

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. 37

TORONTO, JANUARY 16, 1941

Whole Number 974

The Religious Aspects of the Sirois Report

Shall the Dominion Be Mortgaged for the Church of Rome?

An address by Dr. T. T. Shields delivered in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Thursday evening,
January 16, 1941—

Religion is concerned with, and is inseparable from, the fundamentals of human life. It is a voice which speaks of origins and destinies; and insists that the extent to which obligations growing out of the first are fulfilled, must determine the place of the last. There is nothing relating to the life of the individual, to the life of the primary social unit, the family, nor to society at large in its national, international, and world relations, that does not, philosophically, rest upon a religious basis. There can be no true concept of morality in any sphere of life from which a recognition of God is excluded; and without a sense of such moral responsibilities as such recognition involves there can be no right human relations anywhere.

This philosophy of human origins and destinies, and their intermediate obligations and responsibilities, is especially true of the Christian religion. Biblical Christianity relates a man in truth and righteousness to God above him, and to all his neighbours about him, in every sphere and relationship of life. The duty to render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, grows out of our obligation to render unto God the things that are God's.

Christianity was described in New Testament times as a way of life. When Saul of Tarsus was on his way to Damascus, he went armed with authority to "bring them bound unto Jerusalem . . . if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women." No Christian therefore can afford to be indifferent to the constitution of the state under which he lives; and he must ever be on the watch lest the original formulation or later modification of its written principles of life should be of such a character as to render the requirements of Caesar incompatible with his duty to God.

I insist therefore that any theory of statehood which would ignore, or compromise, or impede, or imperil, the full and free and unfettered discharge of one's conscientious religious duty by subordination of religions to economic considerations, must be opposed. We of the British Commonwealth of Nations are now engaged in a gigantic struggle for the preservation of the liberty—liberty in the broadest sense—of the individual, such liberty as Canadians now proudly and gratefully enjoy. While

the state is a divine institution, and its ideal fundamental laws are clearly revealed, any democratic state—which means a state humanly constituted and maintained—like all other human things, will have its imperfections, and will face always the necessity of devising constitutional improvements for its way of life.

The British North America Act was framed to regulate the lives of groups of people widely separated, and spread over a vast and largely unsettled continent. It was framed when means of communication and transportation were in a very primitive state and when the manner of life of the various groups was largely determined by geographical and circumstantial considerations. Hence the instrument which set up a number of provinces, and provided for the erection of others, which now have grown to the number of nine.

The Dominion, now consisting of nine provinces and a central government, is a federal and not a unitary state. Everyone will recognize that in many respects conditions of life obtaining seventy-five years ago when this federal state was contemplated, obtain no longer. We can sit in our own homes and hear men breathe on the shores of the Atlantic and the Pacific. One can now fly from Halifax to Vancouver in less time than a man could drive to see his neighbour in hard weather, forty or fifty miles away, when Confederation was effected.

Localisms and provincialisms, whether of speech or habit of life, or means and methods of maintenance, which seventy-five years ago were deemed indispensable to the individual's freedom, do not, or need not, now obtain. The improved methods of communication, transportation, and distribution, which science has put in our hands, have broken down many of the walls of partition upon which provincial distinctions at the time of Confederation, were founded. It does not seem reasonable that a population scarcely exceeding the population of Greater London should now require nine Legislatures, with a total of five hundred and eleven members; nine Lieutenant-Governors; and a Federal Parliament with a total membership of two hundred and forty-eight (be-

sides ninety-six senators), to enable us to behave ourselves as to get along happily together.

I fear I did not study the terms of reference by which the SIROIS or as it was originally called, the ROWELL COMMISSION, was set up—I am not sure whether they were published or not. But I read of it; and it was my earnest hope that a Commission of honest men of good will would be able to devise such economies in our governmental system as would lift some burdens from Canadian shoulders without in any way jeopardizing such principles of jurisprudence as are indispensable to the unfettered expression of individual life.

But I anticipate the later development of my subject by at once removing one matter from the field of discussion. Nothing in the SIROIS REPORT suggests the possibility or advisability of changing the Dominion from a federal to a unitary state. On the contrary, it sets itself unflinchingly against any such change. I need not burden you with quotations, but if the report were adopted, it would leave us with the nine provincial governments and the government at Ottawa. The report does not ask the member of any Legislature to vote for or consent to his being put out of his position.

One might have supposed that a corporation having nine separate factories, varying in some of their products but fundamentally all doing the same thing, if they were seriously to seek a reduction of the overhead costs, would consider the possibility of closing up some of their factories and amalgamating others, so as to have fewer separate units to heat and light and manage. No commercial or industrial concern, in an endeavour to reduce costs, would think of relieving some of its agencies of a good share of their work, and without reducing salaries or wages, increase its central staff to care for the additional work.

Nine separate Legislatures in the Dominion of Canada constitute a screaming advertisement either of our sectional selfishness or of our crass political stupidity. The nine legislative factories will continue, however, with the blessing of this report—albeit, stripped of some of their functions.

The changes proposed are chiefly economic, and have to do with the rearrangement of sources of revenue, and a re-distribution of the controlling authorities.

And here it may be well to glance for a moment at the personnel of the Commission. No such Commission can possibly become wholly impersonal, or an enlarged business machine. The Commission was made up of four men. In the beginning, the Hon. N. W. Rowell, Chief Justice of Ontario, was selected by the Government as Chairman. Something was done by the Commission under Mr. Rowell's Chairmanship, but his health soon became so unsatisfactory—or at least uncertain—as to compel him to resign. The Commission that did the work and prepared the report consisted of three Professors and one newspaperman. The Chairman was "Joseph Sirois, Esq., LL.D., of the City of Quebec, Notary Public, Professor of Constitutional and Administrative Law at Laval University." The other members were "John W. Dafoe, Esq., LL.D., of the City of Winnipeg, Man.; Professor Alexander MacKay, Esq., Ph.D., Professor of Government, Dalhousie University, Halifax, N.S.; and Henry Forbes Angus, Esq., M.A., B.C.L., Professor of Economics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver."

I hope I shall not be judged unfair if I call your attention to the fact that the Chairman of the Commission

was a Professor in the Roman Catholic Laval University. In the preparation of a report like this, hundreds of experts have been employed; and it cannot be regarded as the work of any one man. The mass of statistical information brought together must have been assembled by an army of experts.

The Commission was more than a fact-finding Commission. The final instructional paragraph of the Terms of Reference reads:

"That the Commissioners be instructed to consider and report upon the facts disclosed by their investigations; and to express what in their opinion, subject to the retention of the distribution of legislative powers essential to a proper carrying out of the federal system in harmony with national needs and the promotion of national unity, will best effect a balanced relationship between the financial powers and the obligations and functions of each governing body, and conduce to a more efficient, independent, and economical discharge of governmental responsibilities in Canada."

It will be seen therefore that the Commission was to do more than gather evidence: it was instructed to express their opinion in respect to the facts assembled, and really to make recommendations which would involve the reconstruction of the constitutional economic structure of the Dominion.

That was its tremendous task—and that of course, would be involved in the adoption of the Commission's report. It would amount to re-writing a very large part of the British North America Act.

In my judgment, the Ottawa Government, by its very action in calling for a consideration of the report at this time, has made a most painful though unwitting disclosure of its whole attitude toward the war. If one could put upon the discussion of this Report the most charitable and conciliatory construction possible; if it could be assumed that its main factors might, by discussion, be soon resolved into a pattern agreeable to all the Provinces, there would still inevitably be left a residue of contentious matter which, though assuming the existence of the best of intentions, would be bound to provoke such discussions as would separate rather than unite, temporarily at least, some of the political components of the Dominion.

Can it be assumed that the Government consistent with a full-time, "all-out", war effort was yet possessed of a surplus, unoccupied, idle, legislative and executive capacity which would enable it to do two big things at once? Must we not rather conclude that by the very fact that while civilization in general, and the British expression of it in particular, is battling to keep its head above water on the seas, and to cope with billows of flame and man-made earthquakes on land, and protect itself from fire and brimstone dispensed by the prince of the power of the air, the Government of Canada can actually contemplate the leisurely re-writing of the Constitution of the Dominion? Does not that fact itself, I say, proclaim the further fact that the Government of Canada is not yet half awake to the perils of the hour? And because its mind and its hands are but half engaged in the war, it has the disposition and the unoccupied leisure to toy with professorial, academic, doctrinaire theories of governmental science.

When Nehemiah was so occupied with rebuilding Jerusalem, which had been laid waste by the Babylonian conqueror, that he gave the order, "Let every one with

his servant lodge within Jerusalem, that in the night they may be a guard to us, and labour on the day. So neither I, nor my brethren, nor my servants, nor the men of the guard which followed me, none of us put off our clothes, saving that every one put them off for washing", when he was engaged thus in this "all out" programme to overcome the destructive work of the tyrant, there were those that proposed they should cease from their labour, and meet in conference; to whom Nehemiah sent messengers, saying: "I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down; why should the work cease, whilst I leave it, and come down to you?"

We may now know how busily occupied the Government at Ottawa is with the war, by its turning aside from its prosecution for the present conference. Had the Prime Minister been properly seized with the horrors that threaten the world, had he ever felt a proper sense of his responsibility for the leadership of the nation in this time of crisis, he would have answered the Sannaballs and Tobiahs and Geshems of Quebec by saying, "I am fighting a great fight so that I cannot come down. Why should Canada's war effort cease while I leave it and come down to you?"

But whether we like it or not, the Report is being discussed—and this, notwithstanding that no Premier or Legislature of any Province in Canada has received a mandate from the people of the Province to re-write the provincial constitutional provisions of the Dominion Constitution. Neither has the Government at Ottawa, large as is its majority, received any mandate from the people of Canada to re-write the Constitution of this Dominion. And such a matter should be contemplated and considered only when the minds of the people as a whole are in such a free and unoccupied condition as to make it possible for them really to understand the far-reaching effects and implications of the changes proposed.

It is of the very essence of true democracy that its Government should be an expression of the intelligent, considered, judgment of all the people.

I return then to a consideration of the personnel of the Commission. Its Chairman is a Roman Catholic professor of Constitutional Law at Laval University. What the religious affiliations of the other members of the Commission may be, I do not know; but the smoking ruins of the devastated neutral countries of Europe proclaim the principle that aggression will always force the hand of inactive neutrality. If anyone suggests that I am unduly suspicious, I remind them of the saying of Premier Godbout that "a little handful of French-Canadians led by M. Ernest Lapointe imposed its will on the country." I must not be blamed when I note that the Committee which appointed Professor Sirois as Chairman of the COMMISSION was composed of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Justice—M. Ernest Lapointe.

I must confess that I read the Report before troubling to see who the Chairman really was, and whence he came; and quite apart from the influence of his name, I discerned at once that the argument of the report is one of the finest examples of adroit special pleading I have ever read. Before facts are assembled, or economic necessities are considered, the argument is designed to prejudice the mind in a particular direction.

Perhaps it was necessary to remind us that the greatest difficulty in the way of union in eighteen hundred and sixty-seven was found in Quebec.

In this connection it is noted that "Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, with their acceptance of the English common law, were in agreement on precisely those matters in which each differed so completely from Quebec." (Book 1, p. 34). From this forward it is argued that successive legislative acts "were long understood to be the essential laws for safeguarding the fundamental institutions and ways of life in Quebec."

The real point, of course, in all this argument is that what is called "the way of life" of French Canada was essentially different from that of other parts of the country comprising the new Dominion; and it seems to be assumed that every law was passed with a view to "safeguarding", and therefore by implication, perpetuating that distinctive difference.

The fourth chapter declares that "the discussion of conscription and other issues which were so disturbing to national unity over twenty-years ago is a delicate matter even at this late date." (Book 1, p. 94). It is also significantly remarked: "At the risk of being misunderstood we have, therefore, felt it imperative that these issues should be recalled, and set out here as objectively and fairly as possible."

It seems to us that if the Commission had especially set out to perpetuate those influences that "were so disturbing to national unity over twenty years ago", it could scarcely have done better.

We make a few further quotations:

"Before conscription became a burning political question, there had been marked differences in the ratio of enlistments among the different elements of the population. Naturally enough, the response of the British-born had far exceeded that of the native-born."

The words, "naturally enough", indicate the point of view of the writer of this chapter. There is a basic assumption that French Canada was essentially different and separate from the rest of the country—that, indeed, there was no real unity at all. No credit is given for the ready response of the British-born: no criticism is passed respecting the reluctance of French-speaking Canada to do its full share. The difference between the two is simply explained by the words, "naturally enough".

Once more:

"There was a difference between English-speaking Canada as a whole and French-speaking Canada in the response to voluntary recruiting."

The responsibility for the difference does not lie with the French-Canadians. From the point of view of the Commissioner, the French-Canadians are impeccable. So, to give them a clean bill for their unresponsiveness, the Government is blamed:

"There were serious and exasperating mistakes in the management of recruiting in the Province, mainly through lack of sympathetic appreciation of how a sensitive people cherished their distinctiveness."

This quotation also contains an illuminating phrase: "how a sensitive people cherished their distinctiveness." We have observed a thousand times that people who shirk responsibilities, and justify themselves for evading burdens legitimately their own, invariably assume that they are a "sensitive people", and therefore are entitled to "cherish their distinctiveness." Of course other people may be "sensitive" and "distinctive" too, but the right of others to indulge their sensitive-

ness, and at the expense of everybody else to cherish their distinctiveness, is never recognized.

In apology for this difference, we are told:

"There were basic factors which lay much deeper. The French-speaking Canadians had been established in Canada for centuries."

And yet tens of thousands of them, in all probability, scarcely know the names of their grandfathers; nor whether they were born in Canada or in Europe! But the writer has a cause to plead, and therefore he proceeds:

"Their political connection with France had been severed 150 years before and they had never formed a close sentimental attachment for republican France with its anti-clerical associations."

Now the whole story is out! French Canada had no heart in the last war, because they had no "attachment for republican France with its anti-clerical associations." Which is to say that the basic reason for the detachment was not that they were French, for France was in the war; but that they were primarily clericalists, or otherwise, Roman Catholics.

And as though to add fuel to the flame, the writer raises the bilingual bogey respecting Ontario schools:

"In that year Ontario enacted further legislation in support of its separate school policy and the Federal Government declined to disallow it. The dispute over the bilingual school question, as it was called, went on with increasing bitterness, revealing the gaps which divided French-speaking citizens, in feelings and interests, from English-speaking Canada and emphasizing again the difficulty of tolerable accommodation between the two races. On the instance of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, a resolution was introduced in Parliament deploring the action of the Ontario Legislature."

We are then informed in a footnote respecting this matter:

"The resolution was actually introduced by Mr. Lapointe and is commonly known as the 'Lapointe resolution'."

Now a few further quotations:

"The split over the bilingual question foreshadowed the much more serious division on the issue of conscription. The principle of the political cooperation of the two races in the two federal parties had already begun to break down in 1916, because one of the races was being rapidly consolidated behind one of the political parties.

"The dispute over the separate school policy of Ontario embittered the debate on conscription . . . The issue led many into bitter opposition of Canada's participation in the War."

And so, because they were denied an official recognition of the French language in the English-speaking Province of Ontario, many of the French-Canadians opposed Canada's participation in the war! These disputes, it is said,

"Inevitably diminished the support which Quebec gave to the supreme objective of the Federal Government."

Again:

"In Quebec, the proposal of conscription met with general opposition."

Again:

"Within the walls of Parliament, the Liberal Party was becoming identified with the Province of Quebec and Parliament itself was dividing on racial lines."

Again:

"Despite passionate opposition the policy of conscription commanded the support of a majority of the people of Canada."

Again:

"The Union Government swept English-speaking Canada while Quebec gave solid support to Sir Wilfrid Laurier's opposition to conscription."

And still the compiler of this Report pursues his argument. Everybody is to blame but the French-Canadians:

"Resentment at the manner in which the Military Service Act was applied in the following year gave an impetus to political action by farmers' organizations and immediately after the close of the War they took advantage of the confusion and weakness in the Liberal Party to enter the political field."

Again it is said:

"Canadians are reluctant to recall the events which reopened old antagonisms and renewed distrust and bitterness between the two races. It is imperative that the distrust and bitterness which should be forgotten but it has been necessary to recall the events which provoked them because they have had a deep influence on the subsequent history of Canadian federalism and because they point to certain general lessons about the operation of the federal system in Canada."

The "lesson" presumably is that there must be no conscription in Quebec for the support of extra-Canadian interests. That perhaps is the reason why, as Premier Godbout says, "A little handful of French-Canadians led by M. Ernest Lapointe, dictated its will to the country." And here is more of it:

"The instinctive diversity of Canadian life did not long remain constant to a single conception of ends and means."

Again:

"Canada lacks that homogeneity and this, in turn, limits the extent of collective endeavour which can be effectively organized under Dominion control."

Surely this is an announcement that there is little use of trying to bring Quebec into line, for it is added:

"This is why Canada is a federal state and must remain so. Deep underlying differences cannot be permanently overcome by coercion."

And so throughout it is always Quebec, Quebec!

"The War period strengthened tendencies and opinions already evident in Quebec."

Again:

"Quebec became still further disposed to question any increase in federal power."

Again:

"Quebec became, more than before, a watchful guardian of provincial rights."

This is enough to illustrate the trend of the argument. The deep-rooted, ineradicable, devotion to clerical, that is, Roman Catholic interests, separates Quebec from the rest of the Dominion, and is assumed to justify her in shirking her full responsibilities as a member of the Federation. And let it be borne in mind that this Report is put forward by the present Government at Ottawa as a basis of national unity!

Noting the drift of population from metropolitan to urban centres both in Ontario and Quebec, it is said that in Quebec this tendency was more pronounced "despite the encouragement to colonize given by the Provincial Government and the Church." Thenceforward we find the Government and the Church generally linked together. Please to observe, "the Church" — not the churches. Not the United Church, not the Anglican Church, nor the Presbyterian Church nor the

Baptist churches, but "the Church—spelled with a capital. This Report, put out by a Government Commission, utterly ignores other religious bodies than "the Church", the Roman Catholic Church, which is so closely associated with the Government.

It is noted later that the British North America Act secured the Province in control of education:

"The possibility of relieving the consequent growing burden on the provinces and municipalities through substantial federal aid to education was limited if not entirely excluded by latent racial and religious issues."

Please keep that in mind. Someone is contemplating "substantial federal aid to education", but regrets that it was "limited if not entirely excluded by latent racial and religious issues." Anyone of discernment who follows that report through its discussions of economic questions may easily recognize that the writer never loses sight of his goal.

We shall see presently that at least one of the principal objects of the recommendations of this Report is to secure more money for Quebec. Ontario supplies approximately fifty per cent. of the Dominion revenue, and a sharp contrast is drawn between Ontario and Quebec. Ontario is as rich as Croesus! Geographically, and in every other way, it is a paradise! Really, one can scarcely read the Report without forming a neutral picture of some men surveying a bank from a distance, with their caps pulled down over their eyes, and telling each other that if only they could get in, they might hope for a rich haul. We do not wish to be offensive, but the attitude of the Report toward Ontario is not unlike that of Hitler toward the Russian Ukraine, the gold stored in the banks at Prague, the food supply of the Low Countries, the wealth of France and of the British Empire. Bluecher is reported to have said of Paris, "What a city to sack!" Ontario? What a province to sack!

What of Quebec? Poor Quebec! She is like Pharaoh's ill-favoured kine. "Naturally enough," she will eat up the kine of Ontario, so fat and well-favoured. Ontario is rich, Quebec is poor; therefore we must find some way for transferring some of the wealth of Ontario to Quebec.

That, in itself, would not be an evil thing if the wealth of the one and the poverty of the other merely happened. The fact is, the wealth of a country does not consist exclusively in its lakes and rivers, forests and fields and mines: the chief asset of any country is its people; and while the Report makes mention of the "cultural interests" of French Canada, and assumes that the people themselves are different and distinct from all others, it might be supposed that Ontario is inhabited by a mongrel population.

What strange presence is there in Quebec which makes it so different from Ontario? It is more than race or language. What withering blight rests upon Quebec? It is not unique. Wherever the same influences are at work, the same contrast appears. Let Lord Macaulay explain, thus:

"During the last three centuries, to stunt the growth of the human mind has been her chief object. Throughout Christendom, what ever advance has been made in knowledge, in freedom, in wealth, and in the arts of life, has been made in spite of her, and has everywhere been in inverse proportion to her power. The loveliest and most fertile provinces of Europe have, under her rule, been sunk in poverty, in political servitude, and in intellectual torpor, while Protestant countries,

once proverbial for sterility and barbarism, have been turned by skill and industry into gardens, that can boast of a long list of heroes and statesmen, philosophers and poets. Whoever, knowing what Italy and Scotland naturally are, and what, four hundred years ago, they actually were, shall now compare the country round Rome with the country round Edinburgh, will be able to form some judgment as to the tendency of Papal domination. The descent of Spain, once the first among monarchies, to the lowest depths of degradation, the elevation of Holland, in spite of many natural disadvantages, to a position such as no commonwealth so small has ever reached, teach the same lesson. Whoever passes in Germany from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant principality, in Switzerland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant canton, in Ireland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant country, finds that he has passed from a lower to a higher grade of civilization. On the other side of the Atlantic the same law prevails. The Protestants of the United States have left far behind them the Roman Catholics of Mexico, Peru and Brazil. The Roman Catholics of Lower Canada remain inert, while the whole continent round them is in a ferment with Protestant activity and enterprise. The French have doubtless shown an energy and an intelligence which, even when misdirected, have justly entitled them to be called a great people. But this apparent exception, when examined, will be found to confirm the rule; for no country that is called Roman Catholic has the Roman Catholic Church, during several generations, possessed so little authority as in France."

The question is, Is there any essential difference between the hackneyed "cultural" life of Quebec and Ontario? Is there any reason for Ontario's being richer, or Quebec poorer? We begin to see a little more light from such a statement as this:

"The municipal and real property tax situation was particularly complicated by the unique role which the Church plays in Quebec. Many functions, particularly in the field of public welfare and education, which are carried out by the local or provincial governments in other provinces are supported by the Church in Quebec. Although the personnel engaged on these services serve for mere nominal pay, there are substantial and unavoidable overhead costs which in the last analysis must be borne by the same incomes that support provincial and municipal taxation. As a result the Quebec taxpayer contributes more for services which in other provinces are largely supplied by the state than is evident from public finance statistics. These costs affect real estate in particular, both directly and through the exemption from taxation of the major portion of religious property."

What are the sources of revenue? Here is the answer:

"The outstanding feature of the Ontario revenue system is the high yield, both proportionately and absolutely, of real property taxation. This particular source has long been the backbone of Ontario public finance as might be expected from the highly urbanized character of the economy. It is chiefly through real property taxation that Ontario governments have taken advantage of the wealth and income which natural advantages and national policies concentrate in Ontario. In addition, Ontario has been in a particularly favoured position to develop income taxes and succession duties to tap the same taxable surpluses. In the decade ending 1937 Ontario collected \$100 million of total succession duty collections of \$180 million in Canada. In 1937 succession duties and income taxes amounted to \$7 per capita, or nearly one-half the total revenue of the provincial government in Quebec, for example."

Here then are two sources of income for Ontario: tax from real property, and the revenue from Succession Duties.

Let us now make a comparison of the income from real property taxation in Quebec and Ontario. I will not trouble to be exact with the hundreds of thousands—who cares for such small matters anyhow? But here

it is: 60½ million dollars revenue in Quebec: 107¼ millions in Ontario. We shall try to explain the difference a little later. Then when we come to Succession Duties, there is also great disparity between Ontario and Quebec. I give you the high and low records in Ontario; the high is 20 million a year, the low, 12 million. In Quebec the high is 11 million, the low, 3 million. The yield from personal income taxes for provincial purposes is also much higher in Ontario than in Quebec, and the same is true of corporation income tax.

What is the reason for the difference in the yield from real estate? We will not bother with hundreds of thousands, but keep to millions. In Ontario exempted property was valued at \$380,000.00; in Quebec, the valuation of exempted property was \$734,000.00. But the \$734,000.00 in Quebec, according to Jean-Charles Harvey, editor of *Le Jour* and former official statistician, does not include property owned by religious orders. In all probability the value of property owned by religious orders, would be as much more, but it is not possible to quote exact figures for the reason that the Quebec law has no authority to obtain any estimation of the value of these properties. They are, indeed, beyond the jurisdiction of the law. It is probably therefore not an exaggeration to say that the exempted religious property of one sort and another in the Province of Quebec has a value of not less than a billion and a half dollars.

No wonder Quebec's income from real estate taxes is so much less than that of Ontario!

Once again, the difference between 11 and 20 million, high, and 3 and 8 million, low, for the provinces of Quebec, in Ontario's favour. Why the discrepancy? The population of Quebec is somewhat less than that of Ontario, and for argument's sake it might be admitted—though I doubt it—there are fewer great fortunes in Quebec. Unless I am mistaken, there are some very, very big ones roundabout St. James Street!

Again I have no figures, but I should think it would be possible to obtain them by an examination of the court records of wills probated in the Province—but I venture the suggestion that perhaps nowhere in the world does any church profit by bequests left in the wills of the people as in Quebec. It would be interesting to discover just how much money is thus bequeathed to the Church—and of course upon all such bequests no Succession Duties are paid. The Church not the Government, profits as these estates are left for the saying of prayers for souls in purgatory.

Nor is that all. The Quebec Government has a Department of Colonization. I give this report from the November 26th issue, 1940, of *Le Devoir*:

"Quebec, Nov. 26: Since the beginning of the summer season 1,700 families of colonists have been established in various districts in the Province.

"This is what we learned yesterday at the Provincial Service for the Establishment of Colonists.

"About 1,000 families, which include 5,500 persons, have been sent to the colonization districts under the terms of the Federal Provincial Plan. 700 other families, making a total of 3,800 persons, have been established according to the Provincial Plan

"The number of houses reconstructed has reached 600. In addition, 700 new houses have been constructed. The Government offers a premium of \$250.00 for the construction of each house. In addition, it furnishes, free of charge, plans and blueprints.

"The Department of Colonization has also brought about the construction of 380 barns for the colonists, by means of a premium of \$75.00 per barn in addition to the plans and blueprints furnished without charge.

"In the spiritual realm the colonists have not been forgotten. The Rev. Father Bergeron, missionary colonizer, informed us that the Department constructed 10 churches and 8 presbyteries (priests' houses). The government gives \$3,200 per church, and \$800.00 for each presbytery. It adds \$200.00 when the colony installs a water system in the presbytery."

It is to be observed therefore that the Quebec Government is so rich that in one year the Colonization Department had constructed ten churches and eight presbyteries—or priests' houses. To each church they had given \$3,200.00, and for the building of each presbytery or priest's house, \$800.00. That is, the Government had given \$32,000.00 for the erection of churches, and \$6,400.00 for the building of priests' houses—and it adds \$200.00 when the colony installs a water system in the presbytery. My surmise is that all eight presbyteries had water systems installed! Which means that during this last year the Quebec Government expended the tidy sum of \$40,000.00 of public money for building Roman Catholic churches and priests' house.

I have not heard of the Quebec Government's ever making a contribution for the building of a Protestant church, or a Protestant minister's house of any sort.

If you look at the income tax returns, you find a disparity there, and discover that in the very large incomes the tax in Quebec for Provincial purposes is only one-third what it is in Ontario. It would seem that it is because so large a proportion of the Provincial income goes into the coffers of the Roman Catholic Church.

There is another matter to which I direct your attention. This report recommends that the Dominion,

"assume the larger of either the net debt service of the Provincial Government (that is, of Quebec) or 40 per cent. of the total net debt service of Provincial and municipal governments."

What would that debt involve? The enormous debt, of course, of the City of Montreal, resulting so largely from its horribly corrupt administration;

"All provincial debts (including both direct obligations and those guaranteed by provinces) plus the debt of certain Quebec hospitals and other charitable and educational institutions for which interest and amortization is provided by subsidies from the provincial government."

But that is not all. I set out a paragraph from the Report:

"The role of religious institutions in Quebec requires special mention for financial reasons, because these bodies have habitually provided educational and welfare services which in other provinces have been for the most part the responsibility of the state. This fact makes comparisons with other provinces particularly difficult, and from some of the submissions made before the Commission it would appear that there are frequent misapprehensions as to the efforts being directed towards educational and welfare services in Quebec. Unfortunately, accurate statistics of the monetary equivalent of the contribution of the Church are not available; for example, most of the personnel are paid only nominal salaries. To allow for this factor the Commission has assumed that the contributions of religious institutions and the fees paid by pupils and other beneficiaries have brought education and welfare expenditures in Quebec to the national average. In view of other direct estimates of this contribution the assumption does not appear unreasonable, although the amount involved is very large. In the absence of any precise statistics this is the only procedure open, since it would be absurd to suggest that the educational and welfare services in Quebec are infer-

ior to those in other provinces to the extent to which the expenditure of public funds in Quebec falls below the per capita expenditure in other provinces."

I have quoted the Report as speaking of hospitals, and orphanages, and other welfare agencies, which are owned by the Church, against which bonds are held by certain trustees, and guaranteed by the province. The paragraph I have quoted includes these institutions as part of the Provincial welfare equipment. Therefore the debts resting upon these Roman Catholic institutions would be included in the total transferred to the Dominion. The same would apply to the educational institutions; and the debt thus transferred to the Dominion would have to be paid by all the rest of Canada. And fifty per cent. of it would come from the tax-payers of Ontario!

Some may object that hospitals and other institutions owned by the Roman Catholic Church are really welfare institutions, and that the legal ownership signifies little. My contention is that there is nothing owned by the Roman Catholic Church anywhere, whether it be a hospital, a monastery, a nunnery, an orphanage, a newspaper, a publishing house, a school, or a church, that is not an agency for the propagation of Roman Catholicism; and the people of this and other provinces would thus be required to help to pay the debt resting upon institutions owned by the Roman Catholic Church.

The Report further recommends a system of National Adjustment Grants. They are, in principle, what we Baptists might call, in respect to our weaker churches, Home Mission grants; what, I believe, the Presbyterians call grants from their Augmentation Fund. But call it what you will, they are designed to make up the deficit of the annual revenue of the local institution, and thus assist in its maintenance.

We are informed that:

In the outline of "Plan I. no conditions are attached to the National Adjustment Grants. They are given when a province cannot supply average standards of certain specified services without greater than average taxation, but the province is free to determine on what services the grants will be spent, or whether they will be used not to improve services but to reduce provincial (and municipal) taxation."

"We do not think it would be wise or appropriate for the Dominion to make grants ear-marked for the support of general education."

These grants are not earmarked for any particular purpose: they are handed over to the Province, and the Province is left "free to determine" what use will be made of them. That is to say, it can apply the grants to the welfare service; it can apply them to education; or, if it likes, it need not apply them to either, but on the strength of this income, may reduce the taxation of the province—because someone else is paying their taxes for them! That surely is a most extraordinary provision.

But again we find this:

"No province would receive a payment to enable it to improve inferior services if it had chosen to have inferior services in order to tax its residents less severely than the average. The only exception to this general method was in the case of Quebec where the notable work of the Church in the fields of education and public welfare could neither be ignored nor measured in monetary terms. Consequently, in the case of Quebec it was necessary to make the arbitrary assumption that the contribution of the Church brought education and welfare service standards up to the national average."

And so, on the basis of an "arbitrary assumption," without any statistical provincial proof of its accuracy, this "only exception to the general method was in the case of Quebec." It will be observed that an exception is made in the case of Quebec everywhere, and always, in Quebec's favour at the expense of all the other Provinces of the Dominion.

But what shall be said of this arbitrary assumption, and of the standard of Quebec services? Poor Ontario comes in for it again, for we are told:

"The per capita expenditures on education and social welfare in that Province (Ontario) are about 10 per cent. above the Canadian statistical average. Even after allowance has been made for the higher costs in Ontario than in some of the other provinces there seems no doubt that the quality of services is well above that of those provided by most other provinces. This high standard can be maintained under Plan I, as it is now, by taxation which is less burdensome than that which is imposed by other provinces. There is no suggestion that Ontario should not continue to provide these services but there is also clearly no claim for national assistance to maintain these standards."

Thus extravagant Ontario has perhaps two bath-rooms where Quebec has only one, and therefore Ontario is not to get so much as a dollar toward paying the plumber's bill; whereas in Quebec the Government—poor Quebec!—provides \$200.00 to put a water system in the priest's house! It will thus be seen that, in order that Quebec should be eligible for the National Adjustment Grants, the fulfilment of the national standard of welfare services is established on the basis albeit of an "arbitrary assumption"; for it is said:

"It would be absurd to suggest that the educational and welfare services in Quebec are inferior to those in other provinces to the extent to which the expenditure of public funds in Quebec falls below the per capita expenditure in other provinces."

But what are the facts? Mr. Jean-Charles Harvey, in *Le Jour*, describes his own Province as "the most ignorant Province in the Dominion". The Prime Minister of the Province, Mr. Godbout, levels rather a wholesale criticism against the French Roman Catholic schools of Quebec. He said:

"Our young people ought not be trained until they are twenty years of age by an education that prepares them for nothing unless they wish to become priests."

The notorious Duplessis at once leaped to the defense of the priests, and insisted that no public man had a right to insult them.

But what are the fruits of a school system completely dominated by the Church? We quote from an official Dominion Government publication, "Illiteracy and School Attendance, Census monograph No. 5", based on the 1931 census, as follows: The percentage of illiterate male population ten years of age and over in the two provinces is as follows:

Ontario	2.71
Quebec	6.21

Startling as the figures are, they do not tell the whole story, as there are many French-Canadians in Ontario, and many English-Canadians in Quebec. Hence the following statistics for the whole of Canada give a truer picture of the fruits of a Roman Catholic school system. The percentage of illiterates in Canada (ten years of age and over):

British races	0.88
French	6.18

This means that French Roman Catholicism produces approximately seven times as many illiterates as are found among those of British extraction, the majority of whom are Protestants.

I quote again from a Quebec report dealing with the rural schools in Quebec, which shows that:

"1. More than 30,000 children from 7 to 13 years of age have not attended rural schools at all during the year 1938-39.

"2. Of 282,865 who are enrolled, 16% have been absent, on an average, each day. That is to say, the majority of the pupils have missed about one day per week.

"3. Of a total of 25,133 pupils who did not return to school, 8,453 are enrolled in another institution. There remains, then, 16,680 children who have finally left school some after the fourth year, the others after the 5th, 6th or 7th."

Notwithstanding the Sirois Report, prepared under the Chairmanship of the Roman Catholic professor of Laval University, insists that it would be "absurd" to assume that the educational system of Quebec is inferior to that of other Provinces.

And mark, the accrued deficit for all these institutions might, under this Report, be charged to the Dominion, and thus to you and to me. And we should be forced, as tax-payers of Ontario, to pay our share of the National Adjustment Grants to Quebec for an educational system that at best, according to the Premier of Quebec, prepares young people for nothing but to be priests; and at worst, allows them by the thousands finally to leave school at the end of periods from four to seven years. And for the maintenance of this splendid condition, a minimum allowance of \$8,000,000.00 a year is to be made to Quebec, plus the National Adjustment Grants that may be made according to the exigencies of the time when they are made, I believe, for five-year periods.

The Premiers of all the Provinces, with their staffs, have been brought together at Ottawa to consider this Report. Premier Aberhart did not use too strong a term when yesterday he said that to presume to base national unity upon the adoption of this Report would be nothing less than "diabolical". Can any reasonable men, with this Report before him, doubt that one of the main purposes of the argument of the Commission—was that "a handful of French-Canadians, led by M. Ernest Lapointe, should dictate its will to the country."

Those who see in this Report the action of certain corporations to enhance the value of bonds held against the various provinces, can, at most, be only partly right. In our view, that is the least objectionable feature of the Report.

If any Province should be in default on its bonds, either in respect to interest or principal, it would be bound to impair in some measure the credit of the whole Dominion. Provinces like Alberta and Saskatchewan particularly, which have suffered so terribly from causes beyond their control, deserve help and ought to have help. The same is true of the Maritimes, insofar as their particular situation, if they are in difficulties, is not of their own creation. Quebec also should be helped if its present condition is due to conditions which Quebec itself could not control. But the undisputable fact is that the Roman Catholic Church, like a malignant parasite, has fastened itself upon the body of Quebec, and is draining it of the last

drop of its blood, reducing it to something little better than an emaciated political skeleton, if the Report is to be believed.

And then this same malignant parasite stretches out its tentacles, and through a "handful of French-Canadians led by M. Ernest Lapointe," seeks to wrap itself about the vitals of the whole Dominion—including this Province.

And on what ground does Quebec demand these exceptional favours? Her superior loyalty? Her unusual service in peace or in war? The Report tells us she was against us in the last war, and implies she is against us in this. The Report tells us she was against us in the last war on religious grounds: on the same grounds she is against us in this. In the last war she was against republican France because of its "anti-clericalism". In this war, she is against Britain, and for the men of Vichy, and the France to which all privileges of the Church—including the Jesuit Order—have been restored. She was behind in enlistment in the last war: she is behind in this. I can only assume that French-Canadians, left to themselves, would be as loyal as other Canadians of other racial origin; but nothing is clearer to me than that behind this Report is the cunning of the Roman Hierarchy of Quebec; and in the insistence of Premier King's chief, Mr. Lapointe, that this Report should be considered now, there is an attempt, under a specious plea for national unity, to fasten a blanket mortgage on the whole Dominion in the interests of the Church of Rome; thus to compel non-Romanist taxpayers, whether they like it or not, indirectly to contribute to the propagation of Romanism.

Were I included in the delegation of Premiers, I would move without delay that the Conference close, that the Premiers and their delegates return to their homes; that Premier King and his colleagues be earnestly requested at once to get back to their jobs, and get on with the war. And I would add a pledge for myself, that so far as I could influence others, I would endeavour to inaugurate a movement which would meet such a report as this at any time it may be presented, now or in the future, with the indomitable resolution, "It shall not pass".

Bible School Lesson Outline

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

Vol. 5 First Quarter Lesson 4 January 26, 1941

PARABLES OF THE KINGDOM

Lesson Text: Mark 4.

Golden Text: "If any man have ears to hear, let him hear"—Mark 4:23.

I. The Sower—verses 1 to 20. Parallel passages: Matt. 13:1-23; Lk. 8:4-15.

No house could hold the crowds who desired to hear the Saviour, so He resorted to the Sea of Galilee, the sloping shores of which formed a natural amphitheatre. It is probable that the boat used by our Lord belong to Peter, Andrew, James or John (Mk. 1:16,19; 3:9; Lk. 5:3).

Sometimes our Saviour taught in a direct manner, at other times by an indirect method, using illustration (Lk. 11:30),

(Continued on page 15)

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

THE PROTESTANT SAMSON AND THE PAPAL DELILAH

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, January 12th, 1941

(Stenographically Reported)

"And she said unto him, How canst thou say, I love thee, when thine heart is not with me? Thou hast mocked me these three times, and hast not told me wherein thy great strength lieth.

"And it came to pass, when she pressed him daily with her words, and urged him, so that his soul was vexed unto death;

"That he told her all his heart, and said unto her, There hath not come a razor upon mine head; for I have been a Nazarite unto God from my mother's womb: if I be shaven, then my strength will go from me, and I shall become weak, and be like any other man.

"And when Delilah saw that he had told her all his heart, she sent and called for the lords of the Philistines, saying, Come up this once, for he hath shewed me all his heart. Then the lords of the Philistines came up unto her, and brought money in their hand.

"And she made him sleep upon her knees; and she called for a man, and she caused him to shave off the seven locks of his head; and she began to afflict him, and his strength went from him.

"And she said, The Philistines be upon thee, Samson. And he awoke out of his sleep, and said, I will go out as at other times before, and shake myself. And he wist not that the Lord was departed from him."—Judges 16:15-20.

I open the discussion of my subject this evening by once more declaring my conviction that the crying need of the hour is that all the resources of Canada, moral and material, should without reserve be thrown into the task of beating Hitler and winning the war. In my view, it is just as much a sacred duty for every one of us to pull his full weight in this great enterprise as it is to pray. The seriousness of the world situation may be judged by the tone and content of President Roosevelt's great speech to Congress last week, and by his subsequent action in setting in operation movements to implement the programme outlined in his speech.

In this war, everything is at stake, I repeat: the freedom of the individual in all its aspects and ramifications, the sacredness of the family, and the interests of Christianity in general. Does anyone say I am half-hearted in our war effort? I advocate that Canada should be, as they say, in England, "all out" for the war.

I am aware that what I shall say this evening may offend not a few. But if I sought to please men, I could not then be the servant of Christ. What I shall say, I am convinced, is the truth; and I am positive the cause of righteousness is never served by concealing or withholding the truth. Furthermore, I recognize that I speak from a peculiar, an unique standpoint. I cannot expect that anyone whose world is contained within economic, material and temporal interests, will share my view. I speak as believing that the surrender of anything which is indispensable to a man's full discharge of his duty to God is treason to life's supreme obligation.

I speak again upon the Catholic question because evidence continually accumulates of its sinister and aggressive operations. I would make myself clear again at this point, that I have no quarrel with Roman Catholics as individuals. I regard them as being terribly deceived, and would, if I could, remove the scales from their eyes. I know the spirit of many of them, and of the institution against which I speak this evening. I do not

blame them particularly for not liking me! I really do not think I am as unlikeable as some of them seem to assume, but even though I speak as one who loves their souls, I do not expect them to agree with me.

I receive many letters, hundreds of them; and I suppose seventy-five per cent. of them would require a small volume to answer. They ask me all sorts of questions. I try to read them all, and with what care may be possible; and answer all that time will permit. As a rule, I do not read anonymous letters. I usually look for the signature first, and if I find that a man is ashamed to sign his name, I do not feel it is incumbent upon me to waste my time reading what he has said. Occasionally, I do read one when there are marks about it that suggests the wisdom of reading it. I read one last week. The writer said he was here last Sunday, and that he was going to be here to-night. I do not know whether he was a crank, a fanatic, or what sort of man he was. The letter was typewritten, and it seemed to indicate that the man had been to school. I refer to it only because it is symptomatic of some other communications I receive. The letter contained an envelope enclosing the charred remains of a page from THE GOSPEL WITNESS, with the ashes made by the burning, and the kindly-spirited writer informed me that only one other thing could give him greater pleasure than he had felt in seeing the WITNESS burning, and that would be to see the Editor in the flames and watch him until he was entirely cremated. I may as well tell you, my friend, if you are here, that so far as I am concerned, and my little influence may be concerned, there is not now—there never will be—peace with the Papacy. I shall never advocate any degree of appeasement anywhere, at any time, with Popery. It is a religious racket, an organization which exists to make merchandise of the souls of men. The more I know of it, the more I am driven to the conclusion that its officers must either be suffering from some terrible delusion, or otherwise, they must be outright knaves. It seems impossible to me to believe that any

reasonable man can seriously believe the burlesque of Christianity that calls itself Roman Catholicism.

I know how vicious it can be. I know very well that its agents sometimes reckon they are doing God service when they actually kill. The bloody history of the Roman Church proclaims that fact.

I want to tell my anonymous correspondent, and any others he may represent, that I am the last man in the world to be intimidated by anyone. Romanism is a religion of fear. Its chief instrument of propaganda, like that of Hitler, is terror. From foundation to top-stone, Roman Catholicism is a philosophy of terrorism. But there are some people who are not easily terrorized. So perhaps I shall save your time and mine in future if I dispose of that matter once and for all. You may write as many threatening letters as you like. I do not care whether you are the black Pope or the head of the Knights of Columbus, I say here in the name of the Lord of Hosts, I defy the Papacy and all its agents, and all who share in or sympathize with its blasphemous pretensions. Always reckon me, not as an enemy of Roman Catholics, but as an implacable, uncompromising foe of the Papacy. I hate it as I hate the devil, because they are twins. If you do not think so, it is because you have not read its history. To me the Papacy, by which I mean the whole Romish system, is the devil's supreme masterpiece.

I.

My text supplies me with an illustration of the subject before us. **THE WOMAN IN THE VALLEY OF SOREK WHOSE NAME WAS DELILAH SUPPLIES A VERY GOOD PICTURE OF THE ROMAN CHURCH.** Mr. Brown read to you her New Testament portrait: "There came one of the seven angels which had the seven vials, and talked with me, saying unto me, Come hither; I will shew unto thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon many waters: with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication. So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness: and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication: and upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." I believe the old expositors were right when they interpreted that and kindred passages as a prophetic picture of the Church of Rome.

Delilah was a Philistine, not an Israelite. She had not a drop of Israelitish blood in her veins. She was, by her birth, by her very nature, an enemy of the people of God. And so is Rome. Paul's description of Elymas whose name by interpretation was the sorcerer,—and such also is the name of the Papacy by any true interpretation,—I say Paul's characterization of Elymas fits the Romish Church exactly, "O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" Rome is an enemy of all righteous-

ness, an enemy of Christ and of His church, and of every single principle of His gospel.

The enemies of Israel used Delilah to entice their champion, to discover his strength and rob him of it. That is always Rome's attitude. When the representatives of God are strong, she seeks to entice them. Then she is the diplomat *par excellence*. She can be courtesy personified. When the church of Christ is strong, when and where Protestantism is virile and vigorous, she does not make an open war upon Samson but seeks by all the wiles of the professional courtesan, to entice him. Romanism sometimes admits the "great strength" of Protestantism, as Delilah admitted the great strength of Samson; and at such times she is always most obsequious.

Delilah received money for her enticements. Delilah was a veritable "gold digger". And so is the Church of Rome. Listen! Wake up! She is the most insidious and most persistent and most unscrupulous gold-digger on earth. Keep that in mind because I shall return to it. The Church of Rome is the richest corporation in the world to-day, but she is always asking for more. (I see a Montreal man down there, and he nods his head—he ought to know.) She is always asking for more money. There is not a miser on earth that is more grasping than the Church of Rome. She never moves but, like Delilah, her hand is out for more silver.

For a good while Samson withstood her wiles. Delilah had no capacity for understanding spiritual values. She could not understand anything about the secret of his Nazarite vow. Samson did not so much deceive Delilah: she was, by the very psychology which her life had developed, self-deceived. The "withs", the "new cords", were her stock in trade, the kind of thing she could understand. The Church of Rome understands politics. No one understands it better. She is the most adept politician in the world. She outclasses all our diplomats. She has the cunning always of the serpent, with none of the harmlessness of the dove. Romanism is at home with her green withs and sorcery of every sort; but cannot understand the invisible power of the Holy Ghost working through the principles of the gospel. It deals in charms, trinkets, relics, holy water, and what not. What a revelation of the capacity of the human mind to love and believe a lie is the history of Romanism! Oh, how dependent are we all upon the gracious illumination of the Holy Ghost! Only by His light can the darkness of the carnal mind be dispelled. As for the Church of Rome it is an institution that is founded in historical untruth; that has been fostered by lies; whose tenets are propagated by deceit; that scruples at nothing, and extends its authority by the shedding of blood. It is a thing that from the beginning onward has manifestly been a chief instrument of the powers of darkness. And yet some four hundred million dupes believe it!

There was a time when the Samson of Protestantism withstood the Papal Delilah. There was a time when the bloody record and the fiery tale of Rome's devastations in England had not faded from human memory. There was a time when our English Samson would have nothing to do with Delilah. They wrote into the British Constitution a provision which required that the monarchs of England should always swear to uphold the Protestant religion; and until the late King George V. came to the throne, when it was modified by the fine Italian

hand, the king was required to declare his belief that the Mass was idolatry and blasphemy. But that defensive measure is still in the Coronation Oath. Why? Because England suffered so terribly. She said, "We will have no more bloodshed by the hand of this blasphemous institution."

Often since then men have stood against the errors of Rome. I read to you a few weeks ago extracts from a series of lectures given by a Mr. Langtry, Anglican clergyman, in St. Luke's Church, Toronto, in eighteen hundred and eighty-five or thereabout. In those lectures he described the horrors of the Spanish Inquisition, he quoted at length the description which Charles Dickens had given of the horrors of that time. Ah yes, even in Toronto, fifty-five years ago—in Toronto—we had some Protestants who recognized that the Church of Rome was anti-Christian, and the devil's own instrument for extinguishing the light of the gospel. I have never said anything stronger than Mr. Langtry—but only because I could not.

II.

THERE WAS REALLY NO NECESSITY FOR SAMSON'S REVEALING TO DELILAH THE SECRET OF HIS STRENGTH. While his great strength remained, had he stood on his feet and asserted himself, he might triumphantly have challenged all the lords of the Philistines. He had not lost his strength. I do not believe Protestantism, even as it now is, has yet lost its strength. It may not be very articulate, it may not be in some quarters very active, but wait until the emergency arises. *We still have the Word of God*, as Luther had: "The word of the Lord abideth for ever." We do not need the authority of the Pope: we have the highest authority in God's Word. We do not need any word of absolution from the priest: we have the gracious promises of God in His Book to assure us of the forgiveness of sin. We do not need a Pope's encyclical at any time for our instruction: The Holy Scriptures were given to us to tell us the things of God, and make us wise unto salvation. We can do without the lurid glare of Rome's candles as long as the true light shineth.

We still have *the truth, the fact of the atonement*. That has not changed. The very heart of the Protestant religion remains. It is for ever true that "the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin." The priest in his impotent speech may, if he will, consign me to the nethermost hell: I wish I had nothing more than a priestly curse to keep me awake at nights. Mr. Spurgeon once said that he had observed that old England never prospered quite so much as when the Pope was pleased to curse her. What do we care for such imprecations, levelled at us because we do not go to Mass, because we say it is idolatry? We still have the gospel of grace which is opposed to the whole system of meritorious works proclaimed by Rome. We still have the presence and power of the Holy Ghost, and we need no other. We have all that Luther had: we have the very dynamite of God—and that is mighty enough to blow up all the fortresses of Rome as it did in the great days of the Reformation, and make the Pope and his minions contend with Mussolini for the championship in the fastest race of all time. We still have the New Testament church. "I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints." Thank God, we know something about the

fellowship of the saints. We still have the great Head of the church of Whom it is said that God "put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all"; He hath "put all things under him"—and that means the Pope of Rome.

III.

HOW DID DELILAH TRIUMPH? HOW DID SHE AT LAST GAIN THE ADVANTAGE? First of all, *because Samson made love to her*. Otherwise, he had never lost his eyes. The most alarming sign of our time is the fact that the Protestant Samson is everywhere making love to the Italian Delilah. He must have a strange taste! Church conferences, where those who profess and call themselves Christians of all denominations, now come together and openly recognize the Church of Rome as a Christian body. The Archbishop of Canterbury and Lord Halifax, shortly before the war, in the British House of Lords, proposed that the Pope be requested to act as universal arbiter, as the only man in the world competent to exercise such an office.

Did you follow in England the history of the Prayer Book revision? Did you know what was involved? The recognition of the Mass and prayers for the dead. It involved the legal restoration to the Church of England of many of the abominations of Rome. It had the blessing of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Thank God, he is not talking much just now! A young lady recently baptized here, the evacuee daughter of a former Anglican clergyman, is here this evening. That clergyman came to Canada when the prayer book revision was under discussion. He went to Winnipeg and elsewhere—it was thought that some reinforcement of the Protestant position might be obtained from some Anglican clergymen in Toronto. He met an Anglican in Winnipeg who advised him to call and see me. I was not an Anglican, but he came. He had a list of English Church ministers in this city whom he was to visit, to see what they would have to say about the revision of the Book of Common Prayer, and the legal recognition in the Established Church of England of certain of the corruptions of Rome. He asked me if I knew the men, and what sort of reception he would get. I told him they would be "too busy" to discuss it, that they would not care anything about it, and that he was likely to find an attitude of indifference toward the whole matter. I told him I feared that the gentlemen he had named were sitting in a canoe with their arms folded, drifting with the stream, and imagining the rare comfort of a day in June. He came back and said—he was an Englishman: "My word! You knew those men. I found them exactly as you said they would be." If not making love to the Papal Delilah, they felt no antipathy toward her.

But in the British House of Commons a layman, a valiant Protestant, a converted man, Sir Joynston Hicks, stood up and championed the cause of Protestantism, and heroically led in defeat of the Prayer Book revision, in spite of the House of Lords and all the Anglo-Catholic movement. Our Samson still has his locks, thank God; so the Hepburn Government found when it was compelled to repeal its iniquitous Separate School legislation.

But this flirting of Anglican and non-Anglican churches with Rome is a serious matter. At the death of the last Pope many of the Protestant ministers, so-

called Protestant ministers, in Toronto, lauded the Pope to the skies, saying his death was a loss to the Christian church. I am sorry when any man dies, but to say that the death of any Pope is a loss to the Christian church is to say what is absolutely untrue. The New Testament Church of Christ has no pope and never had a pope. I cannot believe that a Christian could blasphemously claim to stand in God's place, clothed with divine authority: The phrase, "His Holiness the Pope", is a contradiction in terms. A holy man would not be pope, a pope cannot be holy. You cannot justify any man who receives homage due to God only. The apostles refused it. Yet that condition obtains even to-day. Nearly all the politicians are on good terms with the Italian Delilah. They are interested in the Roman vote.

I must ask you, was the Reformation wrong? Was the Reformation a mistake? Let me read some quotations from the Reformers:

"*The Waldensians*, in their Treatise on Antichrist in 1126 A.D., brand the Roman Church as the Great Harlot, Babylon; and the Pope as the Man of Sin and Antichrist.

"*Wycliffe*, in 1378, branded the Pope as Antichrist.

"*Luther*, October 6th, 1520, in his book, "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church", denounced the Papacy as the Kingdom of Babylon and Antichrist.

"*Melancthon*, in 1530, wrote: "The Roman Pontiff with his whole kingdom is the very Antichrist."

"*Calvin* wrote: "The Pope, in furiously persecuting the Gospel, demonstrates that he is Antichrist."

"*Knox*, at St. Andrew's in 1547, launched the Reformation in Scotland with a sermon on the Man of Sin and Antichrist, taking for his text Daniel vii, and set Scotland on fire.

"*Tyndale, Ridley, Latimer, Cranmer, Jewel, Hooper, Foxe, Bradford, Rogers*, and the Westminster Divines, who drew up our Confession of Faith in 1647, all unanimously condemned the Mass and the Transubstantiation as the Abominations in the Cup of the Great Harlot of Revelation xvii.

"*The Translators of our Bible*, in 1611 A.D., branded the Papacy as Antichrist and the Man of Sin."

But in spite of all the testimony of history, there are not wanting many professed ministers of Christ, who load the Italian Delilah with compliments, and do her honour as though this Babylonian harlot had a proper place in Christian society.

Our text says that Delilah "pressed" Samson daily, "until his soul was vexed unto death." She "pressed" him, "urged" him—she nagged him. She kept at him, at him, all the time. That is Rome. The Wise Man said: "A continual dropping in a rainy day and a contentious woman are alike." Did you ever writhe under the hearing of a "continual dropping" of a leaky tap all night long? When a woman sets herself to do that kind of business, she really succeeds; it is well-nigh impossible to withstand it. She pressed him; she urged him; she kept at him all the time, never allowing him any rest.

That is Rome! If you have any doubt about it, read the history of Separate Schools in Ontario. I have made a diligent study of it for more than thirty years. You cannot effect a settlement with Rome. Give her an inch, and she may smile and thank you—but she will be back for more to-morrow. Nor will what you give her to-morrow, satisfy: she will be back again for more. Rome is like the horseleach which never says it is enough, but always says, "Give, give, give." *Oliver Twist* did not

know how to ask for more! Rome is the supreme exemplification of the passion for more.

President Roosevelt spoke against those who would encourage any effort toward peace with Hitler, any tendency toward an attitude of appeasement. There must be no peace, no appeasement, nothing but complete victory over the enemy. That was the kernel of Roosevelt's speech—God bless him! And God and His angels protect and preserve Him!

Neither can anyone live at peace with Delilah: it is useless to try. Protestantism cannot live at peace with Romanism. There must always be war. I declare it, no peace with that wild beast, as Kipling said of Russia, "a bear that walks like a man". We cannot be at peace. Rome makes recognition of and submission to the Pope a condition indispensable to salvation.

The Pope claims absolute submission. Short of that, Rome never stops. Nor does she cease then—she follows the soul into purgatory, and as long as there is a living fool to pay pence for prayers which God never hears, and which often are never even said, this Delilah will play the rôle of the horseleach and continue to cry, "Give, give, give." I read a Roman Catholic treatise on purgatory, which told of a certain bishop who was alleged to have been six hundred years dead, and still in purgatory! He must have had a considerable estate! Oh, what a damnable doctrine that is, conceived in hell. It is a libel on God. When I think of men who call themselves ministers of Christ even striking hands with that enemy, I find it difficult to confine myself to moderate speech.

Delilah plied her arts in Ireland. Delilah "pressed" John Bull "daily with her words", and urged him, so that "his soul was vexed unto death." I know it. I talked with Delilah once—but her name happened to be Dillon, John Dillon, leader of the Irish Nationalist Party. I have told the story before, but I repeat it. His study was lined from the ceiling to the floor with shelves. But they did not contain books: they were filled with cuttings from newspapers. That was before the Free State was erected. I said: Mr. Dillon, I am seeking information and should like to ask you a question. You and your party have a good many grievances against Britain. Would it not be possible for you and your Nationalist Party to formulate plans for the alleviation of Ireland's ills, or alleged ills, and then go to Westminster with a constructive programme and translate them into remedial statutes? If these ills really exist, perhaps you could thus remove them." "No." "You mean you would accept no responsibility for suggesting anything." "Certainly not." "If you were offered a position in the ministry?" "No Irishman would accept office." "I do not intend to be rude, but I should like to ask you a question; may I?" He was a grim sort of man, but there was a suggestion of a smile on his face as he said, "Yes, you may." "My question is: what do you go to Westminster for?" He came to life then, clenched his fist and thumped the table, and said: "We go to Westminster to raise a row. The function of the Irish Nationalist Party is to present a critical opposition to the Government of the day." No matter what Government! Or what policy! With the Pope behind them, they "pressed" John Bull, keeping at it—not for one year, nor for ten, but for centuries, never giving him any rest, "until his soul was vexed unto

death", and he said, "Take it." They even gave Delilah the ports of Ireland.

That is exactly what the Roman Catholic Church is doing in Canada. When I began my meditation, I had these three books on my desk, and I was minded to make some quotations from them—they deal with the Sirois Report—but I have decided to reserve my analysis of the Sirois Report until Thursday evening.

Here in Canada the Church opposed the first Great War: it is opposing this. I do not know whether you have all seen a copy of last week's issue of THE GOSPEL WITNESS or not, but in it there is a letter from the Censor at Ottawa expressing fear that I might discourage some French-Canadians from enlisting; or that something I have said, if it should be circulated there, might make some who have already enlisted, feel they are not appreciated. I wrote a letter in reply, but have had no answer. I invited the Censor to do a little work in French Canada. My point is this, that they are at it again. I repeat a quotation from a French language paper, reporting a speech by Mr. Godbout, Premier of Quebec:

"I hope 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."

Now a new measure has been passed whereby any man who wants to get out of the army, or refrain from joining the forces, has but to get a letter from a minister of religion—no tribunal, no court—and he will be excused. The priests of Quebec will be kept busy. That regulation is for that province. I have written scores of letters of recommendation since the war began, to help secure admission for men to the army: I have not written one to try to secure a man's discharge. If you want to get a letter of that sort from "a minister of religion", go to the priest; do not come to me! But that is the situation we face.

But this report is too big a job to include in this address. They are going to have a week at Ottawa dealing with the matter—after years of preparation. But I will say this one thing: I had not read very far before I began to observe things which have not been mentioned in any editorial of any paper in this country. The Chairman of the Committee submitting the report is a Professor Sirois with not an Ontario representative on that committee. The financial aspects of it will confer some benefits upon provinces heavily in debt, but in the main this report is a proposal to put a mortgage on the whole Dominion in the interests of the Roman Church. Hospitals, orphanages, charitable institutions, and the whole Roman Catholic School system, may be helped by Dominion funds, to supply which all of us will be taxed. But come Thursday evening, and we will discuss it at length.

But let me say this here. The report purports to make for unity. I am for unity. It is perfectly absurd, in all the changes that have come since Confederation, that we should have nine provincial legislatures and a Federal House, to govern a population that does not exceed the population of Greater London. The cost of government in this country is nothing short of outrageous. It is the

paradise of pettifogging politicians. We ought to try to get together. I believe in unity—but not the union of Jonah and the whale, if I am to be Jonah! But no, that that does not fit. I shall have to correct it, because the Scripture says that "the Lord prepared" the great fish that swallowed Jonah, and I am sure He did not prepare the Catholic Church!

But now the war is on, when French Canada is doing everything to tie our feet and hands, and reduce Canada's war effort to a minimum, and to keep their men at home, while our men go overseas,—God bless them! May more go, if even no French-Canadians ever go!—now under the guise of national unity, they propose to recast the Constitution of this country, and write into it for perpetual, continuous action, principles that will compel every man in Ontario, whether he likes it or not, indirectly to support the Roman Catholic Church and its institutions.

IV.

WHAT FOLLOWED THIS LOVE-MAKING WITH DELILAH? *She made poor Samson sleep on her knees!* Poor baby! Rock-a-bye-baby! She put him to sleep on her knees! What a picture of a part of modern Protestantism, sound asleep on the knees of Delilah! The intelligensia! The giant! Asleep on the Babylonian harlot's knees!

And while he was asleep she sent for the lords of the Philistines. "While men slept, the enemy sowed tares." "Dr. Shields is a fanatic!" I am,—just as fanatical as Luther was; and no more! "It is all nonsense." Very well; lullaby baby, in the tree tops! But you will find out that what I say is true. Be assured that while Protestantism is asleep, Rome is very wide awake, and was never more wide awake than now. And remember short hair may be fashionable with some, but bobbed hair finds no approval in scripture. Less than four blocks from where I stand, month by month, there issues a Jesuit paper that the Audit Bureau reports as having a circulation of forty-three thousand. In Toronto! A Jesuit paper printing forty-three thousand a month!

Let me give you this quotation from Lord Palmerston:

"In 1853, when British intercession was sought in connection with the civil war which broke out among the cantons of Switzerland, the Prime Minister of the day, Lord Palmerston, said in a discussion on the subject in the House of Commons: The cause—the original cause of the conflict was the Jesuits. It was their presence in Switzerland, it was their aggressive proceedings in the Protestant cantons, which produced that war with regard to which our mediation was asked for; and it appeared to me that the only natural mode of putting an end to that war, was to remove the object and cause of it. It was in that spirit that we proposed the Jesuits should be withdrawn. That I did, when making that proposal, state the reasons which induced me to make it, is undoubtedly true. I stated that it was my belief that the presence of the Jesuits in any country, Catholic or Protestant, was likely to disturb the political and social peace of that country. I maintain that opinion still, and I don't shrink from its avowal."

That was from a British Prime Minister who had moral and spiritual, as well as political discernment: "The presence of the Jesuits in any country would disturb the peace of it." It is like a cancer in the body: a malignant parasite which spreads its tentacles through all the organism, wrapping itself around every vital organ of

society, the press, the radio, the centres of commerce and industry, the places of learning, and legislation, fattening on the life-blood of every one of them.

Samson lost his locks while he was asleep. When evangelicalism flirts with Rome, she breaks her Nazarite vow of separation. Whoever falls into Delilah's arms loses his strength.

Then follows the horrible tale of Samson at the mill. They put out his eyes, and bound him with fetters of brass. This one-time champion of light was the blind slave of the Philistines. That was true of all Europe when Rome was in the ascendancy—blind slaves doing the will of the Church. It has been true of every country that has submitted to Papal control.

But thank God, *our Samson, though asleep, has not lost his locks.* Canadian and British Protestantism may be asleep, but I do not think it has yet been to the barber. In England when that Prayer Book revision was in prospect, it seemed for a while as though no one cared; but as soon as the issue was formed, and they saw what was involved, it was rejected. There is still a Protestant conscience.

Before Dunkirk, it looked as though the spirit of Britain was broken. But something happened there, and their spirit was revived. President Roosevelt bore witness that the courage and splendour of dear old England will be for all time the admiration of the world. I do not believe that Protestantism is dead in Canada. Mr. Godbout may boast that "a little handful of French-Canadians led by M. Ernest Lapointe, dictated its will to the country", and I think he was right. But they had better not try us too far. I know many people are asleep, but the time may come—and it may be that God, in His providence, may permit events to occur which will waken some people in another way.

There are people who seldom open their Bibles to read what is there, but when their pocket-books are forced open, they begin to understand. It is my conviction that even yet our Samson, here and in England, will arise and shake himself, and smite the Philistines hip and thigh as he did of old.

If you do not like my message, I cannot help it. I was in bed for a couple of days—and ought to have remained in bed to-night. I said to Mr. Brown, when he telephoned to know whether I was going to take the service, that I would have stayed in bed had I not known that some would construe my absence as a diplomatic illness in time of war.

Our only reason for speaking thus to you is found in the reason for the existence of this church. It is because we believe something, and because those things we believe are so precious to us, we must defend them. I believe there are hundreds of people here to-night who would rather die than surrender to Popery. It is the testimony of all history, and of recent history, that the insidious approach of these enemies of our glorious gospel need to be watched. The proper time to put out a fire is when it begins. "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." "A stitch in time saves nine."

Have you lost your locks? Has the Spirit of the Lord departed from you? Or is He regnant within? Do you know the truth as it is in Jesus Christ? Have you been born again? Have you been washed in the blood? Are

you saved with an everlasting salvation? And is it Rome's contrast to your own experience of redeeming grace that makes you revolt against it? I trust it may be so. You do not need the Pope, the priest, the Church. You need no one but Christ.

"None but Jesus can do helpless sinners good." You need only confess you are a poor sinner and nothing at all; when like the publican you have cried, "God, be merciful to me a sinner," you shall go down to your house justified.

May the Lord bless us every one for His Name's sake. Amen.

EXCESSIVE PRIVILEGES

By Jean-Charles Harvey

In "Le Jour"

(Translated by Rev. W. S. Whitcombe, M.A.)

"This is a very delicate subject. People speak about it, discuss it, complain of it, everywhere. But in public they do not dare lift their voices. They tremble with fear. They come asking me to be the interpreter of a thought which is hidden in the catacombs of timid consciences. I must serve as the scapegoat. The question has to do with the exemption from taxes in Quebec.

According to the Federal statistics of 1935, taxable municipal valuations in this Province were \$2,224,000,000 while the exempted property was \$734,498,153. In Ontario the taxable valuation was more than \$3,000,000,000 and the exempted property was valued at \$380,800,000. The revenue from the municipal taxes in Quebec was \$59,253,000 while in Ontario it was \$122,108,912. These figures have a story to tell.

The property exempt from municipal tax in Quebec was \$354,000,000 more than the exemptions in the neighbouring Province of Ontario. Why this enormous difference? Is it because we are rich enough, we Jeanbaptistes, to make these princely gifts to certain taxpayers, while the people from Ontario have not the means? Is it because we are able to pay for the luxury of disdaining an annual revenue of several millions of which we could make good use? The question has remained unanswered for years.

Certain industrial corporations, which stand in need of municipal help, especially at the beginning, are exempt from paying taxes. That is understandable, provided they do not abuse the privilege too much. State properties are also exempt from paying taxes to the Public Treasury. That is natural. In the same way much property used for religious purposes or for charitable and educational causes, is also spared. Only the abuses are condemnable.

The valuation of \$734,498,000 in exempted property does not include property owned by religious orders and congregations, (ne comprennent pas les biens religieux et de congrégation). This evaluation did not enter into our statistical reports when I was the Statistician of the Province, and as the Federal Government has no other source of information on the subject, I conclude that no one knows exactly the value of these properties which cover a considerable part of our land. A good citizen who examined these figures said to me, with a discouraged air, "It makes one rather anxious".

It goes without saying that churches, presbyteries (priests' houses), public schools, charitable institutions, should not have to pay taxes. But I find it abnormal, absurd, and anarchistic: 1.—that the State should not know at least the approximate value of the wealth under its jurisdiction. 2.—that a total evaluation of all these properties should not be made in such a way as to share the tax justly, not only for certain privileged persons, but also for a host of individuals with small savings who sweat blood to pay what others will not pay.

From my point of view—and this point of view is shared by thousands of French-Canadian taxpayers—all establishments, religious and otherwise, which are on a commercial basis, ought to do their share for the administration of the public affairs. To do otherwise is to commit a gross injustice toward an impoverished and overtaxed people, and toward a multitude of small owners, business men and manufacturers upon whose shoulders fall all the public responsibilities.

It is not generally understood that certain privileged classes are exempt, not only from taxes, but also from the elementary obligation of rendering an account to the power which is supreme in every well organized country, the Civil Government. That is an anomaly that one would not permit to-day in any other country in the world. Why must our little corner of the earth continue to present such pitiable exceptions as this?

A number of so-called educational, or charitable institutions ought to be put on the same footing as other taxpayers. Then, if it is shown that they have need of aid, and that it is in the general interest to maintain them, we shall be able to draw upon the taxes to provide subsidies for them. This is a purely material question. Questions of this kind are within the power of the secular authority.

Another anomaly, still more crying: certain classes of citizens are exempt from the necessity of giving an account to the authorities of the use they make of sums received from the State. These citizens continually demand government help, that is to say, our money. They are given millions, and we have not the right to ask them, by means of an audit, if the moneys paid to them have actually served the ends for which they were given. No well-kept firm could permit such carelessness without going headlong to ruin, and exposing itself to fearful errors.

And these things must happen in Quebec. Poor little people, without experience, and without order in economic questions! We never cease to present the spectacle of our lack of discipline and our childishness. Every day we are losing a little bit of our sense of value. Sometimes it might be said that we cannot distinguish between \$100.00 and \$1,000,000.00. We throw our grain to the sparrows with a lack of concern that is almost touching. Poor little people! Poor little people!

The administration of the Province is above all, a question of dollars and cents, and we do not know how to count either dollars or cents. That is why we are being impoverished every day. We have had in the course of the last three years a sad illustration of that mentality of grown-up children on Parliament Hill. How much longer can we continue in this way?

We quote the following from Pastoral letter No. 17 of the very eminent Cardinal Archbishop of Quebec, April 8, 1935:

"Concerning our religious liberties, for example, it so happens that, by the help of Providence, the Catholic Church is better situated here than in almost any other country in the world . . . By tacit mutual agreement, and reciprocal esteem, an advantageous relationship has been maintained between the Church and the State. In Canada, and especially in our Province, the Church has generally been able to develop in an atmosphere of happy liberty, and her sons have been able to benefit thereby. The civil authorities adopt a respectful attitude toward her, and are not indifferent to her consideration."

BIBLE SCHOOL LESSON OUTLINE

(Continued from page 8)

simile (Mk. 1:10) or parable. A parable is an incident or narrative from natural life which is used to enforce a spiritual truth.

Direct teaching is adapted to believing hearts, but not to the rebellious, prejudiced and stubborn because of the danger of exposing the truth to ridicule or contempt (Matt. 7:6; 15:26). Our Lord taught in parables in order that each of His hearers might extract from His teaching the amount of knowledge for which they were prepared (verses 11, 12, 33; John 16:12). The hidden meaning of the parables could not be understood by those whose hearts were steeled against His influence, those who were determined not to yield to Him (2 Thess. 2:9-14).

The expression "the kingdom of God" seems to signify the reign of God over men and angels. It is of wider significance than the term "kingdom of heaven", which is found only in Matthew and which apparently refers to the sphere of Christian profession on the earth only. In many passages the terms are used synonymously (compare verse 11 with Matt. 13:11; verses 30, 31 with Matt. 13:31).

The parable of the sower is important as being simple and fundamental (verse 13). Our Lord used the symbolism of the field, the sower and the seed without explanation in other parables (verses 26, 31; Matt. 13:24, 44).

Christ Himself was the first Sower, but later He sent

forth the apostles and others to sow the seed of the Word (Matt. 28:18-20; John 17:18; 20:21; Acts 1:8). It is the task of preachers, teachers and workers to scatter abroad the message of salvation in spite of every difficulty and discouragement (Eccl. 11:4-6; Acts 20:24-27; 26:22).

The seed of the Word is incorruptible, and bound to produce results (1 Pet. 1:23). It will accomplish its divinely-ordained purpose, sometimes, when not believed, proving to be a witness against the hearer (Isa. 55:10,11). The results of our labours vary; not always do we see their full fruition. Then the increase may be thirty-fold, sixty-fold or one hundred-fold.

The main point of the parable is the attitude of the individual to the Word of God. The teacher has a grave responsibility, and so also have the hearers. They must take heed *how* and *what* they hear (verse 24; Lk. 8:18).

The four kinds of soil represent four classes of hearers. There are some careless hearers, those who fail to be watchful. They allow the Adversary to snatch the Word from them before it can lodge in their hearts (Eph. 6:11; 1 Pet. 5:8). The superficial hearers profess to receive the message with gladness; they hear but do not heed it. They are enthusiastic, but not serious (John 2:23-25). The absent-minded hearers do not appreciate the value of the Word and give preference to worldly thoughts and considerations (Lk. 21:34; Rom. 13:11-14). Those who are of an honest and good heart accept the Word, hold it fast and bring forth fruit (1 Thess. 1:5,6; 2:13; 2 Tim. 3:15-17). The Greek word translated "receive" in verse 16 signifies an outward formal profession of belief, while that translated "receive" in verse 20 connotes the attitude of hearty welcome and hospitality to the truth.

Let us pray that the Holy Spirit may prepare those to whom we minister, that He may illuminate the minds and hearts of those who walk in darkness (Acts 16:14; 2 Cor. 4:4-6; Col. 4:3).

II. The Secret—verses 21 to 25. Parallel passage: Lk. 8:16-18.

The parable of the candle, or rather the lamp, illustrates one phase of the truth taught in the parable of the sower. The seed is a symbol of the Word, and so also is the lamp (Psa. 119:105; Prov. 6:23). Just as the seed will not produce fruit unless cast into the ground (John 12:24; 1 Cor. 15:36), even so a candle or lamp will not give full light unless placed on a proper stand. A bushel measure or bed would hide the life-giving rays (Matt. 5:15). The truth is intended to bring illumination (Psa. 36:9; 119:130), warmth (Psa. 105:39), guidance (Psa. 43:3) and life (Lk. 1:79; John 1:4; 8:12). We must be willing to act as channels and to hold aloft the testimony given to us of God (Matt. 5:14,16; Phil. 2:14-16; Rev. 2:5).

These matters are hidden from many people; they are mysteries in the Scriptural sense of the word, sacred secrets hitherto not understood, but now revealed to those who believe (verse 11; Eph. 3:2-5, 9). In His own time the Lord will give full knowledge to His children (Matt. 10:26; Lk. 8:17; 12:2; 1 Cor. 13:9-12). The rate of progress toward perfect knowledge will depend upon their readiness to appropriate the truth (verses 24, 25; 2 Pet. 1:5-8). This is a principle of nature, and no arbitrary law. Used muscles develop, while unused ones become flabby. Similarly, in the moral realm, truth makes a way for itself.

III. The Seed—verses 26 to 29.

Wherever there is life there is growth. Progress from day to day may be imperceptible, but it is none the less real. Spiritual growth, like spiritual life, is mysterious, beyond human understanding and observation (John 3:7-9). God gives the increase (1 Cor. 3:6, 7; 2 Cor. 9:10), and as long as His laws are obeyed, progress will be steady and sure, although frequently not spectacular (Matt. 6:28; 1 Pet. 2:2; 2 Pet. 3:18).

Just as there are stages in the development of a plant, so are there certain steps in the progress of the Christian life toward maturity (Heb. 5:12-14). The Christian worker must learn that it is unwise to hinder or to hurry the work of the Holy Spirit. Patience must have her perfect work, and in God's good time the harvest will come (Psa. 126:6; Gal. 6:9; Jas. 1:3, 4; 5:7).

(Continued on page 16)

The Censor's Reply

CENSORSHIP CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

Press Censorship

Rev. T. T. Shields,
c/o Jarvis Street Baptist Church,
Toronto, Ontario.

Ottawa, Canada
January 10th, 1941.

Dear Mr. Shields:

We wish to acknowledge your letter in reply to our communication of December 20th.

We have been extremely interested in learning your views and are glad to have these on record. May we thank you for so carefully and comprehensively reviewing your stand.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) F. Charpentier,

PRESS CENSOR FOR CANADA

BIBLE SCHOOL LESSON OUTLINE

(Continued from page 15)

IV. The Shoots—verses 30 to 34. Parallel passages: Matt. 13:31, 32; Lk. 13:18, 19.

A huge tree may spring from a tiny seed. So also would the kingdom of God extend widely in the earth, although it began in a humble manner (Mk. 1:15; Acts 2:41; 4:4).

The principle of admixture in the kingdom, illustrated in the parables of the tares, the leaven and the drag-net, is merely suggested in this parable (Matt. 13:24-30, 33-35, 47-50). The birds of heaven symbolize the powers of evil, which ever seek to do their nefarious work under the protection of the powers of good. The counterfeit professors pose as real saints, and only the Lord can distinguish the one from the other.

V. The Storm—verses 35 to 41. Parallel passages: Matt. 8:18, 23-27; Lk. 8:22-25.

The close of the day of teaching found our Lord exhausted. He knew what it was to be weary in the way (John 4:6), and He can sympathize with His tired servants (1 Kings 19:4-8).

LONG BRANCH CHURCH

"We have just concluded a most refreshing week of inspirational Bible teaching under the able leadership of Rev. W. S. Whitcombe. The proof of the real enjoyment of the instructive messages was seen in the splendid attendances night after night. The people felt that they were receiving a most nourishing and yet varied diet. There was the 'sincere milk of the Word' for babes in Christ, as well as 'strong meat' for the more mature in the faith. One thing was lacking, and that was that spirit of superficial excitement which all too often accompanies special meetings. The Long Branch saints were joined by those from New Toronto, and all feel that something substantial was done for the church through the edifying ministry of Brother Whitcombe. It would be a grand thing for all of our churches if they could arrange for similar Bible Conferences under the teaching of this man of God.

"We as a church are looking to God for good things during this year. By His grace we are determined to become more and more grounded in the Word and to become more zealously active in reaching souls for Jesus."

S. WELLINGTON.

HOW TO RAISE MONEY FOR MISSIONS

"How can I grip my people with a missionary appeal for our Union work?" That is the oft-repeated question of pastors, Sunday School superintendents, and other leaders in our churches. There is only one possible answer to that question: Give them the facts! To earnest men and women who love the Lord and desire to see souls saved, the story of our Union Missionary activities will have an irresistible appeal because our work is to make Christ known.

In particular we would recommend to Sunday School superintendents the fine example of the energetic leader of the Sunday School at Long Branch. The Union office supplied him with a copy of the addresses delivered by Mrs. Richer and Miss Boyd at the Annual Convention. He read them carefully and made brief excerpts of some incidents and facts recorded there, these he in turn told to his Sunday School at various intervals, making it the basis of an appeal for work among the French-Canadians. The result is that in four months the Sunday School has contributed \$75.00 to the Union. If every Sunday School in the Union would follow this splendid example, our hands would be strengthened to push forward in this work to meet the great untouched need.

From a church in the country comes the following note describing a splendid plan: "I have decided to take each mission field separately. So I started off with Mr. Brackstone of Kapuskasing. I wrote to him and he sent me a personal letter on his work up there. Next month I will go on with another field."

TO ALL READERS OF THIS ISSUE

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