

# 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. 35

TORONTO, JANUARY 2, 1941

Whole Number 972

## PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S SPEECH

The speech by the President of the United States last Sunday evening must have thrilled the freedom-loving people of the world. It was not spoken in the language of diplomacy. In former times such a speech, delivered by the spokesman of a neutral nation, describing other nations in such vigorous terms, would almost certainly have resulted in war.

But in what other terms could the President have spoken? All the world knows that lawless powers are seeking to dominate all nations; and had the President been other than frank and outspoken, his speech would have fallen without authority upon the ears of those who know the facts. There can no longer be any doubt as to the attitude of the United States. The President plainly abandoned the "no delivery" principle; he did not merely say, "We must increase production for Britain", but, "*We must get these weapons to them* in such volume and quickly enough so we and our children will be saved the agony and suffering of war which others have had to endure." (Emphasis ours.)

All that will inspire the hard-pressed British Empire with new hope. Yet we cannot say that our enthusiasm for the speech is without reservation. We find it difficult to understand the American psychology. For instance, the President said:

"The people of Europe who are defending themselves, do not ask us to do their fighting: they ask us for the implements of war, the planes, the tanks, the guns, the freighters which will enable them to fight for their liberty and our security."

What did the President mean by saying that those who fight in Europe are fighting for their own liberty and American security? That is explained by an earlier paragraph:

"Does anyone seriously believe that we need to fear attack while a free Britain remains our most powerful naval neighbour in the Atlantic? Does anyone seriously believe, on the other hand, that we could rest easy if the Axis powers were our neighbour there?"

What we cannot understand, however, is this: how Americans who admit to themselves that we "fight for (our) liberty and (their) security", and who at the same time acknowledge that "the people of Europe who are defending themselves do not ask us to do their fighting", are able to be content with merely sending us implements of war, or with aiding us with everything "short of war".

There are certain people who tell us that the United States is of greater assistance to us as a non-belligerent—for she certainly can no longer be called neutral—than she would be if a state of open war existed between the United States and Germany. To this, we cannot agree. If the United States were openly at war with the Axis powers, it would open all American ports to British warships for refuelling or repairs. It would put all the enemy's shipping now in American ports at the disposal of the United States and Britain and her Allies. It would free the American Merchant Marine from the law which forbids American ships to enter belligerent waters; and so far from accentuating trouble in the Pacific, we are persuaded it would clarify the whole situation; for Japan certainly has not the resources available to offer any serious menace to the United States. Her hands are sufficiently filled with China and other Asiatic problems.

Furthermore, it would greatly simplify the matter to which Mr. Roosevelt alluded in his speech, the activity of agents of the Axis powers within the United States. It would, indeed, make it possible for the United States to deal more vigorously with all sorts of Fifth Columnists that would undermine her strength and retard her programme of defense. The moment war was declared between the British Empire and Germany, Nazi agents were gathered in in Canada; and as soon as Italy declared war, a far greater number of Italians, suspected of being enemy agents were interned. The same condition would obtain in the United States.

Moreover the anti-American elements in that country would not be so free to propagate their anti-American ideologies if the United States were actually at war. And no one can estimate the moral effect that would be produced were the United States openly to align herself with us. However, the President has given his pledge, as did Mr. Willkie, that he will do his utmost to keep America out of the war—and we have no doubt he will do it. On the other hand, the blind fury of the enemy may make it impossible to keep the war out of the United States. Following Mr. Roosevelt's speech enemy agents are likely to become still more active, and any day may provoke some "incident" which would change the whole international situation. But we are profoundly thankful for this great speech which must be as discouraging to the Axis powers as it is inspiring to us.

### LETTERS FROM DR. T. I. STOCKLEY AND REV. A. H. BARHAM

Readers of THE GOSPEL WITNESS will be interested in news from two of our friends in England. Dr. Stockley is gratefully remembered, both in Toronto and throughout our GOSPEL WITNESS constituency, as the former Dean of Toronto Baptist Seminary, and as a frequent and valued contributor to this paper. The Editor was delighted to receive a letter indicating that Dr. Stockley is still safe and in good health, and we publish the letter here so that his former students who read this paper may know his address, and that they may be able to communicate with him. How happy we should be if he were safe in Canada!

The other letter is from Rev. A. H. Barham who for about thirteen years was Pastoral Visitor of Jarvis Street Baptist Church. Mr. Barham is gratefully remembered, and held in affectionate esteem by a host of people. We glory in his spirit. His letter breathes his invariable cheerfulness. All Jarvis Street men in the Canadian overseas forces, every one of whom will receive this paper, will be glad to know Mr. Barham's address; and we suggest that each one communicate with him at his earliest convenience.

Mr. Barham tells us he has not heard for some months from his daughter, Miss Marie, who is one of our Jarvis Street girls, and is now in her second term of service as a missionary in China under the China Inland Mission. We are sorry to have to report that we cannot find anyone here who has heard from Marie within the same period. We trust, however, that she is safe, and that we shall all hear from her in due course.

The letters of Dr. Stockley and Mr. Barham follow:

5 Oakleigh Avenue, Hallow, Worcester, Eng.  
Dec. 3rd, 1940

My dear Dr. Shields:

You will see that I am writing from a new address. The reason is simple. Addiscombe became quite dangerous by bombs and gunfire. Sleep also became almost impossible and so I was advised to seek a new home for a while. After writing to several ministers in likely places we found that so many were moving out of the London area that it was not easy to find a safe and quiet spot. So my niece, who lives with me, came to Worcester and through a friend of hers there we discovered the place from which I am writing now, a very pleasant village about three miles from Worcester, where we—my niece, my housekeeper and myself—came six weeks since. We have furnished apartments in the home of some people who delight to do all they can for our comfort. This is really a great catch for every comfortable home in Worcester and Hallow is filled with people from London or other bombed cities. How long we may remain here depends largely on Hitler. The house in Addiscombe is shut up and my son, Dr. Clement, who lives nearby, has the keys. He cannot leave the district because his medical practice is there.

It is very delightful when the sun shines to take a good walk into the country and see the fading beauties of Nature. There is one serious loss here and that is a good place of worship. There is a Church of England near by where a devout man is Vicar and a tiny Congregational Hall not far off, but for a good Baptist church we must go into Worcester and there is no bus from Hallow on Sunday morning. Perhaps I may find a little sphere of ministry some time later if the Lord has yet some use for me in this world. It would be a joy to be used again for awhile before the Lord calls me Home.

I receive THE GOSPEL WITNESS with much joy nearly every week. Sometimes through enemy action it fails to arrive. But when it does come to hand I am eager to read its message. How I rejoice that you are sustained in strength and spiritual power! How favoured Toronto is to have a ministry such as yours maintained for so many years!

I hope Mrs. Shields is well, Miss Stoakley and all the dear helpers. You are favoured people to be out of England under present conditions. London, Coventry, Birmingham, Bristol, Southampton, Liverpool, etc., are all badly smashed so friends tell me who have visited them. Canada is now a very favoured country. How we wish that our army, navy or air force could utterly crush Germany, that wicked and devilish nation which is carrying ruin and destruction wherever she goes. God will surely soon lift up His Almighty Hand and lay that nation low. Do remember us in your prayers that deliverance may come speedily.

With warm Christian love to yourself, Mrs. Shields and all who may still think kindly of us.

Your own ever-loving friend,  
T. I. STOCKLEY.

21 Monks Walk, Reigate, Surrey.  
Dec. 2, 1940

My Dear Pastor:

My thoughts are often with you and with Jarvis St. and most of the news concerning you I gather from THE WITNESS which reaches me with fair regularity.

At any time I can have a chat with a Torontonion, simply by accosting one of the many Canadians around us, and from time to time we get a visit from one of our own boys, as George Parfitt. The latter is hoping to come to us for Christmas if he can get leave. If others of our men are coming over I should be glad if they had my address and got in touch with me on arrival.

My sister and I are keeping well, thank God, though I cannot say it is exactly peaceful around us. We sleep on makeshift beds downstairs, never fully undressing, and always each with a bag packed with a change in case we or the near locality is bombed. Few people care to go to their garden shelters, finding them too damp after all the rain we have had.

There is no great difficulty as regards provisions. Though some things are scarce, there are other things to take their place. The lack of onions would not trouble you, and with us they are just a fragrant memory. I am the buyer for the house. Two ounces of tea per person per week is sufficient for us; though not enough for you to whom "any time is tea-time."

You may know that my son Alf. is over here in London, in uniform of course, and he likes his job—stationery and printing. Naturally he is in the midst of the daily and nightly noise and is glad to get down to us occasionally, though it is not much better here. It seems that, failing to get through the London barrage, the enemy planes turn and unload their bombs on us before going home.

In spite of all these things it is good to be here, and I would not choose to be elsewhere.

I feel, and I believe you also do, that though we have a very tough job ahead, we are going to win. Of that I have no doubt.

Up to the time of leaving Toronto I was hearing from Marie regularly, but have not received one letter since coming here, and quite possibly she has not received mine, the stoppage being in the Jap controlled territory. But she is well I have no doubt.

After six months' rest I am feeling much better, I am thankful to say, and have opportunities for preaching on most Sundays.

With kindest regards to Mrs. Shields,  
Yours cordially in Him,  
A. H. BARHAM.

### THIS WEEK'S ISSUE OF THE GOSPEL WITNESS

Our readers will recognize the importance of this issue of the paper. We are anxious that this issue should be as widely distributed as that of December fifth.

Again we remind our readers that this is a crusade. We have no capital except the good will which grows out of the profound religious conviction of those who support the paper. We are most grateful for the financial help received for the issue of December fifth; by which we mean the consideration of those who, ordering

(Continued on page 8)

# The Jarvis Street Pulpit

## DOES THE BIBLE PREDICT THE COOPERATION OF RUSSIA AND GERMANY?

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, December 29th, 1940

(Stenographically Reported)

"Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing?

"The kings of the earth—set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed, saying,

"Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us.

"He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision.

"Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure."—Psalm 2:1-5.

"And the word of the Lord came unto me, saying,

"Son of man, set thy face against Gog, the land of Magog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal, and prophesy against him,

"And say, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I am against thee, O Gog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal:

"And I will turn thee back, and put hooks into thy jaws, and I will bring thee forth, and all thine army, horses and horsemen, all of them clothed with all sorts of armour, even a great company with bucklers and shields, all of them handling swords:

"Persia, Ethiopia, and Libya, with them; all of them with shield and helmet:

"Gomer, and all his bands; the house of Togarmah of the north quarters, and all his bands: and many people with thee.

"Be thou prepared, and prepare for thyself, thou, and all thy company that are assembled unto thee, and be thou a guard unto them."—Ezekiel 38:1-7.

I remark upon that which must have occurred to every thoughtful person: ours is a day of increased perplexity. I have no doubt that very many Christian people find it difficult to be at all specific in their prayers; about all we can do is to pray, "Thy will be done in earth, as it is done in heaven."

I am aware that there are some people who are particularly fond of exact definitions, and are ready to identify the events of the times, and the leading actors in them, with particular scriptures, who say, "That is just exactly what is written." I should be the last to desire to speak any word that would make complex that which God has made simple, or add any degree of obscurity to that which God has made plain. It is very dangerous, however, to prophesy apart from the Scripture, for the reason that we know not what a day nor an hour may bring forth. It is equally dangerous—perhaps even more so—to clothe our own predictions, which may be largely our own imaginings—with alleged scriptural authority, and presume to say that the Scriptures teach thus and so, when in many cases they teach nothing of the kind.

It is extremely important that we should none of us try, or even desire, to be wise beyond that which is written. There is a kind of religious mind that seems afraid to say, in respect to any great matter, I do not know. They seem to desire to reach finality, and to be able to speak with dogmatic certainty, "This is exactly what the Scripture means." It seems to me there is very great danger in that direction. It is possible to confuse the minds of very devout people by giving our imaginations free play in our attempts to interpret Scripture, and especially to identify current events as being themselves the fulfilment of something allegedly specifically predicted in the Word of God.

I have said it again and again, and I repeat it: I recommend to you such holy caution as will make you afraid to be too positive about some things. There are things that we may certainly know, and that we our-

selves may experience; but there are other things that are shrouded in mystery. It is very difficult for anyone to be certain as to the future in respect to details even with the prophetic scriptures open before him.

Just at this particular time the whole world is somewhat mystified by the concentration of large Nazi forces in the East. We have been expecting it on the Western coast of Europe, and have been doing our best to prepare to be ready to resist the invader; but now Germany seems to be moving eastward. Russia has long been an enigma. Who knows what Russia is about? What she plans, what she may attempt tomorrow? I am aware that some interpreters think they have discovered in the chapter I read, taken together with the chapter from which I have read several verses as a text, some intimation of the ultimate co-operation of Russia with Germany, the great horde of the enemy then coming down from the north and concentrating about Jerusalem, to do battle against Israel and the Holy City:

It is a very interesting speculation, I grant you. But I have observed there are people who are indisposed to enquire beyond the assertions of certain teachers who are supposed to know. Thus they come to us and say, "Did you see the paper this morning? That is what is said in Ezekiel's prophecy." Are you quite sure that it is exactly what is predicted? I have been trying, during these war months, to caution people against these extravagances lest they should be led to certain expectations which, in the end, will fail of fulfilment; and the failure should then have a very unwholesome reaction upon their own religious life; not because the Word of God has failed, nor because prophecies have not been fulfilled as the Lord said they would be, but because some rather extravagant and fanciful interpretations have been proved to be false by the mere passage of time, and the development of events.

The theory is that this chief prince (*Rosh*) of Meshech and Tubal is Russia, and they find in Meshech a refer-

ence to Moscow and in Tubal to Tobolsk. Indeed, I have here a Scofield Bible, and in the note on the thirty-eighth chapter of Ezekiel, Dr. Scofield says, "That the primary reference is to the Northern European powers headed up by Russia, all agree." Then there are further assertions; and the unsuspecting, uninstructed, but earnest student of the Bible, feeling wholly incompetent to question such an authority, simply assumes that that is exactly what the Bible says. "This is Russia; Dr. Scofield says all agree."

I have been at pains to enquire into that somewhat diligently, and all I have to say is that it is very, very far from being a statement of fact; for there are few things about which expositors are less in agreement than in this very matter. It may be that those of Dr. Scofield's school who read nothing but that with which they are wholly agreed, and which is in harmony with their own preconceptions, will agree with Dr. Scofield's dictum. It is not to be set aside lightly; but to say that "all" interpreters are agreed that Russia is here specifically mentioned is not correct. There are quite as many expositors of equal authority who deny that there is any reference to Russia here.

These names Gog and Magog appear elsewhere in Scripture. You find them in the book of Genesis, and in Revelation. That is a long leap, from Genesis to Revelation; they are the two ends of the arch of divine communication. Gomer and Togarmah are also to be found in the book of Genesis. Indeed, it is always difficult, and as dangerous as it is difficult, to assign particular names to particular persons or nations, and to a particular period of history. Some nations which occupied a very large place both in the historical scriptures and the prophetic scriptures have now entirely ceased to exist; and if certain interpretations could be true, then it would be necessary first of all for God to re-create these non-existent nations in order that this futurist idea of things should be fulfilled.

We are being told to expect the revival of the Roman Empire. I am told a certain so-called Bible teacher who had imbibed these ideas, before Mussolini became quite so important as he became later, and when he was more accessible than in his later years, made a journey to Rome and expounded his theory to Mussolini—and it was very palatable to that gentleman. Evidently he was ready to be a candidate for the office of the new Caesar. We have been told to be on the lookout for the revival of the Roman Empire. It seems at the moment, as I have remarked before, much more probable that the ancient Grecian Empire will be revived than the Roman Empire! Particularly if Mussolini continues in the direction in which he is now going—and he says nothing will stop him!

What I am concerned about is that no one should put an interpretation upon Holy Scripture which could possibly discredit it, or undermine its authority in the minds of men. These imaginative, fanciful, interpretative flights remind me rather of a story I heard in the last war of an old lady who did not know much about aviation. Meeting an aviator she asked him what would happen if they were to run out of gasolene while up in the sky. "Oh", said the aviator facetiously, "they would have to stay up there. There are a lot of them up there who cannot get down." I have known several alleged Bible teachers who have flown away into some stratosphere of their own imagining, and who are still

in the air because all they have predicted has been proved to be wrong by the mere passage of time. Let us be on guard just now when things are developing in Eastern Europe, so that we shall not fall into these errors.

What is the purpose of this prophecy? There is a great confederacy of evil powers, and it is directed against Israel and against Jerusalem. It is a picture, I grant you, the outline of which is not wholly unlike what we see now forming in Eastern Europe. If what we are told is true, millions of men are standing at arms in Russia, and increasing numbers of Germans are moving in that general direction, with the armed forces of Rumania, and Bulgaria, and Turkey, and Yugoslavia, and Hungary, none agreeing together but all armed to the teeth—if they could be brought into concerted action, they would be a formidable foe.

But one cannot help asking why such an enormous force as these chapters describe should be assembled against Israel and Jerusalem. What do you mean by "Israel"? Do you mean the Jewish race? They are not a very numerous race, and so far as I know, except as they are found in the armed forces of other nations, they are unarmed. Nor is Jerusalem in any sense a fenced city. Why such an enormous confederacy should be formed for such a task it would be difficult to see. My British Israel friends would say, "You are discovering a difficulty. Israel cannot mean the Jews. It must be the Anglo-Saxon race. It may yet be the battle will be fought in the vicinity of Jerusalem, and God's Israel, the Anglo-Saxon people will have to defend the city against this confederacy."

I see great difficulty in that direction. I met a man once who happened to mention the name of a certain minister, and spoke of him disparagingly, saying he would not go to hear him under any circumstances. I happened to know the minister, and spoke in his defense; I thought he was an excellent brother, a man of God, a man whose message was worthy of attention. But the man told me that the minister, in the course of an address had made an allusion to a certain incident in the American Civil War. He had become somewhat confused in his identifications, and had got a man of the South, in his story, fighting for the North, and a man of the North fighting for the South. Said his critic, "He does not even know the difference between the blues and the grays. A man who is so inaccurate in his historical allusions cannot speak to me with authority on any subject."

If I follow the interpretations of Dr. Scofield, or even of some others, I find myself in the same difficulty. I discover in this confederacy there are some who—and I have as much authority on that side certainly as Dr. Scofield has for his bold and bald assertions—I find some included in that confederacy who are, ethnologically, our kinsmen, or at least our fellow-nationals. According to Dr. Fausset, Gomer is of the stock of the *Cymry* as the Welsh call themselves, and is represented also by the Gael of Ireland, and Scotland, and gave their name to *Cumber-land*. I am not an ethnological expert: I must leave that to others. But I should expect to hear some objection from many Welsh and Scotch, and Irish friends, even were I to suggest they are likely to be found in this confederacy with Russia and all the rest! Such speculative interpretations lead to endless confusion, and in the end rob the Word of God of its authority.

On the other hand, we cannot write these prophecies, either that of the second Psalm or that of Ezekiel's prophecy, wholly in the past tense. Had I time I could show you that they have both historically found a partial fulfilment. There are some who insist they are wholly fulfilled, and that the only correct interpretation is an historical one. Historical parallels can be found, and it is possible to present a very plausible argument in support of the historical view. It is said to belong to the "latter days", but so did Pentecost by Peter's interpretation; but as I read it to you this evening you must have observed that it is on such a colossal scale it seems difficult to find historical authority for believing these prophecies to have been fulfilled fully and completely.

There is to be a final confederacy. We know that, though we may not understand all the particulars of it. The broad outlines are given to us in the final book of the Bible. There is to be an ultimate battle in which light is to triumph over darkness, good over evil, God over the devil. There is to be a new Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven, which is to be a holy city. There are to be a new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.

Personally, I cannot identify Russia as playing the leading role, which according to that interpretation, she would in the present case. I cannot see Hitler—unless he loses two eyes, a leg, and an arm—playing second fiddle to Stalin or anyone else. The Stalin as chief prince of Meshech and Tubal does not fit in with the present situation.

It is safer always to confine ourselves to principles and to observe that there is always a progressive fulfilment leading up to some final issue; and that every prophecy is fulfilled in stages. There is a partial fulfilment going on all the time. We may err in our racial, national, and geographical, identifications; we need not err in our identification and appraisal of spiritual realities. If we keep within that safe circle we shall be able to find in every portion of the Word of God scriptures which are prophetic of individual and national experiences, and will undergird us with strength in the dark days.

### I.

We may learn that GOD TAKES COGNIZANCE OF NATIONAL COUNSELS AND INTERNATIONAL CONSPIRACIES AND CONFEDERACIES. The portions of scripture I have read relate particularly to nations and rulers of nations. God is speaking, not to particular individuals so much as to collections of individuals in their racial and national capacities. "The heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing. The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed." And the Lord takes account of it, knows all about it, and sends a special message directed to people in their collective capacity.

The same in principle is true of the prophecy of Ezekiel. Whoever Gog and Magog and the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal may be, we have here also such nations as Persia, and Ethiopia, and Libya, and many others, as well as Gomer and Togarmah, all of them representing, not particular individuals, but collections of people, nations and races, of whose character and conduct God takes account, and to whom God directs a specific word.

With that as a background, I remark that *there is a*

*tendency in some directions to make religion exclusively individualistic.* Says someone, "Why do you not preach the gospel"—especially if I say something that they do not like! I have found when I have spoken on temperance, people say that. There are some people who would not know the gospel if they heard it; or knowing it, know it only to hate it. They see no application of the gospel as such discussions involve. We cannot too strongly emphasize the individual aspect of religion. Salvation is an individual matter. People are not saved, in the evangelical sense, in the mass. They are saved individually; they must be born again; they are held to be individually accountable to God: "So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God."

We cannot evade or avoid our individual responsibility to God. Hence the collectivism so prevalent in our day that merges the individual in the mass, the individual in the state, is bound to be wrong. It is wrong politically, and it is equally wrong religiously. Totalitarianism, which assumes that a man is only a speck of dust, and that individuals exist in the aggregate to make up the state, and that the state is the all-important thing, and that therefore millions of lives may ruthlessly be sacrificed in the interests of the state, that is entirely contrary to our conception of statehood and citizenship, and equally contrary to the teaching of the Word of God.

So is it of that religion which makes a man only a part of a great church. That is Roman Catholicism. Roman Catholicism is religious totalitarianism. Salvation is in the Church. Everything is to be sacrificed for the Church: the individual does not count. That is not Christian; and that view, whether applied to the state or to religion, is essentially pagan and anti-Christian. We must hold fast to our individualism, and believe that the Good Shepherd leaves the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and goes after the one that is lost "until he find it". Nothing less than that is the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Out of this grows the conception of a free citizenry and a free state, and a free church—freedom everywhere—based upon that view of individual responsibility.

And yet from these scriptures we may learn that *religion has its social implications.* I know there are individuals who assume that my own business is to get ready for heaven, to make sure I am saved with an everlasting salvation—and the world may go to the devil. My main business is to seek the heavenly city.

That is true. That is my main business—and yours. Our citizenship is in heaven; but I remind you that the gospel of Jesus Christ is the fulfilment of both tables of the law. Christianity is designed to relate us primarily, rightly and savingly to God; but it is equally designed to relate us rightly and serviceably to our neighbour. And you are not exemplifying the Spirit of Christ, nor are you living as a Christian ought to live, if while your heart is set upon things above, you are not doing everything in your power to serve people around you in order that they may go to heaven with you.

I think there is some ground for the complaint that is made by some people who lose sight of the individual aspect of the religion of Christ, and constantly din into our ears their doctrine of a social gospel, as though society at large were to be saved in the mass. No; the individual is to be saved, and society through the individual. But the individual has a relation to his fellow,

and he must recognize the implications of that relation.

That inevitably *implies national privilege and responsibility*. I am part of the state, and I have a right and an obligation as a Christian to fulfil my duty to the state; because God is going to deal with nations as well as with individuals. Therefore I must exercise what influence I can in the national interests.

We have national responsibilities, since God is the God of the nation as well as of the individual, and takes account of collective evils as well as of individual sins. He hears what the rulers say as well as ordinary people like you and me. How evil men pile up evil against the Lord and against His Anointed. In the second Psalm you have it, and in Ezekiel. We hear about the Berlin-Rome-Tokio axis. That is a trinity of evil, and we need have no doubt that God has taken account of all that.

*Such carnal conspiracies are always directed against God.* It is so in the second Psalm, and so in Ezekiel. It is folly to expect anything else from such a source. Whether Russia and Germany work together or not, they are equally opposed to God. However they may differ from each other, they will together further their own evil ends save as God sovereignly intervenes to prevent them. Herod and Pilate may not be on speaking terms—they were not; but where Jesus Christ was concerned, they became friends in their common opposition to righteousness. So you may expect to find that in these confederacies, whether there be a political pact, whether they definitely co-operate one with the other, in their chief aim they are one. As Mr. Chamberlain said, it is an evil thing we are fighting, whether it is Russia, or Germany, or Italy, or all of them combined.

It may not be reckoned as politically wise, but I am convinced that no more good can come from the unequal yoking of nations than of such yoking of individuals. Hence, let us not complain of the coming together of these nations. It was a shock when we found that France had forsaken us. There is much of the salt of the earth in France; many of the Lord's elect dwell in that country. But for France officially and politically little good can be said. France, politically, officially, was almost as corrupt as Germany herself. It was a tree that was rotten at the heart. I am not sorry that we stand alone. I think we may well congratulate ourselves that we are free from the complications which further partnership at this stage would have involved.

Some of you will remember that when it was reported that Germany and Russia had signed a non-aggression pact, I ventured to say that I was profoundly thankful for the news. I had a sense of horror lest by some means we should be linked up with that utterly godless aggregation. I do not say that we should try to multiply our enemies. In the providence of God they will have their place in the final issue, and in effecting the final result; but with all our faults as Britishers—and we have many. I hope you recognize it, and that Canada is a long long way from being, in the biblical sense, a Christian country, and Britain is a long way from being, in the true sense a Christian country—notwithstanding all our faults, I think there is left a residue of Christian conscience so that God in His goodness has saved us from that which stains the escutcheon of those who are now our enemies. We are engaged in a war which we believe to be a righteous cause. I think we shall be freer to fight with clean

hands if for a while we fight alone, not with Russia or anyone else. I think there is a providence in our separation, and we had better be patiently content to take such reinforcements as God Himself is pleased to send us. God will look after us; and if our statesmen, instead of resorting to all the tricks of diplomacy, would pursue a course of righteousness, standing solidly for righteousness and truth in respect to Russia and Germany and Italy and all the other powers, it would be the truest and most successful diplomacy. That, however, is beyond our personal control, but we may pray as the Lord directs.

## II.

From these scriptures we may learn that GOD IS AT WAR WITH ALL SUCH EVIL CONFEDERACIES. That is the teaching of the second Psalm, and of these chapters in Ezekiel. "Therefore, Thou son of man, prophesy against Gog, and say, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold I am against thee, O Gog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal." You remember that someone remarked to President Lincoln that he hoped God was on their side. The President replied, "I am not as anxious to know that, as to be certain we are on God's side." That is the supremely important question for every one of us.

*All that is predicted in this second Psalm will be fulfilled progressively.*

It found a partial fulfilment in apostolic time. You remember how the apostles came together and in their prayer, having been delivered from the oppressor for the time being, they rejoiced and quoted the second Psalm: "Why did the heathen rage, and the people imagine vain things? The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord, and against his Christ." They saw it fulfilled, and they said, "Of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou has anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done." Poor little Herod! Poor Pontius Pilate! "This is the king", wrote Pilate above Him on the cross. "No! No! Do not write that; write that he said, I am the king." "What I have written, I have written."

The second Psalm was partially fulfilled in the experience of the apostolic church, and we have for our authority the inspired Word of God. And remember, the Bible is always the best commentary on the Bible. If you want to know what the Bible means, ask the Bible. If you want to know what it teaches, search the Scriptures.

Here then is the divine attitude: it has been the divine attitude toward every such subsequent conspiracy. God does not change, and wherever evil men get together against the things for which God stands—let me rather say, those principles which are no more than the radiations of His character, the transcripts of His nature, which have their source in Him; when people are gathered together against the Lord and against His Christ, against all that is written in the supreme revelation of divine holiness, God is against them. We do not need to argue the point: we can be certain that God is against Hitler, against Stalin, against Mussolini, against all these workers of iniquity. The Bible says so. And we had better be against them with all our might. Then we can be sure we are on God's side.



Such an interpretation is not exclusive of a final and complete fulfilment of Scripture. I do not believe the second Psalm is completely fulfilled as yet. In principle, it has been fulfilled again and again; but there must be a final fulfilment of all its predictions. The same is true of the divine complacency in the face of all such conspiracies. I have found people a little down when they read of some apparent victory by the Axis powers—afraid of Japan, of Russia, of Rumania: God is not afraid of any of them. When all the world's rulers conspire, "he that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision." That is the only correct attitude.

Learn to take that attitude when you read your paper to-morrow, no matter what the news. Read the second Psalm before you read the worst news that could possibly come. We are glad to hear from Mr. Churchill. We shall be glad to hear President Roosevelt later this evening. We are glad to hear these great national leaders. But for myself I prefer first of all to settle my mind by discovering what is God's attitude toward the day's news, and if God is undisturbed, I need not be. I care not what the news, "he that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision." Do not wear such a long face. If the Lord can laugh, let us join in the laughter! Remember, victory is on the side of righteousness ultimately, and perhaps intermediately. In any event, God is never disturbed.

Mr. Roosevelt will tell us to-night what the United States is doing in preparation for national defense. But let me remind you that this Holy Book tells us of a great Ruler—and it is literally true—*Who has abundant resources of power*. By all means, let us supply everything possible in men and munitions of every sort. Oh that we could do more and more and more; but over and above Britain and the United States, let us continue to believe that this is not the prediction of a pleasant dream, but that it is to be literally fulfilled. He can dash the mightiest nation in pieces as a potter's vessel, and rule them with a rod of iron. He may—and will—use our rods of iron. Let us have plenty of them.

I say, let us multiply our rods of iron, every kind of munition that we can supply—airplanes, tanks, guns, ships. Let us do our utmost. But never forget there is one Ruler Who already has in His almighty hand His rod of iron; and the Scripture says of all these evil conspirators that a holy God will break them with a rod of iron. He will not only break them, but "dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel". I thank God for the grace He gave me years ago, showing me that it is wise to be on God's side. I do not want to be under that rod of iron.

It will very probably be His way to set the conspirators each against the other. You are worried about Russia? I am not. Let them get at it. "I will set the Egyptians against the Egyptians: and they shall fight every one against his brother, and every one against his neighbour; city against city, and kingdom against kingdom." And in our context, "I will call for a sword against him throughout all my mountains, said the Lord God: every man's sword shall be against his brother." I have no objection to Germany and Russia fighting it out between them. That is often God's way, and I say to you again and again that if we could only view the present situation through the medium of Scripture, we should find much to encourage us. We have far more allies in Europe

to-day than Hitler has. He has millions of people who hate him, and millions who fear him—but no one who loves him. And all who fear and hate him are our potential allies. We may not have half as much fighting to do as we have feared—when God fulfils the principle of this prophecy, and all these conspirators come together. He says, "I will set their swords every one against the other, and let them proceed to their mutual destruction in the fulfilment of my judgment upon them."

He will also employ weapons from His own armoury to do it. The teaching of modern science—or let me rather say, the modern teaching of science has almost excluded from the thoughts of men the possibility of God's using natural powers by supernatural intervention. I recall being in a cyclone in Southern Indiana some years ago, or rather on the rim of it. When I came home I spoke on the subject as to whether God directs cyclones. The sermon was published, and someone sent me an item from an English paper. The editor had seen my sermon and he called it, "Fundamentalism gone mad." The idea that anyone in this day and age would be so stupid as to believe that the powers of nature are subject to divine control! It is all part of a system, and we are subject to inexorable law! Everything must be explained on natural grounds. I will not quarrel with the man who argues the inexorability of God's law, but I honour both God and His law, and I insist He can and does interpose. If He does not, the Bible is not true. Our history is full of it. The history of the British nation is full of it. Here He says, "I will plead against him with pestilence and with blood; and I will rain upon him, and upon his bands, and upon the many people that are with him, an overflowing rain, and great hailstones, fire, and brimstone. Thus will I magnify myself, and sanctify myself."

When God opens His artillery barrage the earth shakes. All that human power or skill has designed is as nothing compared with the weapons that are in His armoury. He did it at Dunkirk; He did it at Mons; He did it when He wrecked the Spanish Armada, and saved Britain from being conquered by the Pope and his Spanish allies. He has intervened in your life and mine. I know it, many times. Without violation of natural law He stretches forth His arm to help me. No, I am not lost in the crowd: He has a way of coming to my aid.

When these forces are released, no one can stand against them. That is true of the end as well. I do not know what Armageddon is; I do not know when it will come. I leave that to my very wise and oracular friends who know all about it. I only know there will be such a time, and such an event; a time of ultimate reckoning when God will have His way.

But what He will do ultimately, He may do intermediately. By the second Psalm, the judges and rulers may be wise: "Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth." You may well, every day you live, pray that our judges and rulers may be made wise by the wisdom that is from above, so that they may shape the conduct of this conflict in respect to Canada's part, and others', and that of the Empire as a whole, in such a way as to be in harmony with the divine will and purpose. The ultimate victory is sure, but the intermediate victory is not less sure. For myself, I feel certain that we are on the way; as His Majesty the King said in his Christmas message to his subjects, "Our feet are already set in the path of victory." We have not obtained, but we are on the way.

And so, should you read to-morrow of some new development in Eastern Europe, should you read that Russia and Germany fight each other, or fight together; or that Germany has invaded Yugoslavia or Bulgaria, that Turkey is likely to become involved, and our courageous Greek allies are likely to become embarrassed—do not worry about it. Take the truths of the scripture I have brought to your attention, and learn like the Psalmist to say, "He shall not be afraid of evil tidings: his heart is fixed, trusting in the Lord." Or again, "O God, my heart is fixed; I will sing and give praise even with my glory."

All that for those who are really the Lord's. The all-important thing for you is to see that you are not making war against the Lord's Anointed, to make sure that your heart has been opened to the Lord Jesus, that you have rejoiced in seeing Him and in acknowledging Him as your Saviour and Lord. That being settled, you can say, "If God be for us, who can be against us?" May the Lord so comfort your heart by His Word, for His name's sake, Amen.

### THIS WEEK'S ISSUE OF THE GOSPEL WITNESS

(Continued from page 2)

extra copies, sent money enough to pay for them, and in many cases a little "over and above". But the expense of printing that large issue and of mailing it was enormous. The \$330.00 contributed at the service when the sermon was preached, for the purpose of paying for radio time if it could be secured, or otherwise to assist in spreading the message in printed form, while it was a substantial help, did not half cover the extra expense incurred. If our friends who read that issue and who read this believe that in our testimony we are serving, first of all the cause of the gospel, and then, as well, the great crusade in which Britain is fighting, we are sure they will be ready to lend us what financial assistance may be possible. The United States has pledged itself to send all aid to Britain "short of war". We ask readers who believe with us, to send all possible aid to us—short of nothing, within the limit of their power.

We shall be glad again to receive lists of names to whom our readers would like to have a copy or copies of this issue sent. We shall be glad to send individual copies at five cents per copy postpaid, or packages to one address, postpaid, at the rate of twenty-five for one dollar. We beg our readers to believe that there is not one cent of profit in this, but that we publish and circulate it at a distinct loss; hence the necessity for substantial contributions. Let us hear from you immediately.

### RESPONSE TO OUR DECEMBER 5TH ISSUE

It was in our mind to make a selection from the hundreds of letters received in appreciation of the above-mentioned issue, and publish them in this week's WITNESS. But when we attacked the pile, we were overwhelmed. Let it be sufficient to say that we have received appreciative letters from ministers of all denominations, and from laymen in nearly every walk of life. To select a few, or only as many as we should be able to publish, would constitute a misrepresentation, as it might so easily be assumed that they were representative.

But these letters have come from all sorts of people, from all over Canada, and from the United States. There has not been time to receive letters from Europe or Asia

or Africa; but practically every letter ordered additional copies. We are grateful to all our correspondents for their encouraging epistles.

Copies of the above-mentioned issue containing our reply to Father Lanphier's radio strictures are still available and will be sent on application at the same prices named above for this week's issue.

## Bible School Lesson Outline

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

Vol. 5 First Quarter Lesson 2 January 12, 1941

### THE PALSIED MAN HEALED

Lesson Text: Mark 2.

Golden Text: "They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance"—Mark 2:17.

I. The Paralytic—verses 1 to 12.

Parallel passages: Matt. 9:1-8; Lk. 5:17-26.

The people of Nazareth, the boyhood home of our Lord, had rejected His first recorded public testimony in their synagogue (Lk. 4:28-31). He travelled north to Capernaum in Galilee, and after touring the district, returned to Capernaum, which became known as "his own city" (Matt. 4:13-16; 11:23; Mk. 1:39).

News that Christ was in the Capernaum home, probably that of Simon (Peter (Mk. 1:29), was soon spread abroad. The Christian home should be the source of blessing to the whole community (Acts 10:24-27).

The ministry of the four friends of the paralytic is commendable. They brought to Christ one who was unable to come by himself. It is our privilege to invite and assist others that they may come into touch with Christ and be healed. We should emulate the love of these four for the stricken soul (Rom. 9:1-3; 10:1), their faith that the Lord could and would save him (Mk. 9:23), their zeal and earnestness (2 Tim. 4:2; Jude 22, 23). Again, they refused to be hindered by difficulties, and utterly disregarding the possible ridicule of their companions they continued their unconventional procedure of tearing up the roof of the house.

God searches the hearts of men, and He knows their deepest need (1 Chron. 28:9; John 2:25; Rom. 8:27). A casual observer would probably have judged that this man's immediate need was for physical healing. The most important factor in an individual's condition is his relationship to God.

The blessing of the forgiveness of sins was announced many times by the Christ Who had come to make it possible (Lk. 2:10, 11; 7:47; Acts 13:38, 39; Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14). No human priest has the power to give absolution from sin; to do that is the prerogative of God alone (Isa. 43:25; Psa. 130:4; Acts 4:12; 1 Tim. 2:5). Therefore, the scribes reasoned that Christ, Whom they thought to be merely a man, was uttering blasphemy when He pronounced sins forgiven, for to their mind He was unlawfully assuming Divine authority (Lev. 24:16). Their reasoning would have been correct, had Christ not been God (John 1:1, 14; 8:19; 10:30-33; 17:11).

Christ answered the unspoken objection of the scribes by deeds as well as by words. He demonstrated His Deity by performing a miracle upon the poor diseased body (John 2:11; 20:30, 31). The cure was instant, amazing and complete.

II. The Publican—verses 13 to 22.

Parallel passages: Matt. 9:9-17; Lk. 5:27-39.

Christ did not rebuke the multitudes who thronged Him, but rather He had compassion upon them in their weariness and sin (Mk. 6:34; 8:2). Yet, the individuals were never lost in the crowd, so far as He was concerned. He ministered to the multitudes, and He also called men one by one to come to Him. God loves the world, and He loves each man and woman, boy and girl (Matt. 11:28; John 3:16; Rev. 22:17).

Matthew, the son of Alphaeus, also called Levi, was one of the twelve apostles and the writer of the first Gospel (Mk.

(Continued on page 16)



# The Censor and the Editor Exchange Letters

The letters following this article we believe will be found to be self-explanatory. For ourselves, we are absolutely sure that no person who has ever attended Jarvis Street Church has ever heard one word from its pulpit that could dampen the ardour of any reasonable person for Britain's cause. We are equally sure that not a sentence has ever been printed in THE GOSPEL WITNESS that could fairly be construed by any reasonable person as having a tendency to discourage recruiting for active service in His Majesty's forces.

We have received scores—we believe hundreds—of letters from Britain and elsewhere, from ministers and aviators, men in the army and navy, all declaring that THE GOSPEL WITNESS proves a tonic to their spirits, and an inspiration to their morale.

We repeat what we have said in this paper during the war and before the war, that the greatest enemy of all free countries, particularly of Britain and the United States, is the Italian Papacy. Its bloody history is the proof. And inasmuch as the Papal Church boasts that it is always the same, and has never at any time expressed regret or change of attitude toward these matters, we must, on its own confession, believe that the Church of Rome is the same to-day as it has always been. That the Papacy conspired with the King of Spain to the extent even of promising ten thousand infantry and a thousand horse in the attempt to subjugate Britain, and murder Queen Elizabeth, and was only foiled by the destruction of the Spanish Armada by the genius of Drake and the winds of God, is a matter of indisputable history. It is equally an indisputable historic fact that Roman Catholic Quebec sent Papal Zouaves to fight on the side of the Papal forces against Garibaldi in Italy.

It is also a fact that the Papacy had a large part in stirring up trouble in Ireland in the last war. *The Irish Press* of May 26th, 1933, in an editorial article headed, "Benediction", said:

"Today Ireland learns for the first time one of the most moving and glorious stories in connection with the Easter Week Rising. Before it took place Pope Benedict XV. received a Mission from the Irish Volunteer Executive in the person of George Noble, Count Plunkett. The Count had a private audience of two hours with His Holiness, and disclosed to him the decision to rise and the date of the insurrection, and received from him his Apostolic Benediction on the men who were facing death for Ireland's liberty.—*Irish Press*, May 26th, 1933."

Michael Collins, one of the leaders in the Irish Rebellion, and a Roman Catholic priest, conspired with Sir Roger Casement, who was later executed as a traitor.

Prime Minister Hughes of Australia, speaking at Bendigo, as reported from Melbourne, July 25th, 1920, said:

"The British Empire was surrounded by enemies; it was being attacked by Bolshevism, Sinn Feinism, and Germanism. The British Empire was a League of Nations, bound together by the ties of blood and race, and if they broke Great Britain, they broke Australia. When they saw in their midst men who would break up the Empire and plunge a dagger into its very heart, what were they to think of such men, except that they were traitors?"

"When Archbishop Mannix said that the sentiments he uttered were supported by the bulk of the people of Aus-

tralia, he said that which was not true. He has only one objective, and that is the destruction of the Empire. Mgr. Mannix says that his one hope is that England and America will be enemies and that Ireland will fight England, and that America will fight England."—*The Times*, July 26th, 1920.

In a statement from Melbourne, August 3rd, 1920, Premier Hughes said:

"I see that Archbishop Mannix, continuing his anti-British propaganda, evidently wishes the Americans to believe that he represents the public opinion of Australia. He does not represent the public opinion of Australia on the Irish question or any other; he is merely an acknowledged leader of Sinn Fein.

"From the day of his arrival in Australia, he set to work to fan the dying embers of religious bigotry into a fierce blaze, and gather around him every fanatical alien and Sinn Feiner in the country. During the War he worked incessantly and as openly as he dared, to prevent recruiting, help the enemy, and insure the defeat of the Allies."—*The Times*, August 4th, 1920.

But what has that to do with the present war? We quote the following from *The Globe and Mail*, Toronto, of Saturday, December 28th, 1940:

## "Eire Offered Axis Support if 'Attacked'"

"London, Dec. 28, (Saturday) (CP).—The Dublin correspondent of the London Daily Mail reported today that the Rome radio had offered full Axis support to Eire in the event of 'British aggression'.

"This was the broadcast statement, according to the correspondent:

"Should the Irish people be forced to defend themselves against British aggression they can be assured of the full and whole-hearted help of the Axis powers. Beside this military help the whole Catholic world would be on their side." (Emphasis ours.—Ed. C. W.)

Observe, this report is from the Dublin correspondent of *The London Daily Mail*. The Rome radio broadcast the report to the effect that "the whole Catholic world" would be on their side should the Irish people be forced to defend themselves against British aggression, as well as "the whole-hearted help of the Axis powers". How does it happen that the Rome radio is assured that "the whole Catholic world" will cooperate with the Axis powers?

We insist that it is about time we were recognizing that "the whole Catholic world", as the Rome radio declares, at least officially, is on the side of the Axis powers. That does not mean, of course, that there are not thousands of individual Roman Catholics of all nationalities who put patriotism and their love of liberty before their devotion to the Church, and who therefore fight not for, but against the Axis powers. We have absolutely nothing to withdraw of anything we have ever published in THE GOSPEL WITNESS on this subject.

No one recognizes more clearly than we do the need for national unity at the present time. For ourselves, we are ready to join heart and hand with British patriots of every race and of every creed in the prosecution of the war against the Axis powers. But we have little sympathy for a national unity which consists only in empty words.

Premier Godbout of Quebec spoke in Toronto recently, and made an earnest plea for national unity. But his address was delivered in the wrong place. What the Premier of Quebec needs to do is to preach his doctrine of national unity in the Province of Quebec. Mr. Godbout, like many other French-Canadian politicians, has one message for Quebec, and an entirely different message for the rest of Canada. In Toronto Premier Godbout appealed for national unity: in Plessisville, Quebec, he boasted to a French-Canadian audience that "a little handful of French-Canadians, led by M. Ernest Lapointe, dictated its will to the country."

That sort of speech will not make for national unity anywhere. We are not fighting dictatorships in Europe for the privilege of submitting to the dictatorship of a minority in Canada. We believe the rights of minorities should always be recognized and respected; but it is of the very essence of democracy that majorities and minorities should learn to live together in peace, even though on many points they disagree with each other; and that there should be no dictation from anyone.

It is our opinion that there are many matters of great importance, religiously and politically, which might well be held in abeyance until after the war, in order to secure the fullest possible measure of co-operation of all Canada; but we cannot admit that a minority, whether French or any other sort of Canadian, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, should, under the guise of the necessity for national unity, be allowed to "dictate its will to the whole country".

Papal Ireland has always been a thorn in Britain's side, and has long been a festering sore; and just because of Ireland's continuously aggressive attitude, others, on the plea of unity, were importuned to let the disturber have his own way. But the moment he had his own way, he did not want it; he wanted something else. All the world now knows that the defeat of Britain would mean the destruction of liberty almost everywhere else in the world; and perhaps there is at this moment no greater menace to the British cause than the "neutrality" of the country that calls itself Eire. Surely it must be apparent at least to every loyal Britisher throughout the world that British statesmanship was never more inept than when, for the sake of peace, it yielded to the perpetual nagging of Papal Ireland.

The same principle applies in Canada. We want to live at peace with our French-Canadian fellow-citizens. As individuals, we know of no finer people. Though we utterly disagree with them, we want to live at peace with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens of all racial origins. We would fight for their freedom to make Romanists of us all if they can, by open and straightforward preaching of their doctrines; providing we also are given equal liberty by every medium of public expression openly and straightforwardly to preach what we believe. But while there is breath in our bodies, we will never submit to the political tyranny of an Italian Church; nor yield, either willing or reluctant obedience to a foreign "prince" who claims supremacy over all governments, and who blasphemously calls himself God's vice-gerent on earth.

We cannot admit that the cause of freedom could possibly be furthered by yielding anywhere to the domination of the Italian Papacy.

We ask our readers to study the letter of the Censor very carefully, and with equal care to study our reply.

## CENSORSHIP CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

### Press Censorship

Ottawa, Canada,  
December 20th, 1940.

Reverend Dr. T. T. Shields,  
Editor, "The Gospel Witness",  
130 Gerrard Street East,  
Toronto 2, Canada.  
Dear Dr. Shields:

We have read with considerable interest the December 5th issue of "The Gospel Witness", reproducing a sermon preached by yourself in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, December 1st, 1940. We do not question the sincerity of your motives or the depth of your conviction, but we feel it to be our duty to draw to your attention the damaging effect which certain passages in your sermon as reported here may have on Canada's war effort.

It has been represented to us that the general effect of certain passages on French Canadians, if the material is circulated among them, might discourage recruiting in that province. Moreover, if brought to the attention of French Canadians already in uniform, it might well weaken their will-to-war by making them feel that their services are not fully appreciated in other parts of Canada. There is always the danger that attacks by one group of people in Canada on another may be used in wartime by enemy agents to fan the flames of controversy and thus tend to impair Canada's war effort which depends for its maximum potential on a high state of national unity.

We fully recognize that two parties are involved in these controversies and we have taken steps to draw to the attention of the other parties the danger that the course they are following may bring them eventually within the meaning of 39A of the Defence of Canada Regulations. What is said in a church in Toronto does not come within our jurisdiction in any way, but we are responsible for advising editors of publications against publishing material which might bring them into conflict with one of the regulations which have been drawn up for the protection of Canadian war morale.

We have every confidence in your own loyalty and zeal for victory and we feel sure that by drawing to your attention the damage which may be unwittingly done among certain important sections of the Canadian public by expressing strong views on controversial subjects in these difficult times, we shall have your wholehearted co-operation.

It has been our determined policy since the outbreak of war as Press Censors to extend and maintain the freedom of the press to the greatest possible extent, consistent with the maintenance of Canadian war morale, and we do not feel that it is unreasonable to ask our public to refrain from strong expressions, which may be perfectly legitimate in peacetime but which may, on the other hand, do great damage in wartime if allowed to develop unchecked.

Sincerely yours,

(signed) W. EGGLESTON,

PRESS CENSOR FOR CANADA.

THE EDITOR'S REPLY  
THE GOSPEL WITNESS,  
TORONTO

December 31st, 1940.

W. Eggleston, Esq.,  
Press Censor for Canada,  
Office of Censorship Co-ordination Committee,  
Press Censorship,  
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Mr. Eggleston:

I am in receipt of your letter of December 20th, in which you refer to the issue of THE GOSPEL WITNESS, of December fifth. I have not replied earlier, partly because of the press of the intervening season, and partly because I wanted to give your letter careful thought.

Your communication raises a problem of such grave public importance, that it is impossible for me to make an adequate reply without writing at such length as must exceed the reasonable limits of an ordinary letter. I write deliberately, and with great care, with a view to the publication both of your letter and my reply.

And first, let me present my credentials. I am probably unknown, or little known, to you. I have been minister of Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, for nearly thirty-one years, and therefore may be presumed to know something of the responsibilities of public speech.

During the last war the Jarvis Street congregation gave about three hundred men to the armed services—to be exact, two hundred and ninety eight. And there was not a conscript among them. When conscription was introduced, there was only one man left liable to the new law in this large congregation. In the General Election of nineteen hundred and seventeen I accepted the invitation of the Union Government Committee to deliver a number of addresses in support of the Government and its war measures. Later, I suppose as an indirect recognition of my unreserved support of the British cause, I was invited by the British Ministry of Information to see Britain's war effort. I was the guest of the Ministry, off and on, over a period of four months. During that time, under the auspices of the Ministry, I visited Ireland, and was afforded opportunity of discussing the Irish question with leaders in the North, in Dublin, in Cork, and in London. These included John Dillon, the leader of the Irish Nationalist Party; the acting head of the Sinn Feiners, who was a Roman Catholic priest—De Valera was then in jail; the commanders of the forces in Dublin and in Cork; the Archbishops of Ireland; the principal leaders in Ulster; and later I had the privilege and honour of being Lord Carson's guest at dinner in London, spending a whole evening discussing the Irish problem—especially in relation to the Papacy.

I refer to this merely to show that there is a background of knowledge growing out of years of personal investigation behind the things of which I have recently been speaking.

I am glad that in your letter you do not question the sincerity of my motives or the depth of my conviction. You next remark:

"We feel it to be our duty to draw to your attention the damaging effect which certain passages in your sermon as reported here may have on Canada's war effort"

But so far as I am able to discern, you fail to quote the "certain passages" to which you refer. Perhaps

you will be good enough to let me know what was said in the sermon under review that could possibly produce any "damaging effect . . . on Canada's war effort"?

I have done my utmost to exert what influence I have in support of Canada's war effort. My only complaint is that "Canada's war effort" is not far greater than it is; and I feel sure that the thousands of people who have thronged Jarvis Street Church on Sunday evenings for more than a year past, and the still larger number who have read the printed addresses, would be greatly surprised to hear it charged against me by anyone that any word of mine could possibly have the effect of "damaging" Canada's war effort.

In your second paragraph you say:

"It has been represented to us that the general effect of certain passages on French Canadians, if the material is circulated among them, might discourage recruiting in that province. Moreover, if brought to the attention of French Canadians already in uniform, it might well weaken their will-to-war by making them feel that their services are not fully appreciated in other parts of Canada."

It would appear from these words that complaint is not made by the Press Censorship on the merits of the "certain passages" in question, *per se*, but that certain things have been "represented" to the Censors. Before dealing with the allegation itself, I think I am not exceeding the recognized rights of a British subject, even in war time, when I respectfully suggest that it is difficult for anyone to defend himself against anonymous accusers. I should be reluctant to believe that Canadian jurisprudence had at any point retrogressed to pre-Roman conceptions of justice. A certain governor named Festus is recorded in the twenty-fifth chapter of Acts as saying:

"It is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die, before that he which is accused have the accusers face to face, and have licence to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him."

You do me the honour of giving me credit for sincerity of motive and depth of conviction. I respectfully suggest that no fair judgment of such a matter can be reached without having an equal opportunity to appraise the sincerity of motive and depth of conviction of my critics. I feel sure that your office could have no desire to provoke a religious issue; and I am equally sure there would be almost general agreement that nothing in the Defense of Canada Regulations, nor in the regulations which govern the Office of the Censor, could possibly have been designed to be used in the curtailment of any Canadian's religious liberty.

But now to the substance of these representations which have been made to you.

I note that the possible injurious influence of my remarks is alleged only in respect to its effect upon French-Canadians. In the first place, so far as I am aware, much to my regret, there is now no recruiting proceeding in the Province of Quebec. Indeed, when recruiting was in progress for overseas service in that Province, it was so unsatisfactory that some regiments had to come to Toronto to make up their complement from Ontario by enlisting Ontario men; and that condition was not produced by any remarks of mine. On the contrary, some of these very men who enlisted in Quebec, were my own men, from my own congregation. And let me here remark that considerable numbers of my own men—by which I mean, members of my own church—have besieged the recruiting offices in Ontario,

and, though physically fit, were unable to gain admission to the army. For anyone to suggest that any word of mine, spoken or written, could by any fair construction, discourage recruiting anywhere is, may I say without disrespect, little short, of being absurd.

Your second paragraph further suggests that if what I have said were brought to the attention of French-Canadians already in uniform, "it might well weaken their will-to-war by making them feel that their services are not fully appreciated in other parts of Canada." Any careful reading of what I have said will show that I have always carefully distinguished, first, between French-Canadians and the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. I have repeatedly declared my conviction that if French-Canadians were left to themselves they would be as loyal to Britain and to the Empire as any other Canadians. I have also been careful to distinguish between individual Roman Catholics, whether French-Canadians or Canadians of other racial origins, and the official Papal Hierarchy. I have never spoken on the subject without acknowledging with gratitude the devoted service of multitudes of individual Roman Catholics, both in the Canadian army and in other of the Empire's forces, both French-Canadians and others.

My criticism has been directed against the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in this country primarily, and also against the Papal Hierarchy in general. And I withdraw not one word of criticism I have passed against that organization; and I stand upon my right as a British citizen to exercise my liberty as a Protestant, and protest against the machinations of Papal Rome. That is all I have done, and I repeat, I feel sure—it is only my opinion of course, but I give it for what it is worth—that *there would be in Canada no general approval of the use of war censorship for the suppression of religious opinion.* And I venture to affirm that no reasonable man could object to anything I have said or written on patriotic, but only on religious, grounds.

Having thus written, I now call your attention to some things published in the Province of Quebec. First of all I refer to a report of a speech delivered in Plessisville, Quebec, November 17th, by Mr. Adélard Godbout, Premier of Quebec, and contained in the issue of *l'Action Catholique* of November 18th, 1940. Premier Godbout was reported in *l'Action Catholique* to have spoken as follows:

"The Mobilization Law is the most anti-imperialistic that has ever been passed in this country. This law adds absolutely nothing to the powers which the Federal Government already possessed. On the contrary, it restrains the powers of Ottawa. The Federal Government had the perfect right to mobilize the resources and the citizens of this country for overseas service. The Mobilization Law adds only one clause to the previous statutes, and that is a restrictive clause. This clause decrees that the mobilization of able-bodied men can take place only for the defense of the country. I defy anyone to prove that the law adds anything to the powers of the government of Ottawa.

"I hope that you will understand the incommensurable importance and merits of that legislation. We are a minority in this country. The English, who came here after us, are more attached to England than we are, and that is easily understood. They would like to have seen conscription established for overseas service. But a little handful of French-Canadians led by M. Ernest Lapointe, dictated its will to the country."

*("Nous sommes une minorité en ce pays. Les Anglais qui sont arrivés ici, après nous, sont plus at-*

*tachés que nous à l'Angleterre et cela se comprend parfaitement. Ils auraient voulu que la conscription fût établie pour service outre-mer. Mais une petite poignée de Canadiens français, conduite par M. Ernest Lapointe, a dicté ses volontés au pays.")*

In respect to the above I venture to call your attention to the fact that the Premier of Quebec is allowed to say, and *l'Action Catholique* is allowed to print his saying, that the Mobilization Law was really superfluous save for the restrictive clause which forbade conscription for overseas service. Mr. Godbout remarks:

"We are a minority in this country",

and then adds:

"A little handful of French-Canadians led by M. Ernest Lapointe, dictated its will to the country."

I do not here undertake a discussion of the accuracy of that contention: I merely point out that *the great majority now composing the active service corps of the Canadian army is not made up of French-Canadians, nor is it made up of Roman Catholics; and if it be contended that any words of mine could, by any possibility, have a damaging effect upon the military ardour of French-Canadians whether in or out of uniform, what may be expected to be the possible effect upon the great mass of non-Catholics and non-French-Canadians already in the army, should they read that the Premier of Quebec boasted to a meeting of French-Canadians that*

*"a little handful of French-Canadians led by M. Ernest Lapointe dictated its will to the country", and by so doing made conscription for overseas service and for the reinforcement, by conscription, of those already in uniform, impossible?*

But I make a further quotation, from *Le Devoir*, which is generally regarded as an official voice of the Roman Catholic Church in Quebec. *Le Devoir* is a Catholic Action paper published in Montreal, and its Editor is a former pupil of a Jesuit School. In the issue of *Le Devoir* of November 2nd, 1940, there is an article by Mr. Léopold Richer, Parliamentary correspondent of that paper, entitled, "An Inacceptable Pretext", in the following terms:

"As to the thesis of Mr. Mackenzie King that the principal recommendations of the Sirois Report are a necessity on account of the war, so as to permit the central government to make a maximum war effort, it is entirely inacceptable. French Canada has suffered, in silence and submission to duly constituted authority, the principle of participation in the European War. Mr. Mackenzie King will be the first one to admit that this was an extraordinary concession to Canadian unity on the part of French Canada. But he ought also to admit that it would be neither wise nor prudent, neither in the present nor in the future, to pass the measure. How can he dare ask Quebec to cede to the Federal Government the means which allow the Province to safeguard its autonomy, its liberty, under pretext that it is necessary to fight to the limit in order to assure the liberty of other peoples?"

It is not germane to the subject under discussion to remark upon the Sirois Report, but I call attention to these two sentences:

"French Canada has suffered, in silence and submission to duly constituted authority, the principle of participation in the European War. Mr. Mackenzie King will be the first one to admit that this was an extraordinary concession to Canadian unity on the part of French Canada."

*("Le Canada français a subi, dans le silence et l'obéissance à l'autorité dûment constituée, le principe de la participation à la guerre d'Europe. M. Mackenzie King sera le premier à admettre que c'était là, une*

*concession extraordinaire à l'unité canadienne, de la part du Canada français.")*

Surely the implication is plain that French Canada is opposed to participation in the European War, but "has suffered in silence and submission to duly constituted authority";

and this we are told was

"an extraordinary concession to Canadian unity on the part of French Canada."

That is to say, because French-Canadians submitted to the will of the majority, and suffered "in silence and submission" to Canada's participation in the European war, they made

"an extraordinary concession to Canadian unity."

I call your attention to the fact that these are the words of a Parliamentary correspondent of a French-language paper which is manifestly devoted to the propagation of the interests of the Roman Catholic Church in Quebec. And this Parliamentary correspondent, by saying that French Canada made "an extraordinary concession to Canadian unity" by submitting in silence to "duly constituted authority", to Canada's participation in the war, surely implies that French Canada's participation in the war is a "concession" to "Canadian unity" reluctantly "suffered in silence." I would not have said so, for I hope it is not true.

And this item is reported from Ottawa! And this is published in a French-language Catholic Action paper in Montreal. May I respectfully suggest that if such statements as these were called to the attention of the great majority of our non-French-Canadian soldiers already in the armed services, it would be far more likely to "weaken their will-to-war" by making them feel that "their services are not fully appreciated" than anything I have ever said might do to "weaken the will-to-war" of French-Canadians.

Moreover, such sentiments from such a source, would exercise a far more potent influence upon French-Canadians than anything that I could say.

I venture once more to call your attention to an article in *Le Jour* of December 21st, 1940, entitled, "A Defeatist Friend of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation." The article is written by Jean-Charles Harvey, and is as follows:

#### A Defeatist Friend of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

By JEAN-CHARLES HARVEY—*Le Jour*, Dec. 21, 1940

The double defeat inflicted on the comic opera dictator Mussolini, brings profound chagrin to admirers of Italian Fascism. For some years past these individuals have incessantly blackened the democratic and liberal spirit by offering to us as examples the marvels realized by the gorilla-dictator. It is he who inspired our naughty corporatists, our would-be reformers, our sociologists in slippers, our preachers of the absolute, our failures, our infirm, our austere authoritarians, our kill-joys.

It is not astonishing that they should be confused as they see the ice palace of the Roman tribune crumbling under the heat of defeat, under the breath of justice which brings about its break-up. And hence in *l'Action Catholique* of the 12th of December last, under the signature of M. Louis-Philippe Roy, one finds the following equivocal lines. I invite my readers to weigh every word:

"But if there is reason to rejoice (over the victory of the Greeks and the English against the Italians in Albania and Africa), we ought however, to avoid exaggerating the importance of this victory. In London, official circles invite the press not to forget that if the first phase of the offensive is gained, it is

being pursued without any possibility of foreseeing the final issue.

"At Athens it is admitted that the Italian troops stiffened their resistance since yesterday. The Greeks, however, have obtained some success.

"The conquest of Albania by the Greeks, and the withdrawal of Fascist troops in Egypt are of an encouraging nature. Some are almost persuaded that the outcome of the war is settled.

"Not so fast!

"Even if Italy could not climb the hill again, down which it is now sliding, Hitler's formidable forces remain intact. Unless the Nazi morale cracks and melts with a single blow we shall be forced to conquer the Reich to gain the war. Now, Churchill claims that this will not be possible before two years' time.

"This distant perspective merits reflection. The battle will mean sacrifices of all kinds. Let our present victories be for all an occasion of thanking Providence and of asking Him to make all men more wise in order that the world may merit the divine mercy of peace.

"Let us specially ask God that not a single statesman should despise a single opportunity of making peace if ever this opportunity should present itself. The sooner the war ends the less we shall have to fear that anarchy of which the Honourable Mr. King recently spoke in the Canadian House of Commons.

"There is nothing to hinder us from desiring victories. We have the right and the duty to do so. Again, the Allies will be in a better position to settle the conditions of a just and durable peace if they possess the advantage. Unless it denies its own principles, Nazism cannot impose an equitable peace. On the contrary, in spite of their defects, the Allies have only to apply the principles for which they say they are fighting (*pour lesquels ils disent combattre*) to impose a reasonable peace."

What shall we say of these things? "Let us specially ask God that not a single statesman should despise a single chance of making peace if ever that chance should present itself . . . There is nothing to hinder us from desiring victories . . . The Allies will be in a better position to settle the conditions of a just peace . . . (if they) apply the principles for which they say they are fighting . . ." Otherwise, the Italians would be able to climb the hill again.

In other words this gentleman of *l'Action Catholique* counsels peace at any price, shameful peace if necessary, the peace of cowards, the peace of slaves, in order to hinder the fall of Mussolini. At the most he concedes that it is legitimate to desire "victories". Note that he does not write *the victory*. He says *victories*. He affirms hypocritically that the avowed principles of democracy are only a sham: ". . . the principles for which *they say* they are fighting".

No country at war, outside of Canada, would have let this slyly hypocritical article pass. A censorship awakened in the slightest degree would have applied to such indignities the fitting penalties. In Germany an editor who took upon himself to counsel peace by a voluntary defeat would waken up the morning after in a concentration camp, or perhaps in the next world.

We give this example among many, to demonstrate two things: First, that British tolerance is long suffering toward defeatists and fifth columnists; secondly, that the individuals who are the most favoured by this tolerance are the very ones who bite the hands of their benefactors.

I add that this Mr. Roy is one of those to whom Canadian Broadcasting Corporation gives the privilege of annoying us daily.—J.-Ch. H.

Upon the foregoing I venture to remark that the article under criticism is written by a man who is given right-of-way by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Mr. Louis-Philippe Roy. You will perhaps remember that the sermon which called forth your letter was preached in reply to the radio criticism of Father Lanphier. But here is an article of which, not an English-Canadian but a French-Canadian, says:

"In Germany an editor who took upon himself to counsel peace by a voluntary defeat would waken up the morning after in a concentration camp, or perhaps in the next world."

And this, Mr. Harvey describes as an "example among many".

I am sorry to say that there is little probability of the circulation of THE GOSPEL WITNESS among French-Canadians, particularly among those who do not speak English. And if it were—and Premier Godbout is my authority for the assumption—comparatively few of them would be able to read it.

These considerations force one to the conclusion that such representations as have been made to the Censorship Office in respect to THE GOSPEL WITNESS have not been dictated by a zeal for Canada's war effort, but by a zeal for the Roman Catholic Church.

No one who knows the attempt of Pétain to deliver the French fleet to Germany, can for a moment assume that he is friendly to our cause. And yet Mr. Justice Surveyer of the Supreme Court of Quebec made a public address in Montreal in which he referred to the Pope as "the only sovereign on earth able to appreciate" the action of the Pétain regime; and in face of the British action in possessing themselves of the French fleet—which showed the disagreement of His Majesty's Government with the Pétain regime,—the utterances of Mr. Surveyer were published in all the papers; and so far as I am aware, not one public word of official censure was passed upon it or upon him. Furthermore, Mr. Justice Surveyer described General de Gaulle, who is recognized at the leader of Free Frenchmen by the British Government and is cooperating with the British armed forces, as "a soldier of fortune". Would not such an opinion, publicly expressed by a Justice of the Supreme Court of Quebec, be more likely to discourage recruiting among French-Canadians, and, indeed, among Canadians in general, than anything printed in THE GOSPEL WITNESS?

It happens that we have a fair number of our young men enlisted in the Canadian Navy. Surely it could be argued that a statement from one in such a responsible position as a Justice of the Supreme Court of Quebec to the effect that the only sovereign on earth able to appreciate the action of the Pétain Government which tried to surrender the French fleet to the enemy, was the Pope of Rome, thus implying that His Majesty's Government and the Department of the Admiralty in that Government, took an action that was wrong,—I say, surely that might be taken as likely to discourage enlistment in the Royal Canadian Navy!

Once more: I call your attention to another publication. In *The Catholic Record*, of London, Ontario, of the date of December 14th, 1940, on the front page, with a prominent three-column-wide headline, there is an article which is headed as follows: "Office of Director of Public Information, Ottawa, Ontario. For Release. The Catholic Church and Hitler. In this article a Catholic writer shows the uncompromising opposition of the Pope to Nazi doctrine and philosophy." The article is by Edward Quinn.

I need not discuss the substance of the article. It is enough here to quote from an editorial in the same paper, on page four, as follows:

"Rev. Dr. Shields is a Britisher beside whose patriotism all other patriotism is disloyalty, whose loyalty casts the glow of treason upon all other loyalty. As an antidote

to the phobia with which he has infected his hearers, he has now in his possession a copy of Mr. Quinn's article. It is a statement issued by the office of a department of the Government of the Dominion of Canada of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Catholics will do well to clip the article from the office of the Director of Public Information. The real "Fifth Columnists" will make its possession worth while.

What have we here? A department of the Government at Ottawa used for the defense of the Roman Catholic Church! And the article is published at public expense! Thus the Government at Ottawa uses public money to defend the Catholic Church against its critics. As a consequence an official Roman Catholic paper quotes it as an official Government document to one of the critics of the Roman Catholic Church. And shall Protestants be allowed no liberty to reply? I intend no disrespect when I say that this is analogous in principle—mildly applied so far, I admit, but the same in principle notwithstanding—to Goebbels' propaganda agency: that a Government agency may issue a statement on a religious question, to which no one shall have the right of reply! Here at least is one man who will never submit to such tyranny, even if my protest should cost the last drop of my blood.

I refer now to the third paragraph of your letter in which you say:

"We fully recognize that two parties are involved in these controversies and we have taken steps to draw to the attention of the other parties the danger that the course they are following may bring them eventually within the meaning of 39A of the Defence of Canada Regulations."

Frankly, I do not see how discussions of religious questions have any direct relation to the Defence of Canada Regulations. Personally I make no complaint against my Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. So far as I am concerned, they may discuss me twenty-four hours of every day, and call me what they will. Nothing that they or anyone else could say would dampen my patriotic ardour, nor lessen my desire to do everything within my power for the extension and intensification of Canada's war effort.

In this connection I trust I may be allowed to say that having dealt with men by the hundreds in the matter of recruiting in the last war; and having done my best to make men who are eligible for military service and who are really able to respond to the country's call, as uncomfortable as possible until they get into uniform, I am in a fair position to judge what effect my utterances may have upon others, or the utterances of others upon me.

Of course, the fact is that when any protest is made from the Protestant point of view in respect to the abuse of the radio, or any criticism is offered of Roman Catholic propaganda, we are always assured that "steps will be taken" to prevent its repetition. But the thing goes on just the same. The radio in Ontario and in Quebec seems to be largely dominated by the Roman Hierarchy, and has become one of their chief organs of propaganda.

Not only so, but Canadian stations are carrying network broadcasts by Roman Catholic speakers from the United States, so that the air is filled with Roman Catholic propaganda.

The same is largely true of the public press. In Ontario as well as Quebec, the Papal system is lauded, and articles, like that to which I have referred as issued from the Office of Director of Public Information, are car-



ried in the daily press. No censorship is, or should be, exercised over them in such matters. It would be folly to attempt to reply through the daily press, for the reason that the average paper is too much afraid of a Roman Catholic boycott.

Thus the Protestant conscience is offended, and often insulted. Men of conviction have fought for religious freedom in days gone by, and we had hoped that the battle was won, and that the enemies of religious freedom were finally vanquished. Apparently it is not so.

I thank you for your expression of confidence in my loyalty and zeal for victory. Let me assure you that not even his Majesty the King could be more loyal to our cause, nor more zealous for its prosecution. I must confess that, personally, I writhe in a sense of frustration and impotency when I see what Canada is doing, and when I know what she might do. For myself, there is no position I would not accept, no service I would not gladly render, to hasten the day of complete and overwhelming victory.

Will you allow me to say, with respect, that one who has been many years before the public, and who has been forced to a discussion of controversial matters, does not speak thoughtlessly, and I feel that I am in no danger of doing any damage "unwittingly".

No one could be more desirous of promoting national unity than I am. I enclose a copy of an address delivered before the last general election. I then hoped that national unity was to be a reality. But real national unity will not be effected, as Mr. Roosevelt said on Sunday, by pulling the coverlets over our heads and refusing to face the facts.

I am prepared to produce the witness, and to give the address of the Roman Catholic priest who, in Ontario—not among French-Canadians—said that he was forbidden to discuss Mussolini or Italy's part in the war. And in so saying, he probably spoke for priests in general, and perhaps for Catholic people too.

In speaking as I have done, I have merely called attention to that which is doing more to prevent a united Canadian war effort than any other single thing. The quotations I have made from French speakers and writers show plainly that they do not pretend to such unity except on the terms of a minority dictating its will to Canada—and that in respect to the extent of Canada's participation in the war. This is intolerable to the British conscience, to say nothing of the Christian conscience.

Of course it is true that my discussions will probably be as unpalatable to my Roman Catholic fellow-citizens as their propaganda is unpalatable to me. But as I readily accord them their right to the freest expression of religious views, I demand the same for myself.

In respect to your last paragraph, I cannot but feel that every man of responsibility in Canada will recognize that in a time of war, there must be some curtailment of ordinary liberties. And in respect to all matters related to the armed services—munitions, and indeed Canada's war effort in its totality—persons in authority, must, in the nature of the case, be more thoroughly informed, and are in all probability in a better position to judge as to what information would be likely to be useful to the enemy. I need not assure you of my hearty co-operation in all mat-

ters relating to these concerns. But I am not unmindful of the fact that an effort was made to keep from the public the utterly disloyal address of the Mayor of Montreal; and that the publicity given to that incident made his internment inevitable.

All this has nothing to do with religious propaganda. But there is in this country a religious propaganda that has a political expression, and that is the propaganda of the Roman Catholic Church. I am a loyal subject of His Majesty King George VI. I recognize, only, one higher loyalty, and that to One Who is King of kings, and Lord of lords. If I know my own heart, I am willing cheerfully, if necessity should arise, to die for either of them; and such necessity, as related to the war, would be to die for both, or otherwise to serve both. And it is my profoundest religious conviction that the supreme earthly enemy of both is the Papacy.

I have ventured to submit these matters for your consideration at length in order that you may see not only my point of view, but I think the point of view of a very large number of loyal British Canadian citizens beside.

I am,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS T. SHIELDS.

## UNION NEWS

### AMONG OURSELVES

#### A Column of the Activities of Former Students of Toronto Baptist Seminary

William Street Baptist Church, Lindsay, celebrated their thirteenth anniversary recently. There were good congregations to hear Rev. W. Gordon Brown. The Bible School came within four of its record attendance and had one hundred and twenty-two. Rev. J. Fullard has fine prospects for his work in Lindsay. Some of his regular attendants drive as many as twenty-four miles one way.

Pastor B. D. Wallace has had a long spell of sickness in Westport, Ontario. The supply preacher is Mr. J. Dobson. Mr. Dobson's work at Malvern has been taken on Sundays by Mr. N. Fockler, Mr. A. Melvin, etc.

Rev. J. B. Cunningham, of Bethany Baptist Church, Winnipeg, is now giving time two days a week to teaching in a Bible school in that city.

Rev. John Greening's congregations in Saugerties, New York State, have much improved since he became pastor as the result of a canvass he made of the whole city of ten thousand. His successor at Scotch Line Baptist Church, Ontario, Pastor H. Butler, has had an increase in his congregations throughout the past months.

Private W. Delmas Clark, of the Toronto Scottish Regiment, who through a slight accident was taken with osteomyelitis months ago, has now been invalided home. After a six-day leave at home in Brantford, he is in Christie Street Hospital, Toronto. He is full of enthusiasm for the natural beauties of Old England and for the character of its people. He has some exciting stories to tell of bombing, dog-fights in the air, and so on. Bombs fell in the harbour while the boat in which he returned lay at anchor but he and all his company escaped safely. He says: "I'm still in the army, and hoping I can go back."

### AN INQUEST ON SANTA CLAUS

Now that the good old gentleman in red has come and gone we pluck up enough courage to utter some harsh thoughts about him occasioned by his treatment of our Baptist Treasury in past years. Alas this Christmas was no exception. To come to the point at once we express our suspicion in plain, hard words, even though it may mean some black marks entered against our name in the book which Santa Claus is reputed to keep! We suspect the orthodoxy of this much-vaunted old gentleman. The state of our books each Decem-

ber leads us to doubt seriously whether Santa is really at heart a Baptist! Our only comfort is that it has ever been thus when the joyous Christmas feeling is in the air. But this is cold comfort indeed, especially when we think of the need of our Home Mission pastors who awaited the arrival of our December cheques in order to welcome in fitting fashion Santa's arrival to their chimneys.

We have headed this note "An Inquest on Santa Claus", but that does not mean that we really believe, nor even hope that the old gentleman is dead. It is rather the genuine spirit of Christmas which has been affected adversely, and we hope that these hard words addressed to Santa Claus may meet the eyes of some of those whom he takes into consultation each December. We beg them to remember that the true spirit of Christmas cannot omit gifts to Him to Whom the Wise Men came on the first Christmas, opening their treasures of gold, frankincense and myrrh.

As a post script we add that since Christmas, Santa Claus has already gone far toward redeeming his good name, but there is still the most urgent need of abundant help from all our churches to meet our large Home Mission Budget.

#### ORILLIA AIDS BRITISH WAR VICTIMS

We reprint the following interesting and inspiring note from the "Toronto Telegram":

"Orillia, Nov. 25 (Staff Special)—How the monthly communion offering of a small town church was given in its entirety to The Evening Telegram's British War Victims' Fund, and how the congregation added to it until a total of \$263.05 was reached was told in Orillia today by the Rev. J. Byers of the Bethel Baptist Church.

"We have only 140 people in our congregation," pointed out Mr. Byers. "None of them are what you would call wealthy in this world's goods. Nevertheless we decided to give all we could to the British War Victims' Fund, for little though we might have, we have much more than they.

"The ball was started rolling when we decided to give the entire offering of a monthly communion service. This we did. We were pleased with the response of our people, but decided to add to this sum. A general appeal was made. A farmer member of our congregation gave very substantially. So did everyone. When the fund reached \$263.05 we sent it in to *The Evening Telegram*."

We should like to make the following important addition to the above account. It is taken from a personal letter from Pastor John Byers: "Enclosed please find cheque to the amount of \$50.00 for Home Missions. In October, if I remember correctly, we sent the Union a cheque for \$100.00 so up to the present we are in advance of last year's offerings. Our annual business meeting was held some time ago, and the reports were most gratifying indeed. Over twenty-five baptisms, and the financial report was the best on record, apart from the year the church was built."

We are sure all our readers will wish to join us in heartily congratulating the Orillia Church on their fine work for the British War Victims and on the fact that they have at the same time actually increased their missionary givings. To those who know this fine church this great accomplishment is no surprise. Pastor Byers has built up a strong spiritual church and under his able, aggressive leadership they are able to do wonders as these accounts show.

#### BIBLE SCHOOL LESSON OUTLINE

(Continued from page 8)

3:18). By profession he was a publican or tax-gatherer. In Roman times the duty of collecting taxes for the Government was rented to certain individuals, usually to the highest bidders. If the amount collected by any tax-gatherer exceeded the specified figure, he might keep the balance. This practice encouraged cruelty, oppression and extortion (Lk. 19:8). The minor tax officials were usually Jews, and they were despised by patriotic Jews for renouncing the national ideals and for currying favour from the Romans at the expense of their own countrymen. But the Lord is no respecter of persons (Acts 10: 34, 35); He calls all who need cleansing to come to Him.

Matthew seems to have held a sort of reception in honour of the Lord, inviting men of his own profession and sinners, frequently mentioned in the Gospels along with the publicans, both classes being regarded as outcasts by the scribes and Pharisees. Levi's endeavour to make the Saviour known among those who needed Him was the occasion, but not the cause, for the criticism of our Lord by the scribes and Pharisees, who ever sought occasion against Him. They criticized His association with these so-called outcasts, while His sympathy for the underprivileged condemned their bigotry and selfish aloofness.

The discussion on feasting and fasting suggests that the day of Matthew's gathering may have coincided with one of the Jewish fast days. At any rate, the principle enunciated by our Lord is applicable at all times. Since feasting is connected with joy and fasting with grief, the followers of the Lord have every right to express the bliss they experience in His presence. To be with Christ is the essence of joy; to be separated from Him is the essence of sorrow (Psa. 16:11; Lk. 13:27, 28; Phil. 1:21-23).

The practice of ceremonial fasting as observed by the scribes and Pharisees was but one characteristic of their religion, which consisted largely of externals (Matt. 6: 16-18; 23: 13-33). Our Lord's parable of the new cloth and the old garment was intended to show the folly of patching up the old ceremonial Judaism with the new spiritual Christianity which He was to establish. The legalism of the Judaism then in vogue with its doctrine of salvation by works was not an appropriate vehicle for the dynamic teaching of salvation by grace through the power of God.

#### III. The Pharisees—verses 23 to 28.

Parallel passages: Matt. 12:1-3; Lk. 6:1-5.

The devotion to the externals of religion on the part of the scribes and Pharisees is indicated also in their frequent criticism of our Lord's actions on the Sabbath Day (Mk. 3:2). They had so altered the Old Testament teaching concerning the Sabbath by their traditions that they had obscured the origin and true significance of the day. They became slaves to the letter of the law, and in so doing they contradicted its spirit and purpose (Matt. 15:6; Mk. 7:13; 2 Cor. 3:6).

On this occasion the disciples were hungry; their eating was a "work of necessity". Moreover, the custom of plucking the grain as they passed through the field had Scriptural warrant, and they were taking that to which they had a right (Lev. 19:9, 10; 23:22; Deut. 24: 19-21; Ruth 2: 15, 16). Their action also had Scriptural precedent, for David, whom all the Jews regarded highly, had done a similar thing (1 Sam. 21:6).

The truth brings liberty (John 8:32, 36; 2 Cor. 3:17); not license to disobey the laws of God, but freedom to obey in greater measure. We who belong to Christ have been made free to serve Him (Gal. 5:1; 1 Pet. 2:16). We are to be governed by love to His Person, rather than by a passion for man-made regulations concerning His Word. In our observance of the Lord's Day we shall follow the dictates of the Spirit, knowing that the Lord of the Sabbath is greater than any human law of the Sabbath.

#### BOOKS BY DR. T. T. SHIELDS

|                                                                                                                             |        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| "The Adventures of a Modern Young Man".....                                                                                 | \$1.00 |
| "Other Little Ships".....                                                                                                   | 1.00   |
| "The Plot That Failed" (The story of Jarvis St. Church).....                                                                | 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   |

60 Sermons on the War preached in Jarvis St., from August, 1939, to December, 1940. Five cents each single sermon or any 25 for \$1.00 postpaid. Send for printed list of titles.

The Gospel Witness, published weekly, per annum..... 2.00

Address: THE GOSPEL WITNESS,  
150 Gerrard St. East, Toronto, Can.