong.

The Separate School a Religious Issue

The Separate School question is essentially a religious question. Disguise it as you may, at the foundation it is religious.

It would be impossible to arrive at a correct diagnosis of the case before us without some study of its history. Brushing aside all secondary matters, that which lies at the base of the present agitation is not only religion, but the Roman Catholic religion. As a matter of fact, it is not Dr. Shields in this instance, nor any other protesting person, or body of persons, but Roman Catholicism, which is once more "on the rampage".

What Is Roman Catholicism?

What is Roman Catholicism? As a religion, it is entitled to the utmost freedom of exercise. I believe in absolute liberty of conscience. I believe that the consciences of men should be subject to no human inhibition. I would contend with the utmost earnestness for the freedom of Roman Catholics to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. So would I for the liberty of conscience of any man, whether Roman Catholic, Mohammedan, Jew, or any and every form of religion that is called Christian.

But Roman Catholicism differs essentially from pure Christianity in that it is a religeo-political system. It is just as truly a political system as it is a religious system.

During the Great War I went into the Westminster Roman Catholic Church in London. On a book stall in the entrance I saw a little booklet by Cardinal Mercier, of Belgium. I think the title of the booklet was, "The Duty

of Catholics". Cardinal Mercier was very much in the public eye at the time, and I threw down my penny, and took the booklet. On reading it later I discovered that Mercier said it was the duty of all Catholics to encourage their children to marry at maturity, and to produce a population for the church. I have never seen the distinction between Christianity in the New Testament sense, and Roman Catholicism, more clearly defined. Christianity is propagated, and Christians are multiplied, by a spiritual birth: "Ye must be born again." Roman Catholicism is propagated always by carnal, or natural, means. It is essentially a carnal, or natural, religion; and the weapons of its warfare are always carnal weapons.

Rome's Claim to Temporal Power

I need not argue the point, but merely assert the fact, that the Roman Catholic Church has always claimed temporal power for its Pontiff. It is the teaching of Rome that the Pope is the representative of God on earth, His vicar or vicegerent; and that he is really superior to all earthly kings. And, indeed, that the head of any nation who holds his position of rulership otherwise than by the sovereign Pontiff's consent, is an usurper.

Europe's Bloody History

I need only cite Europe's bloody history for nearly a thousand years in attestation of that fact. It is the teaching of Rome that all who are not Roman Catholics are heretics, and that all Roman Catholics owe their primary obedience and loyalty to the Pope; that his is the supreme authority on earth, and that all other authorities are secondary and subordinate to him. It follows therefore that no truly loyal Roman Catholic can, in the nature of the case, be a loyal subject of any non-Catholic government.

I think no one would charge that John Wesley was an illiberal or intolerant man. The founder of Methodism was, indeed, the reverse. Yet this is what John Wesley has to say upon this subject:

TOLERATION OF ROMANISM

The following appeared in the PUBLIC ADVERTISER in 1780, and now that public attention is drawn to this subject, in connection with Parliamentary and other matters, the letter will be read with special interest:—

"Sir: Some time ago a pamphlet was sent me, entitled, 'An Appeal from the Protestant Association to the People of Great Britain'. A day or two since a kind of answer to this was put into my hand, which pronounces 'its style contemptible, its reasoning futile, and its object malicious'. On the contrary, I think the style of it clear, easy, and natural; the reasoning in general strong and conclusive; the object or design kind and benevolent. And in pursuance of this kind and benevolent design—namely, to preserve our happy Constitution—I shall endeavour to confirm the substance of that tract by a few plain arguments. With persecution I have nothing to do. I persecute no man for his religious principles. Let there be as boundless a freedom in religion as any man can conceive. But this does not touch the point. I will set religion, true or false, utterly out of the question. Suppose the Bible, if you please, to be a

fable, and the Koran to be the Word of God. I consider not whether the Romish religion be true or false; I build nothing on one or the other supposition. Therefore, away with all common-place declamation about intolerance and persecution for religion! Suppose every word of Pope Pius' creed to be true; suppose the Council of Trent to have been infallible; yet I insist that no Government not Roman Catholic ought to tolerate men of the Roman Catholic persuasion. I prove this by a plain argument (let him answer it that can). That no Roman Catholic does or can give security for his allegiance or peaceable behaviour, I prove thus: It is a Roman Catholic maxim, established, not by private men, but by a public council, that 'No faith is to be kept with heretics'. This has been openly avowed by the Council of Constance; but it never was openly disclaimed. Whether private persons avow or disavow it, it is a fixed maxim of the Church of Rome. But, as long as it is so, it is plain that the members of that Church can give no reasonable security to any government of their allegiance or peaceable behaviour. Therefore they ought not to be tolerated by any Government—Protestant, Mohammedan, or Pagan. You may say, 'Nay, but they will take an oath of allegiance'. True, five hundred oaths; but the maxim, 'No faith is to be kept with heretics', sweeps them all away as a spider's web. So that still no governors that are not Roman Catholics can have any security of their allegiance. Again, those who acknowledge the spiritual power of the Pope can give no security for their allegiance to any Government; but all Roman Catholics acknowledge this; therefore they can give no security for their allegiance. The power of granting pardon for all sins, past, present, and to come, is, and has been for many centuries, one branch of his special power. But those who acknowledge him to have this spiritual power can give no security for their allegiance, since they believe the Pope can pardon rebellions, high treason, and all other sins whatsoever. The power of dispensing with any promise, oath, or vow, is another branch of the spiritual power of the Pope. And all who acknowledge his spiritual power must acknowledge this. But whoever acknowledges the dispensing power of the Pope can give no security for his allegiance to any Government. Oaths and promises are none; they are light as air; a dispensation makes them all null and void. Nay, not only the Pope, but even a priest can forgive sins! This is an essential doctrine of the Church of Rome. But they that acknowledge this, cannot possibly give any security for their allegiance to any Government. Oaths are no security at all; for the priest can pardon both perjury and high treason. Setting, then, religion aside, it is plain that, upon principles of reason, no Government ought to tolerate men who cannot give any security to that Government for their allegiance and peaceable behaviour. But this no Romanist can do, not only while he holds that 'no faith is to be kept with heretics', but so long as he acknowledges either priestly absolution or the spiritual power of the Pope. 'But the late Act' (you say) 'does not either tolerate or encourage Roman Catholics'. I appeal to matter of fact. Do not the Romanists themselves understand it as a toleration? You know they do. And does it not already (let alone what it may do by and by) encourage them to preach openly, to build chapels (at Bath and elsewhere), to raise seminaries, and to make numerous converts day by day to their intolerant, persecuting principles? I can point out, if need be, several of the persons. And they are increasing daily. 'But nothing dangerous to English liberty is to be apprehended from them'. I am not certain of that. Some time since a Romish priest came to one I knew; and, after talking with her largely, broke out, 'You are no heretic; you have the experience of a real Christian'. 'And would you' she asked, 'burn me alive?' He said, 'God forbid! unless it were for the good of the Church'. Now what security could she have had for her life, if it had depended on that man? The good of the Church would have burst all ties of truth, justice, and mercy; specially when seconded by the absolution of a priest, or (if need were) a papal pardon.

"If any one please to answer this, and set his name, I shall probably reply. But the productions of anonymous writers I do not promise to take notice of.

I am, Sir,

Your humble servant,

"John Wesley."

"City Road, January 21st, 1780."

A Father of Confederation

But that was in the eighteenth century, and this is the twentieth century. Let me quote then from a pamphlet written by Sir Alexander T. Galt, one of the Fathers of Confederation, published only nine years after Confederation, 1876, and entitled, "Church and State". He quotes as follows from the fifth Provincial Council of the Hierarchy held at Quebec in 1873:

"We assert that the Church is a perfect Society, independent of the Civil power and Superior to it. Between the religious authority of this Society (the fulness of which authority resides in the Roman Pontiff) and the political power of the Christian ruler there exists, from the very nature of things, such a relation, that the latter is to the former not only negatively but also positively subordinate, although indirectly so. The Civil power can do nothing which tends to the injury of the Church, and ought to abstain from such acts as would clash with the laws of the Church, and, indeed, should also, at the request of the Church, cooperate toward its benefit and the attainment of its supernatural end. This is the true doctrine of Boniface the Eighth, in the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, in which he teaches that the material sword should be subordinate to the spiritual sword, and should be used for the Church, but not against the Church. The opinion of the Fathers is the same who write that the Civil power has been instituted by God for the protection and care of the Church."

—p. 21 *Church and State*.

He quotes one of the Bishops, Bourget, as saying:

"Each one of you can and ought to say in the interior of his soul, 'I hear my Curé; my Curé hears the Bishop; the Bishop hears the Pope, and the Pope hears our Lord Jesus Christ, who aids with his Holy Spirit to render them infallible on the teaching and government of His Church!'"

—p. 23 *Church and State*.

Sir Alexander Galt thus summarizes his argument:

"The extracts given prove in the most authentic manner possible, that the Roman Catholic Church in Quebec extends its demands—

1. To the general assertion of the superiority of ecclesiastical over civil authority.
2. To positive interference with both voters and candidates in the Elections.
3. To the exercise of proscription against the press.
4. To the condemnation of freedom of speech, in opposition to the judgment of the Privy Council.

"And Lastly.—To the extraordinary proposition that the Divine assistance claimed to be given to the Pope alone, when speaking *ex cathedra* on 'faith and morals', descends with undiminished force to the Bishops, Priests and Curés.

—p. 24 *Church and State*.

But we need not go back to 1876: we can quote from occurrences sixty years later; for, in the Province of Quebec, ecclesiastical law has repeatedly been held, even by the courts, to take precedence of the civil law; and the supreme legal authority of the Empire has been repeatedly defied by the annulment of marriages which, by Imperial Privy Council decision, have been held to be valid.

What Has Rome Done for the Nations?

We may reasonably ask—and to ask the question is to answer it—What has Roman Catholicism done for the nations which have become subject to it? There was a time when there was scarcely a government in Europe which did not recognize and acknowledge the supremacy, and indeed the sovereignty, of the Holy See. The Reformation did much to deliver Europe from the domination of the Pope. It liberated Germany, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark,

Holland, Finland, England, and other countries, from the dominance of Rome.

But there were some countries which resisted the principles of the Reformation, and became the instruments of the Roman Catholic Church in her efforts to regain those countries of which the Reformation had deprived her. Italy, Austria, Spain, Portugal, and particularly France, were among those which were employed by the Roman power in its endeavour to recapture Europe. The most formidable of these was France, the most trusted child of the church. To refer to one conspicuous example of her zeal, we need only mention the massacre of Saint Bartholemew, with its fifteen thousand dead in Paris, and its upward of sixty thousand Huguenots who perished in that bloody persecution throughout France.

The Price of Devotion to Rome

But what happened to those countries? They all paid the price of their devotion to Rome, France being the last so to do. And when France turned upon the instrument of the church, at last, in terrible vengeance, more than a million perished in the bloody French Revolution. But by these events the temporal power of the Papacy in Europe was largely broken and repudiated.

The Napoleonic wars were really a phase of the French Revolution, and issued in the loss of Rome itself to the Popes.

Victor Hugo on the Papacy

No nation has known more intimately the power and effect of the Papacy than France. Hear what Victor Hugo said of the influence of Rome:

"And you claim the liberty of teaching. Stop! be sincere; let us understand the liberty which you claim. It is the liberty of not teaching. You wish us to give you the people to instruct. Very well. Let us see your pupils. Let us see those you produced. What have you done for Italy? What have you done for Spain? For centuries you have kept in your hands, at your discretion, at your school, these two great nations, illustrious among the illustrious. What have you done for them? I shall tell you. Thanks to you, Italy, whose name no man who thinks can any longer pronounce without inexpressible filial emotions—Italy, mother of genius and of nations, which has spread over all the universe all the most brilliant marvels of poetry and arts, Italy—which has taught mankind to read—now knows not how to read! Yes, Italy is of all the states of Europe, that where the smallest number know how to read! Spain, magnificently endowed Spain, which received from the Romans her first civilization; from the Arabs her second civilization; from Providence and in spite of you, a world America—Spain, thanks to you, a yoke of stupor, which is a yoke of degradation and decay; Spain has lost this secret power which it had from the Romans; this genius of art which it had from the Arabs; this world which it had from God; and in exchange for all you have made it lose, it has received from you the Inquisition—the Inquisition, which certain men of the party tried to-day to re-establish; which has burned on the funeral pile millions of men; the Inquisition which disinterred the dead to burn them as heretics; which declared the children of heretics infamous and incapable of any public honors, excepting only those who shall have denounced their fathers; the Inquisition, which, while I speak, still holds in the Papal library the manuscripts of Galileo sealed under the Papal signet. These are your masterpieces. This fire which we call Italy you have extinguished. This colossus that we call Spain you have undermined—the one in ashes, the other in ruins. This is what you have done for two great nations. What do you wish to do for France? Stop! you have just come from Rome! I congratulate you, you have had fine success there. You came from gagging the Roman people, and now you wish to gag the French people. I understand. This

attempt is still more fine, but take care, it is dangerous. France is a lion, and is still alive!"

Rome's Attitude Toward Education

We come now to a consideration of the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church toward education.

It is not surprising that she should always insist upon the education of her people. The necessity for her doing so inheres in Roman Catholicism itself. Roman Catholicism is a paganised form of Christianity. It abounds with superstitions and idolatries, and it can survive only as it is deeply rooted in the minds of little children. The Separate School primarily exists to inculcate in its scholars the doctrines of Roman Catholicism. The Roman Catholic Church is always more concerned about the children than the adults. She knows that if she can implant her superstitions in the minds of little children, if, in the formative years, they can be taught that the priest is the representative of Christ, and has power of absolution, and absolute authority over their souls, and if they can prejudice the young minds, as they do, against every other form of religion, threatening them with all kinds of penalties should they open their minds to anything contrary to the teachings of Rome, they have secured a hold upon the children which it will be very difficult in later years to break.

In the last year of the Great War I made a tour of Ireland, and had the opportunity of discussing the Irish problem with leaders of all sorts, in the North and in the South. I need not enumerate them; but one thing I may say. Asked by the Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, the purpose of my visit to Ireland, and of my many enquiries, I said that I was endeavouring to secure firsthand information of the Irish question. To which he said, "And what progress have you made?" I said, "I think I have had opportunity of conversing with some representative of nearly every shade of Irish political opinion." The old gentleman shook his head and said, "Not unless you have interviewed every individual Irishman!"

Interview With Lord Carson

But following that tour of Ireland, I had what I then thought — and still think — the distinguished honour of receiving an invitation from Lord Carson to have dinner with him in London. I gladly accepted the invitation; and, sitting with him at his own table, discussed the Irish question. He asked me for my opinion, and I expressed my reluctance to state an opinion to such an expert. He smilingly replied, however, that he would like to hear what I thought of the matter. In brief, I said to him, "Well, I believe that, fundamentally, your Irish problem is an educational one." He asked the ground for that opinion. I replied that I found many of the people of Ireland living still in the days of Oliver Cromwell; that they became furiously angry as they referred to the terrible Oliver, and to all that he had done in Ireland.

I then pointed out that it is unusual for people to live two hundred and fifty or more years behind their time, and unnatural unless they were being taught so to do. I said that somebody was teaching the people of Ireland to nurse the grievances of two hundred and fifty years ago, whether real or imaginary, and that it was that fact which had led me to believe the Irish prob-

lem was an educational one. "Thus far," Lord Carson said, "I believe you are quite correct. What remedy would you prescribe?" To which I replied, "I would take education out of the hands of Roman Catholics and Protestants alike. I would arrange a system of purely secular education, making all religions equal under the law, and allowing all churches to teach with absolute freedom their own tenets—at their own expense."

As I paused, Lord Carson said, "And what else would you propose?" To which I answered, "Twenty-five years of impartial, inexorable, British rule." To that he answered, "If you could do that, you could solve the Irish problem. But you propose an impossibility. The Roman Catholic Church will never surrender its control of the education of her own people; for the reason that her very life depends upon it."

History of Education in Canada

That is borne out by the history of education in Canada—not in Ontario only, but in Canada as a whole. The history of the development of our educational system in Ontario is a record of long conflict with the Roman Catholic hierarchy, from 1841 until now. Sometimes the battle has raged fiercely, sometimes there has been a certain quietness for a little while! but ever and anon the Hierarchy has gone "on the rampage again".

Principles of Separate Schools

It may be appropriate at this point to consider some of the principles involved in Separate School education. If it be true—and I hold that it is indisputable—that the Separate School is essentially a religious school, existing primarily for the purpose of propagating the tenets of Rome, then it follows that under that system the Roman Catholic Church enjoys a privilege which is denied to all other religions. If Roman Catholics have a right to demand that they should be relieved from the support of the public schools, and permitted to divert their school taxes to the support of schools under the direction of their own church, which shall teach the doctrines of their church, then members of all other religious bodies have an equal right to the same privilege. The Jews have a right to their own schools. People of no religion at all have the right to send their children to a purely secular school.

I think I am within the truth when I say that if all the tax-payers who belong to this church were permitted to withhold the amount of their school taxes from the public schools, and pool them in an educational fund, the members of this church would probably be able to secure money enough to maintain a Baptist school in which our children could be taught the principles for which we stand, not Sunday morning alone, but every day of the week. But we, under the law, have no right to do so. Whether we like it or not, we are compelled to support the public school system.

National Schools Desirable

I would not be misunderstood. Personally, I am of the opinion that there should be no denominational primary schools. I believe when people of different nationalities congregate in this country, and families grow up about them, that all these children should be

fused into one common citizenship in a system of national schools.

Separation of Church and State

I believe in the absolute separation of church and state. I do not believe in the exemption of church property from taxation; for by such exemption additional burdens are placed upon the shoulders of the people generally, and indirectly they are thus compelled to pay to the support of churches.

This church, for a number of years, assessed and taxed itself, and voluntarily paid about \$1,200 a year to the City Hall. It paid a total of more than \$20,000 into the city treasury, in the hope of setting an example to other churches, and creating a public sentiment which would result at last in the taxation of all church property.

No Part of the State's Function to Teach Religion

Furthermore, it is no part of the function of the state to teach religion. The consciences of men should be free, and people should not be compelled to pay taxes for the support of a system of education which teaches religious tenets of which their consciences do not approve.

At this point perhaps I may as well call attention to the proposal of the Minister of Education, Dr. Simpson, to introduce into the public schools of Ontario a system of religious instruction. I received only today a letter from a gentleman who said, not unkindly, that he thought we should be illogical to oppose the principle of Separate Schools while freely accepting tax-exemption in respect to church property; and that he had not yet heard any protest from me, or from any other minister, against the proposal to teach religion in the schools.

I am sorry I did not speak loudly enough for the gentleman to hear. I gave a statement to the press immediately, and printed an article in my own paper last week, in which I said that public school teachers became, by virtue of their employment as teachers, servants of the state; and, while they were of sound moral character, and educationally fitted for their position, they were not necessarily competent to teach religion. There are many preachers and teachers of religion in Toronto who do not agree with me in matters of religion, and with whose views I strongly disagree. To me, the Bible is the word of God from beginning to end. I believe in its absolute infallibility, and therefore that it is of supreme authority in matters of faith and practice. But I should strongly object to a Modernistic school teacher being paid by money supplied out of my taxes to teach the children that the Bible is not the word of God.

If the Minister of Education should be foolish enough to adopt any such course as he proposes, I am sure he will raise such a storm as he has not dreamed of. There would be a passive resistance movement here as in England. For myself, I would absolutely refuse to pay taxes to the support of such schools. I would rather suffer the loss of goods, and be deprived of liberty of person, and go to jail, than that a cent of my money should be used for the support of such teaching. I respectfully warn the Minister of Education to mind his own business, and to leave religion alone. As Minister of Education in

Ontario it is none of his concern; nor is it the function of the state at any time to teach religion.

Special Privileges to Rome

The Roman Catholic Church, however, invokes the aid of the state; and when the Canadas, Upper and Lower, with the Maritime Provinces, were brought together by the Act of Confederation known as the British North America Act, education, in section 93 of that Act, was placed within the jurisdiction of the Provinces. Such special privileges as were then enjoyed by any religious sect were, by that act, perpetuated.

No Separate Schools in Maritimes or B.C.

But Separate Schools are unknown in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. About 1877 they were abolished in Prince Edward Island. British Columbia has no Separate Schools, and I believe never has had other than a system of national schools. Manitoba had Separate Schools of a kind when she was admitted to the Union three or four years after Confederation; but, by the Manitoba Act of 1890, Separate Schools were abolished. An appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of Canada, and then to the Privy Council of the Empire, during the years 1893 and 1894. In 1894 the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, endorsed by the Privy Council, was handed down. That judgment was to the effect that the Manitoba Act carried forward section 93 of the British North America Act into the Manitoba Act, and gave the religious minority in Manitoba the same status as though they had been parties to the Union.

Privy Council and Manitoba

The Privy Council held that, under the Act of Confederation, an appeal would lie to the Governor General in Council—which means, of course, the Federal Government—and that the Federal Government therefore was competent to adopt any remedial measure it might see fit, to redress the disabilities which the Roman Catholic minority felt the Manitoba Act of 1890 in abolishing Separate Schools, imposed upon them. But the Privy Council was particular to say:

"The Governor General in Council has jurisdiction, and the appeal is well founded; but that the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authority to whom it has been committed by the statute."

That is to say, the Privy Council said the Federal Government had the right to interfere, but that no obligation was imposed upon it by the statute, and that it was really left to the discretion of the authority in question.

Laurier and Provincial Rights

What was the result? The Government at Ottawa, under Sir Charles Tupper, attempted to pass remedial legislation; but it never did pass the House, because Parliament was talked to death, and a general election was fought on the Separate School question. The Honourable Wilfred Laurier, later Sir Wilfred, of course accepted the Privy Council's judgment, but said, if he were returned to power he would not coerce Manitoba. "I believe in provincial rights", he said. Sir Charles Tupper was overwhelmingly defeated, Laurier was elected; and from then until now no Government at Ottawa has ever had the boldness to interfere with Manitoba.

It ought to be said that Sir Wilfred Laurier later was responsible, for the Autonomy Bills by which the Pro-

vinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta were erected, and that in the original draft of those bills provision was made for separate Roman Catholic education from the primary schools to the University. The original draft, of course, was modified, but the principle of Separate Schools was established in the new Provinces.

Incidentally, I may remark that when crossing to England in 1928, I fell in with a Canadian National official from England, who had been conducting a party of tourists across Canada. He told me that he spoke as a Canadian National official, and without any political bias; but asked me if I could explain why the emigration authorities at Ottawa at that time afforded every facility for the bringing to Canada of immigrants from Southern Europe and Roman Catholic countries, while they seemed, at the same time, to put every possible obstacle in the way of getting British immigrants into Canada. They were sending them out to Saskatchewan and Alberta, establishing them in colonies of their own around the Separate Schools—a little bit of Austria, or Italy, or France, as the case might be. The depression stopped the flow of immigration, but beyond any doubt, it was the far-seeing purpose of the Roman Catholic Church to build up, in Saskatchewan and Alberta, a great Roman Catholic Empire like the French-Canadian Roman Catholic solid block to the east; and in due time Ontario would be at their mercy.

Separate Schools in the North

And now they are supremely interested in this Separate School matter because the mines of the North are rapidly opening Northern Ontario. I suppose it is about the only part of Canada that has been measurably exempt from the depression. All through that north country great Catholic churches and schools and presbyteries are being erected; and the purpose of this new move is, largely, to obtain funds for these schools in the north country.

Separate Schools Could Be Abolished

But my main insistence at this point is that Prince Edward Island and Manitoba, subsequent to Confederation, abolished Separate Schools; and that Manitoba at least was held to be in a position analogous to that of the original parties to the Union, and that the schools abolished in 1890 have never been re-established; and that no Government, whether Liberal or Conservative, that has ever taken power at Ottawa, has dared to interfere with the Province's decision. And, mark you, it would be possible to abolish Separate Schools in Ontario; and I am prepared to tell Mr. Hepburn, Mr. Roebuck, or any of their legal advisers, that I know as much about the British North America Act, and am as competent to interpret it, as they are; that I have studied the decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; and I know that if Separate Schools were abolished in Ontario, by that decision, the Roman Catholic minority in Ontario would, by that decision, have the right to ask Ottawa to override the decision of Ontario, and to establish Separate Schools in this Province in opposition to the will of the majority of its people. They would have the right to ask the Ottawa Government to do it. The Ottawa Government of the day would have, indisputably, the right to do it if they were asked, but I venture to say that no Government will ever take power in Ottawa, of any colour, Liberal or Conservative, who would have the timidity to enact legislation in direct opposition to the people of Ontario. I therefore affirm that it is within the compe-

tence of the electors of Ontario to elect a Government, and to give that Government the mandate, not only to repeal the recent legislation, but absolutely to abolish all sectarian schools within the Province. And, were it done, there is no power that would re-establish them.

Schools of Other Countries

But now let us look abroad for a few minutes. What has been the attitude of other nations toward the insistence of the Roman Catholic Church that the education of its people shall be under its control?

In the United States a system of common national schools obtains. In Mexico separate Roman Catholic Schools have been abolished. In Central America, in Guatemala, they have a system of compulsory public school education for all children between the ages of eight to fourteen. In San Salvador they have a system of state schools and free education. In Costa Rica, a system of state schools and compulsory education. The parochial school is prohibited. The same is true of South America, in the Argentine, Chili, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Brazil. Although these countries are predominantly Roman Catholic, there are no separate schools. These countries have had enough of them, and they abolished them.

Are Separate Schools Superior?

It is contended by our Roman Catholic friends that the public schools are unsafe; that as secular schools they are godless and dangerous to the morals of the children. So long ago as eighteen hundred and seventy-one the then Roman Catholic Bishop of London, said.

"No Catholic parent living within the legal limits of a separate school shall send his children to mixed or common schools, they being adjudged by the Canadian hierarchy as dangerous to faith and morals. Should any Catholic parent unfortunately persist in violating this ordinance, he shall be refused the Holy Sacraments until such time as they shall consent to obey the Church in this matter."

I think it might even be proved that Roman Catholic people generally do not want separate schools. Large numbers of them send their children to the public schools in preference. The separate schools are wanted by the priests and officials of the Church to aid them in the propagation of their religion. But if the contention of the Roman Catholic Church be correct, that the public schools are godless and dangerous to the children's morals, then we have a right to expect that the Roman Catholic Separate Schools, in which the tenets of Rome are taught, will produce superior character in those who attend them.

Canadian Penitentiary Population

What are the facts? For the year ending September thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety, the penitentiary population of Canada was three thousand six hundred and fifty-six. Of that number one thousand eight hundred and ninety-six were listed as Roman Catholics, and all other religions and no religion at all put together made up the other one thousand seven hundred and sixty. At that time Roman Catholics formed two-fifths of the population of Canada, but supplied more than half the convicts to the penitentiaries. In nineteen hundred and twenty-one the census gave the population of Canada as being eight million seven hundred and eighty-eight thousand four hundred and eighty-three. Classified religiously, of that number three million two hundred and eighty-nine thousand six hundred and thirty-six were Roman

Catholics, and the balance was made up of all other religions and no religion at all. The percentage of Roman Catholics to the total population of Canada in nineteen hundred and twenty-one was thirty-eight decimal fifty-seven. In the same year the penitentiary population of Canada was two thousand one hundred and fifty, of which one thousand and fifty-two were classed as Roman Catholics, or but a fraction less than fifty percent of the penitentiary population, while only thirty-eight and a fraction per cent. of the total population of the country were Roman Catholics. According to the last census in nineteen hundred and thirty-one the total population of the Dominion was ten million three hundred and seventy-six thousand seven hundred and eighty-six, of which four million two hundred and eighty-five thousand three hundred and eighty-eight were Roman Catholics, or a Roman Catholic percentage of forty-one decimal thirty per cent. to the whole population. For the year nineteen hundred and thirty-one the penitentiary population of the Dominion was three thousand seven hundred and fourteen, of whom one thousand eight hundred and ten were Roman Catholics. Again, but a fraction less than fifty per cent. of the penitentiary population was Roman Catholic, while the total Roman Catholic population of the Dominion was only forty-one per cent.

Assessment Act Amendment

We come now to a direct examination of the legislation which was passed in the Ontario Legislature only last week. What is the purpose of this legislation? and what will it accomplish? The main purpose, of course, is to secure a larger proportion of public funds for the support of Separate Schools, and such funds as are thus supplied to Separate Schools will not be raised by the taxation of some virgin field, but will be raised by diverting such funds from the treasury of the Public Schools. That is to say, What the Separate Schools will gain, the Public Schools must lose. Now such funds are thus raised by taxation, let it be repeated, for the propagation of the Roman Catholic religion, not primarily for the education of the children of Roman Catholics, for the Public Schools are open to them all. These funds are set aside for the propagation of Roman Catholicism by means of Separate Schools. Without going into details, let that broad fact be recognized.

Significance of the Title of the Act

I would now direct your attention to the fact that there is special significance in the title of the Act which has caused such discussion. It was entitled—what? Did it bear a distinctively religious stamp? Did its title give it a distinctively educational character? The answer to both questions is in the negative. The Act is entitled: "An Act to Amend the Assessment Act". Thus, let it be plainly stated, the Roman Catholic hierarchy makes a raid upon the national revenue for the propagation of Roman Catholicism. Stripped of all disguises, and of all verbiage, that is exactly what the new act means. I do not suppose even ten per cent. of the people have troubled to read the text of the bill, and of those who have attempted to do so, a still smaller number have understood it. Indeed, there is a sense in which no one understands it, not even the men who framed it, for the effect of no statute can be properly appraised until it has been interpreted by the courts, and a precedent

has been established by its practical application. We can, therefore, only do our best to understand its exact language.

I recall that in the discussion respecting the Manitoba Act the lords of the Privy Council insisted they had nothing to do with the intention of the framers of the Act save as it was made plain by the language employed. In general, it would appear this Act aims to tax corporations for school purposes on the basis of the shares held respectively by Protestants and Roman Catholics. And it requires the corporations, notified by their shareholders that they are Roman Catholics or Public School supporters as the case may be, shall pay the taxes thus raised to the schools to which they are assigned. But that will apply only to those corporations able to ascertain the religion of their various shareholders. The shares of other corporations are so widely scattered through subsidiary companies that it would become impossible to ascertain the religion of each individual shareholder. And this will apply to the larger corporations from which the greater proportion of the taxes will be derived.

As an illustration of that, two corporations are named, the Canadian Pacific Railway and The Bell Telephone Company. But the Premier stated that clause would be withdrawn in committee because it was only declaratory and did not affect the principle of the Bill. It really set out only the real meaning of 33b:

33B (3), Section 33A, shall not apply to a corporation which may file a notice under this section; and the whole of the assessments of a corporation governed by this section, in a municipality or school section in or for which a separate school exists, shall be divided for purposes of taxation between the public schools and separate schools in the same ratio as the total assessments of all the rateable property in such municipality or school section assessed to persons who, being individuals, are public school supporters bear to the total assessments of all the rateable property in such municipality or school section assessed to persons who, being individuals, are Roman Catholics and separate school supporters; and taxation for public school purposes and separate school purposes against the said lands, business and income of the corporation shall be imposed and levied accordingly, provided that the rates to be levied in any year upon the assessments of such land, business and income shall in all such cases be the rate for such year imposed and levied for public school purposes.

One Clause of the Act

How, then, are the taxes to be divided? Not according to the number of shareholders, but by the proportion which Roman Catholic individuals, paying taxes for school purposes in a given district, bear to the non-Catholic individuals paying taxes for the support of Public Schools.

A Hypothetical Case

Let us view a hypothetical case for purpose of illustration. Take a mining district in the north as an example. Suppose there is a large mining property, and, for purposes of assessment, let us say its land, business, and income, are assessed at five hundred thousand dollars, and these are taxed for school purposes. But on what principle shall the total amount of money raised by taxation on that property be divided in the municipality between the Public and Separate Schools? The Act provides that it shall be divided in the same ratio as the total assessment of all the rateable property of such municipality or school sections assessed to persons who, being individuals and

Public School supporters, bear to the total assessments of all the rateable property in such municipality or school section assessed to persons who, being individuals, are Roman Catholics and Separate School supporters.

Now, reverting to our illustration, we have a taxable mining property, or other corporation property, of five hundred thousand dollars. The total amount raised on that property is to be divided according to the proportion which the individual Roman Catholics taxed for school purposes bear to the individual non-Catholics taxed for school purposes. Suppose such a mining settlement to contain a population of one thousand taxable individuals. Of these, suppose six hundred are miners, French Canadians, many of them; practically all of them, in some cases, Roman Catholic. They live in shacks of negligible taxable value perhaps, and, truth to tell, they are kept poor by the extortions of the Church. These poor people, kept in dire poverty by the Church's exactions, cannot raise enough to maintain a school, but the big mining property is taxed, and three-fifths of it goes to Separate Schools, and two-fifths to the Public Schools, if that were the proportion of Roman Catholics to the whole. And that, irrespective of the religion of the shareholders of the corporation under consideration! Thus there is more than a probability that in the aggregate millions of dollars of property held by Protestants will be taxed for the propagation of the dogmas of Rome.

What is the Motive Behind the Bill?

We come now to ask the question: What is the motive behind this Bill? So far as the Roman Catholic Church that demands it is concerned, it is perfectly plain, namely, to get more public money to propagate Romanism.

But how shall we explain the determination of the Hepburn Government to carry this measure? In some quarters it is alleged that Mr. Hepburn and his followers were under some secret compact to pass such a Bill. This, of course, is denied by Mr. Hepburn and others. We should expect them to deny it. But the denial of such a company of men affords no proof that there was no such understanding. In such cases direct evidence is scarcely ever obtainable, and the only way by which the truth can be known is through a careful examination of the circumstances of the case.

The fact is, the Government has passed a Bill which will take money away from the Public School Treasury, and put it into the Treasury of the Separate Schools. It is beyond question that by this act non-Catholics will find themselves compelled to support Separate Schools.

Why did the Hepburn Government pass this Bill? I do not know how many members of Mr. Hepburn's Government are Roman Catholics, but they are certainly not in the majority. It is impossible to believe that personal enthusiasm for Roman Catholicism led Mr. Hepburn and his colleagues to pass this measure. But even if they were all Roman Catholics, it would be a flagrant abuse of their trust as trustees of the public interest were they to allow their personal religious views to dictate the Government's policy.

We may enquire further, Is Mr. Hepburn, Mr. Roebuck, or any of their associates, especially noted for religious zeal—for religious zeal of any kind? We have not

heard of any of them being conspicuous for their service in any particular Christian church. Why, then, this special zeal for the interests of the Roman Catholic Church?

Someone may name Mr. Hepburn's well-known friendship for Senator Frank O'Connor. That is Mr. Hepburn's own business. He has a right to choose his own friends. But surely no one will argue that the mere personal friendship obtaining between these two men so dominated the Cabinet, and through the Premier the whole Legislative party in the House, with three noble exceptions, that the House was dragooned into the passage of this Bill, just for the sake of O'Connor's friendship! Can that view be held?

Why did Mr. Hepburn choose to introduce this Bill during the week preceding Easter, when there was a popular holiday immediately in prospect? The Bill became law before even a fraction of the population of Ontario had had an opportunity of reading it. And without even the suggestion of a mandate from the people. Why was it thus introduced? And why was it introduced in such a way? Mr. Hepburn said he would leave his followers free to vote as they liked. But if the Government were defeated, he would resign! Does he think the people of Ontario are so foolish that they cannot interpret such a threat as that? Suppose the individual members exercised their freedom to the extent of voting by a majority against the Government? If the Government had resigned, there would have been a general election. Perhaps there are those who think that would be a good thing. But I venture to say the majority of Mr. Hepburn's followers would not so believe! Not quite two years of the present Government's term of office has run. It is free to sit in the seats of the mighty for three more years, and the members of the Legislature of both parties will have the privilege of drawing their indemnity for three years more. But if a general election were precipitated, they would all be at the expense and labour of going before their constituents for judgment.

The quality of the debate in the House, the sheep-like servility of the whole party with, I repeat, three noble exceptions, prove conclusively the character of the men who sit in the Legislature as followers of Mr. Hepburn. They are either lacking in intelligence, or in moral conviction, or in both; and the house that would pass such an iniquitous measure as that which the Lieutenant-Governor signed last week, would pass anything that Mr. Hepburn demands of it.

Did Mr. Hepburn and his followers pass this Act with any conviction that it would minister to their popularity in the Province? We venture to believe that the reverse of the proposition is the fact. We cannot say we admire Mr. Hepburn's courage, but we cannot withhold some recognition of his daring—a daring that borders upon foolhardiness. No one at all conversant with the facts of the case can, for a moment, question that the Hepburn Government is subject to Roman Catholic direction and control.

Can it be said that Mr. Hepburn's tender heart was moved by the dire poverty of Roman Catholics in general, and that he felt it would be at least a charitable thing to give them a larger share of public funds for the support of their schools, and the propagation of their faith? Surely no one in his senses would believe any such thing. The Roman Catholic Church is, in all probability, the wealthiest corporation on earth

to-day. You will find in this city it never lacks funds to buy any property it wants. Go to the sparsely settled districts of this Province, and you will see huge structures costing thousands and thousands of dollars, rising always in the most prominent position in the whole community. The priests are never poor; they live in good houses. The church always has plenty of money.

It makes merchandise of the souls of men. It taxes them to the limit of their endurance in life, and puts a mortgage on their souls, and pursues them through their imaginary purgatory, compelling those who remain, and who, in their Separate Schools have been taught to believe this horrible superstition, to pay to their last dollar for the saying of masses for the dead, that their stay in purgatory might be shortened.

The great John G. Paton, apostle to the New Hebrides, once told me that he asked a Roman Catholic priest, an acquaintance of his, how it was that, in the most poverty-stricken districts of the earth, the Roman Catholic Church was always able to erect magnificent buildings, and to supply itself lavishly with all the material equipment it needed. He said the priest smiled and answered, "Were you to believe and teach as we do, the doctrine of purgatory, you could build just such churches as we."

It could not be because of the people's poverty that this Bill has been passed. Surely one can only conclude that Mr. Hepburn and his party were under some sort of compact to the Roman Catholic Church to deliver the goods—and this, remember, is only the first instalment. The circumstantial evidence in support of that assumption is overwhelmingly convincing. I think we must conclude that the present Government is under Roman Catholic direction and control.

Nor is the Ontario Legislature the only place where the Roman Catholic hierarchy is exercising a tremendous influence to-day. I cite the example of *The Toronto Globe*. In re-examining the documents upon which this address is based, I was struck by the frequency with which *The Toronto Globe* was quoted, back to the days of its founder, the Honourable George Brown; and always, in those earlier days, it was a champion of the people's rights. It pleaded always for equal rights for all, and special privileges to none. It is not so many years ago that many of us gloried in the independence of *The Toronto Globe*. Not more than ten years ago, I should say, a friend of mine in Michigan told me he was a subscriber to *The Toronto Globe* because he found in it more reliable news of his own country, and of the world at large, than he could find in any American paper.

Many of us have rejoiced in time past in *The Globe's* uncompromising stand on all moral questions. But what has happened to *The Toronto Globe* of recent years? At the head of its editorial page it has a quotation from Junius in these words: "The subject who is truly loyal to the chief magistrate will neither advise nor submit to arbitrary measures." And yet *The Globe* has supported not a few arbitrary measures during the last two years. I am aware that it has occasionally given Mr. Hepburn a little grandmotherly advice. Often as I have read the editorials in *The Globe*, I have pictured to myself a dear old lady talking to a little scamp, in short trousers and skull cap, and saying to him, "Now, Mitch, my dear, you sometimes make me very anxious; and I am sometimes seriously concerned about you. Indeed, I fear if you

go on in your present course, you may at last develop a character which will lead some critical people to say you are rather a naughty boy!"

But we have not observed that the potential naughtiness of Mr. Hepburn has been restrained by *The Globe's* advice. And even in this measure, while it cannot be said that *The Globe* has been very enthusiastic about it, it certainly has shown no decided opposition. It spoke last Friday rather favourably of the three Liberal members who voted against the Government in an editorial entitled, "The right to 'bolt'." It expressed the view that their action, on the whole, was rather creditable to them, and that they really did not deserve to be read out of the party. We are glad *The Globe* has conceded to these three Liberal noblemen the right to do what they did. I would respectfully suggest to *The Globe* that others than members of the Liberal party in the Legislature have the "right to 'bolt'"—including newspapers. It was a fine time for *The Globe* to "bolt" on this question.

I was asked by a representative of *The Globe* whether the withdrawal of Jarvis Street Church's advertisement from *The Globe's* columns had anything to do with its editorial attitude, and I replied something to this effect: You will please not assume that we are foolish enough to suppose that *The Globe* cares whether we advertise in its pages or not. Our advertisement once a week is of such little consequence, and the financial consideration involved so insignificant, that it has never occurred to us that *The Globe* troubles whether we advertise or not. *The Globe* has a right to its own opinions, as we have a right to ours. But personally, I have dissented strongly from *The Globe's* attitude upon moral questions during the last couple of years; and since the editorial and news columns of a paper quite generally reflect the tastes and desires of the mass of its readers, I have concluded that if the readers of *The Globe* are pleased with *The Globe's* editorial attitude, they could not possibly be interested in the advertisement of a church with a positive message like Jarvis Street Church. Large numbers of people have told me that they have become so weary of *The Globe's* attitude of compromise, that it no longer speaks to them with any authority on any moral question, and they no longer bother to buy the paper.

Having these things in mind, we concluded that we were only wasting our money by using the medium of *The Globe* to invite people to come to this church. Although I may be wrong in that; for I do not know anybody that needs the gospel more than people with such a low sense of public duty as can be satisfied with the milk-and-water diet provided by *The Globe*.

I went further, and said to them, "If I knew a preacher who preached like an archangel on Sunday, and lunched with the devil every day in the week, I would not be bothered going to hear him. I have ceased to be impressed with the evangelical sermon contained in *The Globe* on Wednesday, and texts of Scripture printed at the top right hand corner of the editorial page, while its editorials are making every possible excuse for those who are serving the world, the flesh, and the devil, with both hands zealously. I think it is about time *The Globe* should begin to practise the principles of evangelical religion, or, otherwise, cease from its preaching of them.

What is the Explanation?

What is the explanation? I do not know. But I do know this, that on its editorial staff there is a Roman

Catholic, who is a member of the Knights of Columbus, and who sits every day with the editorial council at two o'clock to assist in forming the editorial policy of the paper for the next day. What hypocrisy! while continuing that, to pose as an advocate of evangelical religion.

I will go further. Last Friday morning, in the righthand column, on the front page, there is a good third of a column, with large headlines, given to an article headed, "Priest Finds Three Roses in Ciborium. Congregation had prayed for sign to Little Flower." I shall read the first three paragraphs:

"Calumet, Mich., April 9 (AP)—Three roses, their delicate petals exuding a blood-red fluid, were carefully guarded in a receptacle at St. Ann's Catholic Church to-day by the Rev. Father J. A. Paquet, pastor of the congregation.

"The pastor in a formal statement declared he found the flowers, April 4th, in a communion ciborium after the congregation had prayed the night before to the Little Flower 'to give us a tangible proof of her power with God and her love for us'.

"The discovery, he said, occurred while he was giving communion. On entering the church, he had noticed a very strong odor of roses, but saw no fresh flower."

Think of a paper like *The Globe* giving prominence to that on its first page! It is sheer superstition! A piece of unmitigated religious humbug, as anyone of intelligence must know.

Perhaps one would appear to be greatly daring to suggest that some political Delilah had shorn this Samsonian champion of the people's rights, of its one-time youthfully vigorous raven locks. But he has lost them! Perhaps someone better informed than I will be able to suggest the identity of *The Globe's* barber. All I can do is to adapt a classic lamentation and cry, "The beauty of Canada is slain upon her high places. How are the mighty fallen! Tell it not in Gath; publish it not in the streets of Askelon, lest the daughters of the privileged rejoice; lest the daughters of the illiberal triumph. How are the mighty fallen in the midst of the battle! How are the mighty fallen, and the weapons of war perished!"

The Demoralization of the Legislature

Let us now, for a moment, think of the humiliation, of the demoralization of the legislature which this subtle influence has effected. In all the annals of British legislation in this country, in the Old Land, or in any of the Dominions or Colonies, does anyone know of anything more disgraceful than the language which characterized the debate of last week, the temper and tone of which was precipitated and constantly augmented by the Premier's initiative? That such a debate, ostensibly in the interests jointly of education and religion, should be carried on in the legislative assembly of this Province, aided and abetted by the Head of the Government seems almost incredible. What an example to set before the youth of this country! I will not repeat the Premier's vulgarities. I regret that the ex-Premier should have allowed the Premier's vulgar taunts to provoke him to anger, and I have this against Mr. Henry, that his explosive definition of the Head of the Government as a "contemptible cur" has made him a debtor to the extent of a most humble apology to all the canine kingdom.

No Remedy in the Government Itself

What is the remedy for this state of things? There is no remedy in the Government itself, nor in any of its followers. The entire aggregation from the Premier down are utterly beneath the contempt of all honourable men. We must turn in another direction.

A Third Party? No!

Does anyone suggest a third party? I do not at least. I have no party. The party names of the political parties in Ontario mean nothing. Certainly no act more alien to Liberal principles was ever put upon the Statute Books than that which was passed last week. I would remind Mr. Hepburn and his followers not to be too sure of permanent victory. The United Farmers' Government was a surprise. They lasted but a short time, and were overwhelmed, and the Conservative Party was returned with an almost, I think, unprecedented majority, and it seemed as though they would last forever. But in the last election that party was almost annihilated at the polls. I have not made a careful analysis of it, but as a matter of superficial observation and estimation, it seems to me that governments with very large majorities are seldom long-lived. I cannot believe that the Province of Ontario would ever again entrust the government of its affairs to a man responsible for the beverage rooms and their administration, and now for this iniquitous school law in the form of an amendment to the Assessment Act.

Where Shall We Turn?

But where shall we turn? Let the Conservative Party, if you like to call it conservative, clean its house, rid itself of all questionable characters, and go with clean hands to the electorate. While personally wishing that prohibition were practicable, were I Premier I would not, in the present state of public opinion, interfere with the Liquor Control Act, inasmuch as it is on the Statute Books by popular vote. I would free it from any enactments that have weakened it. But let the Party promise a sane, economical, honest administration which will exercise its authority

in the open, giving public opinion free play to influence its progressive policies from day to day.

A Two-Fold Proposal

And then on two matters I would suggest the Party commit itself irrevocably: First, to the repeal of the Beverage Room law, whatever be its exact title; and Secondly: not only to the repeal of this iniquitous measure of last week, but once and for all to the abolition of Separate Schools in Ontario. Mr. Roebuck himself says that no act can be final. The British North America Act, as we have already said, does not make Separate Schools an abiding fixture in Canadian life. Such compact as was implied has been violated by the Roman Catholic Church again and again. Like the horseleach, it never says, "It is enough". And if the Constitution can be so amended, or ignored, as to give the Roman Catholic Church more than it had at confederation, it can be amended to give them less. Certainly, Mr. Hepburn, himself, would be without argument. It would be vain for Mr. Hepburn to plead the inviolability of contracts, surely! We do not disregard them, but we believe The British North America Act, as interpreted by the highest court in the Empire, is sufficiently flexible to make it possible for a growing country to change its educational system to meet its need from time to time.

We believe that a Party that would go to the country with these three simple positive proposals, a just, economical, honest, administration in general, and in particular the repeal of the wine and beer measure, and abolition of the beverage rooms, and the abolition of Separate Schools, or at the very least, the repeal of this measure, would sweep through Ontario to victory. We believe that meetings ought to be held all over this Province, in churches, in halls, everywhere, and the people should be instructed respecting the perils which lie in this Roman Catholic domination of government and press, and should be aroused to action in these respects.

I have spoken this evening on this subject and in this way and in these strong terms in the hope that I may render some service in this direction.

SEPARATE SCHOOL ADDRESS

Copies of this Booklet (32 pages) may be obtained at the office of THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto, Canada, at the following rates:

Single Copy	10c	25 Copies	\$1.75
12 Copies	\$1.00	100 Copies	\$5.00

(Above prices include postage.)

ORDER FORM

THE GOSPEL WITNESS

130 Gerrard St. E., Toronto, Canada.

Please find enclosed for which send me copies of Dr. Shields' address on the Separate School Question.

Name

Address