

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. 45

TORONTO, MARCH 13, 1941

Whole Number 982

The Gospel Witness Is Discussed in Parliament

Following is the official report from Hansard, March 4, 1941:

MR. W. R. McDONALD (Pontiac): Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate on this resolution reference has been made to the suppression of certain newspapers and pamphlets on the ground that they were subversive of Canada's war effort. In speaking to the resolution I wish to refer to a newspaper or pamphlet which, while I do not go so far as to say it is subversive of Canada's war effort, is, I do say, subversive of national unity in Canada. I refer to a pamphlet or paper entitled THE GOSPEL WITNESS edited by the Reverend T. T. Shields, who, I understand, is pastor of a church in the city of Toronto.

I do not know how I come to be favoured with the receipt of these copies, except that, the contents of it being of a very insulting nature to the Catholic faith and the members of that church, the reverend gentleman thought he was privileged to add injury to insult and forward copies to the Catholic members.

It would take me all afternoon to read all the articles contained in these several copies that I have before me, with their insulting references to the Catholic church and its members. I will not take up the time of the house except to give one or two excerpts so that honourable members will have some conception of what is contained in this sheet, published by a clergyman belonging to a religious denomination which I respect, as I respect the members of every denomination throughout this country. That respect which I give to the members of other denominations and to the religious belief of every other, I expect to be given to mine. Consequently it is not in anger but rather in sorrow that I shall give these excerpts.

In the issue of this journal of January 2, 1941, there is an extract from a sermon preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, on Sunday evening, December 29, 1940. One clause reads:

"So is it of that religion which makes a man only a part of a great church. That is Roman Catholicism. Roman Catholicism is religious totalitarianism. Salvation is in the church. Everything is to be sacrificed for the church; the individual does not count. That is not Chris-

tian; and that view, whether applied to the state or to religion, is essentially pagan and anti-Christian.

In another issue the same gentleman, this time giving a title to his sermon—"The Protestant Samson and the Papal Delilah"—writes:

"I shall never advocate any degree of appeasement anywhere at any time with popery. It is a religious racket, an organization which exists to make merchandise of the souls of men. The more I know of it the more I am driven to the conclusion that its officers must either be suffering from some terrible delusion or otherwise they must be outright knaves. It seems impossible to me to believe that any reasonable man can seriously believe the burlesque of Christianity that calls itself Roman Catholicism.

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

Speaking in this house as a humble member of that church, and, I believe, speaking in the names of four million Roman Catholics throughout this country, I protest with all the vigour of my manhood against the publication and circulation of such material. Thus the reverend gentleman throws his gratuitous insults into the faces of the Catholic population of this country. This is his conception of his duty as a religious leader to preach the doctrines of unity amongst all classes and creeds who so ardently desire the unity of our people during the most critical period in the history of our country.

I should like to ask the members of this house and the people of the country whether, in their opinion, such expressions and statements as I have just cited tend to bring about the unity which we so strongly desire in Canada in this most critical time of our history. It is not for me to pass judgment upon the Reverend gentleman, but I respectfully remind him of the words of the Master: "A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another." I would ask that he respect this commandment and preach this doctrine of love instead of hatred.

MR. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Does that apply to Jehovah's Witnesses?

MR. McDONALD (Pontiac): I am not speaking of Jehovah's Witnesses. I am dealing with these articles which are before me at the present time. I know nothing about Jehovah's Witnesses and I have nothing to say against them.

MR. JOHNSTON (Bow River): It should surely apply to everyone.

MR. DUPUIS: They have just as much love for Catholicism as the others.

MR. McDONALD (Pontiac): After all, this church of which the reverend gentleman speaks so derogatorily has weathered the tempests and storms of two thousand years, and not in this year of grace 1941 can this reverend gentleman, doughty warrior though he may be, hope to make her rock upon her foundations or bring about her destruction. Feeble indeed will be his efforts to blast this rock of ages.

Since the beginning of this war, on divers occasions, especially over the radio, our beloved King, the president of the United States, the worthy Prime Minister of Canada, have pointed out to the peoples of their respective countries that in this time of crisis we need divine help, that it is our duty to pray for divine assistance. With that idea in mind—and these sentiments, might I say in passing, are worthy of the men who uttered them—an invitation to prayer on the part of the Canadian people for themselves and our allies in this war was issued. The Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec a few weeks ago issued a proclamation setting aside a certain Sunday as a day of prayer throughout that province. The great service in the province was held in Notre Dame cathedral in Montreal. The worthy Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) was an invited guest there and also was invited to recite a prayer. This prayer I have before me. The reverend gentleman about whom I have been talking must even criticize that attitude on the part of the Lieutenant-Governor and the clergy of the province of Quebec. I quote part of the prayer which the Minister of Justice read on that occasion, and I ask honourable members and the people of this country if there is anything in it which might not be said by any member of any denomination in Canada to-day. The portion I read is this:

"We humbly beg of Thee, 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 Thy divine rights over sacrilegious usurpations."

That is part of the prayer recited by the Minister of Justice on behalf of the Catholic lay population of the province of Quebec. Yet even that has been held up to ridicule by this distinguished clergyman in the city of Toronto. Nothing that can be done from the Catholic point of view but must be criticized and held up to ridicule. And we, numerous body that we are in this country, are supposed to do like the ostrich, hide our heads in the sand and take this abuse from him.

In sermons and speeches of this kind it is also the habit and the custom to speak of the loyalty of the province of Quebec. That must be always brought up. It would seem to me that this question has been before this house on divers occasions, speeches made and reflections on Quebec loyalty and answers given thereto; and the answer made was clear enough and distinct enough, that if to-day from the flagstaff of these buildings there flies the union jack it is because on two historic occasions the

French-Canadian population of the province of Quebec stood loyally by and saved Canada for the British empire. Nevertheless the old bogey of French Canadian disloyalty must be trotted out to serve the purpose of selfish individuals.

Again this distinguished gentleman, in an article appearing in the same paper, entitled "The Religious Aspects of the Sirois Report", writes as follows:

"But the indisputable fact is that the Roman Catholic Church, like a malignant parasite, has fastened itself upon the body of Quebec and is draining it of the last drop of its blood, reducing it to something little better than an emaciated political skeleton, if the report is to be believed."

That is, the Sirois report.

And then this same malignant parasite stretches out its tenacles, and through a 'handful of French Canadians led by Mr. Ernest Lapointe' seeks to wrap itself about the vitals of the whole dominion—including this province.

"And on what grounds does Quebec demand these exceptional favours? Her superior loyalty? Her unusual service in peace or in war? The report tells us she was against us in the last war, and implies that she is against us in this. The report tells us she was against us in the last war on religious grounds; on the same grounds she is against us in this. In the last war she was against republican France because of its 'anti-clericalism'. . . . She was behind in enlistment in the last war; she is behind in this. I can only assume that French-Canadians, left to themselves, would be as loyal as other Canadians of other racial origins. . . ."

That is a gem, Mr. Speaker. "French Canadians left to themselves would be as loyal as other Canadians of other racial origins." The French Canadians of this province are as loyal as Canadians anywhere and have not to blush for their loyalty in comparison with any others. The article continues:

". . . and in the insistence of Premier King's chief, Mr. Lapointe, that this report should be considered now, there is an attempt, under a specious plea for national unity, to fasten a blanket mortgage on the whole dominion in the interests of the church of Rome; thus to compel non-Romanist taxpayers, whether they like it or not, indirectly to contribute to the propagation of Romanism.

We in the province of Quebec, Mr. Speaker, admit that there is a certain element there that are probably not as anxious to do their bit in connection with the war as others. But also we know the history of these few people, we know what brought about the increasing numbers of that nationalist body some years back. I do not want to go into political matters, but in order to get the background of an argument sometimes it is necessary to bring out these things. A certain body in the province of Quebec, whose attitude at the time Laurier was in power was one of opposition to the naval bill, were encouraged by the then Conservative body in Quebec to fight against the Liberals. In order to attain victory in 1911 the Conservatives financed these men, who were preaching a doctrine of rather less than loyalty to the British Empire. What happened? In the election of 1911 victory was achieved by the Conservatives chiefly because of the number of seats gained in the province of Quebec, and ever since that day we have had to fight this nationalist body. It will be recalled that only a year ago last fall the Minister of Justice took his political life in his hands when he went out and fought that nationalist body in the provincial campaign. The result is well known, the Liberal party came back to power. Only last spring, in the federal election, the Minister of Justice, together with the other ministers and all mem-

bers from Quebec, fought the same fight. The result is well known to-day; a majority of the voters in sixty-five constituencies out of sixty-five in Quebec returned Liberal members, supporting this administration, the party unity which is carrying on the war. That was the answer of Quebec at that time; that is her answer to-day. I said a majority of the voters in sixty-five constituencies supported the Liberal party. There is a single exception, but that does not prove my statement to be incorrect. The gentleman who represents the nationalist body in this house is here by virtue of a decidedly minority vote.

It was only after very serious consideration, sir, that I decided to bring this matter to the attention of the house, realizing as I do how difficult it is to discuss these issues without having wrong motives imputed, as well as the danger of causing divisions among our people. Nevertheless in the interests of national unity I felt it my duty to do so. No racial or religious difference divides the gallant men who are serving in our army, our navy and our air force; and it is my humble opinion and belief, sir, that the people of Canada desire to constitute themselves a solid unit behind those gallant men in a coordinated effort to prosecute this war to ultimate victory. Could my words reach the ears of the reverend gentleman whom I have been discussing this afternoon I would respectfully submit to him that in the interests of peace and harmony in our country, and for the sake of the cause which he claims to have at heart, he should refrain from the publication of these articles. In the event of his refusal to do so, I would suggest that the Minister of Justice, who is charged with the enforcement of the defence of Canada regulations, that THE GOSPEL WITNESS be suppressed for the period of the war; on the ground that the articles published therein are subversive of national unity.

AN OPEN LETTER TO MR. W. R. McDONALD, M. P., PONTIAC

By the Editor

I learn from press reports that in the House of Commons at Ottawa, Tuesday, March 4th, you did me the honour of discussing THE GOSPEL WITNESS and its Editor. I have now before me the official report of the House of Commons Debates for the date named, and the full text of your address to the House on that occasion. As I have not the privilege of answering you on the floor of Parliament; I must use the only other way open to me and address you in the form of this open letter.

Let me first of all express my gratification that you endeavoured, from your point of view at least, to be fair in your discussion of the subject. This, I infer from your remark in the opening paragraph which was as follows:

"I do not go so far as to say it is subversive of Canada's war effort."

One feels comfortable always in dealing with an honourable opponent, for it is well known that it is easily possible to win at any game by the violation of its rules. Christian apologists are in duty bound to "contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints"; but while they strive, they must be scrupulously careful to "strive lawfully". This, though I entirely disagree with your conclusions, I believe you have endeavoured to do.

At the outset I would venture to lay down the principle which I endeavour always to observe in discussing matters relating to the Roman Catholic Church, namely, that I have no personal quarrel with individual Roman Catholics as such. I believe they are in error, but I am prepared to credit them with sincerity of faith and purpose. In this I distinguish sharply between the individual Roman Catholic and the Roman Hierarchy. While I believe the term, Roman Catholicism, is synonymous with the grossest superstition, and that it is itself utterly unscriptural and therefore un-Christian, I have no doubt that many devout Roman Catholics have, by the grace of God, managed to get through the mass of Catholic superstition to Christ; and through personal faith in Him, have been born again, and are genuinely Christians.

In my addresses and articles, my criticisms have been levelled, not against individual Catholics, but against the Roman Catholic Church as an organization. I have repeatedly, with gratitude, recognized and acknowledged the loyalty of many Roman Catholics, numbers of whom are found in the armed services of Canada and the Empire.

You claim to speak "in the names of four million Roman Catholics throughout this country". I think it is probable that the implication of your words, that four million Roman Catholics would approve your objections, would, on examination, be found to be somewhat exaggerated. It is the way of the Catholic Church to claim as Roman Catholics all who in infancy, and without choice of their own, were what the Church calls "baptized" into the Catholic Church. It is probably true that because the Church endeavours to control the children through its own educational institutions from infancy forward, the majority being thus brought up within the confines of Roman Catholic influence, of their own choice in later life, continue in communion with the Church. But vast numbers of people who are called Catholics by the Church are not in any true sense Roman Catholics.

Judging from such "cross sections" of the Roman Catholic population as I have had opportunity to study, I feel the utmost confidence in saying there are hundreds of thousands of people who are listed as Roman Catholics who never attend a Catholic Church, never go to Confession, or to Mass; and, indeed, repudiate all connection with the Church. Many such quite regularly attend Jarvis Street Church, and scores of such people have come to me to be married. However, the Roman Catholic population in this country is large, and I have little doubt that you speak for the majority of those who are really at heart Roman Catholics.

National Unity

I note that your contention is that my articles and addresses are "subversive of national unity in Canada". I am very glad that you recognize the necessity for such unity at such a time as this. I was myself much exercised over this matter at the time of the general election last March. I gave a great deal of thought to it, and at last delivered an address on Monday evening, March 11th, 1940, to nearly two thousand people. The address was published in pamphlet form, and I shall send you a copy with this letter.

Copies of this address were used by various committees of the Liberal party in support of Mr. King and his régime. In that address I spoke with the utmost sincerity when I said:

"I honour Mr. King and his Government particularly for this one thing, that when Aberhart in the West, and Hepburn in Ontario, and Duplessis in Quebec, were doing their utmost to effect the disintegration of Confederation, and to blow this Dominion to smithereens, they wisely held the balance, and by moderate control, secured the unity of Canada, for this great effort in the war."

I believed at that time that Mr. King could do more to unite the people of Canada in a great war effort than could Dr. Manion, and I therefore supported him. I had no idea at the time of the price Mr. King intended to pay for this so-called "unity". In common with many thousands of others who voted for the King régime in the last election, I have been sadly disillusioned. My eyes have been opened, and I have learned, as I shall proceed to show, that such unity as now obtains, has been effected only by complete submission to Quebec—and to Quebec as controlled by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy.

And before I follow your example by quoting from speakers and writers on your side of the question at issue, allow me to say this: Protestantism is being regularly and systematically attacked by the Roman Catholic Church by the use of the radio, with the full approval of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. That medium of publicity which ought to belong to all the people is being practically monopolized by the Roman Catholic Church. I have myself been attacked by at least one Roman Catholic speaker whose broadcasts are attributed to the "courtesy" of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, which I assume means that they do not pay for their time. But I am not allowed to reply even though I offer to pay full radio rates for the privilege.

Always An Appeal To Force

Through its own publications, and through the daily press, the Roman Church is continually making veiled attacks upon Protestantism. To this, we offer no objection. If a Roman Catholic sincerely believes what he professes, then it is his bounden duty to do his utmost, by means of the exposition of his principles, and the use of persuasion, to convince others of what he believes to be the truth. My only objection to such propagation of Roman Catholicism is that the Roman Church claims full liberty for herself to proselytize others, but when others reply she never discusses the questions at issue but immediately makes an appeal to some form of force.

Upon that, you yourself insist. There is no attempt to meet the argument of THE GOSPEL WITNESS, but you say that in the event of my refusal to refrain from the publication of my articles,

"I would suggest to the Minister of Justice, who is charged with the enforcement of the Defence of Canada regulations, that THE GOSPEL WITNESS be suppressed for the period of the war, on the grounds that the articles published therein are subversive of national unity."

It is against that principle, to quote your own words, "I protest with all the vigour of my manhood." A Roman Catholic paper published in Manitoba says of THE GOSPEL WITNESS Editor, "He must be stopped." *The Catholic Record* of London again and again says practically the same thing. And now on the floor of Parliament you join the chorus by declaring that THE GOSPEL WITNESS be "suppressed".

Suppose some of us should ask for the suppression of all the Roman Catholic periodicals? Suppose some of us

should demand that these Roman Catholic speakers be banned from the radio? I have no such inclination. I believe in absolute freedom of speech; and you are welcome to denounce me inside of Parliament and outside, as much as you like. The Catholic press may call me nasty names, and condemn me as roundly as they please: I shall not complain. But while there is breath in my body, I shall demand, and shall exercise, the British right to protest against the teachings of Rome religiously, and to denounce her political machinations.

Premier Godbout in Ontario and in Quebec

So therefore let me ask, Who is it that is disturbing national unity? Premier Godbout of Quebec gave an address in Toronto on December 4th last, at a joint meeting of the Empire and Canadian Clubs of Toronto, on the subject of Canadian unity. I cannot review the address: I am content to quote his closing paragraph, in which he said:

"If my visit here were to result in the closer drawing together of our two provinces, which are the headstone of the entire edifice of Confederation, I should thank God that he had made of me the humble instrument of a great work, and I should invite you, Mr. President, Gentlemen, to come in turn to the Province of Quebec, to bring us your message of unity."

But less than a month before, November 17th, in a speech delivered in Plessisville, Quebec, and reported in *l'Action Catholique* of November 18th, Premier Godbout spoke as follows:

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

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

("Nous sommes une minorité en ce pays. Les Anglais qui sont arrivés ici, après nous, sont plus attachés que nous à l'Angleterre et cela se comprend parfaitement. Ils auraient voulu que la conscription fût établie pour service outre-mer. Mais une petite poignée de Canadiens français, conduite par M. Ernest Lapointe, a dicté ses volontés au pays.")

Let me respectfully ask you whether such a speech as that would be likely to minister to Canadian unity? Or, delivered in French, was it intended to be heard only by French-Canadians? This speech, so far as we know, was never reported in any other English-language paper of the Dominion; it was THE GOSPEL WITNESS that first reported it to the country. I do not question the accuracy of Mr. Godbout's contention: it has long been quite evident that M. Ernest Lapointe is the real Premier of Canada, and that the French-Canadians, holding the balance of power, have really "dictated their will to the country".

In your speech to the House you said:

"A majority of the voters in sixty-five constituencies out of sixty-five in Quebec returned Liberal members,

supporting this administration, the party of unity which is carrying on the war. That was the answer of Quebec at that time; that is her answer to-day. I said a majority of the voters in sixty-five constituencies supported the Liberal party. There is a single exception, but that does not prove my statement to be incorrect. The gentleman who represents the nationalist body in this house is here by virtue of a decidedly minority vote."

What "The Party of Unity" Is Doing

You are pleased therefore to call the present administration in Ottawa, "the party of unity", boasting of the practical unanimous support of the Province of Quebec. That being true, will you be good enough to explain to me why, according to official Ottawa figures, between October 1st, 1939, and October 31st, 1940—

Ontario enlisted 72,000 men.
Quebec enlisted 34,000 men,

and some hundreds at least of the 34,000 credited to Quebec were enlisted for Quebec regiments in Toronto, and perhaps elsewhere in Ontario. Does that look as though Quebec were the major partner in the "party of unity which is carrying on the war"? It would seem to me that nothing could be more destructive of Canadian unity than such a speech as you delivered in the House of Commons.

Once more. There has been much discussion in the press of Canada, of Canada's war effort, and there seems to be wide-spread dissatisfaction with the progress that is being made. But it must not be supposed that the papers—the daily press, or such insignificant journals as THE GOSPEL WITNESS—who have ventured to express their disappointment that the Government is not offering more energetic leadership in Canada's war effort, by their criticism have any intention of promoting disunity among the people of Canada. The Honourable C. D. Howe charges *The Financial Post* with sabotaging Canada's war effort because it has dared to complain that the minister's department is not doing half enough.

The Prime Minister spoke somewhat warmly in condemnation of *The Globe and Mail* and the *Montreal Gazette*, because of their criticisms of the Government; and there were some veiled threats in the speech which seemed to imply that unless certain papers behaved themselves, and talked more softly, they might be brought to book. Perhaps the Government might do so temporarily, but I am positive there would be a sweeping reaction to any attempt to "suppress" any of the papers who exercised their right to criticize the actions of the Government of the day; and especially if such "suppression" were effected on religious grounds.

If a foreman, overseeing a company of workmen, were to observe a group of men to be slackening their efforts, and should exhort them, and even command them, to take their place with the other workers, and pull their full weight in the general enterprise, could such an one reasonably be charged with jeopardizing the unity of that working staff? I heard Mr. King, in the last election, declare most strongly that the real rulers of Canada were the people of Canada; that while the Government was responsible to Parliament, Parliament as a whole was responsible to the people. And it was to the people he was making his appeal. I sat at my radio and applauded his sentiments, and I would respectfully remind you, sir, as a member of Parliament—and members of the Government and of the whole Liberal party—that the people of Canada exercise the functions of the foreman. It is the people of Canada who are determined

to see the war through to a successful issue. And when we call attention to the disloyalty of some elements in Quebec—a disloyalty which you yourself acknowledge in your speech—we are not seeking to make matters worse, but better.

Your speech would imply that the element in Quebec that is not loyal is rather an insignificant one. If that be so, why does Quebec give only 34,000 to the armed services, while Ontario gives 72,000? Mr. Lapointe, yourself, and others, seem to find great pleasure in boasting of your majority; and you treat the minority in Parliament almost with contempt, mocking at the smallness of their numbers. Let me remind you that another election is coming at some time, and that the present Liberal party has before now been confined to the cold shades of Opposition.

A Majority Can Melt Like A Snowdrift

I remind you that in an emergency, a Premier with a great majority in England, right in the midst of war, was forced to resign, and the Government was reconstituted without an election. If only there were a suitable leader, sufficiently vigorous to press the battle to the gate, the Liberal party might find a still more vigorous expression of dissatisfaction on the part of the people of Canada. In the last election hundreds of people, I should suppose, directly and indirectly, did me the honour of sharing their problem with me, saying, "I do not know how to vote." It was because of that I expressed my own views publicly. How many followed my example, I cannot say; but this I do say, that I have met thousands of people, literally, with great numbers of whom the question now at issue has been discussed, say, during the last six months, and I have yet to meet with the first man or woman who is satisfied with the present Government's achievements.

But to return to the question of forming some sort of coalition in order to make the Government representative of all the people, for, small as the Opposition is in the House numerically, it still represents forty-six per cent. of the votes cast in the last election; and notwithstanding the solid support received from Quebec, the popular vote gave the King régime only four per cent. lead over the Opposition.

Mr. Lapointe and National Unity

Here let me cite a report from *The Globe and Mail*, of, I think, February 25th, 1941, as follows:

"Amid roars of applause from Liberal benches in the House of Commons, he (Mr. Lapointe) attacked the newspapers that have been urging a broadening of the present cabinet, and declared:

"My Province is unanimously opposed to that proposal. The mere mention of it rouses such memories that it is really a crime to mention the word. I don't think I could sit in such a national government and claim to represent my Province, and I believe that if I cannot nobody else can. I beseech the promoters of this scheme to let well enough alone. I implore them not to undermine public confidence in their freely elected rulers."

"Mr. Lapointe's declaration against any suggestion of national government was loudly applauded by Prime Minister Mackenzie King. The House was crowded for the speech and there was no doubt that the Liberal members welcomed the stand taken for party solidarity."

May I ask if that sort of thing is promotive of Canadian unity? Is it not becoming increasingly clear that the price of unity is complete submission and sub-

ordination to the will of Quebec—a will that is the political expression of the purpose of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy? Will any French-Canadian dare to set Quebec up as an example of how to promote Canadian unity?

More About National Unity

In *Le Devoir* of November 2nd, 1940, the Parliamentary correspondent of that paper, Mr. Léopold Richer, wrote as follows:

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

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

This correspondent expresses—and his paper publishes—the view that French-Canada "suffered in silence and submission to duly constituted authority" — for what?—"the principle of participation in the European War."

No matter which way one turns, every French-Canadian speaker, it appears, both inside Parliament and outside Parliament, insists that the only way to have a united Canada is for the majority to submit to the minority, and to allow—

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

Catholic Laity Uninformed

Before I proceed further, I should like to remark here that in no religious body I know of, are the laity so ignorant of the genius of the body to which they profess to belong as the laity of the Roman Catholic Church. And in one respect, I say that to their credit; for it is, the only reasonable explanation of their loyalty. Roman Catholicism is a religion of proxy; and if people can believe that the priest stands for them in God's place, having the full power of absolution, it is not difficult to understand how people so trained should form the habit of referring all great matters to the religious experts they have been taught to revere. I have talked with educated Roman Catholic laymen who were utterly ignorant of the history of their Church. They knew nothing of her bloody record, and nothing of her political aims. To them, the Church was a religious institution. The salvation of their souls, they had been taught to believe, depended upon their submission to the Church in all things; and I can well believe that comparatively few Roman Catholic laymen would be competent to discern the casuistry of the Hierarchy's statements and performances.

Quebec's Official Prayer

You, sir, object to my criticism of the prayer recited, as you say, by the Minister of Justice in Notre Dame Cathedral. My criticism of the prayer was that it did not contain the remotest allusion to the King, or to any of his Governments, either in Canada or throughout the Empire; nor did it refer to any of the armed services. I quote again the passage you quote:

"We humbly beg of Thee, 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 Thy divine rights over sacrilegious usurpations."

Anyone familiar with the Roman Catholic position must surely recognize that it is a prayer for the victory of "Thy divine rights"; and it is the teaching of the Church that God's "divine rights" are centred in him who presumes to call himself the vicar of Christ. And that, preceding the phrase, "victory over sacrilegious usurpations", meant nothing more nor less than a prayer for victory in the sense of a universal recognition of the "divine rights" of the Papacy—everything contrary thereto being nothing more nor less than "sacrilegious usurpations".

It is true that the Cardinal himself bade the people pray for the King and Queen: my criticism was directed against the official prayer said to have been "composed by the Archbishops and Bishops of Quebec". But you seem to be shocked because I do not appraise this official prayer at its face value. You say:

"The reverend gentleman about-whom I have been talking must even criticize that attitude on the part of the lieutenant-governor and the clergy of the province of Quebec."

How "High Clergy Lavish Their Marks of Loyalty"

Why do I do so? Let me give you another quotation, a translation of extracts from an article in *L'Action Nationale* of February, 1941. These extracts were quoted in *Le Jour*, March 8th, 1941.

"And the Catholic religion! Although it is not the religion of his Majesty, all its rights are recognized everywhere in Canada—pardon, in the Province of Quebec, because there the minority is in reality the majority—but throughout our history, it has been necessary for our high clergy to lavish their marks of loyalty in order to conciliate the civil authorities, and to hinder them from giving ear to certain propaganda that nothing disarms . . . That is what our politicians call national unity in equality and respect of minorities, of the liberty of thought, of speech, and of conscience. In short, our rights are respected because we do not claim them, because we traffic with them in order to obtain an illusory peace. The only difference which exists between our situation and that of the Czechs and the Poles is that we are more cowardly than they, and do not know how to stand up. Nevertheless, our leaders in all realms have a great admiration for these little peoples who refuse to purchase their tranquility at the cost of their national rights, even when they ask us to go and defend them. Why don't they follow their example? . . ."

"Then they will see if we are better treated than the Czechs and the Poles in Germany, if National unity is really possible; and they will prepare themselves as men to collaborate or to combat, according to the case.

P. 159: "It is time to awake and to make the Government understand that we do not approve such a policy of war; nor that stupid policy which consists in sending our human capital overseas when our war effort, which ought to be and can be, only industrial, even if we take the viewpoint of British interests honestly understood, requires all our hands and more. Nor, with all the more reason, of that policy, criminal in the eyes of every Canadian, which would consist of sending our sons to get themselves killed in defense of a foreign country while certain citizens of that country would escape and come and take their place in our factories . . . If our workmen have not the technical training required to take immediately certain new tasks at home, then let them be given the time that is devoted to preparing them for a military career, and more, if it is necessary. Any other policy would be odiously anti-Canadian and especially disgusting to French-Canadians—dripping with the blood of our soldiers killed over there. . . ." *(The emphasis in the above quotation is my own.)*

"Throughout our history," this Roman Catholic paper says, "it has been necessary for our high clergy to lavish

their marks of loyalty in order to conciliate the civil authorities." That is precisely what Cardinal Villeneuve did at Notre Dame. He "lavished his marks of loyalty in order to conciliate the civil authorities." I respectfully suggest that you make another speech in the House of Commons with this article in *L'Action Nationale* as your text; and if papers are to be suppressed, you might suggest that this should be suppressed, not only on the ground that it is inimical to Canadian unity, but that it is subversive of our war effort. It criticizes the sending of men overseas. It objects to "sending our sons to get themselves killed in defense of a foreign country while certain citizens of that country would escape and come and take their place in our factories." It virtually tells us there are no "Canadians" but French-Canadians. It would be difficult to conceive of anything more likely to discourage enlistment in his Majesty's forces than such talk as this.

It is, however, because there are so many illustrations of the principle here declared that "it has been necessary for our high clergy to lavish their marks of loyalty in order to conciliate the civil authorities." Because such ecclesiastical camouflage has obtained throughout the history of the Roman Catholic Church people who are at all informed on the subject are unimpressed by such performances as took place in Notre Dame, and to which you refer.

"The Religious Aspect of the Sirois Report"

You quote at some length from my address entitled, "The Religious Aspect of the Sirois Report". All I can say to you, sir, is that if you have not recognized that the Roman Catholic Church, like a horseleach which never says, "it is enough," is draining the economic life-blood from the Province of Quebec, and that it is that which makes Quebec poor—I say, if you have not recognized that, I can only conclude that you are not as discerning as you ought to be.

Still Another Promoter of National Unity

Let me give you another quotation. M. Esdras Minville, the President of *L'Action Nationale*, who wrote one of the Studies for the Inter-provincial Commission which produced the Sirois Report, in his pamphlet, "The Work of Colonization", published by *L'Ecole Social Populaire*, of which the general Editor is a Jesuit priest, Rev. Father Archambault, in the last few lines says:

"A hundred years—that is not much in the life of a people—of methodical effort, and all the arable lands in the east of Canada, save perhaps the Ontario Peninsula, will belong to men of our blood. Then depressions can come, as hard as can be imagined: the France of America, with the help of God, will be assured of its future."

Does that sort of thing make for Canadian unity—when objection is raised to sending their men overseas to get killed, and thus to make room for others, and then we are told that in a hundred years, with the possible exception of the Ontario Peninsula, all eastern Canada "will belong to men of our blood", and will be "the France of America".

You are deeply concerned lest THE GOSPEL WITNESS should militate against the highest degree of Canadian unity. Here is a translation of an extract from an article by Jean-Charles Harvey in *Le Jour*, March 8th, 1941.

"The most nefarious organ of this sect is a little review known by the name *L'Action Nationale*. It is the principal vehicle of all the nationalistic stupidities . . ."

I assume that this review known as *L'Action Nationale* is perhaps the organ of that element which you describe as "probably not as anxious to do their bit in connection with the war as others." That surely is a very mild description of them. But I would call your attention to the fact that M. Minville, whom Jean-Charles Harvey describes as "protagonist of corporatism, and anti-democrat", is the author of "A Study Prepared for the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations", entitled, "Labour Legislation and Social Services in the Province of Quebec", and, among the supplements to the Sirois Report, designated as "Appendix 5". The thesis of this "Study" prepared by M. Esdras Minville, that Quebec is different from all other Provinces, and that the noblest and most charitable thing in Quebec is the Roman Catholic Church, is also the thesis of the Sirois Report. If Mr. Jean-Charles Harvey be correct in his appraisal of M. Minville, one cannot help wondering why such a sectarian and separatist should have been selected for such an important "study".

I beg to assure you that I withdraw nothing of what I have written. The Sirois Report recommended measures which would have mortgaged the whole Dominion of Canada in the interest of the Roman Catholic Church. I repeat, my quarrel is not with Roman Catholics as individuals, nor with French-Canadians as a race, nor with Quebec as a Province: if it were not for the blighting influence of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, Quebec, that Province, with its people, would be standing as wholeheartedly as the rest of Canada is now standing for the righteous cause in which Britain is engaged.

In the last war, my own congregation gave two hundred and ninety-eight men to the armed services; and in this war, it has given all that have been allowed to enter. I have been asked by scores of men if I could do anything to assist them to get into the army. Quebec has made a bogey of conscription. The possibility of its being needed in Canada in this war is quite remote. All that is needed is strong leadership on the part of the Government, and I am sure there would be as many volunteers as the army, navy, and air force, could absorb.

Advocate Keeping Our Soldiers at Home

Let me conclude this letter with this special gem from another member of Parliament. In a recent speech at Ottawa, Mr. Pouliot—who is, I understand, with one exception, senior to every other member in the Dominion House outside the Cabinet—referring to the Canadian troops already in Britain, said:

"I believe they should be here to protect our families in Canada, in sufficient numbers and properly equipped to give us all a feeling of security."

Canada's largest Province, Quebec, furnished eleven per cent. of the First Division; and the second largest Province, Ontario, furnished forty-four per cent. And now Mr. Pouliot thinks all our soldiers should be at home "to protect our families in Canada". I venture respectfully to say that as long as such sentiments are expressed by the Province of Quebec, through its members in Parliament, its Premier of the Legislature, and its French-language press, just so long shall we continue to call attention to their disloyal expressions.

A copy of THE GOSPEL WITNESS containing this letter will be sent to every member of both Houses of Parlia-

ment at Ottawa, and to all members of the Quebec Legislature.

I do not know whether I have supplied you with a text for another speech in the House of Commons or not, but I hope that I have at least succeeded in making my position clearly understood. Allow me to subscribe myself,

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) T. T. SHIELDS.

OUR FUNNY COLUMN

After three and a half years of continual application, without a week's respite, the Editor of this paper grew somewhat tired, and has been under the necessity of taking a rest. He has been so busy earnestly endeavouring to wake up Canadian Protestants that he succeeded in making himself so wide awake as to be unable to sleep. The Editor, however, has been steadily improving for some time, and to-day he feels so much better that he began the day in a mood for a little fun. We have often heard that people are getting better when they are able to have a good laugh. By that token, this Editor cannot be far from the crest of the hill.

He is minded, therefore, to share with his readers some of the things that have greatly amused him. One was a report to the effect that in the headquarters of the United Church of Canada—we believe they call it The Bookroom—it was being quite freely and seriously said that Dr. Shields was absent from his pulpit, not on account of sickness, but because he was interned! He has spent the time in his own house, and he found the story of his internment a very happy joke indeed.

This morning the Editor turned to *The Globe and Mail*. There were some good things in it, but the "morning smile" was not up to much. As a matter of fact, it had been misplaced—although no one in *The Globe and Mail* knew it. The real morning smile was on the editorial page in the form of a letter from Rev. P. K. Dayfoot, of Port Colborne; and since—

"A little nonsense now and then
Is relished by the best of men",

we print Dr. Dayfoot's letter:

Getting the Baptists Straight

In your issue of March 5, we were told that a member of the House of Commons had asked that 'The Gospel Witness', published by Dr. T. T. Shields, Toronto, be banned. Lest there should be in the public mind any confusion, let it be distinctly stated that 'The Gospel Witness' is not the official organ of the Baptist convention of Ontario and Quebec. That is 'The Canadian Baptist', published at 223 Church Street, Toronto. Members of that convention have no responsibility for any other publication.

(Rev.) P. K. DAYFOOT.

Port Colborne.

We knew Dr. Dayfoot some years ago, but for years have heard nothing from him, have not even thought of him, and really had forgotten there was such a brother. We thought it was rather amusing that Dr. Dayfoot should ever suppose that anyone should confuse THE GOSPEL WITNESS with *The Canadian Baptist*, or *The Canadian Baptist* with THE GOSPEL WITNESS. But Dr. Dayfoot wants it to be "distinctly stated that THE GOSPEL WITNESS is not the official organ of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec."

What Dr. Dayfoot says is, of course, true. At the same time we are inclined to believe that the majority of Baptists, who are Baptists indeed, irrespective of Convention affiliations, would agree with the endeavour

of THE GOSPEL WITNESS to stand for the great principles of the Reformation and of Evangelical Christianity, against the anti-Christian system of Roman Catholicism. It is just such minds as Dr. Dayfoot's which make it difficult for any "official organ" of any denomination to speak as such organs very often would like to speak.

We should have thought Dr. Dayfoot might well have left the subject of his letter to be dealt with by the Editor of *The Canadian Baptist*, if indeed it were necessary to say it at all. We would very gladly share with *The Canadian Baptist*, or any other religious paper, the honour of contending for the principles identified with the Protestant Reformation. We are of the opinion that, however our fellow-Baptists may disagree with us on some matters, when the battle is joined as between the faith of Protestantism and the anti-Christian system of Roman Catholicism, few of them would be inclined to take the side of Dr. Dayfoot in an implied apology to the Roman Church.

We are neither elated nor depressed by the discussion of THE GOSPEL WITNESS on the floor of Parliament at Ottawa and the floor of the Provincial Legislature in Toronto; and we feel confident that the Editor of *The Canadian Baptist* would not be ashamed to be in the company of THE GOSPEL WITNESS in its anti-Roman Catholic attitude. At all events, this we know, the Editor of *The Canadian Baptist* has shown us many courtesies for which we are grateful.

Perhaps we ought not to be surprised that Dr. Dayfoot should have availed himself of the opportunity to take a fling at THE GOSPEL WITNESS. We have examined our armour, and can find no evidence of its having been dented at any point. In fact, we are inclined to think that his missile, as usual, was a dud. Years ago Brother Dayfoot did us the honour of writing critically of us to *The Toronto Globe*, under date of April 7th, 1926. We will not reproduce his letter here, nor our comments upon it except to say this, that in our reply in THE GOSPEL WITNESS we referred to Brother Dayfoot as "the writer of this vacuous epistle". Following that, we find in THE GOSPEL WITNESS of April 8th, 1926, this little paragraph:

"Note: In seeking an adjective to describe Mr. Dayfoot's letter the word 'vacuous' came to our mind. To guard against any injustice we consulted the Standard Dictionary which defines the word as follows: '1. Having no contents; especially, containing no matter; being a vacuum; empty; unfilled; void. 2. Lacking intelligence; being without expression; blank. 3. Idle; unoccupied.' "Having read this definition we concluded the word *vacuous* was precisely the word required."

From the letter reproduced above our readers will see that Dr. Dayfoot is still running true to form.

We are glad, for our information at least, that Dr. Dayfoot has emerged from obscurity, that he is well, and sufficiently vigorous to write the illuminating letter we have printed above.

IN THE ONTARIO LEGISLATURE

Last week the press reported a discussion of THE GOSPEL WITNESS on the floor of the Ontario Legislature by the French-Canadian, Mr. A. Belanger, member for Prescott. When he receives a copy of this week's issue of THE GOSPEL WITNESS, marked for his direction, we ask him please to understand that it is sent to him with the Editor's compliments, and the suggestion that he read our open letter to Mr. W. R. MacDonald, M.P., Pontiac, as a reply to himself as well as to Mr. MacDonald.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

BANTING, THE R.A.F., AND THE CROSS

A Sermon by Rev. W. Gordon Brown, M.A.

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, March 9th, 1941.

"He saved others; himself he cannot save."—Mark 15:31.

Perhaps the greatest personal loss which the Canadian military forces have suffered so far in this World War II, is that which occurred just over two weeks ago through accident in the wilds of our sister Dominion of Newfoundland. The death of our scientist who had become world renowned through his benefactions to humanity, and who was now doing highly important research for our army, has made our nation mourn. Flags at half mast, with the invisible flag of death at the head of the mast; a multitude at the service in Convocation Hall; parade of representatives of our forces, of our universities, of our legislatures, while crowds looked on; the last salute at the grave—these honours but poorly express the gratitude of the people, the honour of the country. Before the funeral, J. E. Middleton penned these lines:

"My friend, my friend!
Skilful of hand and brain, radiant with youth,
Strong in devotion; taking wisps of truth,
Weaving them in and out, by day, by night,
Until a strange, new pattern lay before his sight!

"My friend, my friend!
All the world 'round his cunning was acclaimed.
Honours came fast from Schools forever famed,
From Castle Hill to timeless Oxenford,
Until upon his shoulders lay the Royal sword.

"My friend! Alas!
Cold on a snowy wilderness he lies.
What matter now that he was great and wise,
That his dear life was like an altar-flame?
—Save that ten thousand thousand rise to bless
his name."

I.

In Sir Frederick Banting, as in many others of like devotion to the truth of creation and the good of humanity, we find exemplification of the Christian spirit. The thoughtless, the cynical, the selfish say, Save yourself for yourself. The Master taught that the way to greatness is a lowly path, and he who would be greatest must be slave of all.¹ The Christian way of life is the road of sacrifice. Those who follow the Lamb may say:

"All through the world I see a cross,
Where sons of God yield up their breath;
There is no gain except through loss,
There is no life except through death."

There is a profound saying in the Gospels, which may apply first to the renunciation of self for the acceptance of the Saviour, and then to constant self-sacrifice in the interests of the Kingdom of God: "Whoever wishes to save his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel's will save it."²

That spirit of losing oneself for the sake of others is not found, with possible rare exceptions, in heathen

lands; and yet I go so far as to say that even among some who may not have made that definite Christian profession for which the gospel calls, there is nevertheless REFLECTION FROM the teaching of Christ and from its supreme example in HIS CROSS, which shows itself in service to others.

It is the spirit of HELPFULNESS. Think of the relief to untold numbers of sufferers brought by Dr. Banting's discovery of insulin, relief not only to those who suffer from that disease for whose conquest it was sought; but by extension of its use in shock, for the restoration of what is sadder than physical disease, certain forms of mental affliction. The disease which miners dread is silicosis, and here our scientist was making progress against the enemy. Flying at great heights with unbelievable speed has introduced new and baffling problems for medical science. It was seeking their solution that Major Banting used every possible opportunity to fly himself, and there was the reason he was going to the Old Country by plane. He was seeking to do for others what they could not do for themselves.

Now in the attempt to save others, there is often necessary FELLOW-SUFFERING. For this our Canadian hero was ready. For instance, there is a certain leg ailment, common in the army, whose treatment he wished to investigate; so he gave himself the disease, and, uncomplaining, suffered so from its ravages that he would be forced to sit while lecturing to medical students in London. His leg became so bad that some doctors said he would lose it, but he only laughed at them. He who would save others must suffer himself.

But whether by the helpfulness of objective research or through the necessity of sharing human ills in order to alleviate them, Dr. Banting sought in a physical way to save others. Yet when the plane crashed and he was conscious for eighteen hours or so, one naturally applied to him the words of our text, 'He saved others; himself he could not save.'

We have said that the Christian principle of sacrifice for service is exemplified by many of our men of science. (Sir Frederick himself, as a young man, seriously considered entering the Christian ministry.) But we are justified in saying that the principle of giving oneself to save others finds for us a host of examples in the army. There is DEATH FOR OTHERS. It was

"In Flanders' fields, where poppies grow,
Between the crosses, row on row,"

for those men died in the World War I. that we might be saved from Kaiserism. The seven hundred and more civilians who were killed last month in Great Britain died for you and me here in safe Canada.

But our principle is strongly exemplified in the Royal Air Force. Here our finest young men give themselves to doing what, within the memory of even the young people here, was thought impossible. Through our Air

¹ Mark 10:43, 44.

² Mark 8:35.

Training Plan there has arisen "an immense migration of young eagles ready for watching and pouncing upon their wretched prey".³ Never can we forget Mr. Churchill's best way of putting it: "Never in the history of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few." They fight that we may have peace. Those who die do so that we may live. With gratitude of heart we may apply our text to each of our fallen eagles: 'He saved others; himself he could not save'.

The life and death of Dr. Banting, the work of the R.A.F., and other examples in the world about us, should remind us that we need not stumble over the central truth of the atonement. In its height and depth, that truth may be beyond reason, but it is not unreasonable. Our illustrations of it in the life of to-day are far from perfect, but they do show us how much the principle of representation, and sometimes of actual substitution, enters into human life.

But "for us men and our salvation", in the evangelical sense of that great word, it is necessary to turn from the cross' reflections, however dim, however bright, to **THE CROSS ITSELF**.

It was in mockery that the rulers,⁴ that is, the religious leaders, united against the Man on the cross. Separatist Pharisees joined worldly Sadducees in the bonds of hate.⁵ It was not enough to denounce Him to the people. It was not enough to seek to catch Him in His words. (He always managed to catch them.) It was not enough to take swords and staves and soldiers to arrest an unarmed young Man in a moonlit garden. It was not enough to force Him to condemn Himself, as they thought. It was not enough to turn the precincts of the High Priest into a chamber of tortures. It was not enough to hand Him over to the civil power. It was not enough to drive Pilate to the use of the lash and the crown of thorns. It was not enough to follow the way of sorrows and hear the women lament Him. It was not enough to stand by and see the soldiers begin the execution. It was not enough to watch the victim's increasing agony. They must add supreme insult to mortal injury. "They that passed by railed on him, wagging their heads, and saying, . . . Save thyself, and come down from the cross".⁶ The soldiers must say, "If thou be the King of the Jews, save thyself." One of the robbers must say, "If thou be Christ, save thyself and us".⁷ Those who stand by and, hearing His loud cry, think that He calls for Elijah, must say, "Let us see whether Elijah will come to save him."⁸ The Jewish rulers must join in the mockery of the people whom they have misled, the soldiers whom they are using, the robbers with whom they sympathize and scoff: "Others he saved, himself he cannot save."

It was not true. There was One Who could save Him from death,⁹ and that was His Father. He himself had all power. He could have blasted the rulers and their dupes. No, it was not true. He could have saved Himself, if He would.

"Was it the nails O Saviour,
That bound Thee to the tree?
Nay! 'twas Thine everlasting love
Thy love for me, for me."

So it was true. He had saved others. He could still save them. He could turn that gallows into a throne,

³ Sir Gerald Campbell, Canadian High Commissioner to Great Britain.

⁴ Luke 23:35.

⁵ Matthew 27:41. The priests were Sadducees, the scribes were Pharisees.

⁶ Mark 15:29, 30.

⁷ Matthew 27:49.

⁸ Luke 23:37, 39.

⁹ Hebrews 5:7.

and accept the designation of king, and reply to the penitent thief words of royal pardon, "Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." But in order to do this for him and for all of us, the mockery had to be true. He could not save Himself, but must give Himself. He must cry in the hours of darkness, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

"Yet once Immanuel's orphaned cry His universe hath shaken;
It went up single, echoless, My God, I am forsaken!
It went up from His holy lips amid His lost creation,
That no man else need ever cry that cry of desolation."¹⁰

But let us inquire from what He saved others, from which He could not save Himself.

He saved others from PAIN. Think of the multitude of the sick that He healed. He said it was right to save life on the Sabbath day,¹¹ and He did it on that day and every other day of the week. To Bartimeus He said, "Receive thy sight: thy faith hath saved thee."¹²

But from whatever pain He saved men in His ministry, He could not save Himself. It is said of God, "He made him sick".¹³ Few, if any, methods of execution have been devised by the fiendishness of depraved human nature, which are more painful than crucifixion. The Roman Cicero said that no fellow Roman should even see a crucifixion. Our Saviour endured one. He saved others from pain; but in fulfilment of Scripture, and so of His Father's will, He could not save Himself.

He saved others, but He could not save Himself, from SHAME, physical and moral.

From *physical* shame He saved men by His healing of such cases as those of leprosy, that disease which was esteemed a plague of God. Those who had it must stand afar off and cry, "Unclean, unclean." But Jesus said to such men, "Be clean", and the shame of their disease vanished.

He saved others from *moral* shame. It was not because they cared for her reformation that the Pharisees brought the sinful woman. Jesus said, "Let the one without sin be the first to cast the stone at her." He wrote on the ground. What He wrote we do not know. One by one, beginning with the eldest, and down to the last, they departed. The Saviour and the shameful were left alone. "Go, and sin no more."¹⁴ He saved her from shame.

But from shame He could not save Himself, whether it was shame physical or shame moral. Think of the scarlet coat cast off by some Roman officer. Think of the scourge by common soldiers. Think of His bearing, as long as it was physically possible, His own cross. Think of the accusation written as for a rebel. Think of the company of malefactors. Think of the place called, in Aramaic, Golgotha; by the Latin, Calvary; in plain English, Skull. Think of the drugged wine. Think of the naked crucifixion. Think of the casting of lots for His clothes. Think of the mockery of the great names which He had taken or which had been applied to Him: Christ, His Chosen, the King of Israel, the Son of God. Think of the apathy of the people and the antipathy of the rulers. Shame is everywhere over that scene, and from that shame He could not save Himself.

He saved others, He could not save Himself, from DEATH. Many did He heal who were near death. Of

¹⁰ Mrs. Browning on Mark 15:34.

¹¹ Luke 13:42.

¹² John 8:12.

¹³ Mark 3:4.

¹⁴ Isaiah 53:10.

His own ministry He could say, "The dead are raised up".¹⁵

But He must die, in pain, in shame, like the criminals by Him. He had cried in trouble of soul, "Father, save me from this hour"; and then, as it were, refused His own petition, saying: "But for this reason I have come to this hour. Father, glorify thy name."¹⁶

"Under an eastern sky,
Amidst a rabble's cry,
A man went forth to die
For me.

"Thorn-crowned His blessed head,
Blood-stained His every tread:
Cross-laden, on He sped
For me.

"Pierced glow His hands and feet;
Three hours o'er Him beat
Fierce rays of noontide heat
For me.

"Thus wert Thou made all mine;
Lord, make me wholly Thine:
Grant grace and strength divine
To me."

Now we come to the heart of things, the centre and core of the crucifixion. What I have already said is true, but it is not enough. He saved others, but He could not save Himself, from SIN.

A certain leader of the faculty in a great university was conducting a Bible study group when he was asked: "Professor, what was the difference between the death of Socrates and the death of Jesus Christ?" His answer was:

"Socrates and Jesus were both put to death unjustly. Jesus desired to tell His people about God and righteousness. So did Socrates. Jesus was accused by the religious leaders of corrupting the people through false doctrine. Socrates was accused of corrupting the youth of Athens by his doctrines. Jesus met death through crucifixion, Socrates through the drink of poison hemlock. Both met their death heroically, maintaining that their teaching was the truth. The main difference in their death was that Socrates was an old man of seventy, who had had a long and fruitful life; while Jesus was a young man of about thirty, full of the fires and passions of youth."

Most of those words are true enough, but left there the question is finally unanswered, and so the answer given becomes falsehood of the worst sort. We never can get away from the fact that "Christ died for our sins".¹⁷

To the paralytic He said, "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee." To the sinful woman who in the Pharisee's house made up for Simon's lack of common courtesy by washing His feet with her tears, wiping them with her black hair, kissing them and anointing them with unguent, He said: "Thy sins be forgiven . . . Thy faith has saved thee."¹⁸ So He forgave others' sins, for He had power to do so.¹⁹

And yet He died for sin. Not that He had any sins of His own: He "knew no sin";²⁰ "he did no sin";²¹ "in him is no sin";²² but in a way which only God can explain, but we must accept, "He made him to be sin for us".²³ "The Lord made to meet upon him the iniquities of us all."²⁴

Here is our need. At the close of a service in Germantown, Pa., some time ago, a stranger accosted the late Dr. D. M. Stearns: "I don't like your preaching. I do

not care for the cross. I think that instead of preaching the death of Christ on the cross, it would be far better to preach Jesus the Teacher and Example."

"Would you then be willing to follow Him if I preached Christ the Example?" replied Dr. Stearns.

"I would," said the stranger, "I will follow in His steps."

"Then," said Dr. Stearns, "let us take the first step: 'Who did no sin'. Can you take this step?"

The stranger looked confused. "No," he said, "I do sin, and acknowledge it."

"Well then," said Dr. Stearns, "your first need of Christ is not as an Example, but as a Saviour."

Do you remember the Prologue of Matthew's Passion as used by Bach?

"Come, ye daughters, share my mourning;
See Him! Whom? The Bridegroom Christ.
See Him! How? A spotless Lamb.
See it! What? His patient love.
Look! Look where? On our offence.
Look on Him. For love of us,
He Himself His Cross is bearing.

While one part of the choir begs us to come and see, another hymns this prayer:

"O Lamb of God most holy,
Who on the Cross didst languish;
O Saviour, meek and lowly,
Who sufferedst bitter anguish;
The sins of man Thou bearest,
Our every grief Thou sharest.
Have mercy on us, O Jesu."

"He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed."²⁵

So is Jesus Christ alone the Saviour of the world.²⁶ His name means Saviour.²⁷ He came to save.²⁸ He spoke that we might be saved.²⁹

He did save others. Think of Mary Magdalene, think of Peter, think of Nicodemus.

He does save others. Hundreds here can testify to that.

He will save others. He came to save sinners.³⁰ So you must admit that is what you are. He saves those who believe.³¹

"I sought Thee, weeping, high and low,
I found Thee not; I did not know
I was a sinner—even so,
I missed Thee for my Saviour.

"I saw Thee sweetly condescend
Of humble men to be the Friend,
I chose Thee for my way, my end,
But found Thee not my Saviour;

"Until upon the cross I saw
My God, Who died to meet the law
That man had broken; then I saw
My sin, and then my Saviour.

"What seek I longer? Let me be
A sinner all my days to Thee,
Yet more and more, and Thee to me
Yet more and more my Saviour. . . .

"Be Thou to me my Lord, my Guide,
My Friend, yea, everything beside;
But first, last, best, what'er betide,
Be Thou to me my Saviour!"

¹⁵ Matthew 11:5.
¹⁷ 1 Corinthians 15:3.
¹⁸ Mark 2:10.
¹⁹ 1 Peter 2:22.
²⁰ 2 Corinthians 5:21.

²¹ John 12:27, 28.
²² Mark 2:5; Luke 7:48, 50.
²³ 2 Corinthians 5:21.
²⁴ 1 John 3:5.
²⁵ Isaiah 53:6 Hebrew.

²⁶ Isaiah 53:5.
²⁷ Matthew 1:21.
²⁸ John 5:34.
²⁹ 1 Corinthians 1:21.

³⁰ John 4:42; 1 John 4:14.
³¹ Matthew 18:11, etc.
³² 1 Timothy 1:15.

HITLER'S FIGHT AGAINST THE CHURCHES

(Ninth of a Series on the Relationship of Catholicism to Nazi-Fascism)

By L. H. LEHMANN

The full story of the rise of Nazi-Fascism has still to be written. When it appears it will surprise most Americans to discover the part played in it by the Christian churches—Protestant as well as Catholic. For Nazi-Fascism is as much a product of the churches as of the state, and is a movement towards religious as well as political and social authoritarianism. European Catholic historians have long pointed out that it is the final act in the Jesuit plan of counter-Reformation instituted exactly four hundred years ago this year. It is for this reason that the articles of this series have stressed from the beginning the ideological background of Nazi-Fascism in the counter-Reformation activities of the Jesuit Order.

Americans will never fully understand the real aims and activities of the church of Rome so long as they continue to look at Catholicism from our American point of view. On this side of the Atlantic attention has been focussed mainly on attempts of a few "liberal" Catholic spokesmen to integrate their church with the American way of life. These are sincere in thinking that Catholic authoritarianism can be reconciled with the liberal, tolerant principles of American democracy.¹ But the Church of Rome has its roots in Europe; there its metaphysic was first established. It is therefore to its background and activities in Europe we must look if we want to judge what its real nature is. It is the policy determined upon "beyond the Alps" in Europe that directs and guides the church even in America. Well-meaning Catholic spokesmen in the democracies are permitted to voice their liberal views, but their wishful thinking has never had any effect in really bringing the Catholic Church into line with our American way of life.

This issue has been bitterly fought out in Europe between Nazi-Fascism and the Christian churches. As far as Europe is concerned the fight is ended—with victory on the side of Nazi-Fascism and Catholic ultramontaniam. In Italy, Spain, Austria, Poland, Portugal, France and Belgium, Catholicism alone was involved. In Germany, however, both the Protestant and Catholic churches have played their respective parts. There the struggles were as bitter, and purges as bloody, within the churches as within the state. They were more severe and bloody within Protestantism than Catholicism; many more liberal Protestant leaders than Catholic were liquidated or put out of the way in concentration camps. By refusing to make any concessions to Nazism, the evangelical Protestant churches are said to have actually paved the way for the success of the "German Christian" movement. These "German Christians"—Protestant fascists—professed to consider it necessary to submit to a spiritual leader in order to free Protestantism of liberalism and rationalism. They thus became one with the Catholic fascists who, in keeping with the *Catholic Action* crusade of Pope Pius XI, were purging every taint of liberalism and democracy out of the Catholic clergy and were bringing the

Catholic Church in Germany into line with pure Vatican absolutism. Gonzague de Reynold, ardent Jesuit Catholic reformer, in his book *L'Europe Tragique*,² states:

"A real fight has been waged within Protestantism. The Evangelical Protestants refused to make any concessions and established a confessional church in opposition to that set up by the state . . . We are on the threshold of a religious schism. *These are the final repercussions of the Reformation. We are witnessing a phase of dissolution [of Protestantism]. Many German Protestants believe that to reject a purely religious authority like the Papacy, would constitute a danger to the church and to Christianity.*"

Professor Karl Barth, the famous Protestant historian, also realized this when he said that National Socialism's campaign against the churches in Germany had for its aim to make Protestantism "ripe for Rome".

In order to understand what happened to the Catholic Church in Germany, it is necessary to go back to the time of Pope Leo XIII, well known for his unrelenting antagonism to the liberal constitutions of states.³ In order to counteract the increasing influence of 19th century liberalism on Catholic countries, Pope Leo XIII urged on Catholic leaders throughout the world the formation of Catholic political parties. He thought that if such Catholic parties took an active part in parliamentary politics they would, by securing the balance of power, succeed in obtaining victory for the church. He even hoped that these Catholic political parties would eventually obtain a large enough majority, by democratic means, to enable them to seize complete control of governments. What actually happened, however, was the very opposite. The Catholic parties gradually came under the influence of their liberal opponents and copied many of their ideas. Thus in Italy the Catholic party became the "popular" liberal party headed by the now-exiled priest Don Sturzo; in Germany it became the liberal "Centre" party.

This liberal influence of Catholic parties became so great that the Holy See began to regard Catholic political trends as a grave danger which threatened the juridical and political unity of the church itself. These Catholic parties became infiltrated with the liberal spirit of the French Revolution of 1789. The ideas of the rights of man, of religious tolerance, of freedom of conscience, of speech and press, were adopted by a great number of Catholic politicians and by many of the lower clergy.

So pronounced had this trend of popular Catholic politics become in the United States, for instance, that when Alfred E. Smith was nominated for the Presidency in 1927, the Vatican and Catholic bishops in Europe were shocked to hear that Mr. Smith had been prompted by priests to proclaim these principles to be, not a mere matter of "favour" (as he first stated) but also a matter of "innate right".⁴ This was rank heresy, and, after Mr. Smith's defeat at the polls in 1928, the Vatican rebuked those who had advised the former Governor of New York to proclaim doctrines so contrary to official Catholic teachings.

By the end of the last war, the Catholic political parties had begun to lose the importance which they had

² P. 329.

³ Cf. *Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII*; also *The Converted Catholic* for October, 1940, p. 19.

⁴ Cf. Alfred E. Smith's reply to the *Open Letter* of the late Charles C. Marshall in *Forum Magazine*, March, 1928; also Mr. Marshall's able work, *The Roman Catholic Church in the Modern State*.

¹ Cf., for example, the article of Rev. John F. Cronin, S.S., *Rome—All or Democracy?* in the magazine *Common Sense* for October, 1940.

in the eyes of the Vatican when it first brought them into being. They became so integrated with democratic states, founded as they were on political compromise, on tolerance and the idea of equality, that it was confusing to note the alliances made by some Catholic parties with bourgeois groups and by others with socialist groups. It had become apparent that the control of Catholic politics was being lost by the Holy See in Rome. Pope Leo XIII's plan had miscarried, and had proved a boomerang against the real aims of the church as he had proclaimed them. Catholic political action had acquired an independence that made it a menace to, rather than a docile instrument of, the Vatican. Liberal Catholicism, in fact, which, to all appearance, had received its death-blow by the decree of papal infallibility towards the end of the 19th century, had taken on a new lease of life by means of the very Catholic political parties which had been established and sustained by Pope Leo XIII to oppose the hated liberal constitutions of democratic states.

This is how the Vatican saw it after the world war in 1918, and the conclusions which it drew from its observations in the matter were the first steps towards the rise of what we now call Fascism.

Many of the non-Jesuit religious orders in Germany, notably the Franciscans and the Benedictines, started movements which displeased the Vatican. The "Liturgical Movement" of the Benedictines; their attempt to establish contact with the Oecumenical Evangelical Movement, and their effort towards a reunion of all Christian churches; the attitude of the *Patres Unionis* ("Fathers of Unity") who were even prepared to modify the dogmas of papal infallibility and the Immaculate Conception in order to help their work of reunion; their open and secret negotiations with groups in the Anglican Church under the guidance of the late Cardinal Mercier—all these liberal reform movements were regarded as tainting the lower clergy and the intelligent laity with the heresy of liberalism and Protestantism. The Vatican regarded its authority as gravely menaced by it all, and determined to wage relentless war against this growing liberalism in political and spiritual matters.

It should not be surprising that Rome became disturbed at the prospect of a revival of the Lutheran Reformation. It was particularly marked in Germany. Friedrich Heiler⁵ has the following to say on this point:

"These recent tendencies of Catholicism have spread to a great extent in Germany. German Catholicism is in fact a particular kind of Catholicism, due to the fact that it has been subject, continually if not visibly, to the influence of the reformed churches of Christendom, and has constantly absorbed certain features belonging to Evangelical Christianity".

But the democratic states were the most powerful in the world at that time. The Catholic political parties had become too strong to be stopped by mild protests or even by encyclical letters from Rome. Repressive action, carried out by the help of authoritarian secular regimes, was necessary. Thus the two great opposing factions within the Catholic Church became locked again in a gigantic struggle: one possessing the liberal Catholic idea, deep-seated as of old in the hearts of true Christian believers; the other, the coldly imperial, sectarian and intransigent Roman Party, repre-

mented by the Holy See under the domination of the Society of Jesuits.

It is in the light of these facts that Hitler's "campaign against the churches" must be viewed. Neither Hitler nor the Jesuits could forgive priests and bishops in Germany who sided with the cause of liberalism and democracy during the Weimar Republic. It was against them that the acts of Catholic repression were directed. Hitler and Pope Pius XI acted in concert to destroy every vestige of liberalism in Germany: the one in social and political life, the other in the sphere of religion. By dissolving the Catholic Centre Party, the Pope removed the last obstacle to Hitler's rise to power, and also deprived the Catholic people and clergy in Germany of any say-so in political matters. He had done the same for Mussolini in Italy by the dissolution of the *Partito Popolare* and the exiling of its priest-leader Don Sturzo. By his *Catholic Action* he concentrated all Catholic political power in the Holy See. Thenceforth, the Vatican was free to make its secret concordats with the fascist dictatorships.

The lower clergy in Germany did not yield without a struggle. Many defied both Hitler and the Pope. Some priests were imprisoned. Even when the pristine ardor of Cardinal Innitzer for Hitler and Nazi Socialism showed signs of cooling, hostility was engineered against him. Catholic schools, mostly under the care of liberal, non-Jesuit religious orders, were closed; some heads of these anti-Jesuit religious orders were punished for attempting to save their funds by smuggling them out of the country. In the press of America this was called "Hitler's persecution of the Catholic Church", and served to conceal the common purpose of Nazi Socialism and ultramontane Catholicism. There were some mild protests from Rome but no adverse action. Even the closing of Catholic schools in Austria went almost unprotested. These were regarded by the Vatican as but a small loss compared to what was gained by the elimination of recalcitrant clergy and their liberal views. The Nazi-Vatican concordat continues to hold and function.

With the extinction of liberal Catholicism and the imprisonment of liberal Protestant leaders, Vatican absolutism was triumphant. Of supreme satisfaction to the Jesuit Catholic faction is the knowledge of the dissolution of Protestantism in Germany, and the fact that the pro-Nazi Protestant "German Christians" are forced to realize, as Gonzague de Reynolds points out, that "to reject a purely religious authority like the Papacy would constitute a danger to the church and Christianity."

Next week: NAZI-FASCISM AND CATHOLIC ACTION.

SUNDAY IN JARVIS STREET

The Lord blesses His Word where people pray. Sunday morning last two men, recently converted, followed the Saviour in baptism. Sunday evening there was a spirit of conviction in the gathering, and at the invitation and afterward there was response. Our large choir added to the spirit of the meeting with Stainer's lovely setting of John 3:16, 17. They and the junior choirs are busy preparing for our annual musical service of praise on Good Friday.

"And the hour shall be filled with music,
With song and praise and prayer,
And the burdens of life be lifted,
From all who enter there."

⁵ Professor of History in the University of Marburg, in his work, *Im Ringen um die Kirche*, p. 174 et seq.

POOR QUEBEC!

We take the following from the *Canadian Automotive Trade News* of February, 1941:

Quebec Leads

There were 8,775 new passenger cars retailed for \$10,550,425 in December, 1940, an increase of 12 per cent. in number and 23 per cent. in value above sales in Dec., 1939, when 7,804 new passenger cars sold for \$8,568,427. Quebec showed the greatest increase over last year with a gain of 63 per cent.; sales in British Columbia were up 23 per cent., and in Ontario 16 per cent. All other sections of the country reported sales below the 1939 level. Sales in the Maritime Provinces decreased 11 per cent., in Alberta 12 per cent., and in Manitoba 15 per cent., while Saskatchewan sales were 28 per cent. below last year.

Trucks Up Five Per Cent.

Sales of new trucks and buses in Dec., 1940, numbered 2,145 units with a retail value of \$2,641,772, up 5 per cent. in number and 11 per cent. in value compared with Dec., 1939, when 2,040 new commercial vehicles retailed for \$2,375,323. Quebec reported the greatest increase over 1939 in this field also with sales of new trucks and buses 45 per cent. above December last year. Sales in Ontario were up 19 per cent., and in Manitoba 8 per cent., while decreases were reported in all other sections of the country.

From the quotation above it will be seen that the increase in new passenger cars sold in Quebec during 1940 was 63 per cent. over last year; in British Columbia, 23 per cent.; in Ontario, 16 per cent. "All other sections of the country reported sales below the 1939 level." Sales of new trucks and buses increased 5 per cent. in number and 11 per cent. in value last year; while for December alone, the increase in Quebec was 45 per cent. above the sales of the year before.

We are glad to observe that Québec is prospering. Perhaps that prosperity is due, in large measure, to the stimulus that comes to all branches of business during wartime. We may hope that this prosperity will continue in Quebec, so that it will not be necessary for the rest of the Dominion to help it to pay its bills, as the Sirois Report proposed.

We have presumed to take the following figures on enlistment from *Protestant Action* of March, 1941. They speak for themselves:

WHO'S ENLISTING?

Ontario, 72,000 - Quebec, 34,000

Official Ottawa figures for enlistments between October 1st, 1939, and October 31st, 1940, are:

Air Force—Ont., 9,664; Que., 2,715; Man., 2,566; Sask., 2,413; B.C., 1,854; Alta., 1,755; N.B., 1,022; N.S., 879; P.E.I., 170.

Navy—Ont., 3,303; N.S., 2,119; Que., 1,860; B.C., 1,624; Man., 871; Alta., 760; Sask., 563; N.B., 528; P.E.I., 417.

C.A.S.F.—Ont., 59,537; Que., 30,023; N.S. and P.E.I., 14,905; Sask., 8,713; Alta., 11,405; B.C., 15,078; Man. and part of Ont., 12,963; N.B., 8,525.

This shows that Ontario gave a total of 72,504, as against Quebec's 34,603. The other provinces stand in the following order: B.C., 18,556; N.S. and P.E.I., 18,490; Man. (and part of Ont.), 16,400; Alta., 13,920; Sask., 11,689; N.B., 10,175.

Dr. Barnardo's Homes in Great Britain are receiving to their hospitality an average of 5 little fugitives every day. In the 75 years of their history they have had within their walls 125,000 children. To-day the Homes are sheltering 8,250 boys and girls, many of whom are crippled and hundreds of whom are under 5 years of age.

—*Watchman-Examiner.*

THE CHURCH OF ROME

Is It Christian or Pagan?

A book of 48 large pages, by Rev. Alexander A. Murray, D.D., Minister of Westminster Presbyterian Church, Sydney, N.S., has come to hand. The preface of *The Church of Rome: Is It Christian or Pagan?* states:

"The (8) Sermons in this volume were preached to my congregation during the months of December 1940 and January 1941. In response to many requests for a permanent record of them, they are now sent forth in the hope that they may enlighten and help all who wish to know the radical difference between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism.

"Roman Catholicism both in doctrine and practice is not Christianity. Indeed it is the very opposite of Christianity. While it professes to be a Christian religion, it is the negation of all that is truly Christian.

"Its doctrines and practices have no foundation whatsoever in the Bible. They are purely of heathen origin, and can be traced back to Babylon, 'the Mother of harlots and abominations of the earth.' This is a strong statement, but the sermons which follow prove the truth of it."

Copies of the work may be had from Dr. Murray at 25c each. We hope that many GOSPEL WITNESS readers will write Dr. Murray at once.

PRACTICAL MR. MOODY

Harold L. Lundquist tells a story of Mr. Moody that illustrates the practical and realistic attitude of that great man of God. It happened at a time when Mr. Moody was deeply interested in the political situation in Chicago. Meeting an officer of his church, the great preacher asked him what he thought of the forthcoming election. Replied the man, with a touch of rebuke for his pastor, "My dear brother Moody, I'm not interested in politics; my citizenship is in heaven." "Yes," Mr. Moody responded, "your citizenship is in heaven all right, but if you intend to go on living in Chicago, you'd better get your feet down to earth for the next sixty days."

—*Christ Life.*

TO QUEEN ELIZABETH

London Bridge is falling down,
Falling down, falling down,
My Fair Lady.

Be it said to your renown
That you wore your gayest gown
And bravest smile
AND STAYED IN TOWN!
While London Bridge
Was falling down, falling down,
My Fair Lady.

From the *Chicago Tribune*, traditionally an isolationist newspaper.

Hoping to touch hearts and pocketbooks for the buying of war saving certificates, a Canadian woman adds:

Be it said to our renown
That we helped her wear her gown
And bravest smile,
AND SAVED THE TOWN,
AND KEPT THE BRIDGE
FROM FALLING DOWN—
For our Fair Lady.

Libyan Nursery Rhyme

Mussolini-miny-mo,
Caught a lion by the toe.
How you'd love to let him go,
Teeny, weeny Benito!

—*Stuart Hemsley in Saturday Night.*

UNION NEWS

Rev. W. S. Whitcombe, Secretary

Jamaica

Rev. J. W. Knight, one of our four Seminary graduates in Jamaica, writes of his work as follows:

"Last week here we had a great week of special meetings. Without any extra effort at advertising, there were fine congregations, great messages that were the means of awaking saints as well as unsaved, and times that can honestly be called 'times of refreshing' from the presence of the Lord. The preacher was Pastor Stanley Harris, whom you will likely remember since the time he was with you for a Sunday at Jarvis Street. Many have turned to the Lord and are testifying of what He has done for them. What precious fellowship we enjoyed!"

"Like Hot Cakes"

One of our Home Mission Pastors writes thus about his weekly bundles of GOSPEL WITNESSES. "THE GOSPEL WITNESS is widely read these days. We have had to increase our number to eighteen and even while receiving twelve, enough money has been coming in to pay for the eighteen. I have had to quit announcing that they are at the door, for they have been gone almost before I could make the announcement."

Geraldton

"Both of our Bible Schools for 1940 were up in the average attendance over all previous years. Our lantern picture meetings continue to be of great interest to the children. While visiting a home recently where the little girls in the family had attended our Bible School before they moved down east, I discovered that they were back and that during their long train ride here they had been singing gospel choruses to the passengers on the train. The two little girls under five were certainly travelling missionaries as they sang the choruses they had learned in our Bible School. Our fiscal year ended on January 31st, and we are happy to report that all our obligations have been met and that there is a small balance in the general fund and almost \$200.00 in the building fund treasury. This is the Lord's doing and it is marvellous in our eyes."—Pastor G. B. Hicks.

Conversions in Sudbury

"The Lord continues to bless our efforts, and a few have been saved, notable among which were two men whose interest was aroused by our exposure of the evil efforts of a Paulist Priest. They were not Catholics, but had suffered at the hands of Catholicism, and found joy in the gospel of a living and accessible Saviour. In challenging the priest's doctrines, we aroused quite an interest, though, in one sense, it was quite appalling when one met dozens of people who seemed quite surprised that we should dare speak out boldly against this notoriously evil system. Such is our state of degeneracy among non-Catholics that Protestants are amazed, and even alarmed, if we protest. However, we have made many valuable contacts, and we still expect to see more conversions as an indirect result of the meetings. The services at which I dealt with the issue were as well attended as any meetings we have ever had, and have brought as much blessing as any effort we have ever made. As a result of the special meeting at which the largest number of Catholics were present, I received a letter from a prominent Catholic who was present, asking me a number of questions regarding our faith. I have replied at some length.

"Our other departments of the work go on with some difficulty. Many men, and even whole families, have gone away to war or war work, and our outside works have suffered badly from this. The radio ministry, in spite of its heavy obligations, which get almost unbearable sometimes, goes on with what seems to be an ever increasing evidence of blessing. It becomes ever more obvious that hundreds look to this message as almost the only gospel testimony they can hear, and proof of the power in the Word thus spoken is strengthened more and more each week."—J. R. Boyd.

British Columbia Baptists

From the *B.C. Baptist Bulletin*, we reprint the following report of three of our Seminary men now labouring in that Convention.

Marpole (Pastor E. V. Apps).—Splendid services, good attendances and at least one conversion during the past month. The recent Sunday School was the most successful in a long time.

Salmon Arm and Sunnybrae (Pastor G. R. Dawe).—Ministry of the Word is well received, and there is a good spirit in all our gatherings. We have been taking up studies on the Tabernacle at the Sunday morning services and Baptist Doctrine at the mid-week meetings.

Kamloops.—Pastor F. J. Carter continues to give his monthly gospel message over the air at Tranquille Sanatorium, with the young people to help with the singing. We know of some patients who are seriously thinking of salvation, and we pray that they may soon put their trust in the Lord Jesus Christ. Some of the Sunday School teachers continue their house-to-house canvass for new pupils, and at the same time give out the mimeographed church bulletins, which contain Gospel messages and Scripture. The Lord is blessing this work as several have been led to come and hear the Old, Old Story through this personal visiting.

AMONG OURSELVES

Devoted to Activities and Interests of Former Students of
TORONTO BAPTIST SEMINARY

Mr. "Johnnie" Longe, as we all knew him (class '31), is still living in Kenora. He is now blessed with a wife and a family of two children. He hopes to be accepted for service in the R.C.A.F.

We cannot but share with our readers the amusement of the following excerpt from a recent letter from our friend, Rev. F. S. Cook, now of Padilla, Bolivia:

"Besides the fleas which work havoc among us, and which cause us a lot of irritation, we have some mice to contend with. The other night I thought I saw one but was too sleepy to hunt for it. The next morning I was looking for something when I saw a thing move in a zipper-bag. I at once closed the entrance and took the bag outside. The man of the house was in and so together we opened the bag and out jumped Master Mouse. Then commenced a merry chase about the yard, when the woman of the house jumped on her bed with a yelling child under each arm, while she herself yelled and the poor servant, who is deaf and dumb and lame, was knocked over by the cat, who got so scared it jumped at her, while Mrs. Cook, the man and I chased the little fellow. Well, a quick foot did the trick and that was the end of it. Then we bought a couple of traps and since then we have caught some more. We seem to be rid of them—the mice—for a while at least."

Russellites, that is, Rutherfordites, that is, Jehovah's Witnesses, are still selling their books in London, England.

From information recently released, it is known that there are now no less than 100 Roman Catholic priests serving as full-time chaplains to the Canadian force on land, sea and air, in addition to 50 part-time chaplains. The Protestants total 186, of whom 15 are Baptists.

The following propositions published in the *Baptist Directory* issued by Rev. E. T. Hiscox in 1859, are very much to the point to-day:

"Every man has the right to hold such religious opinions as he believes the Bible teaches, without harm or hindrance from anyone on that account, so long as he does not intrude upon, or interfere with, the rights of others by so doing.

"All men have the right, not only to believe, but also to profess and openly declare, whatever religious opinions they may entertain, providing they be not contrary to common morality, and do no injustice to others."—B.

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 5 First Quarter Lesson 12 March 23, 1941

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

THE RICH YOUNG RULER

Lesson Text: Mark 10:1-31.

Golden Text: "Come, take up the cross, and follow me"—
Mark 10:21.

I. Regulations—verses 1 to 12.

Parallel passage: Matt. 19:1-9.

The Pharisees had perceived that the message preached by the Lord Jesus differed somewhat from the letter of the law as interpreted by the elders. His failure to obey their traditions increased their hostility to Him, and when they sought to bring Him into disrepute with the authorities (Mk. 3:6; 8:11; Lk. 20:19, 20; John 8:6), they adopted the scheme of exposing what they termed His violation of the law (Mk. 2:18, 20; 7:1-15; John 8:4-6). As a matter of fact, Christ came to fulfill the law (Matt. 5:17, 18, 21-30, 33-48). He expounded the inner spiritual principles, of which the external ceremonies had been foregleams and illustrations.

Christ replied to their insincere question by asking them a question involving their knowledge of the matter in hand. When people criticize the teaching of Scripture, it is sometimes a good move to find out whether they really know the Word. Usually they do not.

Our Lord expounded the principles involved in His regulations regarding divorce, referring to the historical circumstances governing the relationship between man and wife (Gen. 1:27; 2:20-25; Deut. 24:1-4; Eph. 5:31, 32). His commands are not grievous, but reasonable (1 John 5:3), and a knowledge of the historical background of the Word will help us to understand and appreciate it, as well as to obey it.

Incidentally, our Saviour gave positive evidence as to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, the first five books of the Bible.

When the disciples asked Him privately about the matter, Christ answered them directly and definitely (Matt. 5:31, 32; Lk. 16:18), as was His custom (Matt. 13:36; 24:3; Mk. 9:28; Lk. 10:23). Those who abide in Him are in a position to receive knowledge which is hidden from the worldly (Psa. 25:14; Prov. 3:32; Matt. 13:16, 17; John 7:17; 15:15).

II. Rebuke—verses 13 to 16.

Parallel passages: Matt. 19:13-15; Lk. 18:15-17.

While the disciples rebuked the parents of the children, Christ rebuked the disciples themselves for their lack of understanding and consideration. They should have known His great love for the children; He always treated them with tenderness and sympathy. He would teach us to do the same, and to recognize the importance of training them in His way and will.

Our Lord has a place and a plan for the children in His kingdom, and no one should presume to disregard or imperil their spiritual welfare (Mk. 9:37, 42). The childlike attitude is the very first requirement for those who would come into His kingdom. The commencement of eternal life in the believer by the new birth is likened to the beginning of the physical life by natural birth (John 3:3-7; 1 Pet. 1:22, 23; 2:2). We may learn much from the children.

III. Renunciation—verses 17 to 22.

Parallel passages: Matt. 19:16-22; Lk. 18:18-23.

The question of eternal life, inasmuch as it involves one's future destiny as well as present peace, is the most important consideration which can occupy the human mind. The young man did well to apply to Christ, the only One Whose word is authoritative on that matter; He came to bring us life (John 4:10; 6:63, 67, 68).

The Lord answered the plea of the young ruler for light, correctly reading his heart, in spite of the deficiency of his knowledge. He had called the Saviour *good* instead of *God*, had regarded Him as a teacher instead of the Teacher, and

had thought that eternal life could be inherited like earthly possessions (Lk. 10:25-28; 1 Pet. 1:3, 4).

Jesus loved the ruler because of his youthful enthusiasm (Eccl. 11:9), his earnestness, the sincerity of his tribute and his upright life.

The ten commandments may be divided into two sections; the first section deals with man's relationship to God (Exod. 20:3-11), the last six with his relationship to his fellowman (Exod. 20:12-17). It is significant that the commandments which the young man claimed to have observed all come in this second section, but he was unable to stand the test when asked to renounce his possessions and give them to the poor. In reality, he did not love his neighbour as himself, nor did he love the Lord his God with all his heart. He was not obeying the first commandment and the greatest one, nor the second, which is like unto it (Exod. 20:3; Mk. 12:28-33). He had put another god before Jehovah; he revered his gold instead of his God.

The young man had made "the great refusal" (John 5:40). It is sad to see one so promising turning away from Christ, allowing his material possessions to stand in the way of the eternal welfare of his soul.

IV. Riches—verses 23 to 31.

Parallel passages: Matt. 19:23-30; Lk. 18:24-30.

It was the departure of the young ruler which opened the way for the Master's discourse regarding the peril of riches (Lk. 18:24). Used for the Lord, riches may be a means of service and blessing; but used for self, they may easily become a snare and a stumbling-block (Jas. 5:1-5). Wealth may mean power in some circles, but the disciples must learn that it may easily make spiritual progress difficult, tending to minister to pride and self-sufficiency (1 Tim. 6:9, 10, 17).

The "eye of the needle" probably refers to one of the small postern doors in the city gate. A camel could not pass through without stooping down and being relieved of its load. The rich man who desires to enter the kingdom must put aside all trust in his riches (Psa. 62:10; Lk. 12:15).

Peter argued that if riches were a disadvantage in spiritual progress, then poverty must provide an advantage. That does not necessarily follow. The core of the matter is the attitude of the individual to Christ. The sacrifice, of whatever kind, which is made for the glory of God, will be abundantly rewarded in God's own time.

Humility

Humble we must be, if to Heaven we go:
High is the roof there; but the gate is low:
Whene'er thou speak'st, look with a lowly eye:
Grace is increased by humility.

—Robert Herrick

ONLY 18 MORE DAYS

to the end of our financial year in the
books of Jarvis Street Church, *The Gos-
pel Witness*, Toronto Baptist Seminary.

Send your gift at once to:

130 Gerrard Street East,

Toronto, 2, Ont.