

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. 39

TORONTO, JANUARY 30, 1941.

Whole Number 976

Quebec's Official Governmental and Ecclesiastical Attitude Toward the War

Remembering Britain's experience in the last war with subjects of "the Sovereign Pontiff" everywhere, in the thinly-veiled antagonism of the Vatican, which allied statesmen were not slow to penetrate; remembering too the intrigues of the Papacy in Ireland, and the Pope's blessing the Irish insurrectionists in advance of the rebellion of 1916 when he had full advance knowledge of the project, even to the date, and the part of the notorious Count Plunkett in the affairs, as well as that of Michael Collins—a Catholic priest; remembering too, and particularly, the definite opposition to our part in the war by Quebec and the relatively few French Canadians who voluntarily enlisted, remembering these things, and in view of their significance THE GOSPEL WITNESS, from the beginning of the present war has not failed to emphasize the necessity for a united "all-out" Canadian war-effort to defeat the Axis Powers.

When the present Premier talked so much about having secured "National Unity" we hoped it was a fact and supported him and his Government—not, we must admit, without some misgivings because of Mr. King's course during the last war,—but we supported him for the above-named reason, and also because with our personal knowledge of the Irish situation, we found it impossible to vote for an Irish Roman Catholic as a possible Premier.

We did not then know that the boasted National Unity had been achieved by complete submission to Quebec, and by an apparent agreement to set up a war-machine, but to set the gas-gauge at a fixed idling rate. It remained for Premier Godbout, boastfully to inform his compatriots that "a handful of French-Canadians, led by M. Ernest Lapointe had dictated its will to the country"; and for the parliamentary secretary of the Catholic Action paper *Le Devoir* to boast that French Canada had made a great concession to National Unity by submitting to authority, and allowing Canada to participate in the war.

We have followed with the closest interest the development of affairs in Europe and from the time of

the *rapprochement* between the Vatican and the Italian Fascist State after over seventy years of alienation, and the Vatican's approval of all Italy's rapacious adventures—in Abyssinia, in Spain, and in Albania, it has been apparent to any observer of moral discernment that the Vatican is no friend of such world-peace as democratic countries desire.

While there have been a few Roman Catholic voices heard suggesting prayers for peace, such prayers have been for the most part, it seems to us, little more than religious gestures. For example in the *Montreal Gazette* of January 24, 1941, there appeared this item:

A special prayer for "peace and victory," composed by the French-Canadian archbishops and bishops of Quebec, will be read by Rt. Hon. Ernest Lapointe at Notre Dame Church February 9 when dignitaries of church and state in French Canada will gather to pray for victory and lasting peace. The date was proclaimed a day of prayer for victory by Sir Eugene Fiset, Lieutenant-Governor of the province.

The service will be attended by ranking officials of church and state, including the Justice Minister and His Eminence Rodrigue Cardinal Villeneuve.

Following is the text of the prayer:

"Almighty and merciful God, deign to give a kind glance upon Your people, on its knees before You, to beg Your mercy and Your help.

"We deplore, in the presence of Your Divine Majesty, all the sins committed against Your holy laws. We beg Thee, O Lord, who shows Your power by Your forgiveness, forget the crimes of Christian nations and inspire individuals and peoples to observe Your Commandments and to practise the teachings of Your gospel.

"We humbly beg of You, O God of Mercy, to have pity on us and to give us victory. Especially give to humanity the victory of right over might, the victory of justice over injustice, the victory of charity over egotism, the victory of Your Divine Rights over sacrilegious usurpations.

"O Mary, help of Christians and Queen of Peace, Thou who hast so many times given Your maternal protection to our country, carry our prayer to the throne of Your Divine Son.

"St. Joseph, patron of Canada, glorious Canadian martyrs, pray to God for us. Ask that in His mercy He relieve the misery of the people and that He be

touched by its sacrifices and its prayers, and that He give it, with the peace of Christ, in justice and charity, happiness and prosperity.
"Amen."

It is to be observed that this prayer for "peace and victory" has been "composed by the archbishops and bishops of Quebec". It was to be read by M. Ernest Lapointe, the leader of the handful of French Canadians who have imposed their will on the country, with the Lieutenant-Governor of the province, the King's representative, "ranking officials of church and state including the Justice Minister and His Eminence Rodrigue Cardinal Villeneuve", in attendance. Altogether it was evidently planned to be a great occasion.

It is a delicate matter to attempt to analyze a prayer; yet, there are many prayers recorded in Holy Scripture, obviously preserved for our examination, understanding, and emulation. Perhaps in nothing does a man more truly reveal the inner man than in his prayers, as the publican's, for example, "God be merciful to me a sinner"; or on the other hand the self-complacent, self-congratulatory prayer of the Pharisee.

The prayer before us is "composed by the archbishops and bishops of Quebec", and may jointly be regarded as a revelation of the heart and mind of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of Quebec. And inasmuch as the prayer is to be read by "the Justice Minister", Mr. Ernest Lapointe, it may also with equal fairness be regarded as representing the religious and political attitude of mind of that little handful of French Canadians whom he has so skillfully led in imposing their will on the country.

What of the prayer? It begs forgiveness for individuals and for the crimes of Christian nations, and prays that individuals and nations may observe the divine Commandments and practise the teachings of the Gospel. To all of which we can all say, Amen. It is such a prayer as everyone might wisely daily pray.

But what are we to make of the rest of it? Turn back and read the prayer again. It has been prepared to be read on a day "proclaimed as a day of prayer for victory and lasting peace" by the Lieutenant-Governor.

What does this mean: "Have pity on us, and give us victory. Especially give to humanity the victory of right over might, the victory of justice over injustice, the victory of charity over egotism, the victory of Your Divine Right over sacriligious usurpations"?

That prayer would do for Berlin or Rome. It all depends upon the point of view. Hitler claims to be fighting for "humanity" and for "right over might". He says all the rest of us are, or have been, strong-armed robbers. The Vichy Ministry of Propaganda, whose representative is retained for propaganda purposes in Canada, accuses Britain of having stolen Canada and Egypt from France, and of having also stolen our National Anthem, "God Save the King."

The Havas Agency controlled by Vichy charges "the food reserves of the French population were destroyed by the English troops during the retreat from Belgium, and the north of France. To-day England is attempting by every means to hinder the transportation of food from the United States to France." Answering the appeal made by Mr. Duff-Cooper to the Latin peoples of America, the speaker for the Vichy Ministry of Propaganda declared that the Latins had been the perpetual victims of the English. "Great Britain," he said "treated French-Canadians like the Irish—that is, like dogs". This

particular speaker for Vichy accused Great Britain of having taken from the French Canada, India, Egypt, and the Suez Canal. "England", he continued, "is responsible for the 'humiliation' of Spain, and of the 'vasalage' of Portugal, and of the sanctions in 1935 against Italy—a measure that the French did everything to hinder."

We have quoted the official voice of the Vichy government through its Propaganda Ministry, a government which the Pope has especially blessed, and whose representative remains in Ottawa in enjoyment of full diplomatic immunity, and who at a recent banquet virtually said that the cause of France's collapse was her taking education out of the hands of the Church,—this gentleman represents a government which changes Great Britain with being a predatory nation with whom right is might.

For whom then will the Quebec Hierarchy pray—or will others pray in the prayer of the Hierarchy's inspiration for "victory of right over might"?

But once more, the prayer is "for victory of Your Divine Right over sacriligious usurpers." Now every one who knows anything about the history of Catholic dogma, knows that it is the never-changing doctrine of the Papacy that all "Divine Rights" on this earth are represented by the Papacy, and that all governments, kings, and presidents, who exercise their authorities in contempt or in defiance of those alleged "Rights", are "sacriligious" usurpers or usurpations.

To anyone informed of Roman Catholic history and present-day dogma this is anything less than a prayer for the recognition of the supremacy of "the Sovereign Pontiff" the Pope!

Furthermore, this officially proclaimed day of prayer is to "be dignified by the presence of the constitutional representation of His Britannic Majesty, King George VI." But the King is not so much as alluded to throughout the prayer! Neither is Great Britain, nor her government, nor her armed forces! Nor is Canada mentioned, save as she is supposed to be the protégé of "Saint" Joseph.

Can anyone in his senses believe that this brain-child of the archbishops and bishops of Quebec, gives any evidence of the Hierarchy being fired with an ardent desire for a British victory?

We are not interested in prayers addressed to "Mary, Queen of Peace", and "St. Joseph, Patron of Canada, glorious, Canadian martyrs". But if these archbishops and bishops and the Justice Minister want to talk into a toy telephone which has no heavenly connection, that is their privilege.

We have referred to this official prayer "composed by the archbishops and bishops of Quebec", to be offered on an officially ordered occasion, only as a transcript of the official Quebec mind—governmental and ecclesiastical. If victory must come in answer to prayer, or if prayer has any relation to the war at all, if all other prayers were like this "composed by the archbishops and bishops of Quebec", we are bound to confess we should not have the remotest idea whether a British or a German-Italian victory might be expected. However, we may hope that this Hierarchical prayer may sound less ambiguous to the divine Ear—if it ever reaches it—than it does to ours! We venture also to express, not only the hope, but the deepest conviction that countless millions of loyal British subjects throughout the

Empire daily earnestly pray for their Gracious Majesties the King and Queen and for all His Ministers, the armed forces, and for the Empire as a whole, definitely asking God to give victory to the Empire and her allies—all this, notwithstanding they are all completely omitted and ignored in the official prayer "composed by the archbishops and bishops of Quebec" to be offered at an official service arranged by the Government of Quebec. And without intending to be discourteous, but only desiring to give expression to our faith in God as revealed in Christ, and to our loyalty to His Majesty the King, we believe profoundly that the Empire's cause will prosper just as well without this wonderful prayer "composed by the archbishops and bishops of Quebec" as with it. And our prayers will be just as effectual when offered to God direct through our Lord Jesus Christ, though we omit all mention of "Mary the Queen of Peace" and "St. Joseph, patron of Canada".

SOME CANADIAN PRESS COMMENTS

Whoever exposes the intrigues of the Papacy need expect no compliment. It is characteristic of all evil-doers, and errorists of all sorts that they "love darkness rather than life." This paper from its inception has concerned itself to be "set for the defence of the Gospel." We have preached no new thing, but have endeavoured to stand uncompromisingly for "the faith once for all delivered to the saints", for New Testament evangelical Christianity; for the simple doctrines of the Reformation.

In pursuit of that purpose we have quite naturally had to engage in controversy. We have found no Maginot Line behind which we could repose in security. We have found error always to be aggressive, always on the offensive. Hence, unless we were willing like France to make peace with the enemy, and lay down our arms in disloyal and ignominious surrender, we have found it necessary to emulate the example of Nehemiah's men: "They which builded on the wall, and they that bare burdens, with those that laded, every one with one of his hands wrought in the work, and with the other hand held a weapon. For the builders, every one had his sword girded by his side and so builded."

This has been true no matter what the name or character of the enemy encountered; for we have long since learned that all enemies of the gospel of grace, no matter how they may seem to differ from each other in uniform, are all blood-brothers and allies, and when the battle is set in array you will get no help from the religious Stalins, or Francos, or Lindberghs: they will close their ranks and make common cause against the Truth.

The Quebec Front

Among the chief enemies of the gospel we have always, like Luther, and all the reformers and martyrs, classed the Papacy as one of the worst. And from the beginning we have never tried to appease Rome.

Of recent months, as our readers know, we have dealt very plainly with Rome's relation to the war—we mean, of course, Papal Rome. In our issue of January 16, we published an address delivered that same evening in Jarvis Street Church on "The Religious Aspect of the Sirois Report". The address seems to have given Quebec province an attack of nerves, from Premier Godbout down. We do not know how many French

language papers are published in Quebec, but we should think most of them have opened fire upon THE GOSPEL WITNESS and its Editor. The English language papers have not been one whit behind. Hundreds of letters have poured in upon us from Quebec province, and all but one have been favourable. But the papers, English and French, have been vitriolic. This we expected.

Not one of them has attempted to meet the issue raised. Error never does. Untruth is never brave. It hides in the dark. It fights from ambush. Its method is that of the raider who hits and runs. So it follows, that in all the abusive articles we have found not one word of light or leading. It is like fighting Modernism or any other ism opposed to the Truth of the gospel: it will never discuss principles: it abuses the witness. He is an "enemy"; a "troubler" of Israel; "a pestilent fellow"; "he hath a devil"; "a man gluttonous and a winebibber"; "as for this sect, we know that it is everywhere spoken against". These are ever the weapons in the armoury of the disciples of falsehood. They prefer poison-gas to the sword of an honourable combatant. They substitute abuse for argument, invective for reason, and the stones and dust of the mob, for ordered debate in the forum of honour.

"Notoriety Seeker"

It is three hundred and thirty miles from Toronto to Montreal, and perhaps five hundred miles from Toronto to Quebec. Unfortunately, while the Government-owned Broadcasting Corporation for the support of which we are all taxed, gives the Roman Catholic Church free time in which to propagate their tenets, as well as to insult Protestants, it is not possible to buy time on any Canadian network for a Protestant address, unless it is a cup of a kind of religious Ovaltine guaranteed to deliver the listener into the arms of Morpheus in a delightful state of doctrinally innocuous somnolence.

Therefore this editor's voice does not now disturb the ether waves of the Province of Quebec. Thus all Quebec had to do was to ignore us. True, many of them received the address in THE GOSPEL WITNESS. What of it? In common with all other papers we receive piles of exchanges. None of them excite us; some interest us, but the majority we read only occasionally.

First, there is the usual crop of letters to the paper. To refer to only two, one signed "Quebec Baptist", and another "Don River". Both letters in the name of peace and unity "breathe threatening and slaughter", and indicate relationship to old controversies over Modernism in the Baptist denomination. The letters are devoid of truth, and of everything but vindictiveness—from the ambush of anonymity. They both remind one of a reply made to a critic who wrote over a pseudonym. The one who had thus been anonymously assailed, replied as follows:

"Dear Editor:

Your correspondent and my critic who signs himself So and So, evidently belongs to that class of nondescript who has just sufficient intelligence to know that his name would add no weight to his article. When nothing is said by nobody, what is there to reply to?

Yours truly."

Several other letters are obviously written by men who have no intelligent idea of the issues involved. A

man from the West at the close of last Sunday evening's service, who said he had done a million and a half dollars' worth of business this last year, said: "You amaze me! I thought the recommendations of the Sirois Report were simply a way for the Dominion to help the poor provinces." And many with no knowledge of the question "take their pen in hand" and write a lot of nonsense.

The Editorials evidence the usual obsequiousness to the Roman Church. We expected a little intelligence to appear in the editorial columns of Montreal papers. Not one of them even remotely alludes to the tremendous issue with which we have dealt in our addresses. *The Gazette*, and *The Star*, are of the same vacuous quality. We wonder whether Montreal papers are usually so utterly indifferent to questions of fact. In this case they seem to be suffering from an attack of bad temper. Their mutterings are like the incoherent maledictions of a drunken man. Perhaps these editorial writers are quite likeable fellows when they write about matters they understand. They are to be pitied when their advertising department require them to swear more or less politely at somebody they don't know, or, something they know nothing about. Perhaps when they feel the shoe pinch they may have a better opinion of the salesman who advised them not to buy it.

The Prize Montreal Essay

Time and space forbid our even referring to many of the peevish ejaculations of the Quebec press. But we accord the prize for extravagant absurdity to *The Standard*, which, we understand, is a weekly paper published by the Star Co. After our perusal of the Quebec press this last week we cheerfully acquiesce in the opinion expressed by Jean-Charles Harvey, editor of *Le Jour*, when he described Quebec as "the most ignorant province in the Dominion".

The Standard prints in a block in bold type a list of nine of the Editor's sermons, six of them on the Catholic controversy. And it prints that for nothing! We should have to pay for that in Toronto papers. Thanks, heartily, *Standard*. Print them as often as you like. Orders for the sermons are flowing in, and no doubt *The Standard* has helped.

The Standard refers to our having been given attention by the Press Censors. We are really proud of that encounter. The Censors were lovely. After our crushing rejoinder—forgive our estimate of our reply—the Censor replied most kindly, and *The Standard* is fair enough to print it. Here it is again:

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

Ottawa, Jan. 10, 1941.

A BIT OF A GEM

Going Strong

He has a huge congregation and while his followers are certainly not known for their broad-mindedness they are known for the support, both morally and financially, that they bestow on their leader.

Dr. Shields has become ever more aggressive in his attacks on Roman Catholics. He has a church publication "The Gospel Witness" which has grown tremendously in

circulation in recent years. With its growth and power and increased financial return Dr. Shields has become more violent.

Big Following

What the actual circulation of the modest-looking "Gospel Witness" is, Rev. Dr. Shields does not care to reveal, but letters in the files at the church office, which he proudly exhibits, indicate that copies of "The Gospel Witness" are read by at least 100,000 persons in Ontario and surrounding territory. Most of Dr. Shields' sermons are printed in the leaflet from week to week.

There is no "fifth column" organization behind the pulpit of the Jarvis Street Church, in the sense of the word applied to the originator and supporters of the attacks on Catholicism by Premier Godbout of Quebec. But there can be no doubt that the effect of the attacks has been as bad if not worse than any Nazi "fifth columnist" could hope to achieve.

Whether Roman Catholics in Quebec or other provinces should take this Toronto "evangelist" seriously or not is a matter of personal judgment. Ontario people, as a whole, don't think so.

Things looked bad for Shields when he lost the best part of his congregation a few years ago but the setback was only temporary. He has built up his congregation again; has nearly doubled his church's yearly income, if not his own. Burned to the ground two years ago, with a loss of \$200,000, his church has been rebuilt. Sunday evening sermons, in which he takes a new angle of attack on Roman Catholicism nearly every week, pack his church to the doors.

All this will give our readers a good laugh to cheer them on their way. Incidentally Jarvis Street loss was \$300,000, not \$200,000.

We said at the outset that enemies of the truth of all sorts prove allies in the end. In *The Standard* article, the old bitterness engendered by the Marshall controversy crops up. Somebody who was hurt in that battle, which had such a disastrous result to the side which thought it won, but did not make a dent in Jarvis Street's armour, is speaking directly or indirectly in this article, and again with an utter abandonment of the Truth. They do not even keep probability in view. We shall not trouble to correct it, but publish it just as it is printed to show how a Canadian paper can operate as remotely from even the semblance of the Truth as Baron Munchausen himself.

Here is the rest of *The Standard's* Munchausenism:

Dr. Shields said that he "withdrew nothing" from his address of last week. He repeated that the advertisements referred to by Premier Godbout were backed by none except Jarvis Street Baptist Church.

But if anybody thinks Shields is bitter in his attacks on Catholics, they should have seen the conference at Stanley Avenue Baptist Church, Hamilton, some years ago when Shields was trying to run out of college and therefore out of Canada, Prof. the Rev. L. H. Marshall, B.A., B.D., who was then Professor of Pastoral Theology at McMaster University. Marshall's crime was that he was a modernist.

Hard Words

At that time, the more extreme Shields faction had said that if you did not swallow the story that the whale swallowed Jonah, you did not belong in the Baptist church. There was to be no allegory. You had to believe that the whale took Jonah aboard, or else . . .

To keep the record straight at that Baptist battle and make sure that there was no funny business, the Baptists hired three stenographers. Shields had his own shorthand expert. It was a nice, trusting atmosphere.

Chancellor Whidden, shaking with emotion, accused Dr. Shields of a "sinful statement" and later on, of "false statements."

"I am not looking for trouble," said Dr. Shields as he gave his side of the story and also the keynote of

his life in the one sentence. "I can get all the trouble I want without looking for it."

Dr. Marshall when he spoke said: "Dr. Shield's actions are a gross breach of ethics, a gross breach of good manners, and they are also un-British. In England, even the men in the prize ring, the whiskey soaks, the lowest of the low, would be ashamed to stoop to tactics that Dr. Shields adopted."

When the vote was taken on Shields' motion, 399 voted against it and 159 for it. That ended Shields' big bid for supreme power with Ontario Baptists.

But he is still trying.

One of the most ludicrous episodes in connection with Shield's belief in the Gospel according to Saint John, was an aftermath of his insistence that science would back the stand of the Baptist "Regular" clergy in their contention about Jonah being gulped by the mammal.

Finally, one day, during a convention, a Shields satellite claimed that he had scientific proof. Two gentlemen, who were real savants, had come forward with the proof that the Jonah story was absolutely and scientifically possible. What is more, these men were also individuals with a conscience, and to see that right was done to the injured Shields' people, the two scientists had willingly and voluntarily sent forward their testimony.

The Baptist divine then proceeded to read the scientific treatises of Dr. Schmerkase and Prof. Butterbrot.

This scientific testimony created quite a stir.

Next day however, somebody who understood German burst into laughter and rushed to the newspapers and explained that the names of the scientists could be translated into Dr. Cottage Cheese and Dr. Bread and Butter. The doctors were finally identified as a couple of Toronto wags.

"One thing a public man has to learn is to "suffer fools gladly". There are plenty of them about, and some of them presume to write on matters altogether beyond their capacity. How laughable—"Shields' bid for power." His worst enemies know there is nothing within the gift of what we now call "the Old Convention" which he could not have had if he had wanted such baubles. In fact, there was scarcely any position of prominence which he was not offered, but declined. But little place-seekers and office-aspirants cannot understand that attitude.

But to return to this amusing piece of misstatement. The writer is quite ignorant of the fact that John's Gospel makes not the remotest allusion to the prophet Jonah. Whether he believed the rest of the nonsense we don't know. In any event it is notorious that the secular press is less expert—because more careless in reporting religious matters than anything else.

Some years ago we participated in a conference of editors of religious journals in the United States, and one of the brethren told a story apropos of reporters' incompetence.

A certain noted bishop arrived at a hotel in New York on a Saturday for a preaching engagement. On Sunday a young reporter was already waiting in the rotunda for him, and told him he had been sent by his paper to get "a story."

The bishop tried to put him off, but he was insistent. He wanted to know what the bishop was going to preach about. The bishop did not know as yet, and had no manuscript. "Then," said the young sprout, "tell me your text and I'll write something, for I must have a story."

The reporter's persistence won at last. The bishop took him to his room, and when the bell-boy had been disposed of, he sat down with the lad.

"Now," said the bishop, "how long have you been a reporter?" "Two weeks," he replied, "Two weeks!

Then you cannot have had much experience yet; but you seem a nice young fellow, and I admire your perseverance, so I must try to help you."

They drew up their chairs to a table and the bishop said, "Let me see, how shall we begin?" Then to the reporter, "How would you begin? If you were sent to report, let us say, a dog-fight, how would you begin?" "A dog-fight!" said the young fellow, aghast. "A dog-fight? Gee, they would never give me such an important assignment as that!"

Our compliments to the writer in *The Standard*. Our surmise is that he has not yet attained to the reportorial standard of accuracy necessary to report a dog-fight. But we enjoyed viewing his funny-looking rubbish heap. It was without rhyme or reason, but it was not malodorous.

A Western Paper

Somone has sent us a paper from Winnipeg called *Northwest Review*, evidently a Roman Catholic paper. It is dated December 18. This paper, like *The Catholic Record*, invokes the censor. That is the papist method. They specialize in faggots rather than facts. All that the editor can do is to shriek, "It Must Be Stopped!" Why? If the things written are not true, they need not occasion anyone any worry; if they are true, why stop their publication? He speaks of the worthiness and proved loyalty and bravery of many Roman Catholics, all of which we gratefully acknowledge, and THE GOSPEL WITNESS never fails to say so, as often as it criticizes the Papal church as an institution, and Roman Catholicism as a religio-political system.

In the same issue the editor harks back to the Manitoba school question, and criticizes Hon. N. W. Rowell for refusing to deal with it. But in his historical resumé he is utterly at variance with the facts. But what is the use? Only another symptom. Do you hear them? Always trying to gnaw their way into every new house, always infesting and over-running and destroying every old one. Italy, Spain, France, Europe in general, Mexico—and, listen! They are busy gnawing away in South America. And Quebec? We have said enough about that. They have made Quebec so poor, they have almost eaten the government out of house and home.

We salute the Quebec press of both languages. Having no argument with which to meet our presentation of facts, you have substituted mud for ink, and diatribes for discussion. So be it! We shall carry on.

ESCAPING INCOME TAXES

Last Sunday night, before an audience that packed the ample auditorium of Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Dr. Shields spoke for an hour and forty minutes, discussing the religious implications of the Sirosis Report, the attitude of the Quebec Hierarchy to our war effort, and the financial poverty of our sister province as due to exemptions from taxation claimed by the Roman Church.

In this province of Ontario there are large church properties (wrongly enough) exempt from taxation. Much of this property is owned by the Roman Church. Now, in Quebec, clergy belonging to teaching orders, etc., receive only nominal income, and hence contribute nothing to income taxes. We should like to know what exemptions of Roman Church personnel under a similar scheme there are in Ontario.—B.

THE JESUITS AND THE PROTOCOLS OF ZION

(Second of a series on Catholicism and Nazi-Fascism)

By LEO H. LEHMANN

It is admitted by all intelligent people that the so-called "Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion" are criminal forgeries, and could never have been written either by a group of Jews or Freemasons. Yet their authorship remains unknown. The amazing part of it is that this fantastic fraud has succeeded in its planned objective—the ousting of all Judaic-Masonic influence in Central Europe by methods that would bring a blush to the cheek of a Torquemada.

The contents of these alleged Protocols are well enough known, and have been broadcast by Nazi-Fascist (and Roman Catholic) agents in every country as authentic reports—*procès verbaux*—of secret conferences at which certain Jewish leaders drew up plans for the formation of an invisible world-government. With the help of Masonic Lodges and the liberal, democratic, socialist and communist parties, these "Elders of Zion" are said to have conspired for the overthrow of all non-Jewish governments and to destroy all religions other than Judaism. Every despicable means to weaken Christian institutions is set forth by the imaginary leaders of this vast conspiracy.

All this is to be accomplished principally by means of the Masonic orders throughout the world, as the blind dupes and willing tools of this supra-imperialism of the Jews. Credit is claimed for the Jews in having instigated practically all revolutionary movements of the past century, assassination of rulers and heads of states, all the wars, civil, racial and international, and all the upheavals in and throughout the nations—from the Protestant Reformation to the economic conditions that resulted in our business depression. Behind it all there is pictured the cold calculation, the unscrupulous cunning and murderous fanaticism of these "Elders of Zion". Protocol One tells of a vast army of spies and secret agents, well supplied with funds, who bore from within and create dissension and revolution in all countries. Support of anarchist, communist and socialist movements for the destruction of Christian civilization is outlined in Protocol Three; also the debasement and ruin of the currency system, leading to a world-wide economic crisis. Universal war against any nation or group of nations which fails to respond, is planned in Protocol Seven. Protocol Ten contains particulars how all morality is to be undermined and leading statesmen blackmailed, compromised and calumniated in order to force them to serve the ends of the conspirators.

The secret conclave, at which these monstrous plans were purported to have been drawn up, is said to have been held under the auspices of "one of the most influential and most highly initiated leaders of Freemasonry"; they are also said to have been "signed by representatives of Zion of the Thirty-Third Degree."

No group or organization could ever be as evil and satanic as these Judaic-Masonic "Elders of Zion" picture themselves to be. They are the apotheosis of the anti-Christ, and could have been conjured up only by minds imbued with the fearful expectation of the eventual coming of an anti-Christ.

It must be admitted that there is a certain similarity between this revolutionary plan of action and the Bolshevik programme that followed the assassination of the

Czar of Russia and the overthrow of the Kerensky regime. But of the seventeen members of the Council of People's Commissars of the Soviet government at that time, only one, Trotsky, was a Jew. Neither have the Masons ever been the least bit influential in Russia, either under the Czar or the Soviets. A world-wide economic depression also has since happened, somewhat similar to that allegedly planned by these elders of Zion. By no means, however, have the Jews and Masons ever so completely controlled the world's finances. They suffered as much as others as a result of the economic débâcle.

The Nazi-Fascists, who have successfully exploited these Protocols to their great advantage, and who have used these criminal forgeries to attain their primary objective, might well be accused of their authorship. But their publication antedated the rise of Fascism by a quarter of a century, when Hitler and Mussolini were youngsters learning their multiplication tables in school, and Franco babbling his "Hail Marys" at his mother's knee.

Now, authorship of an anonymous document is best discovered from the document itself—by the cause it favours and by the enemies it depicts. These will appear even if placed in reverse. A clear sample of this can be seen from such an analysis of a part of these Protocols of Zion which I have before me. It is a reprint from *The Catholic Gazette*, of February, 1936, a monthly publication of the Catholic Missionary Society of London, England. Space limits permit the quotation of only parts of this nefarious document.

The Judaic-Masonic conspirators are speaking:

"As long as there remains among the Gentiles any moral conception of the social order, and until all faith, patriotism, and dignity are uprooted, our reign over the world shall not come. . . .

"We have still a long way to go before we can overthrow our main opponent: the Catholic Church. . . .

"We must always bear in mind that the Catholic Church is the only institution which has stood, and which will, as long as it remains in existence, stand in our way. The Catholic Church, with her methodical work and her edifying and moral teachings, will always keep her children in such a state of mind as to make them too self-respecting to yield to our domination, and to bow before our future king of Israel. . . .

"That is why we have been striving to discover the best way of shaking the Catholic Church to her very foundations. . . .

"We have blackened the Catholic Church with the most ignominious calumnies, we have stained her history and disgraced even her noblest activities. We have imputed to her the wrongs of her enemies, and have thus brought these latter to stand more closely by our side. . . . We have turned her Clergy into objects of hatred and ridicule, we have subjected them to the contempt of the crowd. . . . We have caused the practice of the Catholic Religion to be considered out of date and a mere waste of time. . . .

"One of the many triumphs of our Freemasonry is that those Gentiles who become members of our Lodges, should never suspect that we are using them to build their own jails, upon whose terraces we shall erect the throne of our Universal King of Israel. . . .

"So far, we have considered our strategy in our attacks upon the Catholic Church from the outside. . . . Let us now explain how we have gone further in our work, to hasten the ruin of the Catholic Church. . . . and now we have brought even some of her Clergy to become pioneers of our cause.

"We have induced some of our children to join the Catholic body, with the explicit intimation that they should work in a still more efficient way for the disintegration of the Catholic Church. . . .

(Continued on page 14)

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

THE ABIDING MENACE OF THE FRUSTRATED ATTEMPT TO SELL CANADA "DOWN THE RIVER"

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, January 26th, 1941

(Stenographically Reported)

"The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites. Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? Who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?"

"He that walketh righteously, and speaketh uprightly; he that despiseth the gain of oppressions, that shaketh his hands from holding of bribes, that stoppeth his ears from hearing of blood, and shutteth his eyes from seeing evil;

"He shall dwell on high: his place of defence shall be the munitions of rocks: bread shall be given him; his waters shall be sure.

"Thine eyes shall see the king in his beauty: they shall behold the land that is very far off."—Isaiah 33:14-17.

The subject as announced for this evening is, "The Abiding Menace of the Frustrated Attempt to Sell Canada 'Down the River'"—whatever that phrase means—"to sell Canada 'Down the River' to the Papal Hierarchy". You have heard the phrase, "down the river"? Premier Hepburn used it. I do not suppose that one per cent. of the people of Canada have read the Sirois Report; and of those who have read it, a comparatively small proportion really understand it. I shall not weary you this evening with an extended discussion of it. I have already analyzed its religious aspect to some extent, and that analysis is contained in the address delivered a week ago Thursday evening, and published in THE GOSPEL WITNESS of January the sixteenth. I shall again refer to it, and touch a few of the salient points in the Report; but I refer to it now because it is merely a symptom of a condition which still obtains in this Dominion.

Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, in itself, did not bomb London, nor burn a large section of the old city; nor did it kill thirty thousand British civilians and another thirty thousand of the armed forces. It was only a revelation and transcription of a state of mind. So the Sirois Report is a revelation of an attitude of mind, of a certain spirit which has not yet been exorcised.

That spirit did not pass when the Report was temporarily pigeonholed. An attempt at robbery or murder, or at any lesser crime, may not legally be as culpable as would be the actual commission of the offence; but the fact that the one who attempted the offence was frustrated in its commission would not make the offender innocent before the Law. The deed was not done, but the will to do it was there, and the attempt to accomplish it was in itself an offence.

Premier King and Mr. Lapointe have told us that we have not heard the last of it. Very probably not. But whether or no, we must concern ourselves with what the recommendations of that Report attempted to do to this country; for the menace of the will to do that thing still remains. And in all probability, the attempt, in some modified or disguised form, will be repeated.

So far as I know, not a single secular paper in Canada has editorially called attention to the religious aspect of that Report. Some papers did carry references to my analysis of it, in their news columns; but

so far as I am aware there was no reference to the religious aspect of it in the secular press of the Dominion, either in the news columns or editorially, save as they reported what we had said. So far as the press is concerned, it was silent on the religious aspect of it.

Not a political leader said anything about it except Mr. Hepburn, and he did it incidentally, in these words:

"I happen to know something about religious and racial issues. I can speak feelingly on this subject. We tried, as a Government, to remedy a simple, obvious injustice and inequality with respect to school tax revenues. We failed."

Of course the Catholic press takes hold of Mr. Hepburn's words, and reminding him of his promise, says that he admits that a "simple and obvious injustice" remains unremedied. To answer that would take me into another field of discussion this evening, but I pause only to make this remark.

I suppose if all the members of this church and congregation who pay taxes, either in rent or in their house-taxes, for school purposes, were to combine their payments, it is quite possible that the aggregate amount of taxes paid by the people related to this individual congregation would be enough to maintain at least a small separate Baptist school, with a Baptist teacher who from Monday to Friday would teach the principles that this church believes and teaches. But we should not be allowed to do it. We must pay our taxes as Baptists, or Presbyterians, or Anglicans, or United Church people, or what not; and we are all lumped together under the general term of public school supporters; for whether we like it or not, we must pay our public school taxes. Then if you want your children especially educated religiously in the things which you believe, you must pay for that over and above your public-school tax. And, I believe, we all recognize that as a just and wise provision. But the Roman Catholic is in a position of special privilege. He is exempt from all obligation to pay the public-school tax, and pays his tax for the propagation of the tenets of his Church in "Separate" schools. There is, in fact, no injustice to be remedied, in respect to our Romanist fellow-citizens: they already have more than their rights. The very existence of Separate Roman Catholic schools is in itself a flagrant injustice to all the Protestants of

this Dominion. And surely it is utterly absurd for people who insist on "separate" schools to pose as advocates of national unity.

There are two columns of editorial discussion in *The Catholic Record* intimating that Mr. Hepburn will be required to implement his promise; but expressing gratitude for the increase of grants to the Separate Schools in the meantime. With that exception, so far as I am aware, no political leader has even referred to the religious aspect of the Sirois Report; and yet, as we shall see, from beginning to end, it is primarily religious, especially as it concerns the Province of Quebec.

I go farther. So far as I am aware, not a single Protestant denominational paper in the Dominion of Canada has mentioned the religious aspect of the Report. A few independent religious papers like THE GOSPEL WITNESS may have done so—I know of one that has referred to the Catholic question, but I have no certain knowledge of any other paper in the whole Dominion than THE GOSPEL WITNESS that has referred to the religious aspect of the Report until we did. Now, of course, there is scarcely a paper in the Province of Quebec, either in the English or French language, that is not discussing it, and blaming me for raising the issue.

And so far as I know, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, not a single preacher of any denomination has yet mentioned the religious aspect of this Report that proposes, because of a religiously-created economic condition, a reconstitution of the whole Dominion. At all events, we have awakened Quebec. The Premier of Quebec has spoken about it; so has also the Provincial Treasurer of Quebec. The French and English papers have given attention to it, both in their news and in their editorial columns. I may freely admit that I did not speak with any expectation of the approval of Quebec, or of Romanists anywhere. Nor am I concerned about their vitriolic criticisms. In spite of all they say about notoriety-seekers and all that nonsense, it is they and not I who have given such wide publicity to my address. The matter I discussed on a Thursday evening is made the subject of the principal headlines in at least some of the French-language papers. One correspondent from Quebec says the address has created "a great commotion" in Quebec.

But why should they pay any attention to me? I am a very unimportant man. They all say so! Premier Godbout says so. The Premier of Quebec says he does not know very much about Dr. Shields: he only knows that he is a Protestant minister of some description, without a church! I thought this was a church! I have been its Pastor for nearly thirty-one years—and that is more years than the months Mr. Godbout has been Premier of Quebec. But then I should not expect the Premier of what Jean-Charles Harvey, Editor and Publisher of *Le Jour*, calls "the most ignorant province in the Dominion" to know much about me! But why all this bother? Here is an obscure man who speaks from his own pulpit of a week evening when they say people do not go to church—and it sets the press of a whole Province in a ferment!

The Sore Spot

Do you remember calling in your doctor when you feared something was wrong? You lay down, and he

began to feel over you, saying, "Tell me if I hurt you." Presently you cried, "Ouch!" "Oh, did I hurt you? That is a tender spot, there, is it?" He touched you somewhere else, and again the exclamation, "Ouch!" I only felt over the corpus of Quebec as a physician diagnosing a case and when I touched the religious spot, the Premier of Quebec cried, "Ouch!" And when I touched upon taxes, in relation to religious institutions, the Provincial Treasurer of Quebec said, "Ouch!" Then all the Papal press chorused, "Ouch!"

Have you any idea why? I believe "the sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites." Could they have thought they were going to get that recommendation through without anyone's noticing it? Could they have dreamed that Canada was so drugged with religious indifference that it would allow that glaring injustice to pass?

I shall not thresh over old straw by repeating what I have already published in my analysis of that Report; but there are some other things germane to the discussion which I omitted from my former address with which I must deal.

Delayed-Action Bomb

Why fight shy of the religious aspect of this question? They say it is dynamite. Quite so! But someone must deal with the Sirois delayed-action bomb! Someone must dig it up, and explode it, or something of greater value than the physical structure of St. Paul's Cathedral will be destroyed. Religious liberty in this country on a Dominion-wide scale would be infringed.

The newspapers of course are commercial institutions. Some of them are very heroic. I should like to pay my tribute to *The Evening Telegram* of Toronto for daring to say some things that other papers will not say. I recognize that if the secular press were to deal with this religious aspect, within twenty-four hours they would hear from every Roman Catholic advertiser, threatening them with boycott. When a certain course in respect to the ever-present Catholic problem was urged upon a certain newspaper publisher in Canada, some years ago, he replied, "If I take this course, what compensation can you promise me for the twenty thousand circulation I shall lose over night?" He knew too well that is how Romanism works.

As for the politicians: they know very well that an organized, regimented minority that can always be depended upon to do as they are told, can defeat an unorganized majority every time. The politicians know that if they say a word about it, Roman Catholic voters will be instructed never to vote for that man or his supporters; and one bold statement might lose some politician his seat in the Legislature or in Parliament.

And as for the denominational papers, they are threatened by the religious pacifists among their readers. "Now! Now! No row! Do not let us have any trouble about that." I said, "Threatened"? A silent threat, no doubt, but none the less menacing.

I received a letter from one such gentleman in Montreal. He said he is working among Roman Catholics, and that Roman Catholics would not be won by my statements. I will venture to say that we have more converted Roman Catholics in the membership of this church than in any other church in the city of Toronto. My Montreal correspondent is a religious appeaser. I

have not had time to reply to him yet, but I shall write to tell him that my primary object in this discussion is not so much the conversion of Roman Catholics, but the awakening of Protestants—and for that, strong speech is sometimes necessary. The physician sometimes finds it necessary to abandon soft words about an “indisposition” and a little lung congestion, and awaken a careless patient by the fell words “cancer”, or “tuberculosis”.

As for my brother-preachers, why do they not speak? Not always because they would not like to, but because they are forbidden by the business interests represented in their congregations. Twenty years ago I gave a lecture in McMaster University when it was on Bloor Street, on the Irish question, after my return from Ireland and a firsthand study of the subject with all Irish leaders. Later some of the ladies of this church waited on me one afternoon and said, “Pastor, why cannot we have that lecture in the church so that we can all hear it?” I said, “I should be very glad to repeat it if you want to hear it.” What happened? (You sometimes wonder why this preacher had a revolution in Jarvis Street). What happened? Immediately some of the business men of this church came to me and said, “Pastor, it must not be. We cannot have it in the church. We have Roman Catholic customers, and if you speak on this question it will mean an enormous loss; and besides, who knows but they will come in and break up the church?” The lecture was not given! *The Evening Telegram* printed the lecture *in extenso*, and without my asking it, they ran off a hundred copies and sent them to me. I had forgotten all about it until last week I found a copy in my archives, and I am going to publish it in *THE GOSPEL WITNESS*. It is still pertinent although twenty years old. The Irish problem promises to continue as green as Ireland itself. But I suppose if many preachers were to raise this issue in their pulpits they would have a revolution in their congregations. I do not think that preachers are justified in submitting to such restraint, and the reason we had our little difficulty in this church was that this man would not submit to such restrictions—not only in respect to the Roman Catholic question, but in respect to all matters contrary to revealed truth. We believe that the prophet of the Lord should be free—and in this place people and preacher are as free as air. We have mastery of the air!

What Does a Preacher Know?

There are not a few who would appear very superior, saying, “What does Dr. Shields know about the Sirois Report?” I should like to debate it publicly with the Premier of this country, Mr. King, or with Mr. Lapointe. I should like to debate it with Premier Godbout. I’ll promise to give him enough to keep him awake for a week! “What does Dr. Shields know about such a matter as that?” I know a little—more than the Roman Catholic politicians like me to know. Sometimes people say I speak strongly. I do not know whether you think I do, or not, but if you knew how much I restrain, you would admire my moderation. And when these little intellectual pygmies some of whom call themselves preachers affect a superior air—to me they are about as dignified and impressive as “President Andrew H. Brown of the Fresh Air Taxi Company”. “Intellectual”? “Intelligensia”? Ah me!

I could eat a dozen of them for breakfast and not know I had eaten.

To ignore the religious aspect of this Report is to ignore it altogether, to misinterpret it. What would you think of a doctor who said, “I never resort to X-rays”? Or one who said, “I never use a stethoscope”? What would you think of the mariner who said, “The pole star? What do you mean by that? I do not know anything about it. I never look at it”? Or the mathematician who should boast that he ignores his fundamental axioms?

Minority Problems

Hitler is expert at creating “minority problems”. Before the war, he always had a minority problem on his hands. He had one in Danzig, in Poland, in Austria, in Sudetenland—and then that Austrian incarnation of benevolence suddenly took an interest in minorities that were being suppressed, and arose in their defense. He made the discussion of minority problems always the occasion for aggression. So does the Roman Catholic Church. It always has a minority problem cooking up in the frying-pan. Listen to this, taken from page fifty-one of Book Two of the Sirois Report:

“It has been urged upon us that the existing safeguards for religious minorities should be extended so that Roman Catholic minorities in every province may be free to insist that their taxes for education be paid for the upkeep of separate schools. . . . These representations indicate the existence in several provinces of a sense of grievance which may well lead to disunity as well as lack of harmony within the province concerned. But we are compelled to say that it does not fall within our terms of reference to advise the provinces what course they should pursue.”

Why did they thus deal with something that did not fall within the terms of reference? Then follows a list of nine such representations. Where are they from? British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, and the Maritime Provinces. No province is omitted. Thus these people who are so concerned for national unity endeavour to bring pressure to bear to set up within these several provinces minorities having their own language and their own schools; and the Report warns us of possible disunity, if these “minorities” are not allowed to have their way. Why should we not work up a Baptist minority grievance, and a Presbyterian minority grievance, and an Anglican minority grievance; and a United Church minority grievance—for anyone would qualify as a “minority” in relation to the whole—and go to the Government and say, “If you do not grant our demands there may be disunity in the Province”? What nonsense! Why should a “minority” because it is a minority be allowed special privileges which the necessities of the case must deny to the majority? Only, as I see it, on the principle that the spoiled and ill-tempered child of a large family who is in the habit of disturbing the peace of the household by his screams if his slightest wish, however unreasonable, is denied, may be indulged with strawberries in January although they are too expensive for the rest of the household.

Who are these people who talk of national unity, who are perennially introducing into the life of the Provinces and the Dominion the most divisive questions that can be conceived? Of course, I am only a notoriety-seeker! So be it. I sent all these addresses

to the various Premiers for their information: I intend to send what I now say for their further information. I say, with respect, they need it. The prophets were called "seers" in ancient times. Noah saw something in his day that no one else saw. "By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house." Abraham saw the destruction of Sodom before it came. Jonah at last, repenting, cried in the streets of Nineveh, "Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown."

Prophets' Testimony Derided

But always the prophets of truth are derided: they always have been. I will magnify my office and tell you that the men who have done things, who have warned their generations of the evils of the day, as a rule, have not been recognized until they were dead. Their contemporaries said they were disturbers of the peace, called them all sorts of names. There never was a prophet more belittled and derided than the One Who was the very Incarnation of truth, and He said to the men of His day, "But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth." I tell you the truth about these matters—the Premier of Quebec, and Mr. Lapoint, and Mr. King, and the whole aggregation of them together to the contrary notwithstanding. Conceit? "Do you know more, see more than they?" Yes! And that is paying myself no compliment. I do not believe there ever was a more thoroughly integrated conglomeration of governmental ineptitude than is represented by the King Government. And I voted for him! I supported him! I supported Premier King and his government as the lesser of two evils. Perhaps he was, but if so, what appalling governmental lassitude we escaped.

We are in the midst of a world social, political, and religious revolution. We are in the midst of a moral earthquake: "Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven", saith the Lord. And this old world is in the midst of a moral earthquake. There is not a spot of earth where the tremors cannot be felt by spiritually sensitive souls. Canada ought to be in the war up to the eyes. Why not? There ought not to be a man of seventy years old and under idle in Canada. If we were really properly seized of our responsibility, we should have all the men at work. Mr. Churchill said in effect, they were going to comb and scrape the military services; because in the immediate future the war would make greater demands on man-and-woman power than ever; yet here in Canada thousands of men are still unemployed, while tens of thousands beg for the privilege of enlisting—and we are doing relatively little to what we ought to be doing. We have no need of conscription. All the men want is permission to get into the army.

I wish I could make myself heard throughout the Dominion. I wish we could see what is coming. We need at this moment half a million men, and as many more as possible, trained for war against the day when hell breaks loose in Europe, and man-power is needed to restore order. As the case now stands there is no one but Britain to do it. If an attempt at invasion is made, while it will most certainly fail, its defeat will take a great toll of our armed forces. The failure of an invasion would precipitate almost immediately a general European revolt, which would require millions of fresh troops to reduce to order. We ought to be preparing

our quota of that army now. Why are we not doing so? We are being hindered by the Canadian subjects—willingly or unwillingly—of the Papal Hierarchy that is behind Hitler, and behind Mussolini, and that was responsible for the civil war in Spain, and for the collapse of France, and is the aider and abetter of all this world-wide carnage everywhere. "An extravagant statement"? You will learn one of these days. That is what is hamstringing our efforts. Mr. Godbout said it. It is in my letter to the censor. He boasted of the Conscription Act, as adding nothing to the Government's powers, and said it only restricted the Government's powers by limiting its application to home defense:

"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."

I did not say that. The Premier of Quebec said that. The Parliamentary correspondent of *Le Devoir*, Mr. Léopold Richer, said:

"French Canada has suffered, in silence and submission to duly constituted authority, the principle of participation in the European War. Mr. Mackenzie King will be the first one to admit that this was an extraordinary concession to Canadian unity on the part of French Canada,"—by allowing the rest of us to go to war! That is one of the things I told the Censor, and he could not answer it.

These are the reasons for the halfway measures that have been holding Canada back.

Cardinal Villeneuve has appointed a day of prayer. I do not want to be irreverent or unkind, but I frankly say that I am no more impressed by such a gesture as that, as I believe Heaven will be when the prayers are offered. It is nothing but a gesture.

What of Our Taxes?

What the Report proposes is not the abolition of any of the Legislatures. Canada is to remain a federated, not a unitary state. That is to say, it is to be a federation of autonomous provinces, and not a nation with one central government. It does not propose to do away with any of the legislatures. I do not see why all the prairie provinces should not get together in one, and the Maritimes in one, that would leave Ontario, and Quebec, and British Columbia—five provincial governments instead of nine. But the Report says again and again that that is beyond the terms of reference. They propose only that the Provinces shall yield certain sources of income to the Dominion, and receive certain compensations for such surrender. The Provinces shall surrender to the Dominion the Succession Duty Tax field. The Dominion has power, I believe, to impose that Tax, or to encroach upon that field. Their recommendation would not so much give the Dominion extra powers as take away from the Provinces some of the powers they now possess. The Provinces would be excluded from the field of Succession Duty Tax: it would all go to the Dominion.

We used to have Municipal and Dominion Tax. Then the Province took over the Municipal, and later the Dominion undertook to collect both Provincial and Dominion. Now it is proposed to exclude the Provinces from that field altogether. Likewise, the Provinces would be

excluded from the Corporation Tax revenue; and there would be left to the Provinces their major source of revenue, the real property tax, liquor control, motor licenses, gasoline tax, and so on. You will notice, the Dominion already has authority to encroach upon all these sources, but what is proposed is that the Provinces be excluded from these fields. What is to be done in return for that?

The Dominion proposes to take over all the Provincial debts as Dominion debts, the bonded indebtedness of the various Provinces, exclusive of municipalities, except in the case of Quebec, where they would take over forty per cent. of the enormous debt of Montreal. The Dominion takes over the Provincial debts, and gives us a clean sheet to start with. What else would it do? Take care of the relief question: practically all of it would become a Dominion obligation.

And what else? They would make the Province that can show that it needs a grant, a stated grant. In Alberta they would take over three hundred and fifty millions of dollars' interest that is unpaid, and by endorsing the Provincial bonds they would enhance the value of Provincial bonds by about two hundred millions.

I have no sympathy whatever with those who, in matters of that sort, talk about the "money barons" as not needing the interest. Those bonds are usually held by trustee companies, trust companies or insurance companies who hold money in trust for investors. If an insurance company is to keep its covenant with us on the basis of its actuarial estimates, it has a right to insist that those with whom they have entered into covenant, shall keep their covenant with them. It must be mutual. I think the interest should be paid, even though the other Provinces must come to the help of an indigent Province, if it can be shown that that Province is not responsible for its condition.

But Quebec, as I have pointed out, is always the "exception". Because it is so poor!—among other things it is to be given an irreducible annual grant of eight million dollars; and in addition to that it is to be given, with the other Provinces, a "national adjustment grant" which is to last for five years. Every five years it is to be reconsidered, and the Provincial Treasurers will come to the Dominion at a stated time and say, "Our budget is so-and-so, and unless we greatly increase our taxation we shall be behind, and therefore we shall need an annual grant from the Dominion Treasury of so much". That is the National Adjustment Grant.

Wealthy Ontario

Ontario gets nothing! I was reminded of a story when I read the Report's description of Ontario. I heard of a man who had a house, and as he became wealthier he grew tired of his house and said to his wife, "What do you say about selling the house? It will do us good to go to a new neighbourhood, and to have a modern house". He put it in the hands of a real estate agent to sell, and began looking around for something more suitable. One evening he picked up the paper and read the advertisements of houses for sale, and was struck by the description of one. Calling his wife he said, "Come here a minute. Listen to this description of a house that is for sale." They agreed that it was exactly what they wanted, and called up the real estate man—only to discover that the advertisement described the very house

he was trying to sell! They never dreamed they were getting rid of such an attractive house.

I had no idea that we in Ontario lived so near to paradise until I read the Sirois Report. We are so rich we do not know what to do with our money. You can almost sweep it up in the streets. We are so prosperous, and our standards of life are so much higher than others, that we are overflowing with good things. Of course the Report says that the Committee does not recommend that we should reduce our standards, but only that at the rate we are living it is evident we do not require any annual grant, and we do not need any National Adjustment Grant. We in Ontario do not need anything—except the opportunity to pay other people's debts.

But Quebec! Poor Quebec! I have tried to find out why Quebec is so poor. Its revenue from real estate is much lower than ours—sixty and a half million dollars in Quebec and one hundred and seven and a quarter in Ontario—about forty-six and three quarter million in our favour. That is the major source of Provincial revenue. Quebec has twenty-seven per cent. of the population of the Dominion, and Ontario about thirty-two per cent., a difference of five per cent. of the total population of the Dominion. Why is it that Quebec is so poor in this matter of real estate taxes? I read an article—and I published it with my analysis—by Jean-Charles Harvey, in *Le Jour* (See THE GOSPEL WITNESS for January 16, p. 14.), in which he points out that there are in round figures seven hundred and thirty-five million dollars' worth of property exempt from taxation in Quebec, and that the exempted property was three hundred and fifty-four million dollars more than is exempt in Ontario.

Separation of Church and State

As justification for speaking of this, I may tell you that this church years ago protested against the principle of the exemption of religious properties from taxation, on the ground of conscience. Here is a church, a block north is another, a block east another, and so on. Those churches have certain real value. If they are exempt from taxation, the taxes must be levied upon someone else to make up for it. Among taxpayers there may be people who have no religious interest, who do not want to give to religious objects. There may be some Roman Catholics who do not want to give to the relief of a Baptist church, or Baptists who do not want to give to the relief of Roman Catholic institutions. We said, "The state should not thus infringe upon the preserve of conscience. All religious organizations should be taxed like with others." And for a period of years we assessed ourselves and we voluntarily paid twelve or fifteen hundred dollars a year taxes to the city—until we had paid a total of about twenty thousand dollars which we were not required to pay by law, as a reinforcement of our position. At the end of that time the City Council rewarded our protest by making a present of a piece of city property, owned by all the citizens of Toronto, to a certain religious body—and then we ceased paying such taxes.

I say that to show you that I am not inconsistent in opposing this principle. And that three hundred and fifty-four million applies only to churches and religious institutions that are associated with the churches. It does not include property owned by religious orders in Quebec, and they are many. I can make only a rough

guess, it is only approximate, but my estimate is that if the churches and the property adjacent to them are worth seven hundred and thirty-four millions—nearly three-quarters of a billion—the property owned by these religious organizations must be at least equal in value to the churches. I believe, indeed, my estimate is a very conservative one. That is only my estimate; but if it holds there is a billion and a half worth of property in the Province of Quebec, owned by the Church of Rome, that pays no taxes.

But once again. This Report tells us that most of the social work in Quebec is done by the Church instead of by the state. Hospitals and other institutions are owned by the Church. And so it is proposed to take over the bonded indebtedness of all these institutions, by the Dominion, because their debts are guaranteed by the Province. So the debts on all these institutions would be transferred to the Dominion—another thing that you and I would have to pay. (*Book II, p. 124, second column.*)

Nor is that all. The Report says there is a certain average standard of social efficiency in the Provinces. Ontario is high; Quebec is low. But they assume a hypothetical average standard, and they recommend in the Report that no Province should be allowed to lean on the Dominion to make up for their own deficiencies. That is to say, if they let their schools and other institutions down, or lower their rate of taxation so that they have not the money to keep up these services, the Dominion would not help them. They must keep up to the average standard; and presumably as often as they apply for the National Adjustment Grant they would have to prove that the average standard is being maintained. But once again they say Quebec is different. In everything Quebec is "different". "Exception" must be made in the case of Quebec. Quebec is different! Different, for example in this, because the people who work in all these institutions do not receive salaries but only a nominal remuneration, and therefore it is impossible to set a monetary estimate upon their services. Teachers in schools, workers in hospitals, in orphanages—these people do not receive salaries but only a kind of honorarium to which there cannot be attached a monetary estimate. But what about their food and clothing and living quarters?

The Report says it would be absurd to suppose that Quebec falls below the average, and therefore by an "arbitrary standard" they write it into the Report that the Quebec average is standard. So far as I can see, it is the only Province that has not to prove that it is standard.

To meet these deficiencies Quebec is to be given an irreducible annual grant of eight million dollars from the Dominion Treasury, plus a "National Adjustment Grant".

National Adjustment Grant

And then there is this gem:

"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."

Do you understand that? It can be applied to hospitals, schools, or if they do not need it there, they can reduce taxation—by increasing ours! The Dominion grant to the Province is not to be labelled for education. They particularly state that. Why? If labelled for Quebec education, you and I would have some ground of complaint that we were being compelled to pay for the Roman Catholic education of Quebec. Anticipating that, they say, "Here you are. Put it in the bank, and spend it as you like."

Another thing that is not in my printed analysis. Take all the hospital services, orphanages, and all the so-called welfare organizations under "the Church".

"Accurate statistics of the monetary equivalent of the contributions of the Church are not available; for example, most of the personnel are paid only nominal salaries."

The schools are taught by brothers and sisters, members of religious orders, who have "only nominal salaries". The entire personnel of those institutions having a monetary value of a billion and a half dollars receive no stated salaries, or "only nominal salaries," and therefore, we assume they pay no income tax. What about Ontario with her large revenue? Our public school teachers, our high school teachers, university professors, doctors, nurses, and all others included in the personnel of institutions pay income tax, if their salaries or wages come within the tax ratio. Indeed, the Defence Tax is deducted at the source from their remuneration, and then according to scale of salary they must pay income tax. So far as I can see, there is no provision for that in the Quebec arrangement. This vast organization is not only exempt from the real property tax, but is at least in a large part, exempt from income tax on the part of the personnel. Consider what that means. A billion and a half dollars worth of property, and the larger portion of the personnel which operate it, numbering many thousands, exempt from taxation. I do not know about the priests. I understand there are two or three in Quebec! One friend told me of a certain church in Montreal where the rector, or whatever the head is called, has a staff of thirty priests. It requires the whole thirty to hear confessions and perform the other necessary services of the Church. There are many who would be called "secular" priests, who are not members of religious orders, but who exercise the work of the priesthood. Most of them receive small salaries—plus lodgings, food and clothing; though there are some substantial stipends.

Mr. Godbout—Please Answer

It is the privilege of the ignorant to ask questions. It is the right of the taxpayers of the rest of the Dominion, when Quebec asks for "exceptional" treatment which involves taking over much of her debt, and thereafter making her an "exceptional" grant out of Dominion revenue, what "exceptional" conditions has brought Quebec to her present economic plight.

I therefore put these questions to Premier Godbout:

1. Whether our estimate of a billion and a half worth of exempted property is approximately correct; and if it is not, whether he will give us the correct figures.

2. Whether he will tell us the total population living within or upon this exempted property, including the personnel required for its operation; and what proportion of the total "are paid only nominal salaries", and therefore of necessity pay no income tax.

3. Since it is quite possible to obtain a complete list of all Protestant ministers in the Dominion, and the amount each one is paid as an annual stipend, will Premier Godbout inform the taxpayers of the Dominion

the total number of "secular" clergy in the Province of Quebec, and whether any account of their individual incomes is required and received by the Provincial and Dominion Governments.

4. And therefore whether Premier Godbout will inform the taxpayers of the Dominion (a) of the amount of money lost to the municipal, or other treasuries of Quebec on account of the enormous proportion of Quebec real property which is exempt from taxation on religious grounds; and (b) whether Premier Godbout can form any estimate of the loss to the Provincial and Dominion treasuries on income tax account by the exemption from income tax obligation of the thousands of "religions" who occupy so large a part of the exempted property; and an account of the thousands of priests, who, while possibly paying a small tax on relatively nominal stipends, give no account to anybody of, and therefore pay no income tax on, the greater part of their income.

5. And further, will Premier Godbout inform us whether commercial and industrial corporations in Quebec, owned and operated by religious orders, pay taxes on their real property, and whether they pay corporation tax as other competing corporations must do. And if the answer to this question is negative in whole or in part, whether Premier Godbout can estimate the approximate loss in real estate tax and corporation tax, respectively, occasioned by these conditions.

"Excessive Privileges"

Apropos of all these questions we quote from an article entitled "Excessive Privileges", by Jean-Charles Harvey in a recent issue of *Le Jour*. It is worth remarking that Jean-Charles Harvey was for years the official statistician of the Province and knows whereof he writes. Here follow the excerpts:

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 eco-

nomie 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!

In further illustration of the "exceptional" privileges to which our Quebec friends seem to think they are by divine right entitled, 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."

Building in War Time

I mention one other matter. I happen to know of one particular case. A certain business concern wanted to extend its place of business. The plans were drawn, and money was in hand to pay for it. They received tenders and were ready to let the contract. In the matter of steel, the tender had to be approved by the Steel Controller or whatever he is called, at Ottawa—and it was vetoed. They were told, "It is war time, and we cannot let you have the steel to build." That was right. If this church had not been rebuilt before the war, we should not have thought of trying to rebuild after war was declared. Nor should we have complained if the Government had said, "The war is our main business. We cannot afford you the steel."

I have in my hand a paper—not a religious paper. As a matter of fact it is entitled, *Canada Lumberman*. Sermons in stones? Yes, and in trees! This magazine appears twice a month. There is a good deal of construction going on in Ontario, nearly all of it extension of plants for war work. There are a few apartment houses being built, for people must have somewhere to live; but in all of Canada with one exception—there are but two religious institutions to whom permits have been given. A United Church has a small contract of thirty thousand dollars, and another for sixty thousand dollars—ninety thousand dollars in Ontario and in all the rest of Canada for religious purposes. Perhaps I ought to include a Separate School at Sudbury, owned by Roman Catholics, for sixty thousand dollars. That makes a total of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars for religious and educational and charitable purposes in the entire Dominion, with the exception of Quebec. What about Quebec? Contracts have been let in Quebec reported in the month of January in this trade journal, for churches, monasteries, and religious institutions owned by the Roman Catholic Church, for how much? For a total of eight million, one hundred and forty thousand dollars. One hundred and fifty thousand permitted in all of Canada except Quebec: in Quebec alone, eight million, one hundred and forty thousand dollars.

But, as the Sirois Report always reminds us, conditions in Quebec are "exceptional" and therefore, "an exception must be made in the case of Quebec"!

One place at Mont Royal, the Basilica, is to cost six

million dollars, in war time! Over eight million dollars' worth more of property upon which no taxes will be paid, and presumably, part of their debt transferred to the Dominion for us to pay.

Do not these facts speak for themselves? I have not quoted from a religious paper. It does not call attention to it: it simply prints the lists of contracts let. Talk to me about "national unity" in the interests of the war! Premier Godbout is a very discerning man. No doubt he was right when he said:

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

Following this address I shall get still more abuse. But once upon a time a man called Elijah went down to a certain vineyard—did you ever hear or read the story? A vineyard that a man called Ahab had covetously desired and criminally acquired. When Ahab went down to view his new possession he found the rugged prophet awaiting him, and he hissed at him, "Hast thou found me, O mine enemy?" To which Elijah answered, "I have found thee: because thou hast sold thyself to work evil in the sight of the Lord." At another time this same prophet went to show himself to Ahab, and Ahab said, "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" And Elijah replied, "I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father's house, in that thou hast forsaken the Lord and thou hast followed Baalim."

"He That Buildeth Israel"

He is always a troubler of Israel who will not let the devil have his own way. Stand across the path of evildoers anywhere, at any time, and you will always be called a disturber of the peace; and good people will still help throw stones at you. Many religious people in our day are willing to hold the coat of a young man called Saul while he stones Stephen to death. But it does not affect the truth. The thing that "troubled Israel" in Elijah's day was the worship of Baal; and that is still the cause of our trouble; that which is threatening us to-day, is the Roman Catholic Hierarchy.

Do you ask what all this has to do with us? I answer: This debt that is to be piled on to Ottawa is to become an obligation of all the taxpayers of Canada. We shall be compelled to support every Roman Catholic institution in Quebec, to help pay the upkeep of Separate Schools. Remember, Ontario pays about fifty per cent. of all the Dominion revenue.

Is not that a pretty dish to set before the king? Do you not think the Sirois Report a lovely thing? It is no wonder Premier Godbout does not like me. No wonder the Catholic press is crying, "Ouch!" But they may have to cry again and again.

I have spoken long but I wanted to say much more. I must say this. At the foundation of it all, so far as I am concerned, is my devotion to the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, to all the liberties and advantages which that gospel brings to those who believe it in this life, and the salvation which it ensures beyond. I beg of you to believe the Gospel. Some people say Dr. Shields deals with political questions. I do when they have a direct religious bearing. That is my chief concern. But what of it? Oliver Cromwell dealt with political questions; so did Martin Luther, Canon Wilberforce, John Wesley, and every reformer—every man who recognized that the religion of Christ is for the whole man, for all that concerns him here and all that concerns him hereafter.

We cannot justly separate ourselves from these things, as though we had no responsibility therefor. I am deeply and profoundly concerned that so few nowadays see that the Protestant church co-called has so generally departed from the principles of the Book, that many have become indifferent to these great principles upon which our liberties, civil and religious, depend. But some day they will wake up. Some day, unless something is done, the Roman Catholics will have the majority in this country—they are nearing it now—and woe betide us when that day shall come! Our liberties will then be at an end. I beg of you, give this matter thought. Inform yourself on these things, and so together let us do what we can to come up to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty.

I bethought me how I could put the whole matter in a way you could remember. Here is almost a complete analogy.

Hitler has stripped Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, of all their food supplies. Now some well-meaning but short-sighted people like Mr. Herbert Hoover, say, "We must feed the starving people of the German-occupied countries." In so doing of course they would feed Hitler and his hordes.

Roman Catholicism, like a plague of locusts, has stripped Quebec of its wealth, it has eaten its fields bare. Now the same ravagers of that naturally rich and fruitful province, concoct a scheme which would throw open the fields of all the provinces for similar devastations.

Some people want peace: so do I. Lindbergh wants a negotiated peace which would be a peace conditioned upon unconditional surrender to Hitler—the peace of a slave in chains. All of us here believe that peace at such a price would be worse than death.

Quebec talks of "national unity". I am in favour of national unity, and ready to do everything which could justly be done to promote it. But if "national unity" in the view of Quebec means as Premier Godbout suggests, submission to the dictated will of a handful of French Canadians led by Mr. Lapointe, and if that submission means, as I fear it does, acquiescence in such a nefarious plot as the Sirois Report involves, which again in turn means an indirect acceptance of the Papal yoke in the form of a perpetual tax-burden in support of Roman Catholicism—in short, if the price of national unity be submission in any form direct or indirect, to popery—then such a price even for national unity is too high, and I, for one, will never pay it!

THE JESUITS AND THE PROTOCOLS OF ZION

(Continued from page 6)

"We are the Fathers of all Revolutions—even of those which sometimes happen to turn against us. We are the supreme Masters of Peace and War.—We can boast of being the Creators of the REFORMATION! (sic). Calvin was one of our Children; he was of Jewish descent, and was entrusted by Jewish authority and encouraged with Jewish finance to draft his scheme in the Reformation.

"Martin Luther yielded to the influence of his Jewish friends, and again, by Jewish authority and with Jewish finance, his plot against the Catholic Church met with success.

"Thanks to our propaganda, to our theories of LIBERALISM and to our MISREPRESENTATIONS OF FREEDOM (sic), the minds of many among the Gentiles were ready to welcome the Reformation. They

separated from the Church to fall into our snare. And thus the Catholic Church has been sensibly weakened, and her authority over the Kings of the Gentiles has been reduced almost to naught. . . .

"We are grateful to PROTESTANTS for their loyalty to our wishes—although most of them are, in the sincerity of their faith, unaware of their loyalty to us. . . .

"France, with her Masonic government, is under our thumb. England, in her dependence upon our finance, is under our heel; and in her Protestantism is our hope for the destruction of the Catholic Church. Spain and Mexico are but toys in our hands. And many other countries, including the U.S.A., have already fallen before our scheming. . . .

"Likewise, as regards our diplomatic plans and the power of our secret societies, there is no organization to equal us. *The Jesuits are the only ones to compare with us.* But we have succeeded in discrediting them, . . . for they are a visible organization, whereas we are safely hidden under cover of our secret societies.

"But the Catholic Church is still alive. . . ."

"We must destroy her without the least delay and without the slightest mercy. . . . Let us intensify our activities, in poisoning the morality of the Gentiles. Let us spread the spirit of revolution in the minds of the people. They must be made to despise Patriotism and the love of family, to consider their faith as a humbug. . . . Let us make it impossible for Christians outside the Catholic Church to be reunited to that Church, otherwise the greatest obstruction to our domination will be strengthened and all our work undone. . . .

"Let us remember that as long as there still remain active enemies of the Catholic Church, we may hope to become Masters of the World. . . . And let us remember always that the future Jewish King will never reign in the world before the Pope in Rome is dethroned. . . .

"When the time comes and the power of the Pope shall at last be broken, the fingers of an invisible hand will call the attention of the masses of the people to the court of the Sovereign Pontiff to let them know that we have completely undermined the power of the Papacy. . . . The King of the Jews will then be the real Pope and the Father of the Jewish World-Church."

When all this is placed in reverse, the following appears:

The Catholic Church is the only upholder of morality, the social order, faith, patriotism and dignity. . . .

The Catholic Church is the only institution which has stood, and which will always stand, in the way of anti-Christ.

The Catholic Church is the great exemplar of methodical work, edifying and moral teachings; she always keeps her children self-respecting, and will never bow to satanic allurements.

Only when Catholics become ashamed of professing the precepts of the Church and obeying its commands, shall we have the spread of revolt and false liberalism.

The Catholic Church has been blackened by the most ignominious calumnies, her history has been stained, and her noblest activities disgraced. The practices of the Catholic Church are not out of date or a mere waste of time.

Freemasonry is allied with Satan against the Catholic Church. Not all priests are to be trusted; liberal Catholic priests only serve the work of the devil.

The Reformation was the work of evil conspirators. Calvin and Luther were financed by them to overthrow the Catholic Church.

Freedom and liberty are mere representations of good. Protestants have unwittingly helped to bring all the evils into our present world. Protestant England aims to destroy the Catholic Church. All that may happen in Spain and Mexico is a part of a plot against the Catholic religion.

The Jesuits are not an underhand organization, but all they do is open and above board. The Jesuits are the only organization, however, who can defeat the force of evil in the world.

FINALLY: As long as the Pope remains on his throne in Rome the world is safe. . . .

This is exactly what is taught in all Catholic schools. Every retreat and mission given to priests and lay people begins with St. Ignatius' picture of "The Two Camps"—the Catholic Church led by God on one hill, and the combination of Protestants, Jews, Masons, communists, socialists and atheists on the other led by Satan.

And all of this is to be found again in Father Coughlin's *Social Justice* magazine. In its issue of February 5, 1940, for instance, he reiterates that the Catholic Church is "the ideal Christian Front" and proclaims that all those opposed to, or not with, it belong to anti-Christian groups which will soon "*appear incarnated in the person of Anti-Christ himself.*" He says that "lay Christian leadership of social matters is to be condemned." A Special Correspondent of his magazine in Rome writes an article that the "Only Hope of Christian Europe Lies in Rome," and that Europe can be saved only by the restoration of the Holy Roman Empire; that England, "who more than any other country now represents the neo-Judaic, anti-Catholic spirit," will be destroyed by Germany and Italy. In another part of this issue, liberal Catholic priests, like Mgr. John A. Ryan, are called "Hireling Clergy" paid by left-wing revolutionary groups. Towards the end is a trick questionnaire which implies twenty answers aimed to secure a poll from its readers which will be condemnatory of democracy.

Although first published in Russia in 1903, the Protocols of Zion had their origin in France and date from the Dreyfus Affair, of which the Jesuits were the chief instigators. They were planned also first to take effect in France, by the overthrow of the "Judaic-Masonic" government of the French Republic. But the discovery of the gigantic fraud of Leo Taxil, who had been openly supported by the Jesuits, the concluding of the Franco-Russian alliance, along with the Vatican's difficulties with the French government at that time, made it more opportune to have them appear first in Russia.

These Protocols of supposedly Jewish leaders are not the first documents of their kind fabricated by the Jesuits.

For over a hundred years before these Protocols appeared, the Jesuits had continued to make use of a similar fraud called *The Secrets of the Elders of Bourg-Fontaine* against Jansenism—a liberal French Catholic movement among the secular clergy. The analogy between the two forgeries is perfect—the secret assemblage in the forest of Bourg-Fontaine, the plan of the "conspirators" to destroy the Papacy and establish religious tolerance among all nations, the alleged plot against Throne and Altar, and the setting up of a world-government in opposition to the Catholic Church. There is the same dramatization of the *negative* pole of the historic evolution of the world, in order to bring out, by contrast, the *positive* Christian [Catholic] pole, around which all conservative forces—the monarchy, the aristocracy, the army, the clergy—must gather to save the world from Satan's onslaught.

Analyzing, therefore, the ends to be attained by these Protocols of Zion, the means to be employed, the forces depicted as evil and those to be considered good, we must reach the conclusion that only to those whose objectives these forgeries were clearly intended to serve, can their authorship be attributed.

Next week: "THE STRANGE CASE OF LEO TAXIL".

Bible School Lesson Outline

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

Vol. 5 First Quarter Lesson 6 February 9, 1941

THE SIN OF UNBELIEF

Lesson Text: Mark 6:1-31.

Golden Text: "And he marvelled because of their unbelief"—Mark 6:6.

I. Unbelief in the Church—verses 1 to 6.
Parallel passage: Matt. 13:54-58.

Confusion may exist in the minds of some with regard to the setting of this passage. Nazareth was the boyhood home of our Lord (Matt. 2:23; Mk. 1:9; Lk. 2:39, 51), and at the commencement of His public ministry He revisited the place, preaching in the synagogue. But they rejected His testimony, and sought means to destroy Him (Lk. 4:16-32), whereupon He made Capernaum His headquarters as He toured Galilee with His disciples (Matt. 4:13). This chapter tells of further witness in Nazareth, another example of the patience and grace of our Saviour (Rom. 2:4; 1 Tim. 2:4; 2 Pet. 3:9).

The town of Nazareth was evidently notorious for its wickedness (John 1:46). The shadow of the cross lay athwart the early life of our Lord, and the sword began to pierce the heart of His gentle mother, when the gossips of the town put their own evil interpretation upon the holy Incarnation (Psa. 31:11; Matt. 1:18-20; Lk. 2:35).

Men of intellectual, scientific or artistic genius are frequently unrecognized by their co-patriots and contemporaries (Matt. 13:57; Lk. 4:24). The old saying is unfortunately sometimes true to some people, "Familiarity breeds contempt". But the blindness of the Nazarenes was a very serious matter, one of eternal moment for them. What an opportunity they had been given! As far as we know, this was the Saviour's last visit to that place. When He preached in the synagogue of Capernaum and elsewhere, men marvelled at His words of grace and authority (Matt. 7:29; John 7:46), but His fellow-townsmen were now merely curious as to the origin of the wisdom and power which He displayed (John 6:42; 7:14, 15; Acts 4:13).

Their minds were closed to the truth through their senseless prejudice against Him. Their darkness was not accidental, but deliberate (John 3:19). Because of their disobedience they were offended, or made to stumble (Matt. 11:6; 1 Pet. 2:7, 8). In their minds He was a carpenter, and nothing more. They wilfully refused the light that was available for them, and remained in ignorance of the person and teaching of the Saviour Who was in their midst. It is a serious thing to reject the truth of God, and the greater the privileges, the greater the condemnation (Lk. 12:48).

So great and so unreasonable was the unbelief of the people of Nazareth that even the Son of God marvelled. It also had the effect of limiting His ministry. The Lord's opportunity to give blessing is at all times limited to the individual's capacity to receive blessing.

II. Unbelief in the Country—verses 7 to 13.

Parallel passages: Matt. 10:1-15; Lk. 9:1-6.

The twelve disciples had been ordained to be with Christ, to learn of Him and to go forth preaching and healing in His name (Mk. 3:14, 15). On this occasion they were sent out two by two, that by the mouth of two witnesses the matter might be established (Deut. 17:6; Matt. 18:16).

The disciples were not to take extra provisions, since their errand was an urgent one, and there must be no extra weight to hinder their progress (Heb. 12:1). Let us remember that the King's business requires haste (1 Sam. 21:8). The scrip or "begging bag" had no place in their equipment, because the labourer is worthy of his hire (Lk. 10:7), and they would find shelter in the homes of their hearers (Rom. 12:13; 1 Pet. 4:9).

But not all the people would accept the message; some would hear and heed it, while others would reject it. The

same condition has prevailed since that time, and the Christian taught must not be surprised that his testimony is not always believed (Acts 17: 4, 32-34).

That disciple whose well-authenticated witness was refused would shake off the dust of that place as a testimony against the obstinate ones, his act symbolizing the fact that he had done his part, and that he was now free from responsibility (Ezek. 33: 1-6; Acts 18:6). The teacher must take care what and how he teaches (2 Tim. 1:13; 4:2-4), and the hearer must take heed what and how he hears (Mk. 4:24; Lk. 8:18). The opportunity of hearing the Gospel message brings with it a solemn responsibility. Those who did not believe the testimony of the disciples laid themselves open to punishment more sure than that meted out to the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, notable examples of judgment upon unrepentant sinners (Gen. 19:24; Isa. 1:9; Matt. 11:20-24; Jude 6, 7).

III. Unbelief in the Court—verses 14 to 31.

Parallel passages: Matt. 14:1-12; Lk. 9: 7-9.

There are three Herods mentioned in the New Testament: Herod the Great, who slaughtered the children at Bethlehem (Matt. 2: 1, 12-16); his son Herod Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee (Lk. 13:31, 32; 23:7-12); and Herod Agrippa, the persecutor of the church (Acts 12:1, 6). It is Herod Antipas of whom this chapter speaks.

Herod's conscience troubled him, and he feared that the new Teacher Who was causing such a stir was none other than John the Baptist come to life. A guilty conscience needs no accuser (Jer. 2:19).

John the Baptist had been fully justified in rebuking the sins of Herod (Lk. 3:1, 19, 20). That ruler's union with his niece Herodias, the sister of Herod Agrippa, was objectionable because of its incestuous character, and because both parties had a living mate.

At first Herod had listened to the testimony of John (Matt. 13:20), but he feared the displeasure of his partner and his companions more than the displeasure of God (John 12:43). He was sorry to hear the brutal request of Salome, the daughter of Herodias, but he was not strong enough to refuse her. He forgot that an evil oath is better broken than kept. Thus, the sin in his life was at the root of Herod's unbelief; he refused to allow the truth to have sway over him. His unbelief was essentially disbelief, which is disobedience (1 Tim. 1:19). Sin keeps men from the Word of God, just as the Word keeps them from sin.

BOOKS BY DR. T. T. SHIELDS

"The Adventures of a Modern Young Man".....	\$1.00
"Other Little Ships"	1.00
"The Plot That Failed" (The story of Jarvis St. Church)	1.00
"The Oxford Group Movement Analyzed"05
25 copies	1.00
Russellism or Rutherfordism, (103 pages)35
"The Papacy—In the Light of Scripture"10
"Why I Believe the Rapture Cannot Precede the Tribulation." Also "The Meaning of the Parousia". In Booklet of 32 pages10
20 copies	1.00

60 SERMONS ON THE WAR

Preached in Jarvis St., from August, 1939, to December, 1940. Five cents each single sermon or any 25 for \$1.00 postpaid. Other addresses on "The Pope's Fifth Column". See list of titles on page 12.

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

Address: THE GOSPEL WITNESS,

130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto, Can.