

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, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2, Canada.
Registered Cable Address: Jarwitsem, Canada.

Vol. 19, No. 28

TORONTO, NOVEMBER 14, 1940

Whole Number 965

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

MORE ABOUT THE PAPACY AND THE WAR

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Thursday Evening, November 7th, 1940

(Stenographically Reported)

It is extremely important that every effort should be made in Canada to secure the wholehearted support of the entire population in the prosecution of the war. No one could feel, I think, more deeply than I do the necessity for a unity of spirit, of purpose, and of action, on the part of the Canadian people; and I think he would be rendering a disservice to the cause, we have at heart who would say or do anything that would provoke disunity. But we cannot promote such unity by ignoring or failing to recognize things in our national life which secretly endeavour to neutralize our efforts.

Once again I feel it necessary when speaking on this subject to say that I have no quarrel with Roman Catholics as individuals. There are vast number of Roman Catholics to whom the Church is nothing more than a religious institution. They were brought up in Romanist homes; they were trained from infancy in Romanist Separate Schools; they have been educationally and religiously, and in some cases socially, segregated from all but their own people; and have never questioned the adequacy and finality of their religion. To them, the Church of Rome, with all its sacramentarianism, is the way to heaven, and nothing more.

There are indeed countless millions of Roman Catholics who are as uninformed respecting the inner-working of the Roman Catholic Church as are Protestants. The reason for this, of course, is that the Roman Catholic Church as a whole, and equally the individual congregations, is and are absolutely without lay-control. I talked not long since with a lawyer who is a Roman Catholic—or at least who thinks he is. He had not the remotest idea of what Romanism really is; and apparently is utterly ignorant of the history of his Church.

It is quite as necessary that the matters we consider this evening should be discussed for the information of Roman Catholics as for the information of Protestants.

Furthermore, in what I shall say this evening I intend to cast no aspersions upon the loyalty of individual Roman Catholics as such. I recognize, and gladly acknowledge, that in all the armed services of the Empire, as well as in some Departments of Government, there are Roman Catholics who are as loyal to their country and their flag as any Protestant. But when I say that, I use the term Roman Catholic in the sense in which it is generally employed. Such Roman Catholic British loyalists as I have assumed are really more "catholic" than "Roman"; and more British than either.

But to be a Roman Catholic in the sense in which that designation is employed by the Roman Church officially, and to put into those two words what true Romanists put into them, must mean the exaltation of the Pope of Rome above all presidents and princes, rulers or governments, of any kind—in short, to give one's first and supreme allegiance to the Pope of Rome.

Is Hitler Against The Papacy?

In order that we may have a general background for the understanding of our evening subject, I want you to look again at the Romanist position in relation to the war throughout the world. An editorial in one of our evening papers yesterday or the day before was indicative of a very general assumption that Hitler is the enemy of the Roman Catholic Church; and that his attitude toward the Church has been demonstrated by his persecution of the Church in Austria and Germany. But the writer of that editorial is as ignorant of the true situation as others are who entertain the same assumption.

Many Divisions Within The Church

It is a matter of historic fact which is illustrated and demonstrated in numerous historic movements within

the Church of Rome, that that church is not the unit it professes to be. Romanists often contrast the state of Protestantism, divided into many denominations, with the alleged unity of the Roman Catholic Church. The fact is, however, there are just about as many denominations within the Roman Catholic Church as there are among the churches called Protestant. The various orders within the Church all differ among themselves, and many of them originated as reform movements. In the beginning they were opposed; but when they became too strong to be wholly suppressed, Rome threw her mantle over them, and absorbed them, until ultimately they settled down as integral parts of the Church.

The Jesuit Order An Example

The Jesuit Order is one outstanding example of this principle. Not all the Popes have been alike. Some of them have been among the vilest men who ever lived; some of them have been of a much higher order. It has occurred on more than one occasion in the Church's history that a fairly liberal man has been elected to the Papacy. Under the reigns of liberal Popes, the Jesuit Order has been suppressed and excommunicated again and again. But in due course the Jesuits have regained their position and power; and now for a good many years the Jesuits have been in the ascendancy in the Roman Church—and whenever and wherever they have gained such ascendancy, all the worst features of Romanism have come to the fore.

John Wesley was an Anglican clergyman. He never acknowledged he was anything else. He had no intention whatever of starting a new church or of organizing a group of new churches. He did not indeed call his companies of converts churches: he called them "societies". If Wesley had been a Roman Catholic, instead of an Anglican, when his movement had become so large that it could no longer be suppressed or ignored, it would have been adopted; and John Wesley, instead of being the founder of a new denomination would, by this time, have been canonized as a saint, as Ignatius Loyola was, as Francis of Assisi was, and many others. In such case, Wesleyans would have been another monastic order within the Church.

Martin Luther was a Roman Catholic. Martin Luther aimed to reform the Church, and protested against its abuses; and out of the protest of himself and others grew the great Protestant Reformation. But that Reformation was not the only one that had a beginning in the Roman Catholic Church. There have been many liberal and liberalizing movements instituted; and not a few of them have been suppressed.

Persecution of Romanists In Germany

An examination of the persecution by Hitler of Romanism in Austria and Germany, I think would show that it was a persecution of the liberal elements in the Church; that indeed the reactionary elements in the Roman Church were not persecuted, and they have since declared their allegiance to Hitler, and promised their full co-operation with him.

Hitler boasts of the unity of Nazidom, but it is a unity such as is found within the iron bars of a prison. Those who have refused to surrender their souls to him have been confined in concentration camps; and in the infamous "blood purge" of June, nineteen-thirty-four, vast numbers of them were sent to their graves—and thousands more have been led along the bloody

trail since that day. The persecution of the Church of Rome in Austria and Germany, by Hitler, was really a "blood purge", and a concentration camp discipline exercised upon the liberal and recalcitrant elements in the Church.

Totalitarianism a Papal Conception

The fact is that in the papal conception of the Church it is an organization above the state, and to the will of its head the state and everybody in it must be subject. In other words, Romanism is totalitarianism. It brooks no opposition. It slays those who rebel against it if and when and where it has the power to do so. Again I say, I do not speak of Roman Catholics as individuals, but of the established policy of the Church as an anti-Christian, continuing institution; and that it is so, the pages of centuries of her bloody history plainly attest.

Abyssinia and Spain

I cannot go into details: I content myself at this point with a mere résumé of recent history when I remind you that Fascism is nothing less than Romanism in action. That was shown in the rape of Abyssinia, which earned the papal benediction. It was further proved by the participation of Italy, without any declaration of war, without any just cause whatsoever, in the Spanish Civil War—a war which I am sure history will yet show was instigated and largely financed by the Church of Rome. The murderers responsible for the death of a million or more received the Pope's blessing; and immediately following his victory, Franco showed his hand by restoring to the Jesuit Order all their confiscated estates; and their former position of special privilege and power.

The Papacy and British Foreign Policy

The influence of Rome was seen in British Foreign Policy for a number of years. The declared policy of Manning and Newman, of developing a Roman Catholic ambassadorial school which should capture the Diplomatic Service of the British Empire, while not completely successful, has had far too large a measure of success for British safety. The non-intervention policy of the British Foreign Office during the Spanish Civil War cannot be explained on the ground of British commercial interests alone. There were reactionary influences at work in Great Britain which, but for the mercy of God, would have ruined Britain and the world's civilization. Britain will not now be rewarded by a similar non-intervention policy on the part of Spain if and when Spain thinks she can profitably intervene. Franco has declared his purpose to realize the ambitions and proposals of "the Catholic" Isabella I.; and we may yet see that the machinations of Rome in our own Foreign Office in leading us to stand idly by while a million people were ruthlessly murdered, led us to take a course which will cost an enormous price in treasure and in blood.

Ireland and The Papacy

But not only so. The greatest irritant in British political life for generations has been the Irish question. It may be that the Irish people are a little peculiar, but my conviction is that if they were left to themselves, if the springs of life in Ireland had not, for generations, been deliberately poisoned, Britain would

have had no more difficulty with Ireland than she had with South Africa, or any other part of the Empire.

I had the opportunity during the last war of studying the Irish question at close quarters and somewhat intimately. There was not an Irish leader of any prominence of any shade or stratum of Irish political opinion whom I did not meet, and with whom I did not converse personally. I talked with the representative of De Valera—De Valera being then in jail—who was a Roman Catholic priest. I talked with nearly all the Ulster leaders in Ulster itself; with the rank and file of Irish Protestants; and with the rank and file of Irish Sinn Feiners. I discussed the question with the Commander-in-Chief of the British Forces in Ireland, and with the Commander-in-Chief of the Southern District, in Cork. I visited also, and conversed with, the Admiral in command at Queenstown (now officially called *Cobh*) who was then responsible for the safe conduct of Atlantic convoys approaching the British Isles. I talked with soldiers who had been on duty in Ireland, officers and men; and last but not least, I spent one whole evening in his own home with Lord Carson, discussing the Irish question.

I ought also to mention that I had an hour or so with John Dillon who was then leader of the Irish Nationalist Party in the House of Commons, at Westminster. It would take me not only all night, but many nights to relate my experiences; but let me point out one or two things.

It was still war time. An officer in Londonderry told me that the Roman Catholic authorities had so cleverly interpenetrated the military service as to be able to secure Roman Catholic sentries for posts on the West Coast of Ireland where lookouts had to be maintained. He told me that they had discovered, and had arrested priests, who in the darkness of the night, visited these Irish Catholic sentries, and gave them instructions as to their duty in respect to the submarines that needed help.

Everybody knows about the Irish Rebellion in 1916, the threatened rebellion in other parts of Ireland.

I must tell you a story of a man who came to my hotel in Cork to explain the grievances of the Irish, in the hope that I would transmit them overseas, to Canada and the United States. He had been engaged in the Rebellion of 1916, and had been exiled for a year to America, and then allowed to return. His name was Fawcett. He declared that they would never rest until Ireland was completely independent of Britain. I reminded him that Ireland was a maritime nation, and that her defense would have to be a naval defense, and asked him how a land with such a limited population—because of course most of the Irish had left Ireland to become policemen in other parts of the world!—how Ireland would be able to afford the most expensive sort of defense, namely, a naval defense. To that the man replied, "But why should we need a navy?" When I asked him why they would not, he said, "There would still be the British Navy!"

That remark has special significance at this hour—twenty-two years and more later. At that time Ireland was the spoiled child of the Empire. There was no conscription, no rationing. Coddled and petted and given everything, Southern Ireland even then sought by every means to destroy its chief benefactor.

Discussing the matter with Lord Carson, when in response to his enquiry I said that Ireland's problem was an educational one, he asked me how I had reached that

conclusion. I told him that I had found Ireland living in the days of Cromwell, and denouncing people who had been dead for nearly three hundred years. I said, "People do not live behind the times like that, of themselves, unless they are taught to do so. Someone is teaching them." Lord Carson said I was absolutely correct, that in his judgment the Irish problem was an educational one; and when in response to his further enquiry I said, "My remedy would be, not the political separation of Ireland from Britain, but the secularization of the Irish educational system; the taking out of the hand of Protestants and Romanists alike the education of the people, giving them all religious equality before the law, and, allowing all religions full freedom of conscience, and, hence, the right to conduct what educational institutions they desire at their own expense. Then I would give them twenty-five years of just, impartial, but inexorable, British rule." Lord Carson replied, "If you could do that, you would solve the Irish problem. But no one could do it, for the reason that the Roman Church will never release its hold on education." Keep that in mind when we come in a few minutes to discuss Quebec.

The Papacy and Irish "Independence"

What have we now? In 1938 the last black chapter of British blundering diplomacy was written, and Chamberlain surrendered the Irish ports, Queenstown on the South and other ports on the West; and all naval and military forces were finally withdrawn. But who was responsible for that age-long agitation which ultimately issued in the setting up of this strange creation, this republic of Eire, Southern Ireland, with an outpatient of a madhouse as President? There is no doubt about it whatever. The separation of Southern Ireland from Britain, and all the evils that led up to it, and all the evils that have followed—and must yet follow it—are directly to be attributed, not primarily to the Irish character, but to the satanic machinations of the Papacy.

Mr. Churchill opposed the surrender of these ports. He warned the British people in the House of Commons that the Admiralty was of the opinion that in the event of war, it would make it extremely difficult for the Navy to fulfil its mission if it were deprived of naval and air bases on the Western and Southern Coasts of Ireland which would serve for re-fueling and repair. But the then popular but deadly appeasement policy prevailed. True, Mr. Chamberlain did not instigate it; but it was the last black chapter, I say, in the British policy of surrender to the Vatican.

I had some reason to see something of the truth of this even in advance of the day that Mr. Churchill protested against these measures. I was to have left Dublin for London on a Thursday, in October 1918, but remained longer than originally planned in Cork. On returning to Dublin, I was met in the Shelbourne Hotel by Lord Decies who said, "I am glad to see you alive. You are supposed to be dead, and at the bottom of the sea." Then I learned that the ship on which we had been scheduled to sail on Thursday, had been torpedoed in the Irish Channel, with a loss of five hundred lives. I learned that on a Saturday. I wired the Ministry of Information in London, saying we were safe, and Sunday morning before setting sail, went through a long morgue where I saw more than two hundred bodies that had been brought in from the sea. The names were attached and I walked down the long line to see if I could find a Canadian name among them,

But now, as this Irishman said to me, they still have the British Navy! And the British Navy is expected, not only to protect the United States without the privilege of her armed ships finding anchorage and safety in American harbours, but she is to protect Ireland as well—and yet she is to be denied the privilege of having any of her armed vessels enter Irish ports!

If I had my way I would demand a lease of these ports, and space for airports at least for the duration of the war; and if Eire refused I would in Ireland's own interests forcibly possess them. I feel morally certain that German and Italian submarines are finding hospitality in these ports; and that that largely accounts for the destruction of shipping in the north Atlantic. It is sheer folly to permit Eire's "neutrality" in such case to stand in the way.

You tell me that we ought to leave these matters to the experts? My answer is that in these matters British experts, so-called, in British Foreign policy of recent years, have played the fool more completely than any body of men on earth; and but for the mercy of God the British Empire would by this time have been destroyed. And so to-day we find the Totalitarian powers hand-in-glove with the Vatican, everywhere conspiring against that free way of life represented by the Commonwealth of the Empire and by the United States of America.

The Papacy in the United States

Before I refer to our Canadian affairs, let me call attention to this. In the United States as soon as the conscription measure was made law, and the day of national registration was in prospect, "the Catholic bishops, represented at Washington by Mgr. Michael J. Ready, General Secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, urged the Senate and House to change the Burke-Wadsworth bill to exempt not only priests, but also seminarians and Brothers of Catholic religious orders from military service."

I have myself listened to Roman Catholic broadcasts from the United States, urging opposition to the Amendment of the American Neutrality Law, opposition to giving aid to Britain; and now opposition to the enlistment of Roman Catholics, particularly members of religious orders, in the armed services of the Republic. Surely one must be utterly blind and devoid of moral, not to say spiritual perception; not to see that some sinister hand is at work against the world's freedom in all these countries to which I have referred.

The Treachery of Leopold and Pétain

I have not referred to the treachery of Leopold in Belgium, which cost us thousands of lives—how many, we do not know; and nearly cost us the entire Expeditionary Force; and which cost us eighty per cent. of all the mechanized equipment Britain had laboured so hard to produce. I have not referred to the treachery of Pétain and Laval. In an article appearing in THE GOSPEL WITNESS of to-day's issue, which I have reproduced from *The Converted Catholic*, the Editor, a former Roman Catholic priest, points out "that Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, and the greatest part of the highest officials in the Third Reich are Catholics by birth and education. Hitler was trained by the Christian-Socialist Party and by the Jesuit-controlled Congregations of Mary. Goebbels was once the treasurer of the Borromeo Association which is also directed by the Jesuits." So that to-day you have a Europe dominated by what is generally spoken of as

"the Berlin-Rome Axis"; but which I think might more appropriately be called "the Rome-Berlin Axis", inspired by the teachings, the ideals, and the practical co-operation of the Vatican itself.

The Papacy in Canada

We come now to a consideration of the Canadian situation. Some months ago we had a Dominion election. I supported Premier King's régime. I did so, I must now frankly say, only as being, as I considered, the least of two evils. The leader of the Conservative Party, Dr. Manion, was a Roman Catholic; and even though I must bear the obloquy of being called a bigot, a fanatic, and one who is out of step with the times, I proclaim my faith and practice. It is that of John Wesley, and of a great many others, that I will not, if I know it, by my vote, put a man in a position of leadership who considers he owes his primary allegiance to a foreign sovereign, and who makes his duty to the state and the citizens of the state second to his duty and his allegiance to the Pope of Rome. You may do it if you will—I never will!

I knew, of course, there were some in Mr. King's Cabinet who were Roman Catholics; but I felt it was safer that the premiership should be in the hands of a man who at least was a professed Protestant, than in the hands of one who was an avowed Roman Catholic. And I repeat, not on the ground of his religion *per se*, but on the ground that that which he professes as his religion is indissolubly married to the most gigantic and unscrupulous and widespread political system the world has ever known. For that reason I supported Mr. King, for I hoped that notwithstanding the handicap of his Romanistic affiliations, he would prove a better leader than his Roman Catholic Conservative opponent.

I voted for him, too, on the same principle which leads me to feel a little greater satisfaction in the election of Mr. Roosevelt, than I should have found in the election of Mr. Willkie—that principle being that had Mr. Willkie been elected, Mr. Roosevelt would virtually have been without authority further to prosecute his policy of affording help to Britain, and that Mr. Willkie on taking office in January would require some months to put his policies into operation. Hence, American contributions of war supplies would be obliged to suffer serious diminution. I say it was on that principle I voted for Mr. King; for it seemed to me that an administration with a staff already organized, and a work partly begun, would be better able to carry it forward with speed and efficiency than another body who would have to begin all over again from the beginning.

But I am bound to confess that I have been grievously disappointed by the little that has been done by the present Administration. I should be happy, delighted indeed, to discover that the military effort of the Government has been far greater than any of us know. But if that be so, we who feel such disappointment in the present Government's effort, cannot justly be blamed for so feeling. The responsibility rests with the Government which has failed to take us into its confidence. And I am sure that, without divulging any information that would be useful to the enemy, the Government might more fully have informed the people of Canada of what they were doing.

We earnestly hope that the forthcoming discussions in Parliament will be carried forward with vigour; and that the Opposition will relentlessly and even ruth-

lessly, press their inquiries; for while it is necessary, and no one will complain of it, that much that the Government does must be done in secret, and no public declaration of certain matters can be made, at the same time, as it is necessary to withhold information that would be of military value to the enemy, lest he gain an advantage over us, so it is not only necessary, but imperative, that the people of this country should know all that may be known, subject only to such reservations, that the morale of the people should be brought to the highest pitch.

This war will not be over immediately. We have engaged in a crusade that, before it is finally completed, may occupy us for years to come. Therefore we must put on our harness and gird ourselves for the battle, not sectionally and in parties, but as a whole people.

Canada in Comparison With Other Commonwealths

What ground have we of complaint? Let me name just a few figures for which I quote British official authority, over the British News Reel a night or so ago:

Canada was named first, and, of course, commended, for her war effort. Out of our 11,000,000 we were told we have an army of 172,000, with 52,000 overseas. We have also an Air Force with a personnel of approximately 30,000. But Australia, with a population of only 6,677,157 has now an army of enlisted men of a quarter of a million. And with its much smaller population, has an Air Force with a personnel of 40,000. New Zealand, with a population of 1,500,000—less than the combined populations of Montreal and Toronto, has an Air Force of 10,000 personnel, and a contingent now overseas of 20,900 some odd—in round figures, 21,000. To equal the war effort of New Zealand, this, the oldest of all the Dominions, ought now to have overseas an army of 154,000 men instead of 52,000. And to equal New Zealand's Air Force, we ought now to have 73,000 in our Air Force instead of 30,000.

What shall be said of the Active Service Corps? I have met with scores of men, physically fit, who have done everything in their power to get into the army, and were not received. Why? There are still great numbers of unemployed. I see no reason why men fit for military service should not be in the army—especially when vast numbers want to enlist. And if that were so, all the unemployed would soon be absorbed, and instead of paying for relief, the tax-payers of this country would be paying for defence, and protection, and the maintenance of their liberty.

I give you the example of one young man who was a student in our Seminary. He went out to his summer field, but felt in duty bound to serve his country. He sought enlistment in the Air Force, but was above the age for flying. He sought, then, enlistment in the Air Force in some other capacity. He left his field and returned to his former occupation to await his call. But it was not until August that he was given a medical examination, and was found apparently quite fit for duty. Still he waited, and waited; and only a couple of weeks ago he was informed that an order had come through on the 31st of July setting out some regulation which made it impossible for him to be accepted. He was then told that if he would train himself, to become expert in office work, he *might* get in. That was not what he wanted, but even in such case, he had no

guarantee of ultimate acceptance. Why should tens of thousands of splendid young men, eager to fight for their country, be denied the privilege?

Compulsory Military Service a Mere Picnic

On top of that came the National Registration, and the Conscription Measure. Now don't let anyone say that I am standing in the way of full obedience to that law. I advocate always complete obedience to law, as long as it is the law. My only complaint is that the law does not go far enough. And so men have been called up for a month's training, 29,000 or thereabout at a time. It must be admitted that a month is better than nothing—it is a beginning. But it is not enough. In the last war men were not sent to the front until they had had many months of training. Thousands of them did not get to the front until they had been more than a year in training, to my certain knowledge.

I readily admit that in those who have received this preliminary training there may be a potential army, upon which we may be able to draw in time to come. And personally, I have found the greatest delight in observing that many of the trainees are now eager to enlist in the Active Service Corps. But what is all this for? It is for Home Defence. So much for that.

Why the Half-Way Measure?

But this limited Conscription Measure which, while it does something, does so little, it seems to me must have been designed as a sop, or opiate, to the eager spirits of all but one of the Provinces of this country; and a compromise offered to one Province, a large part of which is determined not to fight. I tell you, my brethren, the *Fifth Column in Canada, Canada's chief handicap in war, and in peace, is the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of Quebec*. What has it done? On the question of education it has disturbed the peace in Manitoba, in the Prairie Provinces, in Ontario, and elsewhere.

Encouraging Signs in Quebec

What have you now in Quebec? There is one encouraging sign, to my mind. I believe there is a movement on in Quebec that is away from the Church of Rome. I wish it were toward Protestantism, but I am afraid unless something is done to evangelize Quebec, we shall see, in the course of the next generation or so, a movement comparable to that in France, where multitudes will leave the Egyptian bondage of Romanism, but will stay in the wilderness of infidelity, or secularism, instead of advancing to the Promised Land of Evangelical Christianity. I have said that liberalising movements have sometimes operated within the Church of Rome for a while, but that they have generally either been suppressed or absorbed, and overwhelmed. The defeat of Duplessis was, to me, a very happy augury of better things to come. The action of his successor at several points seems also to be encouraging. I do not know enough about Premier Godbout to speak positively, but already he has openly declared his dissatisfaction with the educational system of Quebec. He has insisted that it is inadequate—and of course he refers to the Romanist education. In one speech he said that the people of Quebec must have an education that will fit them for something else than becoming priests. That is what the educational system in Quebec is for—to train and discipline the people from infancy

to abject submission to the Church of Rome. On more than one occasion the Quebec Premier has urged upon his compatriots the necessity of learning, and teaching English, and the removal of the language barrier between Quebec and their other eight millions of English-speaking competitors in this Dominion. I recall also that Cardinal Villeneuve opposed the extension of the franchise to the women of Quebec, and that Godbout granted it in spite of the Hierarchy's opposition.

Now I very gratefully recognize and acknowledge that the defeat of Duplessis, and the success of Godbout, were due in no small measure to the efforts of the present Minister of Justice, Mr. Lapointe, and his fellow French-Canadian colleagues in the Cabinet. I wish one could be sure that these gentlemen in the Dominion Government share the liberal views of the Quebec Premier.

The Present Situation

But what is the present situation? A representative of the Men of Vichy, the Vichy Government, is still permitted to remain at Ottawa. He may be a liberal man, but still in his official capacity he represents a government that has utterly betrayed us, I am sure, at the instigation of Rome. Why is he allowed to remain? It has been plainly stated that to require his departure would create a delicate situation in respect to French-Canadian Quebec. But why, in deference to Quebec, should a representative of what is virtually an enemy government, be retained in the Canadian Capital? What influence is at work in the Dominion Government that makes this possible?

Furthermore, a man and his followers were arrested and put in confinement somewhere. Those men were proved to have been guilty of sedition, and of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of Canada by force. I refer to Arcand, Leader of the Fascists of this country, who was shown to be the agent of enemy organizations in Rome and in Berlin. Why is not Arcand brought to trial, as the Minister of Justice implicitly promised he would be? Surely a man guilty of a conspiracy to effect an armed revolution which would overthrow the Government of this country is something more than a mere suspect, who for safety's sake should be put in an internment camp? Who is it that prevents his being brought to justice? or would his trial uncover evidence of the complicity of others? I don't know.

Once again I ask why a Justice of the Supreme Court of Québec, an appointee of the Federal Government, should, without censure, be permitted, publicly, to condemn the critics of the Men of Vichy, publicly to defend the traitors Pétain and Weygand, and at the same time to declare that the Pope of Rome was probably the only sovereign in the world who was capable of appreciating Marshal Pétain's motives? Think of a man in public office, a Judge of the Supreme Court of Quebec, making such a traitorous declaration, and being allowed to continue in office! I am a Protestant, and against that sort of thing, with all my soul I protest.

And now what have we? Four divisions in the Canadian Active Service Corps, two divisions overseas, one on guard on the Atlantic Coast, and the other on guard at the Pacific Coast. The proper place to defend Canada just now is in Britain, and in the Mediterranean. There is, however, something to be said for a part of the Army Service Corps being held at the Pacific Coast.

For even with Britain still in the ascendancy in Europe, and still commanding the seas of the world, it is conceivable that an armed force on the Pacific might be necessary, not to defend Canada, but to be in readiness for transportation to the Far East, to join the New Zealanders and the Australians in combat over there.

Therefore, I think one should be very reserved in his criticism of such disposition of part of our forces. They may be more necessary there than in England. The Division held on the Atlantic seaboard are doubtless being held there in readiness for transportation to Britain, or later, to the Continent.

It may be that the Government is just as dissatisfied with our present effort as the rest of us. It may be they are seeking to avoid a rupture with the Quebec Hierarchy, and are following, so far as the Papacy is concerned, a policy of appeasement. I would like to give the Government the benefit of the doubt, for I have no desire whatever to embarrass anyone charged with heavy responsibilities. But I submit that the country did not allow the Quebec Hierarchy to hinder its war effort in the last war, but united in all parties, in all provinces, in support of the Government's war effort; and by so doing said to Quebec what Mr. Churchill virtually said to France, "If you cannot help us, at least do not hinder us."

At that time the rest of the country said to Quebec, "If you will not help us, we are resolved you shall not hinder us"—and we got on with the war in spite of Quebec.

But someone will say, "Do you mean to say that there are no French-Canadians in the army, and that there are no Roman Catholics in the army?" Not at all! There are many Roman Catholics and many French-Canadians—Roman Catholics of the sort I described in the beginning—who put duty to their country and their God before their duty to the Church of Rome. All honour to them. But statistically, the Province of Quebec is at the bottom of the list. There are not half as many French-Canadians in the army or navy or our armed services of any sort, as there ought to be; and many of those credited as having enlisted in Quebec were not people of Quebec at all, for both Quebec and Montreal regiments had to send to Toronto to complete their enlistments—and they did so from the hundreds of men that were being denied admission in Ontario. Scarcity in Quebec: a surplus of volunteers in Ontario and the other provinces.

Why then this? I shall not burden you with quotations, but I am able to substantiate my statements, and say that while there are many, many loyalists in Quebec beyond all question, yet taking that part of Quebec which is subservient to the Roman Hierarchy, I affirm it is not loyal to Britain or to British institutions. You have only to go to Quebec to discover that it is anti-British, and anti-war. And it is because of that deadly grip of the Hierarchy upon the Government, because of the Government's fear of the regimented vote of a solid Quebec that will go like a flock of sheep to the poll to do as they are bidden—it is for this reason Canada's war effort is not nearly what it ought to be.

But someone will say, "But do you not sympathize with the Premier in the political difficulties in the situation?" Yes, I do. I know how difficult it is to get men of different minds, different training, different outlook, to work together. *I know how impossible it is—Ireland and other places being witness—to get any company of people dominated by Rome, to co-operate in furthering*

the interests of the British Empire, and the free institutions for which it stands.

Only One Way to Become Independent of Quebec

And there is only one way by which the Premier can deliver himself from this thralldom. There is only one way, I say, by which the Premier can double, or perhaps treble or quadruple Canada's war effort; and that is by uniting all people, of all parties—and indeed, of all creeds and of all races—who will openly and avowedly unite in the prosecution of the war. Mr. Roosevelt invited into his Cabinet Senator Knox, and a former Secretary of State, Mr. Stimson, both of whom were Republicans. I believe the world would be thrilled if Mr. Roosevelt could invite Mr. Wilkie into his Cabinet, and show a united front to the whole Totalitarian world. And I believe there are men of all parties quite as competent as any Liberals Mr. King has yet laid hands upon, who would be glad to put politics aside, to throw themselves with enthusiasm and without reserve into Canada's war effort.

Example of the Last War

In the last war the leaders of all the Provinces were invited into the Government. No one has more severely criticized Mr. Hepburn than I have. I still abhor his beer policies, and many other things he does. But he said something yesterday with which I agreed—and I am such an agreeable man that I try to agree with any man so far as my conscience will allow me! The head of the C.I.O. said if Mr. Roosevelt was elected he would resign from the C.I.O. When Mr. Roosevelt's re-election as President was known, and in allusion to what Mr. Lewis had said, Mr. Hepburn said, "If he goes, I shall say, 'Thank God and Amen.'" And for once I can add several *umens* to Mr. Hepburn's. But I do not care who the man is, who will put energy into the work. I think men of all parties ought to be enlisted in the Government. And then, should there be any sort of deterrent, or any attempt to exercise a hindering or retarding influence upon the Government's effort, with the solid support of all parties in all provinces who stand for Britain and the British conception of liberty, the Government would be absolutely independent, and able to pursue its course without let or hindrance.

What alarms me now as much as the present aggressiveness of Jesuitical Romanism is the apathy, indifference, and inactivity, of present-day Protestantism. This week I received a letter from a gentleman, the author of several books, a theologian and historian of some note, telling me that he intended to republish the lectures of Dr. Langtry published in 1885, in opposition to the attacks by the Roman Catholic Toronto Archbishop Lynch of that time upon the Protestant churches, and asking permission to include a Sunday evening sermon of some weeks ago, "Why I am not a Roman Catholic", in the volume. Another friend, a member of this church, brought to me a volume which he had discovered among his books, entitled, "Report of the General Christian Conference—a Conference of the Evangelical Alliance held in Montreal, from October 22nd to 25th, 1888." In this volume which I hold in my hand there are many addresses on the problem of the Papacy, and its machinations, delivered by outstanding men of all denominations, in the French-Canadian Roman Catholic city of Montreal!

Do you ever hear of such a conference now? Is there one word of protest against the insidious inroads of

Jesuit Rome upon our civil and religious life heard from any Protestant pulpits? Why the change? Has Rome changed? Not at all. *Semper eadem* is still her motto. She boasts that she is always the same. Surely the reason for it all is that our Protestant Samson, lying in the lap of Delilah, has been shorn of his locks, and now, with blinded eyes, he grinds at Philistia's mill. Rome is the same. Her doctrines of demons, the Mass, auricular confession, purgatory, and all the other sacramentarian, human inventions, are being taught as vigorously to-day as they ever were.

Oh for a revival of Evangelical Christianity! Oh for a return to the Book of God! Oh that God would lay His hand upon some modern Martin Luther, who would throw down the gauntlet to hell's chief agency on earth! Let us all be Luthers, and, having done all, panoplied in the whole armour of God, let us declare, "Here I stand. I can do no other; so help me, God."

UNION NEWS

AN INDUSTRIOUS PASTOR

The following excerpt was not written for publication. The author of the letter from which this excerpt was taken will probably be its most surprised reader. He will have to blame a very near relative of his who passed it on to us. We venture to print it here because of the vivid way it pictures the activity of a Seminary graduate who became the pioneer pastor of a new work that has made rapid progress in the last three years.

"I have laid out quite a large program for the winter and it will take an industrious preacher to fulfil it. I get up every morning without fail before 8.30 and keep going all day until twelve or one at night, and really enjoy the intense activity. I have not weakened in three weeks of this and do not intend to.

"I started my children's meeting last Friday and did some real magic. The place was nearly filled with kids and the whole performance was tremendously effective. So much so that I felt the place will be literally stormed next week. I also have begun work on my children's choir and have sixteen girls who are anxious to be in it. I expect this will help to solve our music problem.

"The Sunday School and Church services have also come along remarkably well. The attendance in Sunday School has jumped. Last Sunday in the Beginners Class alone there were fourteen twisting, squirming youngsters all under the maternal wing of one of the ladies of the church. Two weeks ago a man and his wife came forward in the evening service, and last Sunday night we had a fine baptismal service. Four adults were baptized and the church was practically filled for the meeting. I enjoyed preaching and we had really a great time. Next Sunday I expect to use my children's choir for the first time and hope that I will contact a few of the parents who never go anywhere. The 10th of November is Anniversary Sunday, and the speaker, as I think you know, is to be Rev. John Byers of Orillia. I am hoping things will be at peak interest by then. We are going to take another offering for our building fund on the occasion.

"All day yesterday we were busy taking out all the old painted windows in the church and installing new pebble glass. The old glass was all scratched up with names and initials, so we thought we would change it so that it would look nice and no one could write on it. It looks grand now."

We are sure that our readers would not want this letter to remain anonymous, and we have much pleasure in telling that the manifold activities described in the above letter find their scene of action in the Sarnia Regular Baptist Church.

MAPLE HILL CHURCH

The name of this church has a poetical sound and its location on the brow of a great hill overlooking the Holland marshes with the silvery surface of lake Simcoe far in the background is one of the finest views in Southern Ontario. Some years ago a small group of consecrated believers began a small work in the homes in this district. The Lord blessed their faithful testimony and added others to their number. A fine church building was erected by sacrificial giving and

labour. For ten years the Word has been proclaimed in this building, and now under the pastorate of Mr. Arthur McAsh the last cent of indebtedness has been cleared away and the church is free of debt—except of course that greatest of all debts, which this church has always been ready to recognize: the debt to preach the gospel. With their hands free from building debt, the friends at Maple Hill look forward to bearing an increasingly large part in missionary work farther afield.

A fine company gathered last Sunday night to hear of our Baptist work in the Canadian West. There was a goodly proportion of young people in the congregation, and in the days to come this church will no doubt make a large contribution to missions with that most precious of all capital—consecrated young people to give the testimony of their lives and lips to the power of the gospel.

SPECIAL MEETINGS AT SUDBURY

"We greatly enjoyed Mr. Macgregor's ministry with us at Minnow Lake. There was a work of conviction wrought, and the Lord's people rejoiced in the feasts of heavenly food which he gave us. We have had some response since the meetings, and Sunday we rejoiced in seeing one man profess faith in Christ and others respond to His command concerning baptism."—J. R. B.

Bible School Lesson Outline

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

Vol. 4 Fourth Quarter Lesson 47 November 24th, 1940

THE BIRTH OF SAMSON

Lesson Text: Judges 13.

Golden Text: "The child grew, and the Lord blessed him."—Judges 13:24.

For Reading: Judges 11, 12.

I. The Annunciation—verses 1 to 7.

The incidents recorded in this chapter illustrate in a remarkable way the mingling of the Divine and human factors which contribute to the equipment of one who is to become a conspicuous leader among his fellows. On the one hand, one might consider the Divine foreknowledge and purpose, the Divine revelation of that purpose, the Divine guidance and instruction, the Divine blessing and the Divine unction. On the other hand, one cannot help but see the operation of natural laws and influences; such as, home religion, earnest self-sacrifice, prayer, willing dedication and careful training of the child. The Christian parent and teacher should find herein encouragement and instruction for the supreme task of bringing up the children in the way of the Lord.

God has His man for the times (Acts 13:17-22), but the reverse statement is also true: the times produce the man. Israel's case seemed hopeless, as they had been oppressed by the Philistines for forty years. But God was waiting for the times to be ripe for the deliverer (Mk. 1:15; Gal. 4:4).

The Philistines were a wandering tribe, whose headquarters were in Philistia, a strip of land bordering the coast of the Mediterranean-Sea in the South West corner of Palestine. They had attacked Israel on various occasions since Isaac's time (Gen. 26:1, 15; Josh. 13:1-3; Judg. 3:31; 14:4; 15:9), and they later caused trouble to Samuel (1 Sam. 4:10), Jonathan (1 Sam. 14:1-14), Saul (1 Sam. 14:47; 17:1-3) and David (1 Sam. 17:50).

The heavenly annunciation indicated that this was to be no ordinary child (Gen. 16:11-13; 17:15-22; Lk. 1:11-17, 26-33). In fact he was to be entirely separated unto God from his birth until his death (1 Sam. 1:11; Jer. 1:5; Lk. 1:15; Gal. 1:15). The laws governing the Nazarite vow represented various aspects of their utter devotion to the Lord (Num. 6:1-21). The Nazarites abstained from wine or any fruit of the vine as a sign that they renounced mere human joy (Judg. 9:13). They engaged in no practice which might cause their holiness to be polluted (2 Cor. 7:1). Their long hair perhaps signified their willingness to endure shame for the Lord's sake (Judg. 16:17; 1 Cor. 4:10; 11:14). Parents have the privilege of dedicating their children to the Lord.

Incidentally, the prohibition concerning wine is of present significance. One of the great social problems of our day centres around the danger to the health and well-being of

future generations caused by such evil habits as drinking and smoking on the part of mothers.

The Lord did not promise that Samson should be completely victorious; the strong man was destined merely to begin to deliver Israel from the Philistines (Isa. 6:11, 12). We should be willing to do the Lord's will, whether or not we are privileged to see the fruits of our labour (Eccl. 11:4; Isa. 32:20; 55:10, 11). One soweth, and another reapeth (John 4:36-38; 1 Cor. 3:6-9; 15:58). Our concern is to be faithful, whether or not we are successful.

II. The Admonition—verses 8 to 23.

As soon as Manoah and his wife recognized that their messenger had come from God they prayed for light and leading. With the realization of God as God comes a consciousness of His wisdom and our own ignorance (Isa. 6:5-8), followed by a desire that He would teach us (Exod. 33:11-13; Psa. 25:4, 5; 143:10). Christian parents rightly long for grace to train their children in the way of godliness (Gen. 18:19; Prov. 22:6; Eph. 6:4). Teachers and workers who are in charge of young lives will echo the prayer of Manoah, that the Lord would give them strength to discharge their solemn duty.

The Lord answered the prayer, and sent His angel once more, but no further instructions were given. The former commands were repeated with an exhortation to obedience. Manoah and his wife, whose name we are not told, evidently did not need more knowledge, but simply grace to do that which they already knew. Most of us fail at that very point; our practice falls far short of our profession (John 13:17; Jas. 4:17).

When Manoah enquired as to the name and nature of his visitor he was told that the name was secret or "Wonderful" (Gen. 32:29; Isa. 9:6). God in His fulness cannot be comprehended by the human mind, nor can He be defined or described in human language (Job 11:7; Psa. 145:3; Eccl. 3:11; 8:17; Isa. 40:25-28; Rom. 11:33-36).

The meat-offering, which Manoah in his ignorance had suggested to honour the angel, became a whole-burnt offering in praise to Jehovah (Judg. 6:18-21). The burnt-offering, wherein the sacrifice was entirely consumed by fire (Lev. 1:17), denoted the complete dedication of the offerer to God. On this occasion it was not sufficient for the parents to dedicate their child to the Lord; in this symbolic act they consecrated their own lives also.

III. The Anointing—verses 24, 25.

The name "Samson" means "solar", "like the sun". What a glorious thing it is to see a child growing into boyhood or girlhood with the blessing of God attending its progress (1 Sam. 2:21, 26; 3:19-21; Lk. 1:80; 2:52)! The ministry of Samson began in his early life (1 Sam. 2:18; 3:1; Isa. 11:6), showing that the Christian boy and girl can serve the Lord acceptably.

It is not surprising that Samson began his ministry near his home city, and among the members of his own tribe (Compare verses 2, 25; Judg. 6:25-27; Acts 1:8). The Holy Spirit empowered him for this service.

TO ALL READERS OF THIS ISSUE

● New subscribers 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.