

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

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

Address Correspondence: THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 180 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2, Canada.
Registered Cable Address: Jarwitsem, Canada.

Vol. 19, No. 18

TORONTO, SEPTEMBER 5, 1940

Whole Number 955

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

MORE ABOUT THE POPE'S FIFTH COLUMN

With a Reply to an Editorial Article in *The Catholic Record*.

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, September 1st, 1940

(Stenographically Reported)

"Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin."—Hebrews 10:18.

The sum of divine revelation is the person of Jesus Christ. The Word—every word that God had ever spoken—"was made flesh" in the God-man, Jesus Christ. This great epistle opens with the declaration that "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son." In one of His parables, the Lord represented the king as sending "last of all" his son. God has no other word to speak to men than that which He has already spoken in the person of Jesus Christ. He is the divine Ultimatum, God's last Word to the world.

Hence Paul speaks of a day when "God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel". The revelation made to the world in Christ will be the norm, the standard of judgment in the last great day.

Central to that revelation, and basic to everything that God has said, is the atoning work of Christ. He was and is a teacher; He was and is a philosopher; He was and is the supreme authority even in matters of natural phenomena; but primarily, Jesus Christ was born to bleed. He came to die; and the life He lived in perfect obedience to the law of God, fulfilling all the requirements of the law, was a vicarious life. It is just as true that Jesus Christ lived for us as that He died for us; and His vicarious death derives its value from His vicarious life; for being made "under the law", He fulfilled the Law's requirements, and wrought out for bankrupt humanity a way of salvation, by providing a flawless righteousness in substitution for man's sin, and then gave His life

in expiation of man's default. So therefore from the manger to the cross, through the grave, to His place at God's right hand, He was and is still our Substitute.

You may multiply metaphors if you like—He paid our debt, He expiated our guilt, He was our Redeemer Who paid the price of our ransom, He was our Deliverer Who came in power to release us from the shackles of our sin—but it is all summed up in this, that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself."

The Bible teaches us that the expiation He effected was complete. As He said on Calvary, "It is finished." "Once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. "This man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down." "By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." Jesus Christ did not come to provide salvation on an instalment plan. Nor did He Himself come to pay our redemption in instalments. He counted down the ruby drops until the last farthing of the world's indebtedness was paid; then He cried, "It is finished."

That is the philosophy of grace; and the gospel is a gospel of grace. The greatest of all heresies is the denial of the principle of grace. There are many brands of heretical Protestantism in this respect as there are differing societies and organizations within the Roman Catholic Church; but all who preach salvation by human effort, on the ground of human merit, implicitly pervert the gospel of the grace of God; which gospel declares that everything is already paid, and that salvation is to

be received as the gift of God. It is not for sale. It is the gift of His sovereign grace to poor bankrupt sinners.

So complete is that work of Christ in our behalf that we are told in this text that God not only forgives our sins as they are washed away in the blood of Christ, but He forgets them; He blots them out entirely from His remembrance, and receives the believer in Christ for Christ's sake as though he had never sinned. Thus His redeeming work spans the record of our life from the cradle—to the grave, we should say; but having regard for certain of the teachings of Rome, let me say that it spans the record of our lives from the cradle to the judgment-seat. Sin is forgiven: "Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." And our text says, "Where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin."

It is useless to pay a debt already paid; and nobody can possibly add to the infinite value of the price already given for our salvation. Anyone who would take from the work of Jesus Christ, or would attempt to add to the work that is already complete, is doing violence to the revelation of divine grace, and offering to man, instead of that which God has provided, a substitute, a counterfeit religion.

It seems necessary to say some things over and over again—the hundredth time, I suppose, for the simple reason that ninety-nine times are not enough. So again I say, I have no quarrel with Roman Catholics as individuals. I can make my own a remark of one of our students who is a great preacher, and a great missionary. Going from door to door, speaking to people about Christ, he came, in the summer-time, to the door of a porch closed with a screen door, where a woman within was sitting in a comfortable chair, knitting or doing something of the sort. Through the screen he introduced himself, and the woman said, "But, sir, I am a Roman Catholic." "Oh well", said he, "I have a Saviour Who loves all Roman Catholics. Will you let me come in and talk with you a little while about Him?" I too have a Saviour Who loves all Roman Catholics, and I believe there are some Roman Catholics, in spite of the darkness and superstitions of Rome, who have found their way to the feet of Christ. I dare to believe that the Roman Catholic Church has in it—for God will have His witnesses everywhere—a remnant according to the election of grace. I have no sympathy with people who cherish an antipathy toward anyone, whether he be a Roman Catholic, or a Jew, or whatsoever he may be. As men made in God's image and likeness, Christ died for us all.

I distinguish between Roman Catholics and Roman Catholicism. And I distinguish too between both lay and official representatives of the Roman Catholic Church, and the Roman Catholic Church as an organization, inseparable from its record. The Church of Rome—which, in the true sense, is the antithesis of "Catholic"—is a most influential factor in the affairs of the world. I have before spoken of the Roman Church as a political organization, and to that I shall return in a moment. But I now say that there is every reason why those of us who have an open Bible, and who have seen God in Christ, should oppose Roman Catholicism with all our might; and every reason why we should hate the system of Romanism. I do. I make no apology for it. I hate it as one of the world's greatest scourges; and all history is confirmatory of that assertion.

I take issue with my Modernist friends, be they Baptist, or Presbyterian, or United Church, or Anglican, or Anglo-Catholic, or what-not, who say that we ought to be charitable toward the Roman Catholic Church. To me, the Roman Catholic Church is just as much an implacable enemy of mankind as Hitler himself. That is a strong statement; but it is a political organization that honeycombs society in every country on earth; it is a malignant cancer that destroys its votaries and victims wherever it has opportunity.

Religiously, it is the negation of Christianity. How absurd some of the proposals of church union—the union of the Western church and the Eastern church and the Anglican, and of all so-called "free" churches. The Roman Church is not a Christian institution: it is wholly pagan. It is a paganized form of Christianity, if you like, a pagan religion bearing a Christian name; but there is not a doctrine of the gospel of Christ which Roman Catholicism does not negate and nullify.

I have spoken of the adequacy of the divine Atonement. I insist upon it. But what does Romanism say? That it is reserved to the church to complete the sacrifice. That which we shall observe this evening as a memorial feast, which is utterly without significance or value apart from the spiritual receptiveness of the participant, is converted into the sacrifice of the Mass; and the observance of it is made indispensable to salvation. If a Romanist who has observed the "sacraments", but who neglects at a prescribed time the observance of the Mass, should his life be terminated before he has opportunity to confess his omission and to obtain absolution, he will, by that neglect, be guilty of a mortal sin which sends him, not to purgatory, but straight to hell. Is it any wonder they get up early in the morning to go to Mass? That teaching denies, nullifies the very heart of the Christian gospel.

Furthermore, Romanism exalts Mary to equality with God, and teaches people to worship her as they worship God. Mariolatry is no figment of the imagination. Romanism is an idolatrous system. I will go farther and say it is a blasphemous system, because it exalts as God one who is not God, and puts someone else in the place of God. I look upon Romanism as one at least of the devil's greatest masterpieces. It interposes between the individual soul and the Saviour, the Church, with the Pope at its head, and its entire sacramentarian system. The priest with his auricular confession, is a damnable institution. I say again, anyone who knows anything about the history of Rome, knows that the practice of auricular confession is dangerous in the extreme. It ruins priests and penitents—but is one of the secrets of Rome's power.

We in this place are called Baptists, and I know what some of you paedobaptists are thinking, "That is right; go for the Pope." But what about the rest of you? Do you know why we contend for the scripturalness of believer's baptism, and insist that baptism, like this ordinance of the Supper, is not a sacrament, and confers no grace upon its recipients apart from the spiritual receptiveness of the subject? It is simply an outward confession of the believer's union with Christ in His death, and burial, and resurrection; and no one ought ever to be baptized who has not first of all been converted, born again, made a new creature in Christ, and who has intelligently received the gospel. I care not how young

they are, if only they are old enough intelligently to receive Christ. But paedo-Baptist churches have borrowed infant baptism from the Church of Rome. There is no warrant for it in the Word of God. Baptism does not make anyone a Christian, but is designed only as an outward confession of a grace inwardly received.

Infant baptism is one of the rags of Rome, and if you realized the implications of it, the putting of the name of Christian on people who are "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise", throwing wide the door of a Christian church, so-called, to the world, the flesh, and the devil, so that the rank and file of people can discern no difference between the mass of people who are called Christian and the people who make no profession, you would recognize the necessity for the discontinuance of the practice.

The Roman doctrine of baptism is unspeakably horrible. I have a treatise on my shelves, bearing the imprimatur of the Archbishop of Toronto, giving instruction for the administration of the sacrament of baptism; and so much importance does the Roman Church attach to baptism that, notwithstanding its doctrine of holy orders, and its sacramentarianism in general, and notwithstanding its restriction of the celebration of marriage as a sacrament to the office of the priest, it specifically gives direction for the baptism of infants by a doctor, by a nurse, by an orderly in a hospital, by a janitor—by anybody—where prenatal baptism may be necessary. Something must be done if there is danger of death, that the child may be baptized before it is born, if necessary, even at the expense of the mother's life—by anybody. What for? "In the case of unbaptized infants it is the doctrine of the Church that they cannot enjoy the Beatific Vision." (Baptism, by Very Rev. Dean O'Sullivan, p. 5.)

What a misrepresentation of God! What a libel upon God Who was revealed in Christ, Who took the little children up in His arms, and blessed them! Do you wonder we stand for scriptural baptism, and protest with all our souls against any departure from scriptural teaching?

I am to speak to you about the fifth column. The Roman Church is a political institution, and I should impugn your intelligence if I were to spend time arguing the point. The pages of history are red with the results of papal intrigue, where rulers and nations have been set against each other; and other pages record how martyrs innumerable were delivered up to death for their testimony to Christ and His gospel. And to-day, right up to this minute, the Roman Church teaches that it is justified in the persecution of those who resist its claims, even unto death. If I had Romanists here, I could prove it to them, from their Church's own statements and decrees. And inasmuch as the Church boasts of its immutability, that it is always the same, we are justified in estimating its character by an examination of its record. Because I have before argued my thesis, I now merely repeat my conviction that the collapse of France was due, more than to any other single thing, to the intrigue of the Roman Church, through Pétain and Weygand, who are devout Romanists.

The Pétain Government subsequently has given evidence which is virtual proof of it. They have established what they call the corporate state, have abolished Labour

unions, Free Masonry—because "Masonry wields an influence against the nation's Catholic faith." I am sure that wisdom will be justified of her children; and as the story of the war unfolds we shall see ever more clearly how much of the disaster which has overtaken our ally was due to their being undermined by ecclesiastical Romanism.

The Vatican's diplomatic corps, no matter where they are, in Britain, Canada, America, France, Spain, have been made citizens of the Vatican State. That announcement was tucked away in a little corner of the paper. Now they enjoy "diplomatic immunity", and remain in their several capitals professedly representative of a neutral state, but holding direct communication with Italy—correspondents enjoying what is called "diplomatic immunity", and are the real fifth column everywhere.

I repeat a matter here because the Government has taken no action. A Justice of the Superior Court of Quebec, in an address to one of the service clubs in Montreal, asked the people of Canada to think kindly of the Pétain regime, and said that the only sovereign—"sovereign", if you please—in the world who seemed to appreciate the Pétain position was His Holiness the Pope! I agree! I think he fully appreciates his position, understands it fully—because he had so much to do with it. Pétain and Weygand did exactly as they were told. But a Judge of the Superior Court of Québec made that statement in Montreal, and was unrebuked by the Government. Why? Because the Canadian Government has retained at Ottawa the representative of the Pétain Government. Britain has severed diplomatic relations with Pétain, but Canada maintains those relations notwithstanding Pétain handed over four hundred German aviators whom our men were largely instrumental in shooting down; and did his best to hand over the French fleet to Germany—and has been manifestly anti-British throughout. Yet his representatives—if there is a Romanist here representing a Romish paper, publish it on the front page. I will take full responsibility for what I say—the representative of a Government that is no friend of Britain, is at Ottawa enjoying "diplomatic immunity", free to correspond with the Government at Vichy, and with the Pope, without let or hindrance. I say, that ought not to be!

Justice Surveyer said that de Gaulle is "a soldier of fortune". General de Gaulle is the leader of free Frenchmen. At least three French foreign possessions have allied themselves with him, to fight alongside Britain. Thousands of Frenchmen who made their way to England in the army, some in the navy, and some in the air force, are to-day playing a noble part. Beyond doubt, there are hundreds of thousands of French people under Hitler's heel who would fight if they could. But General de Gaulle to whom His Majesty's Government has given recognition, whom it recognizes as the leader of free Frenchmen, and co-operates with him, is called "a soldier of fortune" who is to be disregarded, to whom no attention is to be paid—and that by a judge of the Superior Court of Quebec, by one of the Justices of one of His Majesty's Courts, sworn to administer the laws of Canada as a British possession. Yet he tells us to have no regard for General de Gaulle, but to be sympathetic toward the traitor Pétain! And the Canadian Government is silent!

What effect does this produce in Quebec? Again, there are hosts of loyal Romanists who are more truly "Cath-

olic" than their church, many of them in the armed forces. I think very many of them look upon the Roman Church as a religious organization, and nothing more. They ignore its political character. I have never said, nor do I now say, that Roman Catholics, as such, are themselves disloyal. Many of them are: many of them are not. A little while ago there was an advertisement in a Toronto newspaper asking for recruits: "Do your part. Enlist now in the Royal Rifles of Canada". Who are they? A Quebec regiment. Why, I ask, should a Quebec regiment have to come to Toronto and advertise in our papers for recruits? Have you any answer? I think you have a pretty good idea!

I clipped from the paper last night an interesting illustration. Two American boys, brothers, came from Morgantown, West Virginia—hitchhiked to Toronto because they could not wait for Uncle Sam. John Bull is very slow, but some of Uncle Sam's sons feel that their dad is a little slow too sometimes. He is going to be all right by and by, but these two men hitchhiked to Toronto to enlist in His Majesty's forces because they believe it to be right that they should. I saw a reproduction of a photograph in a recent paper, of a large company of American airmen, splendid fellows, no better can be found in the world. They too had come across the border, and are wearing His Majesty's uniform, because they believe they ought to fight in defence of liberty.

But these two men, when they got to Toronto, found that recruiting for overseas service in Toronto units had been discontinued, because the Toronto regiments have a surplus of men whom they could not receive. But a Montreal regiment—the other to which I referred was of Quebec City—the Victoria Rifles of Montreal, has recruiting agents in Toronto. I thought Montreal was a considerable city. I had an idea that Montreal rather looked down upon Toronto as a little village in the west—Montreal is Canada's largest city. But the Victoria Rifles had to come to Toronto to make up their complement. We had a waiting list of one hundred and seventy-five men, and the officers of the Toronto regiment said, "We must not reflect upon them because these men want to get into the army, and we could not receive them"—but why were there not one hundred and seventy-five waiting in Quebec? Why should Quebec and Montreal have to come and recruit its regiments in Toronto.

In the First Canadian Division Ontario was represented by four hundred and eighty-two officers and ten thousand, six hundred, and sixteen men; Quebec by one hundred and sixty-six officers, and thirty-nine hundred and ninety-two men. And how many of the thirty-nine hundred and ninety-two they had got from Ontario, I do not know. The one hundred and seventy-five, more or less, from Toronto enlisted in Montreal units, and others enlisted for Quebec, will be reckoned as Quebec recruits.

We intend no criticism of French-Canadians as such. French-Canadians would be as zealous for the British cause as we are if they were let alone. It is not French Canada, it is not the French-Canadian people: it is the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in Canada: that is Canada's ball and chain. When the Minister of Justice the other day broadcast an exhortation to all the French-Canadians to co-operate in the work of national registration, that was good. He spoke in French, to French-Canadians.

But no one had to speak in English to the people of Ontario for the same purpose. Why? The people of the other provinces did not need the admonition of the Minister of Justice or of anybody else to obey the law of the land.

The occasion for Mayor Houde's internment is an example of the same sinister attempt to weaken Canada's war effort. After recruiting was started, an order was issued that in future—not long after the beginning of the war—no man should be enlisted who had more than two children unless he were willing to sign a declaration that he would not expect support for more than two children; and any already enlisted who were not willing to make such declaration were to be discharged. That was another notice that was tucked away in a corner on an inconspicuous page of the daily press; but a good housekeeper sweeps the corners. Do not read the headlines only.

Some of you may perhaps have thought that no government should be required to support more than two children of a man defending his country. But that rule would apply especially to Roman Catholics for the reason that nearly all Roman Catholics have more than two children, and it was designed, not merely to protect the taxpayer against the cost of maintaining soldiers' families: it was a ruse to put out of the army the Roman Catholics that had already got in it, not only in Quebec but in Ontario as well.

I do not see why a man should be deprived of the privilege of service in the army because he has more than two children. I think in all probability he would make a better fighter, because he has more to fight for. That is not mere pleasantry, but a sound principle of the highest patriotism.

The same malignancy troubles Ireland to-day as it has troubled her for centuries. I know something about Ireland. I have been there and studied it. Ireland is one of the loveliest countries in the world. Can you tell me why the south of Ireland is the only spot within the British Empire that calls itself neutral? Think of an Irishman being neutral when there is a fight on! Why is it? The Separatist Movement in Ireland which has brought about the Free State, and imperilled the British Isles, is one that has been engineered for centuries by Rome. It has long been a disturbing factor in British political life. I was brought up on it, learned it at the breakfast table. Ireland is the Quebec of Great Britain; and the same Italian hand is responsible for both.

I once had a talk with Lord Carson, the great Northern Irish leader, when his guest at dinner in London. When in response to his enquiry I gave him what I considered a true diagnosis of affairs there, he said, "You are right. There would be no trouble with Ireland if it were not for the Roman Catholic Church." And there would be no trouble in Quebec, nor the flying of the Tricolor and the papal flag to the serious neglect of the Union Jack, if it were not for the agent of "the only sovereign in the world" who understands and appreciates Pétain and other traitors of his ilk.

I am charged by *The Catholic Record* in an editorial article with many things. I am not bigoted. My speech is not inspired by bigotry. It would be too much to expect those who charge me with bigotry to accept

what I say, but I dare to affirm that my criticism is based upon a little historical intelligence. Anyone who knows the history of Romanism, knows that what I have said this evening is true.

There is another paper published in Toronto that I should like every member of this congregation to receive. It is called *Protestant Action*, and the Editor is Mr. Leslie Saunders, a member of the Toronto Board of Education. The paper is only one dollar a year, and contains more information respecting the machinations of Rome than any other Canadian publication I know. Many a copy of *Protestant Action* is worth, not only the subscription price for a whole year, but many times the price. It does not contain exclusively the opinions of the Editor, valuable as they are, but is replete with quotations from other Protestant periodicals—and Roman Catholic too—the world over. If you would be informed on these things, you can hardly afford to be without this paper. Had I money, I would endow it, so that it could go by the million throughout Canada. Leave your subscriptions at our office, and we shall be glad to forward them to *Protestant Action*. I have said this without any suggestion from, and without the knowledge of anyone connected with that paper.

I have another paper here, published in London, Ontario. It is called *The Catholic Record*. It is dated Saturday, August twenty-fourth, nineteen-forty. This is the leading editorial in the paper, entitled, "Where are the censors?" I quote:

"Have the officials at Ottawa who administer the Defense of Canada Regulations taken any notice of the sermon preached by the Rev. Dr. T. T. Shields in the Jarvis Street Baptist Church on August 11th? Have the Press Censors read the account of it as published in the Toronto Evening Telegram on the following day? Have they taken any action? If not, the Catholics of Canada, not only the commissioned and non-commissioned officers and the private soldiers of the active and non-permanent forces but the citizens of the Home Front, want to know why. And they are thoroughly justified in asking the question."

I do not know whether or not the censors have taken account of my sermons: I only know they receive a copy each week. My sermons are stenographically reported, and a copy of THE GOSPEL WITNESS goes to the Headquarters of the Censorship Department, to their chief office at Ottawa, every week. We were asked for it, as all other publications were; and if the censors have not taken any notice of my sermons, they do not know what they have missed!

It is most interesting to note that our Roman Catholic friends think that the censors ought to take note of them, and that I ought to be denied the liberty to say such things as I am saying to-night! This battle we are fighting in Europe, in which the Church of Rome is playing such an important part, is vital to every free man. The Church of Rome was eminently successful in Spain, with the immediate result that all religious liberty is now at an end. And it would be here. It is greatly restricted, so far as they can manage to do so, in Quebec at this day. The Editor of *The Catholic Record*, if he had the power, would silence my testimony. The Hierarchy would use any means or method to silence this, or any other pulpit that proclaims the principles of the Reformation, and thereby opposes Rome. They are

not the only people who have tried to silence this pulpit—but we are still here!

I quote again:

"It is no answer to say everyone in Toronto and its suburbs knows the Rev. Dr. Shields and that no one pays any attention to his incessant, bigoted ravings."

Do you live in Toronto? Why did you come to-night? Of course they do not pay any attention to the ravings of Dr. Shields! Like Paul, I become a fool in glorying, for although they pay no attention to the "ravings of Dr. Shields", this place has been packed to capacity all summer while a great many churches have been nearly empty, and some of them closed, at least in the evenings. I will boast a little more. My sermons not only go throughout this country, but to the ends of the earth. I want you who hear me to feel you are my principal hearers, but every sermon is recorded, at least one a week is printed verbatim, as this will be printed, on Thursday; and but for the war in Europe it would go to sixty different countries, to ministers of all denominations, missionaries in all countries, college presidents and professors. They must be an ignorant lot to listen to "the ravings" of this pulpit! Still a fool in glorying, I may remark that this sermon will be read by many more thousands than the multitude assembled here this evening. That by the way. I shall send the Editor of *The Catholic Record* a copy of this sermon. I resume my quotation:

"That is only a half-truth. The Telegram is read beyond the confines of Dr. Shields' notoriety. His congregation applauded when he ended his attack upon the Catholics of Canada by saying, 'We shall win—victory will be ours—the Pope notwithstanding.'

"It is only after obtaining a dispensation from one's self-respect, and making apology to one's intelligence, that consideration of Dr. Shields' remarks and the Telegram's report of them, is possible."

Then why talk about it? Why bother to get a dispensation from their self-respect? Why not treat such a contemptible witness with silence?—I quote again:

"The report suggests that the sermon could not have been as absurd, illogical and malicious as it was made to appear. The sermon suggests that no job of reporting could so perfectly reflect the murky thinking of a diatribe as to defeat analysis and defy understanding. But the combined performance of the speaker and the paper is nothing but an attempt to play upon the war spirit in order to hurl insults at Canadian Catholics. It cannot be interpreted as anything but a poorly concealed effort to weaken the British war effort by setting Protestant against Catholic in Canada. Of its very nature it is designed to destroy Canadian unity and split Canadian solidarity wide open with a wedge of religious bigotry."

It could scarcely be split any wider than it is already in the Province of Quebec. You who come here regularly will be witnesses as to whether what you hear from this pulpit has a tendency to "weaken the British war effort". If I could not help to make you feel like fighting, I would not thus speak. Again:

"If Dr. Shields and the Telegram do not claim the prize for the best fifth column achievement in Canada to date, they are doing themselves an injustice.

"The Jarvis Street orator set himself the task of answering the question which, he alleges, he was asked, 'Why does the Pope aid Hitler?' He completely ignores the established facts which, for all intelligent people, deny the malicious assumption. He drags in the laughable formula that 'according to the Catholic Church, once

a Catholic always a Catholic' to prove that Hitler's baptism makes him now a pillar of the Church. Shades of Julian the Apostate and Martin Luther. The Reverend Doctor forgets all his Canon Law on excommunication self-inflicted."

In saying what I did say, I was only alluding to what a Quebec Roman Catholic Judge said when he annulled a marriage between two people who had left the Catholic Church and joined the United Church. The Judge said because they had not formally written their renunciation of their Catholic faith, and sent it to the Bishop, and been properly excommunicated, notwithstanding they had joined the United Church, they were still Catholics. Then he said that, even if they had done so, and if they had subsequently been excommunicated as a result, that would not relieve them of the obligation imposed upon them by baptism, that they are bound by the laws of the Church in respect to marriage. A Roman Catholic Judge in Montreal said that, not I. But here is the report:

Mr. Justice Forest said that under Canon Law certain formalities must be observed by persons wishing to renounce the Roman Catholic religion. A formal renunciation of the faith must be made in writing in the presence of witnesses and forwarded to the Bishop of the diocese. This results in the excommunication of the person concerned.

The Superior Court justice said, however, that excommunication still did not relieve a person from following the rules of the Catholic Church with respect to marriage. In the Bouchak case, he found, the renunciation of faith was not made in the specified form.

Mr. Justice Forest also ruled that a parent has no right to take a minor child away from the Roman Catholic Church with him.

"A distinction should be made," he said, "between the authority a parent may exercise over a minor child in temporal or material matters as opposed to those spiritual. While the principle is admitted universally that a child owes obedience to a parent until he is 21 years of age, in matters of conscience he owed no such obedience."

I need hardly say that I never suggested "that Hitler's baptism makes him now a pillar of the Church." I resume my quotation from *The Catholic Record*:

"There is not the most remote suggestion of evidence in Dr. Shields' sermon to prove that the Pope does help Hitler. Therefore, with Shieldish logic, he proceeds to fail in his attempt to answer the question why. No offering of fact, no submission of reason, no argument which would convince the least friendly to the Church, draws the applause of his Jarvis Street congregation. Insinuation and innuendo lead him to the grave of discarded calumnies, a thousand times refuted. From it he drags out, into a complete intellectual blackout, the corpse of the charge that a Catholic cannot be loyal to his Church and loyal to his country at the same time."

In what we said, we were quoting W. E. Gladstone, and others. A true Roman Catholic owes his primary allegiance to a foreign prince, or "sovereign", as the Quebec Justice Surveyer denominates the Pope, and "no man can serve two masters". I quote again:

"Taking advantage of the current heat wave, he warmed it out of its rigor mortis and his people clapped their hands. The Telegram put the calumny in its trucks and peddled it far and wide.

HITLER AND THE CHURCH

"Seven years of Hitler attack on the Catholic Church in Germany make answer to Dr. Shields' ignorance which could be ignored were not culpable ignorance influential upon the more ignorant. A concordat flagrantly violated, Cardinals and Bishops assaulted, priests put

into the hell-holes of internment camps, sisters deprived of their posts of mercy and charity, seminaries closed, church property seized, vile attempts to convict clerics of detestable crimes, all Catholic papers suppressed, these form but part of the answer to the incredibly stupid question which Dr. Shields, in a more incredibly stupid way, did not answer. The litany, carried into Austria, Czecho-Slovakia and Poland, could be unknown only to such people as applaud Rev. Dr. Shields. The papal condemnation of the principles underlying racism and excessive nationalism as well as the wanton violation of the neutrality and sovereign rights of small, defenseless nations, contribute to the answer. But none of these things found their way into the Jarvis Street pulpit. They did not serve Dr. Shields' purpose.

"It would be beside the point and would be taking the Reverend Doctor's declamation much too seriously to stress the fact that the Catholics of Canada and Great Britain are doing their share, shoulder to shoulder with their fellow-citizens to destroy the Hitler menace. From the pronouncements of their Eminences Cardinal Hinsley and Cardinal Villeneuve, through the work done by Catholics in war cabinet positions down to the service of the thousands of Catholic soldiers in the ranks, comes once more the refutation of the foul insinuation against loyalty of Catholics.

TIME FOR ACTION

"But what is of paramount importance in these days of high tension and sacrifice, is the impression created in the minds of more than forty per cent. of Canadians by Dr. Shields' attack on them. It does not need to be true to be irritating, insulting, offensive. If Canada were dominated by Doctor Shields and his hand-clappers, Catholics could not be blamed for thinking it not worth their efforts to save.

"Defense of Canada Regulations officials and the Press Censors must not be deceived if the Catholics of the Dominion fail to become excited over the Dr. Shields-Toronto Telegram gesture. The internment camps confine many a person whose offense against Canada's interests of the moment is trivial, by comparison. If the Defense Regulations and Censorship rules permit the spread of the Dr. Shields-Telegram type of propaganda, it is time for further amendments. It is no excuse, in the circumstances, that a newspaper publishes the news. Subversive news is precisely the concern of the officials who are safeguarding Canada's war effort."

The Toronto Telegram's report was excellent, but we are long metre in this place, and no reporter could report it all. As a matter of fact, I dealt with all these things in the sermon under review. I shall send this very enlightened and informed and logical and intellectual Editor a copy of the full text of the sermon he criticises, so that he may be still more thoroughly informed as to my "ravings".

But we know something else beside. I quote from *Protestant Action*. A Diplomatic Correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* has also written recently on the attitude of the German Catholics to the Nazi State. His report ran:

"Among the higher ranks of the Catholic clergy a decisive majority desire to see the victory of the Reich or at least a peace that will leave Germany's political and military strength unimpaired. At the same time they still look to an eventual Catholic-Conservative restoration. The National Socialist State has, it seems, been able to reach an understanding with the Catholic leaders. Assurances have been given as to the status of the Church in the Bohemian-Moravian Protectorate and in Germany itself. The special position of the Catholic Church in Poland is also to receive due recognition. In spite of the persecution of laymen and priests by the Nazis, in spite of all the attacks upon the Christian religion, new hopes have been raised among the German

Catholics as a result of these negotiations"

—*Manchester Guardian, May 24, 1940.*

There appeared in a Toronto paper another little report tucked away where it would scarcely be noticed—not of course deliberately to hide it, but because of its supposed unimportance—in which it speaks of a letter written by the clergy of Germany, to be put upon the agenda of the greater German Roman Catholic Bishops' conference, calling upon the people of the Reich to co-operate in every way with Hitler. But here is the item:

GERMAN BISHOPS MEET

Berlin, Aug. 19 (AP Via Radio).—The German radio said today that the drafting of a pastoral letter appealing to German Catholics to co-operate with Adolf Hitler's fight for the existence of the German people is on the agenda of the greater German Roman Catholic Bishops' conference. Forty-five of the forty-eight German Bishops attended the opening meeting today.

I quote further from a letter in *The English Churchman* by John Kensit, dated the second of July, to Sir John Anderson, Minister of Home Security, as follows:

The Italianised Papacy is as active now as ever against us. *The Times*, on the 20th of last month, published a report that "two Italian Archbishops and 47 Bishops have petitioned Mussolini to insist that the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem be taken out of the hands of Great Britain and entrusted to the Royal House of Savoy."

In combing out all possibilities of danger, the Government should have in mind that the Roman Catholic Church demands its members to subscribe to the claim "that the Pope is above all temporal rulers." This is the language of *The Tablet*—the leading Roman Catholic paper published in this country, and as recently as the 15th June last.

No one familiar with Romish casuistry will be deceived by the professed loyalty of a few high officials of the Roman Church. We have had examples of Bishops in Quebec speaking for the hearing of Protestants in other parts of Canada in one direction, while the priest privately instructed their people to vote the opposite way.

Well, if this pulpit should be vacant some Sunday, you will know the Pastor has been interned! I was minded to pass the whole editorial over, but on reconsideration thought it best to answer it, with a little emphasis. I withdraw nothing of what I have said before.

The Papacy is our most dangerous fifth column. Against this we need to be always on guard. My criticism of Quebec, is not intended to set Ontario against Quebec; but to call attention to the fact that the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of Quebec is already opposed to Canada's doing her utmost in the war; that we have within this Dominion a fifth column, a papal influence that is seriously restricting our war effort all the time.

But all this is my strange work. Far more important to us as individuals is the note upon which I began. The one Offering has been presented. Let us be Protestants indeed in the sense that Luther was a Protestant, being justified by faith, knowing the Lord, loving the Lord, prizing our liberty in Christ so highly that we shall count not our lives dear unto ourselves, that we may stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ makes free.

"Should all the forms that men devise
Assault my faith with treacherous art,
I'll call them vanity and lies
And bind the gospel to my heart."

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC VIEW OF BAPTISM

In support of what we have said in the sermon in this issue about the Romanist view of baptism, we quote a few passages from a treatise on baptism by the Very Rev. Dean O'Sullivan, published by The Catholic Truth Society of Canada, 67 Bond Street, Toronto, and bearing the "imprimatur" of the late Archbishop McNeil. In the Introduction, page three, we read:

"There are two very good reasons why the laity should possess thorough and definite information in regard to the sacrament of Baptism. The first reason is based on its necessity as a means to salvation; and the second on the fact that lay people are often called to administer it."

Page five says:

"It is not on the testimony of Scripture alone but also of Tradition, that we know of the divine institution of the sacraments."

Page eight tells us:

"Baptism is the gate of the Church, the door to the other sacraments, the efficient cause of our supernatural birth, and of incorporation in the body of Christ."

On page eleven we find:

"Thus we are taught at the very outset that Baptism is the sacrament of faith, the root and source of all justification, but that this great gift of God may avail us to eternal life, it must be put into practice, that is, it must be fruitful of the works of charity. The triple breathing of the priest upon the child's face reminds us that it is delivered from the power of the devil and restored to the grace of God. As God breathed into the body of the first man, Adam, the breath of life, so the breathing of the priest upon the child indicates that by Baptism its soul receives supernatural life. The placing of the hand on the child indicates that henceforth it will enjoy the protection of Christ's Church. The frequent signs of the cross remind us that when we become children of God in Baptism we must not recoil from bearing the cross of Christ, which is the Christian's portion. The salt placed in the child's mouth signifies heavenly wisdom which will preserve it from the corruption of the world. The exorcisms recall the truth that through original sin we are in the power of the evil one and that he must be driven forth before our souls can become the temples of the Holy Ghost."

On page thirteen the author says:

"I have already mentioned the fact that Baptism is absolutely necessary to salvation."

Again on the same page:

"Some sacraments are necessary as a matter of precept. That is, it would be a grievous sin not to receive them if an opportunity offered itself, though their reception is not absolutely necessary to salvation. Baptism is necessary not only as a matter of precept, but also as a means to salvation. For this reason if a person were debarred from it, even through no fault of his own, he would be forever deprived of the vision of God."

Once more, pages thirteen and fourteen:

"In the case of unbaptized infants it is the doctrine of the Church that they cannot enjoy the Beatific Vision."

We wish our readers would get a copy of the pamphlet and read it for themselves. It is amazing that people of intelligence anywhere should be subject to such superstitious absurdities as abound in this tract. Nothing in any pagan system could be more devoid of reason, or could more horribly caricature God.

"A FOOL IN GLORYING"

There are few matters in which people so greatly exaggerate as in their estimates of the number of people assembled within a given space. We should not like to charge them with deliberate misrepresentation: we can only assume that they have failed to erect a reasonably accurate standard in their minds by which, in the event of their being unable actually to count, they can make a fairly correct estimate.

There is no excuse for a minister's not knowing at least the utmost capacity of the church in which he preaches, though perhaps we may make some charitable allowance for his estimate of the proportion of the building occupied at a given time. An extended experience has taught us that the ordinary estimate of the number present in a congregation may usually quite safely be cut at least in two.

Greenway Hall seats actually, comfortably, three hundred and fifty. One Thursday in the early summer, when chairs were used which brought the number up to five hundred and three, we had asked a ministerial brother to sit on the platform, to make room for someone else in the pew. When the people stood to sing, he whispered to us, "There must be a thousand people here." There were actually five hundred and three! But by many, much less than five hundred would be reckoned a thousand; while a thousand would be estimated as over two thousand; and when a crowd reaches two thousand, in the average view, it grows to four thousand or more.

A preacher, standing on the platform in our new auditorium, one week-day when it was empty, remarked, "This must seat thirty-five hundred people"—more than five hundred in excess of the capacity of Massey Hall!

We scarcely ever describe a congregation in terms of numbers, but we have said some things in the sermon in this issue which may sound almost like boasting; but in justification we borrow the apostolic saying, "I am become a fool in glorying; ye have compelled me." Interested readers of THE GOSPEL WITNESS in many parts of the earth remote from Toronto have enquired as to the progress of affairs in Jarvis Street Church. *The Catholic Record* says, "Everyone in Toronto and its suburbs knows the Reverend Dr. Shields, that no one pays any attention to his insistent bigoted ravings." When we read this Sunday evening, the congregation responded with audible merriment; for the reason that Sunday evening it was more than a congregation, it was a human flood, and a large part of it had receded from the building because it could not get in.

But this was not unusual, for while in not a few instances in the city of Toronto, where two and three churches combined for union services during the summer, the net result assembled fewer people than often gather at our Saturday night prayer meeting; while a number of churches for a month or more held no Sunday evening service at all; yet though no one in Toronto and its suburbs, according to *The Catholic Record*, "pays any attention to the ravings of the Jarvis Street pulpit", with but two exceptions on very hot nights—and even then there were large congregations but a few more could have been accommodated—the church has been packed to capacity.

We insist, however, that the loyalty of any church or minister to the gospel, and the effectiveness of their ser-

vice, can never safely be estimated by the size of congregations. Some of the most able and faithful ministries we have ever known, were never largely attended; while on the other hand, we have known religious services attended by vast multitudes of people, whose spiritual usefulness was very doubtful. "It is required in a steward that he be found faithful"; and if we are faithful to our trust in the place where God has put us, whether our opportunity be large or small, and our hearers many or few, we shall not fail of our reward.

We have spoken of numbers in this instance only as a reply to the sneer of *The Catholic Record*, that no one pays any attention to Dr. Shields' "ravings". We will venture to add that if those who hear the Jarvis Street sermons, and those who read them, be taken together, the Jarvis Street pulpit, in the thirty-first year of its occupancy by this Editor, in all probability, reaches more people, in a more widely extended area, than any other pulpit, not only in Toronto, but in the Dominion of Canada. There now, Mr. Editor of *The Catholic Record*, how do you like that? Once more, "I am become a fool in glorying; ye have compelled me."

THE FRENCH CANADIAN PRESS AND THE WAR

By W. S. Whitcombe, M.A.

"An information paper of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs on the attitude of the French Canadian Press toward the war, arranged and classified without criticism." By Florent Lefebvre (*The Ryerson Press, Toronto and Halifax, 25c*).

Those who are responsible for the publication of this little booklet have rendered a genuine service to English-speaking Canadians. Especially in time of war it is of the greatest importance that everyone should be acquainted with the true state of affairs on the home front. Unfortunately many Canadians are almost totally unaware of the existence of the powerful streams of thought in French Canada that sway politicians and play a large part in shaping governmental policies. This little brochure, "The French Canadian Press and the War", written by a French Canadian, will shed light on the present state of mind in Roman Catholic Quebec. We earnestly hope that many English Canadians will read it, though we warn those who have believed the current "Pollyanna" reports regarding Quebec's loyalty that they may expect to receive a distinct shock when confronted by this digest of French Canadian opinion on the war as expressed in its press.

The author of this study rigorously adhered to his intention of limiting himself to objective statements. As the foreword puts it: "The digest does not attempt to assess the relative importance of various views; it merely sets them forth as factual statements." Those who study the evidence brought together in this booklet will not think, however, that the author has overstepped the limits of a factual report when he concludes in the following words: "Their obligations toward their country, the respect which they recognized that they owed to the sentiments of the Anglo-Saxon section of the nation, their clearly perceived interests, and perhaps, even if they did not give full account to it, their conviction of the justice of the struggle of the British Commonwealth and the French Empire with Germany—all these influences induced them to accept or tolerate our intervention in Europe. But they still adhere to a compromise." (Italics ours).

Lest this statement should be regarded as an unfair interpretation of the opinion expressed in the French Canadian press we give the following quotation from "L'Action Catholique". This paper has the largest circulation in Quebec City and carries at the head of its editorial page the title, "Organ of the Catholic Social Action". It was founded by a former Archbishop of Quebec and speaks officially for the hierarchy in that province. Its comment on the defeat of Mr. Duplessis at the provincial poll is especially interesting

in view of the fashion in certain quarters of interpreting Mr. Duplessis' defeat as the defeat of anti-British sentiment. The organ of the Catholic Social Action here addresses the French Canadian Federal ministers—the authors of Mr. Duplessis' defeat: "Messieurs the French-Canadian ministers at Ottawa, Quebec accepts the policy of compromise which you say you have obtained, and wants you to stay at your posts and *vigorously resist any attempt to go beyond the compromise lest Canada be ruined.*" (Italics ours.)

The following statement appeared in "Le Devoir" (p. 34): "The Cabinet, under the authority of Messrs. King and Lapointe, is the least imperialistic Government possible we could have at the moment." Our author characterizes this assertion as "a statement on which the Liberals and "La Patrie" at once capitalized." If this statement was capitalized by French liberal papers in Quebec, the censor may not consider it invidious to print it in an English paper in Ontario!

Mr. Lefebvre apparently assumes that his readers are aware that the French language press in Canada forms a solidly Roman Catholic block, but we doubt whether many English-speaking Canadians realize to what extent the press in Quebec is under the control of the Church. A cursory glance at various issues of French Canadian papers will bring home in a vivid fashion to one who reads French how strongly Catholic these journals are. "L'Action Catholique" as we have remarked, is the organ of the Catholic Social Action. That is to say, it is owned by the Church and published under its auspices to promote its official teachings. Yet "Le Soleil", its privately owned competitor, boasts that it is no less strongly Catholic in its doctrine and loyalties. "La Presse" which carries the proud sub-title, "The largest French daily in America", on its front page, prints the following motto at the head of the editorial column, "La Presse as established by the Honourable Trefflé Berthiaume, is an institution irrevocably devoted to French Canadian and Catholic interests . . ." "Le Droit", published in the capital of Canada, is the mouthpiece of the French Canadian minority in Ontario. The following is a translation of the heading which it carries on its editorial column: "The future belongs to those who fight. A journal independent in politics and totally devoted to the interests of the Church and the Fatherland. Published by the Union of Social Works (Le Syndicat d'Oeuvres Sociales)." This paper too is a church publication. "Le Devoir" of Montreal is fanatically Catholic and ferociously anti-British, even in time of war. No word of praise for anything English ever finds a place in its pages. The enemies of Britain are always its heroes. Leopold, Pétain, Lindberg, et al, find sympathy and support in its editorial pages. If not more narrow it is certainly more bigoted than its clerical contemporary, "L'Action Catholique". The interest of "Le Devoir" in any prominent person seems to be limited to the question: "Is he a Catholic?" or "Is he favourable to Catholics?" In a recent issue, for instance, it discusses the question of Mr. Roosevelt's re-election. The following paragraph is an important part of the article:

"Neither is Wilkie a Catholic, but he has large Catholic sympathies and counts numerous Catholics in his family, of which two members are nuns. He has publicly denounced Catholic antipathies. Personally Roosevelt sympathizes with Catholics. He includes or has included Catholics among his counsellors, of whom some are eminent prelates. He is aware of the fact that it is the sole religion whose discipline does not change, though the laxity in the morals of the United States frightens him. But he has not the courage to make known his private sentiments. Farley gone, he believed it urgent, however, to replace him at the head of the Democratic Committee by a well known Catholic, but that is electoralism. . . ."

A personal illustration may serve to bring home the narrow Catholic outlook of these French Canadian papers. One of our pastors in a community where there are a large number of French Canadians decided to follow the example of business men in his church who advertised in French papers for French Canadian custom. Accordingly this pastor sent an announcement of his meetings to the office of the French language paper in town. His copy was returned to him with a polite note saying that the paper could not accept his advertisement. The official organ of the Roman Catholic hierarchy was precluded from announcing the meetings of heretics! This policy is consistently pursued not only in

advertising columns but also in the news and editorial columns of all these papers. Items of news and notes of Protestant churches, Y.M.C.A.'s or other non-Catholic religions or semi-religious groups, are severely excluded from the pages of the French Catholic newspapers.

There is only one French paper in the whole of Canada that dares raise its voice in criticism of any part of the church policy. This paper, "Le Jour", edited by Jean Charles Harvey, is a newcomer in the field. For the past few years it has conducted a vigorous crusade for school reform in the province. It may be of interest in passing to note that Quebec has no law providing for compulsory school attendance, and its teachers receive the lowest average salary of any body of teachers on the North American continent. Education in Quebec is under the direct control of the Hierarchy. Mr. Harvey protests that he is a good Catholic and takes pains never to offend in point of doctrine, yet his campaign for school reform has called down upon his head the dreaded epithet of "anti-clerical". To suggest that the school system, this mighty bulwark of ignorance, might be something less than perfect, is, in the province of Quebec, tantamount to criticizing the infallible church, and hence makes one an anti-clerical. But "Le Jour" is the only paper of its kind, and has only a few years of history behind it. For the rest, Quebec's press marches with unbroken rank in step with the Roman Hierarchy.

No one will be so foolish as to suppose that it is by mere chance that these French papers are unanimous in their aloofness from the British cause, nor can anyone fail to see that in this they express the attitude of the French Canadian Roman Hierarchy. In saying this, some may accuse us of giving comfort to the enemy, but we are convinced that the enemy will receive far more comfort through our ignorance of the true state of affairs in Canada than by our knowledge of them, however painful it may be for Canadians to look at things as they are.

MR. JUSTICE SURVEYER'S MONTREAL ADDRESS

(The following is a partial summary of an address by Dr. Shields delivered in Jarvis St. Church, Thursday evening, August 15th.)

Before a large congregation Thursday evening, August 15th in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Dr. Shields, in his weekly "Review of Latest War News in the Light of Scripture", referred to the address of Mr. Justice Edouard Surveyer in Montreal, Wednesday, August the fourteenth.

After referring to the multiplying evidence of the growing might of the Royal Air Force, Dr. Shields quoted from the radio address of the Right Honourable Ernest Lapointe, Minister of Justice, in which he told his French-Canadian hearers that only Britain's navy, army and courage, stood between Canada and a pitiless foe. He said he joined with Mr. Lapointe, as would all loyal Canadians, in urging upon every Canadian citizen the necessity for wholehearted co-operation in the work of national registration. He said that the Government and the Opposition had pledged themselves, all too emphatically, as he believed, against conscription for overseas service. Expressing the utmost confidence in the ultimate victory of Britain, he said that Germany would be subdued, not merely by the defence of Britain, but by carrying the war to the continent, and "mopping up" the countries under Hitler's heel. While the four divisions authorized for overseas service might be all that could usefully be employed in Britain herself, we ought to have an army of hundreds of thousands in process of training in Canada, ready to assist in the "mopping up" process. There was no reason why they could not be trained to the highest state of efficiency in Canada itself, and ready to go from here to the continent as soon as they are needed. But as the best effort toward that end available to us at the present, we should assist by every possible means in effecting the national registration, both by registering ourselves, and by volunteering to assist in the work of registration.

Dr. Shields said that he had little doubt, as necessity might arise, opportunity for voluntary enlistment for overseas service might be re-opened later, although there was no government promise to that effect. He remarked on the fact that Mr. Lapointe advised his radio hearers to follow "the wise

advice given by Cardinal Villeneuve to facilitate its execution", that is, national registration. He said that for once he found himself in cordial agreement with Cardinal Villeneuve, and he commended the sagacity of Mr. Lapointe in naming Cardinal Villeneuve, as he knew the church was the supreme authority to those who were in need of Mr. Lapointe's admonition. He said it was significant that it was unnecessary for Mr. Lapointe to address such an admonition to any other part of Canada than to Quebec.

Dr. Shields then quoted a report from an evening paper of the speech of Mr. Justice Surveyer, in which he expressed the view that "of all the consequences of France's capitulation, the saddest for its authors, and for those who loved France is not the capitulation itself, but the way it has been interpreted by the outside world". He said he was familiar, in his own experience, with the shrewd attempt to conceal the true purpose of a course which it was not desirable the public generally should understand, by charging its critics with inability to understand it. He then quoted what he called the astounding statement of Mr. Justice Surveyer to the effect that "the only sovereign who seems to appreciate France's position is the Pope". And this, said Dr. Shields, "from a Justice of the Quebec Superior Court".

Mr. Justice Surveyer was careful to refer to the Pope as a "sovereign". Dr. Shields said that that, unfortunately, went to the very heart of the Quebec problem. Here we have a Justice of the Superior Court of Quebec apparently setting the intelligence of a foreign "sovereign", and the alleged "sovereign", the Pope, above the intelligence of the sovereign of this country. It was an extraordinary assumption that notwithstanding the advice of all his British ministers, his naval, army, and air force commanders; notwithstanding the advice of all his ministers from all the other overseas Dominions; notwithstanding the fact that all these advisers had the advantage of the entire British intelligence system, His Majesty, King George VI., was quite unable properly to appreciate the action of the Pétain Government, since the Pope is "the only sovereign who seems to appreciate France's position".

Dr. Shields said further that notwithstanding the Pétain Government had delivered to Germany the four hundred German aviators in custody in France—most of whom had been shot down by British airmen—in violation of the Government's pledge; and that notwithstanding, in violation of its pledge, the Pétain Government had done its best to deliver the French fleet into German hands, and notwithstanding the Pétain Government had severed diplomatic relations with Britain, and had passed sentence of death upon General de Gaulle, and all free Frenchmen in the army and navy, who had elected to continue the war at Britain's side, Mr. Justice Surveyer had requested Canadians to think well of the Pétain Government on the ground that "the only sovereign who seems to appreciate France's position is the Pope".

Dr. Shields said that he could agree with Mr. Justice Surveyer thus far, that it was extremely likely, and almost certain, that the Pope thoroughly understands the action of the Pétain Government, for the reason that it did exactly what the Pope instructed it to do.

Reverting further to Mr. Justice Surveyer's remark that the "saddest of the consequences of France's capitulation for its authors and for those who love France is not the capitulation itself but the way it has been interpreted by the outside world", Dr. Shields said he believed that vast multitudes of people were seeing ever more clearly from what quarter the capitulation of France was advised; and it is just because that is being understood, and not misunderstood, that the consequences to its authors are likely to be so serious. Dr. Shields insisted that he understood and appreciated the Pétain surrender just as clearly as the Pope himself.

The speaker then expressed his hearty approval of an editorial in *The Evening Telegram* of Thursday, and his gratification that *The Telegram* had directed attention to it. He then remarked that the reports appearing in the press had obviously passed under the hand of the censor inasmuch as some parts of the Judge's address reported in a Wednesday evening broadcast had been deleted from the Canadian Press report.

If there was anything in the address of Mr. Justice Surveyer that was not safe for the public to hear, then it logically followed that the Judge ought to be called to account

for saying it. The speaker remarked on the fact that it was reported that Mr. Justice Surveyer had described General de Gaulle as "a soldier of fortune", and then said that by this remark the Judge had cast aspersions upon the judgment of His Majesty's Government in Britain, and through the Government, on His Majesty himself, for having given official recognition to General de Gaulle as the leader of all free Frenchmen. Mr. Justice Surveyer preferred to set the Vatican's estimate of General de Gaulle above the British Government's appraisal of him.

The speaker asked why the Judge's speech had been censored, and asked, if it was worthy of being censored, why such subversive speech should be permitted to go unchallenged. He expressed the opinion that if Parliament had not been in session, the outrageous statement of the Mayor of Montreal might also have been so censored as to have left the public uninformed of the Mayor's disloyalty.

Referring to the function of censorship, Dr. Shields said he entirely approved of it; that its purpose was to withhold all information from the enemy that would be useful to him in his war against Canada and the Empire; and that if any public man should inadvertently speak unwisely on such matters, if he were a loyal citizen he would only be thankful for the correction of the censor; for the reason that he would be unwilling to give any sort of aid or comfort to the enemy. But he insisted that censorship was not being properly exercised when it was used for political purposes, or to conceal the disloyalty of citizens of Canada, and to keep the public generally in the dark concerning the operation of fifth columnists in the Dominion.

At this point, Dr. Shields quoted from an evening paper a despatch from Vancouver which reported that a United Church minister, Rev. W. E. G. Bovey, of Peachland and Westbank, B.C., had been sentenced to jail for six months, and fined \$100.00, for having "refused to permit the National Anthem to be sung in his church, and making statements derogatory to Canada's participation in the war." He further quoted the report as follows:

"In passing sentence, Judge W. C. Kelley in County Court, declared that any man in Bovey's position and with his age and maturity, who made such remarks, had something wrong with both his heart and his head."

Dr. Shields said he entirely approved of the action of the British Columbia authorities, and said that no position or calling should be allowed to shield anyone who was disloyal; and then remarked, "In an evening paper of August 15th we read of a comparatively obscure minister of the United Church in British Columbia being given a jail sentence of six months and a fine of \$100.00 for refusing to have the National Anthem sung, and for making statements derogatory to Canada's participation in the war; and the same paper contained a report of a speech by a Judge of the Superior Court of Quebec expressing approval of the action of the Pétain Government in utterly betraying Britain to the enemy, and calling upon Canadians to form a charitable judgment of Pétain, while condemning the valiant General de Gaulle who is doing his utmost to rally all free Frenchmen to assist Britain in the prosecution of the war." Then Dr. Shields said, "I insist that if the United Church minister in British Columbia deserved a jail sentence and a fine—and I think he did—Mr. Justice Edward Surveyer of Quebec deserves no less."

Dr. Shields called upon the Government in general, and the Justice Department in particular, to take such action as would clear its skirts of the suspicion of showing any partiality to any race or creed or class in the Dominion, and to make it perfectly clear to the Canadian people that the Dominion Government does not share Mr. Justice Surveyer's view, that only the Pope in Rome has the discernment necessary to an appreciation of France's betrayal of her Ally. Dr. Shields said, however, that the decision of the Canadian Government to permit the Consul-General of France, now that Britain has severed diplomatic relations with the Pétain Government, to remain in Ottawa, had compromised the Government's position, and had prepared the way for just such statements as that of Mr. Justice Surveyer; for if the Government maintains friendly relations with the French Government by which Britain has been so terribly betrayed, it is difficult to see how any Canadian should be required to take higher ground.

**The
THIRTEENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION
of the
UNION OF REGULAR BAPTIST
CHURCHES**

of
ONTARIO AND QUEBEC

will be held in Jarvis Street Church,
Toronto,

OCTOBER 8th, 9th, and 10th, 1940

Plan now to come, and pray for a time of unusual
blessing.

TORONTO BAPTIST SEMINARY

Prospective Students—Attention!

All students in course, as well as prospective students, contemplating entrance September 24th, will oblige by communicating with the Seminary immediately. Owing to the difficulties created by the war, and the number of young men—actual and prospective students—enlisting in the armed services, it is imperative that we should know immediately what students, and how many, contemplate entrance or continuance in the Seminary course this Fall.

Please write immediately.

BRITISH COLUMBIA CONVENTION

Rev. John Bennett, newly elected President of the Convention of Regular Baptists of British Columbia, has sent a message to the members and friends of that Convention. The first few paragraphs of that message will be of special interest to those of us in Ontario and Quebec who remember his predecessor in office, Rev. W. J. Thomson. We reprint them here:

To the Regular Baptists of British Columbia:

I feel that my first duty as your president should be a word of appreciation for my predecessor in office, Rev. W. J. Thomson. Bro. Thomson came to us as a man sent from God. Bro. Thomson, with a kind yet firm hand, took charge of a difficult situation. His wealth of experience and firm determination, under the blessing of God, have brought the convention to the place it now occupies.

At Home.—In all the thirteen years of our history our convention was never in better condition than at the present time. The outlook is bright. Churches are being strengthened and built up through the faithful preaching of our pastors. New preaching stations are being opened and Sunday schools organized in the city and other parts of the province.

Abroad.—Not only our work at home but our work in Manchuria has felt the effects of the wise counsel of Bro. Thomson. Our missionaries are enjoying the blessing of the Lord. Increase in enquirers, conversions, baptisms and church membership. New workers are coming in and new preaching stations are being opened. All this, we believe, is due, under the blessing of God, to the wise leadership of Bro. Thomson.

Go Forward!—My next word to you will be found in the Word of the Lord to Moses: "Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward." If the Lord has blessed and

prospered us in the past convention year, are we now to stop or slacken the pace? Surely we are not going to be satisfied with past attainments, or think we have reached the goal! Is it not as true today as in the days of Joshua—There is yet much land to be possessed. Lift up thine eyes and look upon the fields: are they not white unto harvest, and he that reapeth receives the wages and gathers the fruit unto life eternal. What an opportunity we have today to reap, make wages and gather fruits unto life eternal! Everywhere we go we find men, women, boys and girls hungry for the Gospel. How shall they hear without a preacher and how shall they preach except they be sent?

FURTHER PROOF "MEN OF VICHY" POPE'S TOOLS

With each passing day evidence accumulates that Pétain is more the Pope's puppet than Hitler's, just as the post-civil war developments in Spain proved that the legitimate government in Spain was the victim of Vatican vengeance.

The following news item in *The Toronto Star* of this evening, September 4th, affords further confirmation of the general thesis of the sermon and other articles in this issue:

By PAUL GHALI

Special Cable to The Chicago Daily News and Toronto Star

Vichy, Sept. 4.—France today ended the 36-year-old rift between church and state. The Pétain government formally repealed the law of 1904, thus abrogating a series of discriminatory measures then designed to restrict the influence of the Catholic Church in the field of education.

The first of the two ancient measures specifically forbade "the right of association" of monastic orders in France, and the second nominally barred religious orders from conducting schools.

The decrees issued this morning thus restore the spirit of the concordat signed between Napoleon Bonaparte and Pope Pius VII, permitting Jesuits to teach in Catholic educational institutions and allowing convents to reopen officially.

AN IMAGINARY LETTER

An American magazine publishes the following imaginary letter by St. Paul:

Dear Sir and Brother,

Doubtless you will recall the invitation you extended to me to come over into Macedonia and help the people of that section. You will pardon me for saying that I am somewhat surprised that you should expect a man of my standing in the church seriously to consider a call on such meagre information. There are a number of things I should like to learn before giving my decision, and I would appreciate your dropping me a line, addressed to me at Troas . . . No mention was made of the salary I was to receive. While it is true that I am not preaching for money, there are certain things that need to be taken into account. I have been through a long and expensive course of training; in fact, I may say with reasonable pride that I am a Sanhedrin man. The day is past when you can expect a man to rush into a new field without some idea of the support he is to receive . . . Kindly get the good Macedonian brethren together and see what you can do in the way of support. You have told me nothing about Macedonia beyond the implication that the place needs help. What are the social advantages? Is the church well organized? I recently had a fine offer to return to Damascus at an increase of salary, and am told that I made a very favourable impression on the church at Jerusalem. You might mention these facts, and also that some of the brethren in Judaea have been heard to say that if I kept on, in a few years I might have anything in the gift of the church. I will say that I am a first class mixer, and especially strong on argumentative preaching. If I accept the call, I must stipulate for two months' vacation and the privilege of taking an occasional lecture tour. My lecture on "Over the Wall in a Basket" is worth two drachmas of any man's money.

The Scottish Guardian—May 29, 1931.

TO ALL READERS OF THIS ISSUE

● New subscriptions to this paper in considerable numbers are reaching us every day showing that the paper is meeting a real need. If you are not a subscriber we invite you to subscribe now. The price is only \$2.00 for fifty-two issues. Write your name and address on an envelope, put \$2.00 within and mark "Gospel Witness subscription," and either mail, or put on the plate in church, or hand in at the office, 130 Gerrard St. E., Toronto.

Bible School Lesson Outline

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

Vol. 4 Third Quarter Lesson 37 September 15th, 1940

THE LEAGUE WITH THE GIBEONITES

Lesson Text: Joshua 9.

Golden Text: "Lying lips are abomination to the Lord: but they that deal truly are his delight"—Proverbs 12:22.

I. The Hasty Covenant—verses 1 to 15.

The inhabitants of Gibeon, having heard what God had done at Jericho and Ai, saw that they must make some move to prevent the destruction of their city. Two courses were open to them. They might submit to Joshua and co-operate with Israel in the conquest of the land, or they might endeavour to stave off the attack. When the Holy Spirit convicts a person of his sin, the wise man will surrender joyfully to His leading (John 15:8-11; Heb. 6:9), but the unwise may endeavour to get away from His influence (Acts 17:32; 24:25; 26:28).

The Gibeonites were no match for the Israelites, but they refused to acknowledge their inferiority. They preferred to win by deceit and wickedness. An honourable man will not stoop to such dishonourable methods; he will be just, whether he is victorious or not (Prov. 6:16, 17; Rom. 12:17; 2 Cor. 8:21; Eph. 4:25).

One may have an intuitive feeling at times that all is not well, even when no reasonable explanation of the fear can be given. The men of Israel were suspicious of these Hivites from Gibeon. God speaks to His children in various ways (Num. 22:22-31; Heb. 1:1, 2), and the leaders should have investigated the claims of these false ambassadors.

The Israelites would not object to the Gibeonites because of geographical location; that is, because they dwelt near Gilgal, where Israel was encamped (Josh. 5:10), but because God had said that all the people who dwelt in that vicinity were evil men, against whom Israel was to be constantly at war (Josh. 11:19, 20). Compromise with evil is entirely unsafe; extermination is the only wise course (Eph. 5:11). Joshua and the princes of Israel should have taken greater care not to disobey God's strong and specific commands regarding the treatment to be accorded to the people of the land (Exod. 23:31, 32).

The ambassadors claimed that they had come to Gilgal because of the name of the Lord. It is easy to find a pious excuse for wrong-doing (Matt. 25:24, 25), and some of the worst crimes of history have been perpetrated in the name of religion (John 16:2; Acts 26:9; 1 Tim. 1:13).

No lie is so hard to meet as the half-truth, which is the substance on which propaganda flourishes. The Gibeonites had indeed heard the fame of Jehovah (Josh. 2:10; 6:27), but they were actuated by fear, rather than by the desire to worship Him.

The elders of Israel "received the men by reason of their victuals" (verse 14, marginal reading), and "asked not coun-

sel at the mouth of the Lord": This is the secret of most mistakes. It is wrong for a Christian to rush headlong into action without waiting to know the mind of the Lord (Num. 27:21). The Israelites were deceived through lack of prayer, and lack of care (Matt. 26:41); they had relied upon circumstantial evidence instead of upon the Word of the Lord.

II. The Late Regret—verses 16 to 27.

At the end of three days the Israelites were disillusioned, but it was too late to undo their mistake. The covenant, however inconvenient, must now stand. The teaching of Scripture is clear with regard to the sacredness of a covenant. Vows and covenants were not to be lightly made, or lightly broken (Num. 30:2; Deut. 23:21; Psa. 50:14; 66:13, 14; Eccl. 5:4, 5). For that reason one should consider well, before making promises (2 Cor. 1:17, 18).

The children of Israel were quick to blame their leaders for their lack of foresight. The leaders in Christian work must not be surprised when their followers turn against them in the time of difficulty (Num. 14:1-3). People will readily take the credit to themselves for a victory, but will just as readily blame others for a defeat.

The Gibeonites were allowed to live, but only as hewers of wood and drawers of water. They remained rebellious at heart, and caused much trouble to the Israelites, who suffered for many years from the effects of their oath. King Saul attempted to slay the Gibeonites, and his sin in violating the covenant caused a three years' famine in Israel (2 Sam. 21:1, 2). Urge the young people to walk carefully and prayerfully, lest they make a false step which would bring pain and sorrow to themselves, and cause reproach to the name of the Lord. Regrets may come too late, and last too long.

BOOKS BY DR. T. T. SHIELDS

"The Adventures of a Modern Young Man".....	\$1.00
"Other Little Ships"	1.00
"The Plot That Failed"	1.00
"The Oxford Group Movement Analyzed"05
25 copies	1:00
Russellism or Rutherfordism, (103 pages)35
"The Papacy—In the Light of Scripture"10
"Why I Believe the Rapture Cannot Precede the Tribulation." Also "The Meaning of the Parousia". In Booklet of 32 pages.....	.10
20 copies	1.00
About 30 War Sermons from "A Sword Bathed in Heaven" to the Sermon in this issue—postpaid, individual sermons, each.....	.10
The Gospel Witness, published weekly, per annum	2.00

Address: THE GOSPEL WITNESS,

130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto, Can.