

# 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. 20, No. 8

TORONTO, JUNE 26, 1941

Whole Number 997

## The Romanist Appeal to Force

A church that really abides by the teaching of the New Testament, recognizes and utilizes, for the propagation of the gospel, no other force than that spiritual power which is promised the church of the firstborn in the presence and dynamic of the Holy Spirit.

It is the contention of the Roman Catholic Church that it uses two swords, that it is indeed within its rights when it invokes the power of the secular arm for the propagation of the faith. The bloody history of the Roman Catholic Church, lighted by the lurid glare of a million martyr fires, proclaims the philosophic kinship of Romanism with Nazism and other systems of government which depend for their maintenance and furtherance upon physical force.

The Roman Catholic Church has not changed. It is true to its motto, *semper idem*. THE GOSPEL WITNESS, without apology, proclaims itself the uncompromising foe, not of Roman Catholics, but of Roman Catholicism. In his speech of last Sunday Mr. Churchill described Nazism as an enemy of Britain with which there can be no compromise, and against which Britain must contend until victory is secured. We take precisely the same attitude toward the Roman Catholic Church.

We have said it a hundred times, we repeat it: it is essentially anti-Christian. It is not only un-Christian, but it is anti-Christian. Its teaching, its spirit, its authoritarian claims, and the methods of its propagation, are all as utterly anti-Christian as it is possible to be. We have no sympathy with Anglo-Catholicism, nor with so-called Free Church movements that talk about union with the Roman Catholic Church. It is so utterly contrary to the gospel that again, without hyperbole, we say it would be quite as easy to propose union with the devil himself. We are of the number who believe that the Reformation was not a mistake. We preach no new doctrine, but take our stand with the Reformers, and with the noble army of martyrs who gave their lives in defense of the gospel.

But having said all that, we must also say that we would not, under any consideration, willingly do the slightest injury to a Roman Catholic anywhere. In our view, there are two classes of people: those who are in

a state of nature, and those who are regenerated by divine grace—to one of these two categories all men belong. It is our sincere desire that those who do not know Christ should come to know Him, that they should be converted, be born again, made new creatures in Christ, and by virtue of the precious blood of Christ made heirs of eternal salvation.

Because of that, we hate every system that would put a stumbling-block in the way of faith. We abhor every religion that would substitute any mediator between God and man for the Man Christ Jesus. To us, Romanism is the most blatant and blasphemous idolatry. It exalts Mary to an equality with God, and names a thousand saints as additional intercessors. The whole system is a system of error, of falsehood, of anti-biblical blackness, which has absolutely nothing in common with the gospel of the grace of God.

It is for that reason we oppose Roman Catholicism and the Roman Catholic Church. We recognize the right of everyone to believe what he will. We believe in absolute freedom of conscience. And we offer no complaint on account of anything the Roman Catholic press may say about us. But we call attention to the fact that Romanism will never meet argument with argument.

For months past the Catholic press has been screaming that Dr. Shields must be stopped; he must be interned; he must be brought into court; he must be jailed; he must be silenced. Every word they write is true to the Romanist conception of things. It is an appeal to force. Elsewhere in this issue we publish a number of translations from the French language press. The Catholic press is determined to keep up the fight—and so are we. And we can keep on as long as they can!

Some time ago we preached a sermon on the subject, "Why I Am Not a Roman Catholic." The sermon was translated into French and given wide distribution, both in Quebec and Ontario. It has produced a storm of protest. But on second thought, it may be well for us to deal with these translations item by item: we content ourselves, therefore, in this article with calling attention to the fact that Rome still endeavours to wield the sword of the temporal power.

## Translations From the French-Language Press

All our translations from the French-language press quoted in this issue are made by Rev. W. S. Whitcombe, M.A., to whom THE GOSPEL WITNESS is greatly indebted.

### Why We Oppose Roman Catholicism

A sufficient answer to this question may be found in the article below from *Le Droit*, Ottawa, May 13th. We direct attention particularly to the paragraphs printed in bold type. We are roundly abused by the Roman Catholic press of Canada for our criticism of the Roman Church, its teachings, and its methods. We are denounced up and down the country for having allowed a sermon on "Why I Am Not a Roman Catholic" to be translated into French. The sermon is quoted in Parliament. And the Catholic press, not only in Quebec, but in Ontario and the West, demands that we be silenced because our criticism of Roman Catholicism endangers "national unity"! And yet here we are told that

"the Catholic Church is the sole moral force which sustains humanity. It makes the light of truth shine in the intelligence of its children and without ceasing it recalls to human consciences and wills the divine teachings which will inspire and guide them. Outside of the church there is no hope and there is no salvation."

Thus Protestants are waived aside. There is "no moral force" in Protestantism. The Catholic Church is "the sole moral force which sustains humanity." Furthermore it is said that "outside of the church there is no hope and there is no salvation." Many of us, therefore, are in a pretty bad way. Nothing that we have ever said or written about the Roman Catholic Church could be more insulting than this. While we have condemned the church and the teachings of Rome, we have always insisted that distinction must be drawn between official Romanism and Roman Catholics.

We repeat, we can well believe that in spite of all its idolatry and superstition, some Roman Catholics do manage to get through the darkness to Christ. We have never dared to say that "inside of the church there is no hope and there is no salvation."

Once more, we are told "as guardian of the truth, the church also guards the laws of social and economic life of nations, the remedies to intellectual errors, to moral failures, to excesses of power." All this is part of the Roman claim that the Pope is the king of kings, and that all governments of every sort, exercising authority without the approval of the Pope are "sacrilegious usurpers".

Mgr. Vachon mentioned in the article below, was a member of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. He may be so still, we do not know. He was also, until recently, a leading teacher at Laval University, Quebec City, where Dr. Sirois also taught. The article from *Le Droit* is as follows:

#### HIS EXCELLENCY MGR. VACHON RECEIVES THE PALLIUM

Yesterday in the course of a consistory of the Sacred College of Cardinals, His Holiness Pius XII conferred on Monsignor the Archbishop of Ottawa, the Pallium, the emblem of archepiscopal authority. The Pallium, the dispatches add, is a circular band of white wool that archbishops wear around their neck. The Pope alone has the right to confer the Pallium. It is a dignity accorded to archbishops to symbolize their participation in the supreme pastoral power of the Pope.

" . . . . the Pallium," writes Mgr. Emard, "is a mark of honour and a sign of authority and of jurisdiction, but it is above all an emblem of the pastoral zeal and devotion which Our Saviour Jesus Christ wished to make the soul of the sacerdotal ministry, created by Him to perpetuate in the Church His work of justification and the salvation. . . ."

By the act of sending the Pallium to archbishops the church means to mark the importance it attaches to whatever has to do with the authority with which it is clothed and which is transmitted perpetually from the Pope to the archbishops and bishops.

In our troubled epoch when might is held to be right, and pagan doctrines seek to oust Christianity, the Catholic Church is the sole moral force which sustains humanity. It makes the light of truth shine in the intelligence of its children and without ceasing it recalls to human consciences and wills the divine teachings which will inspire and guide them.

Outside of the church there is no hope and there is no salvation. This truth has all the more force at the present when, more dangerous than ever, the theories of heretics and pagans have made their appearance, as well as those of all schools of thought which will not recognize the spiritual fatherhood of the Vatican.

The church holds from God religious truth, that which has always given the greatest concern to the human intelligence and heart; and it from God that it holds the authority to transmit integrally that truth to all peoples and to all souls.

As guardian of the truth, the church also guards the laws of social and economic life of nations, the remedies to intellectual errors, to moral failures, to excesses of power. Today and since the first hour of its existence it is the beacon light which guides humanity toward its destiny, and its light never fails. Its doctrine impregnates both private and public life, individual consciences as well as governments, institutions and laws.

It is its principle of divine authority which makes it ever active, ever young, and ever victorious. It also guards particularly this principle of life and never allows it to be attacked.

We have in our midst the representative of that supreme authority in the person of the head of our diocese, who has just received the emblem that the church reserves for archbishops.

We take advantage of the opportunity to express to our venerated archbishop our profound respect and perfect allegiance, assuring him again of our sincere feeling of veneration, devotion and affection, and we again express our prayer that he may long remain at the head of this diocese whose destinies he directs with such wisdom and charity.

### A Sample of Roman Charity

Below we print another diatribe against the sermon, "Why I Am Not a Roman Catholic", printed in French. It breathes the spirit of the Romanist Church. It approves of driving colporteurs from the door "with a broomstick". They complain that His Majesty's Mail is now used to perform the task of Protestantism. Why not? What is His Majesty's Mail for but to carry the messages of His Majesty's subjects? We are deluged with Roman Catholic propaganda, which reaches us by His Majesty's Mail. We have been informed of scores of people, no doubt representatives of thousands, who have been circularized by Roman Catholic institutions, as we are continually. We have even received a little piece of lead that is supposed to carry some special benediction with it, on condition that we make a contribution to the Church. We offer no complaint. We are not obliged to read what is sent us. The priests object because the truth is put into the hands of their people.

In answer to the implication of the Second paragraph, we may say that the sermon was translated by a French-Canadian merely for the love of it. He did not receive one piece of silver for his labour, to say nothing of thirty.

The third paragraph refers to "the eloquent reprobation of a proud French-Canadian member of Parliament." That was in the House of Commons. That is all to the good. We have no objection to French-Canadian members of Parliament preaching our sermons in the House of Commons. We have not any doubt there are many members of the House of Commons who need the truth contained therein. We are not an "enemy of bilingualism". We should be glad if everyone in Canada could speak English and French with equal facility. We do object to the setting up of a French language barrier among French-Canadians. It is not to bilingualism we object, but to the substitution of French for English in an English-speaking country.

As to the fourth paragraph, it is true that we do not call the Pope the Holy Father, nor Mary the Holy Virgin, nor the Lord's Supper the Holy Eucharist. To us "the Holy Father" is an impious imposter, and worship of the Eucharist so-called, and the Virgin, utterly anti-Christian.

Our sermon is said to be compounded of "honey, vinegar, arsenic". The sermon is "a dirty rag", and people are advised to "throw his trash into the fire. There is enough of it to destroy the 'famous' Bibles that he dreams of sending us—to add insult to injury". Let it be observed that to offer a free copy of the Word of God to a Roman Catholic, according to this writer is "to add insult to injury".

This provides another sample of the spirit of the French language Roman Catholic press.

Here follows the article from *Le Droit* of June 7th, 1941:

"Le Droit", June 7, 1941

"WITHOUT MENTIONING NAMES . . .

"A certain Toronto pastor has it in for the Catholics. As he does not like those who constitute the greatest Catholic force in Canada, this gentleman addresses his petty insults and his papers to our fellow-citizens. French-Canadians are honoured by such attention. The aged mother of the famous Father Lacasse, O.M.I., found it useless to chase Bible colporteurs from her door with a broom-stick. Nothing can quench the proselytizing zeal of these Protestants. However, as many of these propagandists are badly received, the good apostles have adopted less dangerous tactics: they ask His Majesty's Mail to perform their task. And that is why. Mr. X. of S. F. D'Assise, Widow Y of Notre Dame d'Ottawa, and Miss Z. of Eastview surreptitiously received this wretched 'literature'.

"One fact will put our fellow Catholics on guard: the translation of this pamphlet (the original, in this case, being in the language of the Reformers) bears the signature of a poor fellow . . . this unfortunate dared to deny everything which he formerly taught . . . he has made his contribution to a propaganda which he knows is destructive and deceitful. But he is hungry, and the thirty pieces of Judas are still worth thirty pieces! It is the anti-Catholic custom to employ deserters and rebels: the Church has no part in that first treachery . . . its history begins with the eleven faithful apostles and with the One Whom it is not necessary to name.

"This tract which has just been distributed in the Catholic homes of Ottawa and Hull, earned, as is well known, the eloquent reprobation of a proud French-Canadian member of Parliament. It continues none the less to do its sly work on imprudent minds, and on those who do not understand that we must never compromise for an instant with error. With a sweet tone he makes them drink his poison. How the author must rejoice! Note the traditional farce, this enemy of bilingualism adopts bilingualism as a means of evangelisation. (He must be an enemy of bilingualism since he is constantly insulting the Catholic clergy of Quebec.)

"The title of these lines is 'Without Mentioning Names'. The holy preacher would be too elated if we did him the honour of advertising him. He is already known for his

anger and blasphemy against faith in the Holy Eucharist, the Holy Virgin and the Holy Father. With a total lack of that charity spoken of by St. Paul, whom he quotes recklessly, and regardless of meaning, he spares none of our sacraments, and sends us to the very bottom of the abyss of darkness and fire. Is it not understood that those whom he wishes to convert are the dishonour of the world and the abomination of the temple? Honey, vinegar, arsenic, this delicious madman pours without stint into the leprous cup of our Roman Catholic souls. For he burns to burn Rome, and to cause the Church to perish at the stake. That is very kind of him, though quite useless, since the Devil has not succeeded in doing so.

"But let us leave this dirty rag and throw his trash in the fire. There is enough of it to destroy the 'famous' Bibles that he dreams of sending us—to add insult to injury. In these days there is a protestant mania seeking to infect our Catholic homes with such propaganda. But our good housewives will decide that all this paper will make a fine fire . . . That is all this apostolic fire-wood is good for . . .

"But, but . . . let us meditate on this, and take our medicine. Let us ask ourselves, is it not curious that heretics show so much zeal and that the . . . (please finish the question)."

## Catholic Register and Westminster Abbey

The spirit and attitude of the Roman Catholic Church are the same the world over. Hitler knows that no matter what countries he may acquire, or what victories he may have elsewhere, unless, and until he subdues Britain, he cannot be master of the world. What Mr. Churchill calls our "Island Fortress" effectually bars the road to world conquest. Long ago Cardinals Newman and Manning recognized that the same Island Fortress, but of Protestantism, barred the way to the conquest of the world by the Roman Catholic Church.

The subjugation of Britain is still the principal objective of the Vatican. We print below an excerpt from the leading editorial of *The Catholic Register* of Toronto, of May 22nd, 1941. *The emphasis is ours.*

### The Stones of Westminster

Though Westminster Abbey has been out of Catholic hands for nearly four hundred years, English Catholics would feel more wounded by its destruction than if their Westminster Cathedral were reduced to rubble as their Southwark Cathedral has already been. The whole English-speaking world looks upon Westminster Abbey as a common possession. The descendants of American Puritans and of those who revolted with George Washington against the rule of the Mother Country venerate St. Peter's Abbey of Westminster as their ancestral shrine. But none who are not of the same religion as St. Edward the Confessor who founded the Abbey and of the monks who lived the Benedictine life within its walls for six centuries before its desecration by the Tudor dictator can share the filial piety towards the Abbey that Catholics feel. Except for a very few features like the Tomb of the Unknown Warrior the Protestant period has added nothing of value to the Abbey and it is responsible for many disfigurements. Nothing in the Abbey can be understood apart from its original purpose as a home for monks and a church for Catholic worship with the Sacrifice of the Mass. However, Protestant England has this to its credit, that for four hundred years it has preserved, not indeed the whole of Westminster Abbey, which used to be far greater in extent than it is to-day, but the Abbey Church, the Cloisters, the Chapter House, the Abbott's House, and some other precious remnants. Though the voices of Catholic clergy are excluded from pulpit and sanctuary, the very stones cry out the Catholic origin and character of the Abbey. As long as the walls stand English Catholics will never give up hope of seeing a Papal Legate standing once again before the Abbey altar to offer up the Sacrifice of the Mass and to reconcile England to the seat of Catholic unity.

## The Gospel Witness and the Censorship

Last week we published an editorial from the Orange Sentinel. In that editorial there was reproduced a letter from the Censor to the Editor of the *Times Journal*. To refresh the memory of our readers we publish the letter again as follows:

### Letter of Warning

"The Editor,  
"The Times-Journal,  
"St. Thomas, Ont.

"Dear Sir,

"It has been brought to our attention that Rev. Dr. T. T. Shields, of Jarvis St. Baptist Church, Toronto, is to address a public meeting in St. Thomas under Orange auspices, on May 28, during the session there of the Grand Orange Lodge of Ontario West.

"As you are probably aware, Dr. Shields has been conducting through sermons in his church and through his publication, the 'Gospel Witness,' a withering attack on Roman Catholic institutions in Canada, and particularly against what he calls its 'fifth column' activities in French Quebec.

"His attacks are, of course, not conducive to unity in Canada in these times of stress when a united war effort is so necessary. Dr. Shields has been warned, but it may happen that he will seize upon this occasion to make a more sensational attack than before, and we would advise you, in the event that you are covering his address and publishing it in detail, to keep in mind the Defence of Canada regulations.

"Thanking you for your co-operation in the past.  
"We are," etc.

We can think of no more unjustifiable course than that of the Censorship Office in writing such a letter. Here we find the office of the Censor springing to the defence of Roman Catholic institutions in Canada. We propose to continue our "withering attack".

We supposed there was religious freedom in Canada. We have no objection to Romanists attacking us in their papers. They do it all the time. We claim the same right to reply. The fact is, we have a Government in Ottawa that is virtually controlled by the Roman Catholic Church, and the Roman Church goes just as far as it dare in using Government agencies for the propagation of its tenets, and the persecution of all who oppose it. What nonsense this is:

"His attacks are, of course, not conducive to unity in Canada in these times of stress, when a united war effort is so necessary."

One cannot produce unity by talking about it, and the only unity we have in Canada, so far as Quebec is concerned, is that it has condescended to allow the rest of Canada to fight at Britain's side.

That Roman Catholic Quebec is, as a whole, opposed to Canada's participation in the war, there can be no doubt. Thousands of Roman Catholics have volunteered for active service. But the Church itself is anti-British. We shall be told that many Roman Catholic officials have spoken in support of the war. True! Hitler said he had no more territorial ambitions in Europe after the Munich Pact. He posed as the friend of Holland and Belgium, and then destroyed them. And since Munich he signed a non-aggression pact with Russia. Hitler is generally regarded as the world's greatest liar. But he is no more untruthful than the Vatican. Anyone who accepts the Vatican's assurances on any subject at their face value, would be just as simple as anyone would be who would believe Hitler. Rome justifies lying; it advocates lying; it is ready to grant absolution to the liar if he lies in a good cause.

For this reason we do not believe the officials of Rome when they speak in support of the British cause. The bishops and archbishops can say one thing, and the people will do the opposite, for we know very well it is the parish priest who gives the order—they will do as they are commanded.

We challenge the Government to publish the figures of the number of Roman Catholic voluntary enlistments in the armed forces in all the provinces. Canadian unity, of which the Premier speaks so much, is conditioned upon Quebec's being allowed to have its own way in everything. Premier Godbout recognized that when he said:

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

That the Roman Catholic Church is a fifth column everywhere, we have not the slightest doubt. There are, of course, thousands of Roman Catholics who are as loyal as any other British citizen. There are no finer people than the French Canadians, and were it not that French Canada is cursed with the incubus of Romanism, it would be as prosperous and as loyal to all British institutions as any other part of Canada. We are not against French-Canadians; we are not against Quebec: our contention has been a religious one, and we register our protest against the use of Government agencies for the propagation of Romanism and the persecution of its opponents.

This letter from the Censor says, "Dr. Shields has been warned". When, and how, has he been "warned"? We received a letter from the Censor dated December 20th, 1940. We replied December 31st. We published both letters together with appropriate comments in THE GOSPEL WITNESS of January 2nd, and we later received an acknowledgment from the Censor's office, dated January 10th. In order that our readers may have all this before them, we republish the entire matter that was contained in our issue of January 2nd.

But how unfair for the Censor's office thus to write! But we can expect nothing else from any Department of Government subject to Roman Catholic control. We reproduce the matter contained in our January 2nd issue on page 10.

## Protestantism in Spain

All reports confirm the fact that the Roman Catholic Church in Spain has become as intolerant under the Franco regime as it was during Inquisition times. To favor Protestantism and Democracy there is to run the risk of being branded as a Red and imprisoned, as many have been. Only two Protestant churches remain open; Bibles sent by the British and Foreign Bible Society have been confiscated; a new law makes it obligatory to be married by a Catholic priest or not at all.

The preaching of the Gospel in Spain under the Spanish Republic was not only permitted but encouraged and was showing beneficial results. With the Catholic church again in complete control of religious life, this has all been lost. The folly of England in appeasing the Franco forces during their assault on Spanish democracy is thus bearing bitter fruit. It would seem to be a repetition of that folly now to attempt to wean Franco Spain from the Axis by gifts and loans from Britain and America.

It is said that the Roman Catholic population of Toronto is about 10%, but they run 62% of the beer parlours.

# The Jarvis Street Pulpit

## A FULL-LENGTH PORTRAIT OF CHRIST

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Sunday evening, June 22, 1941

"What think ye of Christ? whose son is he?"—Matthew 22:42.

It is the last of the very few days of Christ's public ministry, which have been recorded by the pen of inspiration. Knowing the insults and raillery, the scourging and crucifixion that await Him, He has for months past steadfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem. There in the Holy City His sworn enemies, who for three years have fanned their hate as they plot against Him, now officially and publicly challenge His authority as He teaches in the temple of God His Father. When He answers their question by hanging them on the horns of a dilemma, their next move is to seek to ensnare Him with hard questions. The Pharisees and the Herodians, always enemies as they were, sink their differences for the moment, and together they bring to Jesus one of the vexed politico-religious questions of the hour, "Is it right to pay tribute to Caesar?" The way in which the answer of the Lord Jesus cut the Gordian knot, amazed all who heard Him. Presently the Sadducees bring one of their stock questions: "If a woman were married to seven brothers in succession, whose wife would she be in the resurrection?" Again the Teacher come from God silences their quibbling. Now it is a lawyer of the Pharisees who brings a question of the Law, and receives the answer of Him Who could interpret it best.

His enemies have questioned Jesus. Now it is His turn to question them. The Pharisees have been life-long students of the Old Testament. Many of them can repeat whole books by heart. Their learning centres specially about prophecy of the Messiah. If there is one thing besides the Levitical Law about which they know more than another, it is the teaching of the Old Testament concerning Him Whose coming they have so long awaited. The Teacher of Nazareth, Who is not a graduate of their school of divinity, Who has not accepted their recognized interpretations of the Law, asks them a question whose answer lies in their own chosen field of knowledge: "What is your opinion about the Messiah? Whose son is he?" They have a ready answer, "David's." But here is a difficulty: "David in spirit calls Him Lord, saying, 'The Lord said to my Lord, Sit on my right hand until I put your enemies under your feet.'" "So if David calls Him Lord, how is He his son?" There is a quotation from Psalm 110, which these students of the Old Testament doubtless know by heart. And yet there is a difficulty in that verse, a question of the sonship of the Messiah, which they have never noticed, and the answer to which they cannot now bring forth. Before the people who look up to them as paragons of wisdom, they are put to silence by this question which the Prophet of Galilee puts to the doctors at Jerusalem. Ashamed, they slink away, and no one of them dares from that time to ask Him any more questions.

But the question which the Lord Jesus asks that day, is the key-stone of all religious thinking. On your

answer to it hangs your whole creed, yes, and more, your eternal destiny. It is this question I bring you to-night, and it is to it that I pray God I may be able to help you find the answer: "What think ye of Christ? whose son is he?"

### I.

I suppose the most obvious answer to one who knows anything of the life story of Jesus is that He is THE SON OF MARY.

The angel Gabriel who stands in the presence of God, comes one day to the quiet and pretty village which nestles in a pare-shaped valley among Galilee's hills; and there he appears to a young woman, may be in moderate circumstances, but of the best blood of the Hebrew race. He greets her in these words: "Hail, you who are highly favoured, the Lord is with you." The maiden is troubled, but the angel says in effect: "Don't be afraid, Mariam. You will be the mother of a child called Jesus; He will also be called the Son of the Highest, and He will reign in an endless Kingdom." The woman wonders how, and the angel explains. It must be a miracle, but her faith is strong; and in the submission of that faith she says: "See, the handmaid of the Lord. Let it happen to me according to your word."

Months later, with Joseph to protect her, Mary lodges for the night in the rough inn of the little town of Bethlehem, not in a guest chamber but in the barnyard as we should call it, since the inn is already full—when the couple arrives. There amidst all the discomfort of the courtyard of an eastern inn, Mary, with her own hands, because there is no other woman to help, herself cares for her firstborn babe.

And through many years she cares for Him in Egypt, back in Judaea, and finally home again in the bad little village of Nazareth. She tells Him Bible stories and teaches Him Scripture verses. From her He learns to sing the Psalms that praise the God of Israel. There are others in the family, three other boys and at least two girls; but Jesus, the eldest, no one understands as Mary does. Has she not locked in her heart the secret of His birth, and is she not waiting with Him for the fulfillment of it all? And yet she but poorly understands, as later history shows. When years pass, sorrow touches that home, for Joseph, I take it, has died, and now Jesus is the chief support of His mother.

About thirty years of age, He enters on His public ministry, and His mother is there when He works His first miracle. With the deepest interest, although without a full understanding, she follows His work as best she can. His popularity astounds her, and she one day yields to the persuasion of the rest of the family who say that He is mentally unbalanced. With them she comes to take Him home, but home He will not come.

The brief three years of His ministry are soon over, and His mother stands,—where the rest of the family were we do not know,—supported by the beloved disciple John, at the foot of that cross whose sword pierces through her own soul. Jesus, even amidst agony of body and spirit, shows the pity of a considerate son, and He says in effect: "John, take her to your home over in the city. This is no place for her." But the gladness of the resurrection changes it all, and tears of grief turn to tears of joy. Fifty days later Mary is found with that group that wait in the Upper Room, on whom the Holy Spirit comes in power.

Yes, Mary,—beautiful, meditative, believing Mary,—stumbling, misunderstanding, sinful Mary,—she was "the mother of my Lord". It is not Mary who pleads for us, but it is Mary's Son.

But when I reminded you that one answer to our question of the sonship of Christ is that He is the Son of Mary, there immediately leaped into your minds, I am sure, the question,—no, the fact, of the virgin birth. The Son of Mary is unique among men, He had a human mother but no human father. Mary and Joseph had other children, but Mary's firstborn Son was different.

Does someone object? Is someone prone to quote the unbelievers of the hour, who join with the skeptics of former ages in deriding the doctrine of the miraculous conception of Jesus Christ? Would these infidels tell us that the virgin birth is a biological miracle which the modern mind cannot use? O my doubting friends, do not be so easily robbed of the inheritance of faith. If you listen to the apostles of darkness, who transform themselves as ministers of light, they will leave you no Bible below, no heaven beyond, no God above.

Jesus said that to be converted we must become as little children, and that is the proper attitude for any man in the face of the facts. This matchless story of the virgin birth is no Jewish fable nor pagan myth. Such stories take years and years to grow. The tales of miracles attending the birth of the Buddha come hundreds of years after the life of Gautama. But here we have records which go back to within, say, thirty years of the time when Jesus Christ ascended on high, books written by those who had either knowledge of personal enquiry or information from such. It is on so sure testimony as that of Matthew, the apostle, and Luke, the beloved physician who got information for his Gospel first hand in Palestine, that we accept the simple but profound story of the supernatural birth of Jesus Christ.

The stainless life of this Man, to call Him no more, is itself a moral miracle. Nowhere else have we, as I hope presently to show, an example of a perfect man. Yet here was One Who, though He was meek and lowly, could say, "Which of you"—His bitter enemies—"which of you convicts Me of sin?" And is such a moral miracle any more wonderful than a biological miracle? Maybe "the modern mind" cannot use this miracle, but I have a strong suspicion there is a very close connection between "the modern mind" and what the Epistle to the Romans calls "the carnal mind". It is enmity against God. "The spiritual mind" accepts the fact that the God Who made this world, is free to work in His own creation; and it rejoices to believe that that God has, by the stupendous supernaturalism of the virgin birth, actually entered into human life for the redemption of mankind.

Christ was born of Mary by a miracle, and Christ must be born in you by the Spirit of God. You may

accept the virgin birth as a matter of history, but there is no saving virtue in that unless the Christ Who was born in Bethlehem be also born in you. Only then can you have the hope of Glory.

## II.

"What think ye of Christ? whose son is he?" The Jews were right: the Jesus of Bethlehem was THE SON OF DAVID, and the Christ of Glory is glad to call Himself "the root and offspring of David".

The Jews of all later time have looked back to the reign of David as the time of their greatest national glory. Saul, the first king of Israel was a hopeless failure, but his divinely-chosen successor was, both naturally and spiritually, a king to be remembered. In spite of his faults David was a man after God's own heart, and the Almighty covenanted with him that his kingdom would not fail nor fall as other kingdoms do, but that it would abide forever. Centuries later Jeremiah and again Ezekiel foretold another David. The Jews of Christ's own time remembered these glowing promises, yet they looked to their Holy City to see it desecrated by Roman feet. Herod the Great reigned over Judaea, but he was a hated foreigner, a low-born usurper, and a man from whose hands dripped the blood of numerous murders. Had God forgotten His promise?

Now David came to them in David's greater Son. Open your New Testament, and in the very first verse read of Jesus Christ as the Son of David. When Gabriel came to Mary, he promised her that to her Son the Lord God would give the throne of His father David, and that He would reign over the house of Jacob forever, and that of His Kingdom there would be no end. Joseph, Jesus' legal father, was of the house and lineage of David; royal blood flowed in his veins. The promised Child was born in David's royal city, as the angels announced and as the shepherds found true. Being of David's line, He was David's rightful Heir. When the magi came from the East, they inquired for the born King of the Jews. Herod was not a born king but one set in royal power by the help of Roman conquerors. No wonder the old villain feared for his crown. If this babe for Whom strangers sought, was the Christ, He would reign over the Jews and Herod's kingdom would fall. He was, and Herod's kingdom soon went, and his very family was extinct within a century.

When the Jewish rulers sought Christ's death, they knew they must get the consent of the Roman governor in order to have Him killed. How could they persuade Pilate that this good Man ought to die? They told this representative of the Roman throne that there was One Who made Himself a King. When Pilate asked Him, "Are you the King of the Jews?" Jesus answered that He was, but that His Kingdom was not of this world, rather that He was a witness to the truth. Later, when Pilate, for fear of the people, handed Jesus over to the will of His accusers, and gave sentence that He should be crucified, he wrote for the superscription of His cross, "This is Jesus the Nazarene, the King of the Jews." The rulers could see the mockery, and they might object, but weak Pilate firmly said, "What I have written, I have written."

Come and stand before that cross. Look upon this spectacle of shame and suffering. See the naked brigands crucified on either side. Hear the gibes and jeers of the

jostling crowd. Now answer me, Is this Man the King? Can the One Whose present throne is a cross, Whose crown was just now of thorns, and His sceptre a reed, and Whose honour is in blood, can such a One reign for ever and ever? Darkness may fall upon the Kingdom of God, and for three hours it may be heavier than the thick darkness of Egypt, but skies will shine again. Doubt, no, despair may seize the hearts of those who wait for the consolation of Jerusalem, when for three days this Jesus lies in a sealed tomb; but on the third day the doubt will be faith; the despair will be victory, and presently He will ascend up above all heavens that He may fill all things, and sit down with His Father on His throne, and promise that we who believe on Him, may sit with Him, too.

"Sinners in derision crown'd Him,  
Mocking thus the Saviour's claim;  
Saints and angels crowd around Him,  
Own His title, praise His name.  
Crown Him! crown Him! angels, crown Him!  
Crown the Saviour 'King of Kings!'"

This Son of David is the King, to be sure, the King of men and of angels, but I pause to ask you this personal question, Is He your King? Have you owned His sway? Are you in His Kingdom? "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." That Kingdom is entered by the new birth. You cannot earn your way into it, but by God's grace you may be born into it. "Blessed are the poor in spirit because theirs is the kingdom of heaven." Those who are subjects of this King of immeasurable wealth, have nothing in their own right. They do not come with the modern version of the hymn, and sing:

"Just as I am, young, strong and free,  
To be the best that I can be,  
For truth and righteousness and Thee";

—no, that is of no avail. They come rather as beggars to God's door, as those who have nothing, and who elsewhere can get nothing, and they sing:

"Just as I am, without one plea,  
But that Thy blood was shed for me,  
And that Thou bidd'st me come to Thee,  
O Lamb of God, I come, I come!"

Only thus may the Lamb of God become the King of your lives.

Let me appeal also to you who are saved, and ask you of how much of your life Christ is King. Is He King of your body, have you offered it as a living sacrifice to God? Is He King of your purse, is His Kingdom's work supported by you as it ought to be? Is He King of your mind, do you entertain no thoughts that are contrary to Christ? O let us crown Him King of all we have and are and hope to be, for the Son of David is worthy of all honour, praise and power. "Hosanna (to) the Son of David."

### III.

But "what think ye of Christ? whose son is he?" The name by which Jesus Christ most liked to call Himself was that very significant title THE SON OF MAN. It is used some eighty times in the Gospels. He told us that the forgiveness of sins, the redemption of man, the judgment of the world, all are to be accomplished by the Son of Man. Let us ask, then, what He meant by such a title.

Very simply, then, when the average man reads of Jesus as the Son of Man, He takes that to mean that He is

a man. Born of a human mother, He lived like you and me. His clothes, His food, His home were very much like ours. The Gospel recorded by John specially pictures our Lord Jesus as divine; indeed, it is written to prove that He is. But it is interesting to notice the way in which that same Gospel stresses the perfect humanity of Him Who was and is God. See Him as He sits by Jacob's Well. His feet dusty from Samaria's rough roads, His form tired from the long trip, His throat dry from the hot sun. See Him again just outside the village of Bethany, as He meets the sorrowing sisters of Lazarus, watch those tears as they fall, and hear the Jews that stand by say, "Behold, how He loved him!" And then get that other picture, some days after the resurrection, when through the morning mists a stranger to the five fishermen appears on Galilee's shores. "You haven't anything to eat, have you?" He shouts. "No," say the fishermen who have worked all night without getting a fish. "Cast your net on the right side of the boat and you will find some." They do so, and the catch is one hundred and fifty-three big ones. Now John says to Peter, "It is the Lord." When they get to shore, they see that the pierced hands have made a fire and cooked some fish and heated some biscuits for these tired and hungry men to eat. Could anything be more human than such a picture of the Son of Man? Yes, He was a real man.

He had a real body. John later said that the Word of Life had been seen and heard and actually handled. May I offer a personal testimony? I think I have been very ill once, and the greatest spiritual lesson which I remember from that sickness, is that at the time when the bodily functions are so exaggerated, and weakness is such a weariness, the humanity of Jesus was a supreme comfort.

He had a human mind, too, for we read that He grew, not only in stature, but also in wisdom. Our blessed Lord was a true man.

That leads me to this further thought, that He was not only a man, but He was *the Man*. You know, there is something noble about a man wherever you find him. To encourage one we say, "O be a man"; but we never think of saying to a dog, "Be a dog," lest he should bite; nor do we ever read of one saying to a crocodile, "Be a crocodile," lest he should snap him in bits. Shakespeare's Hamlet goes into raptures on this paragon, man. And why not?

Yes, but why? Have you ever met a perfect man? Have you ever read of one? Think of the great names you know, and ask whether they, all through, can take the position of perfect men. Think of the Hebrew Moses, and remember that he was the meekest of men, but recall also that at Meribah he lost his temper in violent fashion, and because he spoke unadvisedly with his lips, he was kept out of the land of promise. Turn to the glory of the Greeks and you will mention Socrates. I suppose that graceful country produced no better man. Yet Socrates, with all his excellence, countenanced crimes which we should blush to mention. Look to Rome and search for your perfect man. Julius Caesar will not do, for he drenched nations in blood. Seneca will not answer, for he preached poverty and the simple life, but lived in wealthy luxury. But why go on? If we search through the East or the West, if we go back into ancient history or if we study modern times, everywhere we shall meet with the same failure, everywhere man is

broken by sin. Did I say everywhere? With this one glorious exception that here in the One Who loved to call Himself the Son of Man, we have God's idea of a man, the Man, Christ Jesus.

Now because He was a man and the Man, Scripture calls Him *the second Man*, the second Adam. God made a man at the beginning, who was perfect and upright, but he fell and went away from God. Thousands of years later there came another Man, and He conquered sin and death and all the results of the first Adam's folly.

"Oh, wisest love, that flesh and blood  
Which did in Adam fail,  
Should strive afresh against the foe,  
Should strive, and should prevail."

Now this One Who is the Head of the new race of regenerate men, is also *the Judge of men*. Jesus Himself said that the Son of Man would come in His glory, and before Him would be gathered all nations. When we at last see God upon the throne, the object of our vision will be the Son of Man. As a man He will judge men. As a perfect man He will take account of their sins. What will be the standard of judgment? That Man Himself. A great many people in these days are fond of referring to the Sermon on the Mount as if its teachings were a warrant for lax views in theology and indifference to the justice of God. But that Sermon on the Mount is a transcript of the character of Christ, and by such a standard must men at last be measured. Go and read it again, you who say that you believe that but do not also believe the rest of the Bible, read it, and ask yourself: Am I poor in spirit? Am I meek? Do I hunger and thirst for righteousness? Am I pure in heart, pure enough to see God? Why, to ask such questions is to answer them, and the answer is a loud no, no, no. Well, according to that sermon, by the Christ Who preached it will you be judged. If you are not as good as He, then you need Him, not as an Example but as a Saviour, not as a pattern but as a sacrifice. But more of that presently.

That the Son of Man is the Judge of men hints the real meaning of the phrase "the Son of Man". Modern discovery has shown that it was used in the religious phraseology of Christ's day, though perhaps not very commonly. Basing their thought on Daniel 7:13, where one like a son of man came with the clouds of heaven to the Ancient of days, sitting in judgment, and received an everlasting kingdom, the Jewish doctors held that there was One with God Whom He would send to consummate the Kingdom, and they called Him the Son of Man. The Son of Man means, then, *the One sent from God to bring in the eternal Kingdom*. So the emphasis of this phrase is not on the humanity of Jesus but on His divinity. When He was asked if He were the Son of the Blessed, He answered: "I am; and ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven."

#### IV.

So our third answer to our question leads to the fourth. "What think ye of Christ? whose son is he?" He is the virgin-born Son of Mary, the royal Son of David, the divinely sent Son of Man; then can you take with me this final step and call Him THE SON OF GOD?

Indeed, it is in calling Him so that we may find the answer to the question that Christ put to the Pharisees. They did not understand the divine, along with the

human, nature of the Messiah. How could David, the father of the Messiah, in spirit call Him his Lord? This David did in the 110th Psalm. (I hope you notice in passing that Jesus believed that David was the author of that Psalm, modern critics to the contrary. We ought to stand with Christ on all these things, as I have said, making Him Lord of our minds. If Jesus said it, then it is right.) What is the answer to Christ's question? It is to be found in the two natures of our Lord. As Man He was David's Son, as God He was David's Lord. According to the flesh He is the seed of David, but according to the spirit He is God over all, blessed for evermore.

But what support have we for our faith in the divine sonship of Christ? Well, we have this, among many other proofs, and it is this which I wish to emphasize, that those who, in the early days of the founding of Christianity, were closest to this Jesus Christ, believed, as Christians have ever since believed, that He was more than Man, that He had the nature of God.

It is at the opening of His public ministry, and Jesus is not widely known even as a rabbi or teacher. A few have attached themselves as disciples and others are coming. Philip finds Nathaniel, and with joy exclaims, "We have found Him, the Messiah." Nathaniel is skeptical, but he does the sensible thing, and comes to see. Jesus hails him as a true Israelite, and Nathaniel asks how He knows him. Jesus says: "Before Philip called you, when you were under the fig tree, I saw you." Nathaniel's doubt is changed to faith, and he says: "Rabbi, you are the Son of God, you are the King of Israel."

Months pass by, and the little group of twelve which Jesus gathered about Him, have companied with Him here and there over the land. They have eaten at the same tables, drunk from the same wells, slept in the same homes; and all the while they have watched His miracles and performed some miracles, too, and they have heard His teaching and repeated some of it to others. Just now they are on a sort of excursion outside the land of the Jews, off there in the north, near high Hermon. Jesus examines their faith. Do they believe now what their first faith held? "Who do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?" Well, some say that He is John the Baptist, risen from the dead; others say that He is Elijah, whom the Jews were expecting; still others name some other prophet. These were the popular answers to the riddle of Jesus. Now comes the great question, "But you, who do you say that I am?" Simon Peter, enlightened by God, makes the great confession, that cheers the heart of Christ, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God."

Again months roll round, and Jesus is in the south part of the land. He has come at the call of the two sisters at whose home He had often been entertained. Lazarus is dead but his death is for the glory of God. Jesus has already told the twelve that. Near the village of Judæan Bethany Martha meets the Master with the tragic words, "If you had been here, my brother would not have died." Jesus meets her despair with the triumphant answer, "I am the resurrection and the life. Do you believe this?" Martha we have often wronged, I fear. When a woman is so occupied with the things of her home that she forgets her prayers, her Bible and her church, we call her Martha. Well, Martha sometimes was overly anxious about such things, but the same Martha was a woman of the strongest faith. Listen to



her answer: "I have believed, I do believe that you are the Christ, the Son of God, the One Who was to come into the world." The confession of that woman is as noble as the confession of the chief apostle.

It is the week after Easter. Jesus is risen from the dead and ten of the apostles have seen Him, but the whole ten together cannot convince the eleventh that the resurrection is real, that Jesus is alive. He simply will not believe because he cannot believe. He declares that he must see in His hands the mark of the nails, and put his finger into the nail holes, and thrust his hand into the spear wound, before he will believe that the Christ Whom men crucified, is back with them again. The group is gathered together, with all the doors shut for fear of the Jews. Suddenly, without opening anything, Jesus is in the midst, with the greeting of peace. "Thomas, bring here your finger and see My hands, and bring your hand and put it into My side, and do not be faithless but believing." Thomas can make but one answer, the supreme confession of faith which we find in the Gospels, "My Lord and my God." Jesus accepts the worship of Himself as God. He is the Son of God and God the Son. Blessed be His Name!

Now if Jesus be God, He asks you to worship Him. He says that you cannot come to the Father except through Him, and that the one who honours the Father must honour Him. O believe it, that the Christ who was born in the inn at Bethlehem, Who lived in the village called Nazareth, Who taught by the lake of Galilee, Who suffered under Pontius Pilate, Who rose again from the dead, is the Son of God, for "he who believes that Jesus is the Son of God is born of God".

Now will you notice that these four sonships of Christ meet at the cross? For the body in which He suffered was the body that God prepared Him, as the Psalm says, and that by His miraculous birth as the Son of Mary. The words which He uttered because of the blackness of darkness that He endured, were traditionally the words of David, His father, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken Me?" Why did He die? "The Son of Man," mark that, "the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and give His soul a ransom instead of many." And how could the death of that One redeem so vast a multitude from so deep a hell to so high a heaven? The value of His death was infinite because the One Who died was Himself the Infinite, the Son of God.

In one of our papers I was taken with a story of a thirteen-year-old girl, Eva Hall, who was lost in the woods near Magnetewan, up in the bush country, from a Monday till the next Thursday. She had gone out after blueberries and turned aside from the rest to get a drink at a spring, but she did not find the spring, and in trying to make her way back got lost. She wandered about in the bush with nothing to eat but some blueberries, her legs torn by the bushes, unable to sleep because of the rain, growing so weak that she could not answer the shouts of her would-be rescuers. All the while, however, she said: "I prayed to God to save me and I wasn't a bit afraid. I kept saying to myself, 'The Lord will take me out of this woods even if it takes a long time.' I just prayed and prayed." I don't know, maybe Miss Eva is a Christian; I judge she knows the gospel. Certainly, she believed the fact that God answers prayer, and her prayer was answered, for some-

one found her on the fourth day. They took her back home, and she got well again.

As I thought of that story, I remembered that the Bible teaches that we by ourselves are all lost, and that we cannot find our way back. Not only are we lost, but weak, too weak to answer the calls of Heaven. Helpless we are and hopeless unless someone find us. And then I remembered that the Scripture said of this Christ Whom I preach to you, that "the Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." He has come, here He is. He has sought you, and as you hear His voice, He has found you. Now just trust Him, and He will take you back to safety, back to God.

### United Church Ministers and Roman Catholic Priests Fraternize

A correspondent calls our attention to an item in the *United Church Observer* of June 15th, which begins as follows:

"The Fourth Annual Ministerial Retreat for 1941 is over. Again this year it was held at the guest house of the Trappist Fathers at St. Norbert, Man.—an ideal place for such a gathering and about ten miles from the heart of the city of Winnipeg."

The report says that thirty-four ministers, representing eight denominations, were in residence for three days, and a total of forty-five participated in the conference, which was said to be the best of the four.

The same correspondent sends us a newspaper clipping containing an excerpt from an address given by Principal Kent of Queen's Theological College, at the Bay of Quinte Conference recently held at Belleville.

Following is the quotation:

The hope of closer friendship of the United Church ministers and Roman Catholic priests was expressed by Principal H. A. Kent of Queen's Theological College. Principal Kent returned recently from serving as a chaplain overseas.

#### Chaplains Co-operate

"Chaplains of all churches are co-operating in their work beyond all belief," he said. "While serving overseas, I was associated with a Roman Catholic priest. We lived together, worked together, and expressed views together in perfect harmony. We, the ministers of the United Church, ought to cultivate the friendship of the priests of the Roman Catholic Church more than we do."

One might assume that Principal Kent believes the Reformation to have been a mistake, and that the sooner its effects are obliterated from religious life, the better.

How is it possible for ministers of the New Testament to fraternize with priests of a church which perverts the whole gospel of Christ? One can come to only one of two conclusions: either these men have no experimental knowledge of New Testament truth, and of the saving gospel of Christ, or else they have no knowledge of Roman Catholic history, or of what the Roman Catholic Church is to-day.

**Subscribe for The  
Gospel Witness**

# The Censor and the Editor Exchange Letters

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## CENSORSHIP CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

Press Censorship

Ottawa, Canada,  
December 20th, 1940.

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

Dear Dr. Shields:

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely yours,

(signed) W. EGGLESTON,

PRESS CENSOR FOR CANADA.

## THE EDITOR'S REPLY

THE GOSPEL WITNESS,

TORONTO

Decemebre 31st, 1940.

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

Dear Mr. Eggleston:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In your second paragraph you say:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"We are a minority in this country", and then adds:

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

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

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

*and by so doing made conscription for overseas service and for the reinforcement, by conscription, of those already in uniform, impossible?*

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

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

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

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

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

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

and this we are told was

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

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

"an extraordinary concession to Canadian unity."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"But if there is reason to rejoice (over the victory of the Greeks and the English against the Italians in Albania and Africa), we ought however, to avoid exaggerating the importance of this victory. In London, official circles invite the press not to forget that if the first phase of the offensive is gained, it is being pursued without any possibility of foreseeing the final issue.

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

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

"Not so fast!

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Upon the foregoing I venture to remark that the article under criticism is written by a man who is given

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

position of the Pope to Nazi doctrine and philosophy." The article is by Edward Quinn.

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

"Rev. Dr. Shields is a Britisher beside whose patriotism all other patriotism is disloyalty, whose loyalty casts the glow of treason upon all other loyalty. As an antidote to the phobia with which he has infected his hearers, he has now in his possession a copy of Mr. Quinn's article. It is a statement issued by the office of a department of the Government of the Dominion of Canada of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hierarchy, and has become one of their chief organs of propaganda.

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

The same is largely true of the public press. In Ontario as well as Quebec, the Papal system is lauded, and articles, like that to which I have referred as issued from the Office of Director of Public Information, are carried in the daily press. No censorship is, or should be, exercised over them in such matters. It would be folly to attempt to reply through the daily press, for the reason that the average paper is too much afraid of a Roman Catholic boycott.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In respect to your last paragraph, I cannot but feel that every man of responsibility in Canada will recognize that in a time of war, there must be some curtailment of ordinary liberties. And in respect to all matters related to the armed services—munitions, and indeed Canada's war effort in its totality—persons in authority, must, in the nature of the case, be more thoroughly informed, and are in all probability in a better position to judge as to what information would be likely to be useful to the enemy. I need not assure you of my hearty co-operation in all matters relating to these concerns. But I am not unmindful of the fact that an effort was made to keep from the public the utterly disloyal address of the Mayor of Montreal; and that the publicity given to that incident made his internment inevitable.

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

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

I am,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS T. SHIELDS.

### The Censor's Reply

#### CENSORSHIP CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

Press Censorship

Ottawa, Canada,

January 10th, 1941.

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

Dear Mr. Shields:

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

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

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) F. CHARPENTIER,  
PRESS CENSOR FOR CANADA.

(Signed) F. CHARPENTIER,

### Why I Am Not a Roman Catholic

A sermon by Dr. Shields, translated into French, entitled, "Pourquoi je ne suis pas Catholique Romain". Copies of this French edition may be obtained at THE GOSPEL WITNESS Office, 130 Gerrard St. East, or the office of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches, 337 Jarvis Street. Help to circulate this gospel message among the French-speaking people of these provinces.



## Sundry Quotations From The French-Language Press

Extract from *L'Action Catholique* reprinted from *Le Droit*, June 2

"Reverend T. T. Shields, Pastor of Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, raises the cry of religious warfare. He has just attacked, once more, the Catholic Church in Canada, and the Pope. We shall be told that we might better not pay any attention to the statements of this individual. All the same, if he had said the same thing against the British Empire, he would long ago have been prevented from speaking. His statements, nevertheless, do as much harm to our war effort and to national unity at the present hour. Why then leave him a liberty that is refused to others?"

*Our offence is we attacked the R. C. Church and the Pope! We know no two objects more deserving of attack. The Church and the British Empire are classed together. It is admitted our "attack" is against the Church, not the Empire of course.*—Ed. G. W.

### QUEBEC'S IDEA OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Extract from *Le Droit* of May 30th, entitled: "No Sale of Bibles Here"

E. M. Taylor, septuagenarian, with a long reddish beard, living at Namur, Que., must spend seven days in prison for having peddled Bibles without permission in the city of Hull. This biblical old man was refused permission by Chief Robert, but, probably more convinced of the justice of his cause than of that of the municipal regulation, continued his sales in spite of the refusal, which caused him to be hauled before the recorder's court. Imbued with the importance of his mission he was preparing to deliver his message when the sentence put an end to his eloquent discourse.

Extract from *Le Droit* of June 3

### CONVERSION OF INTERNED GERMANS

Eight Germans Interned in Canada are Converted to Roman Catholicism

Saint-Antoine sur le Richelieu, June 3.

His Excellence, Mgr. Arthur Douville, auxiliary bishop of the diocese of St. Hyacinthe, made known to-day that he had ordained two interned Germans on the 18th of May, 1941, and that he had confirmed eight others who have been converted to Roman Catholicism.

Mgr. Douville declared that the two young priests were studying to become priests in England when they were sent to an internment camp in the province of Quebec last year as interned civilians. In a tour of his diocese, His Excellence Mgr. Douville visited this Quebec town situated 25 miles northeast of Montreal.

Extract from *Le Droit* of June 3, 1941, from editorial page, by *Argus*

"For the fourth or fifth time in the space of six months, the Pastor Shields, of Toronto, has just attacked, during an address delivered before the Grand Lodge of Ontario, the Catholic Church and the French-Canadian element, whom he accuses of being the disguised agents of the fifth columnists, and of hindering the war effort of the Canadian people. In his hatred of Catholicism this unrestrained and incorrigible lecturer has even dared to say that 'the papal delegates enjoy diplomatic immunity and that, for that reason, the Pope maintains a fifth column in all the governments of the world.'

"To defend the Catholic Church, the representatives of the Pope and the Canadian people is not a difficult undertaking. It will suffice to recall, on the one hand, that the Catholic Church exercises around the world an entirely spiritual mis-

sion—that of saving souls—and that she mixes in discussions of a political and economical nature only in the measure in which morals are involved.

"On the other hand, it is easy to prove that French-Canadians, encouraged by their religious and civil leaders, are doing their part in the pursuit of the war, as much by their voluntary enlistment under the colours to help England to beat her German and Italian enemies, as by their participation in the different war activities. Many of our fellow-citizens of Anglo-Saxon nationality have borne non-equivocal testimony concerning us on this point."

*Our criticism of the last two paragraphs is they are utterly untrue. The Pope's claim to temporal power is proof of the political character of the Church. Romanism corrupts the politics of all nations.*

*It is equally untrue that French-Canadians are "doing their part". The whole country knows they are not.*

—Ed. G. W.

From *Le Droit*: June 10, 1941

"It is not without reason that Dr. Shields' pamphlet, 'Why I Am Not a Roman Catholic' has been denounced in the House of Commons. This pamphlet, which is insulting to Catholics, was circulated in the city of Hull, and one of the priests of that city thought it wise to protest against it from the pulpit last week-end. What measures will be taken to stop the distribution of this pamphlet?"

*Why should the distribution of religious literature be prevented?*—Ed. G. W.

## Why Premier King Declines To Go To England

There has been a very general feeling in Canada that the Premier of this Country ought to visit England as the Premiers of the other Commonwealths of the Empire, with the exception of that of South Africa, have done. We were given to understand that there was no desire for a conference of Dominion Premiers. But yesterday Mr. Churchill, in the House of Commons, expressed the keen desire of the British Government for a Conference, but added that both Field-Marshal Smutz, and Premier MacKenzie King "regret the exigencies of their work in their respective countries make it impossible for them to come here in the near future".

Everyone will understand why General Smutz is needed in South Africa, but there does not seem to be any good reason why Prime Minister King could not go to London. What are the "exigencies" which prevent Mr. King's attendance? We venture to suggest two. One is that it would be useless for him to go unless he could take M. Lapointe with him. Charlie McCarthy would be dumb without Bergen! Mr. King would not dare speak on any subject of importance without M. Lapointe's approval. The other "exigency" of the situation which may prevent Mr. King's attendance may very probably be found in the submarines which infest Atlantic waters. But if Ambassador Winant could fly in an American bomber from Montreal to Scotland, we should think Mr. King might reasonably hope to make a safe crossing. But more and more the Premier of Canada gives loyal Canadians cause to feel ashamed. However, we can only hope that Mr. King may have a very pleasant holiday in the West. We have no doubt whatever that when the dangers of the war are over, Mr. King and M. Lapointe will be on hand, and very much in evidence at the Peace Conference.

The overwhelming majority of the people of Canada are far and away in advance of their Government in their desire to do everything humanly possible to help Britain bring Hitler down.

### The Winnipeg Free Press

We have a letter from a prominent lawyer in Winnipeg enclosing a cutting from *The Winnipeg Free Press*, containing a letter by Rev. John B. Cunningham. The editorial to which Mr. Cunningham refers, was sent on to us. But as there was nothing in it but a little abuse, it seemed to us there was nothing to reply to. It is not economy to use a gun of high calibre, or even, a machine gun upon mere mice.

We are not surprised that the Editor of *The Winnipeg Free Press* does not like us. He was a member of the Commission responsible for the Sirois Report. There never was a more wicked proposal made to any people than that contained in that Report. We said at the time, and repeat it, it was a scheme to mortgage the entire Dominion in the interests of the Roman Catholic Church. We do not know the Editor of *The Winnipeg Free Press*. We do not see his paper regularly. He may be a very pleasant sort of gentleman. He may have a better heart than head. We are prepared, charitably, to acquit him of any conscious intention of making us all pay for the propagation of Romanism. The obtuseness of some of *The Free Press* editorials leads us to assume that the Editor may not have been sufficiently astute to understand the full purport of the Report he signed.

The editorial note at the end of Mr. Cunningham's letter, is characteristic of *The Free Press*' mentality. Being without reason, it contents itself with just being nasty, and often crassly stupid.

Following is Mr. Cunningham's letter, which appeared in *The Free Press*, Saturday, June 17th:

#### Reader Enters Defence For Stand of Dr. Shields

To the Editor,—I am writing this in reply to an editorial in *The Free Press* on May 30, under the heading, Prove It or Shut Up. It is surprising to find a paper, which claims to be as fair-minded as *The Free Press*, stooping to such an abusive editorial as this. It is evident that it was written without any attempt being made to arrive at the true facts of the case, or else it would never have been written. You will know, even better than I, that any newspaper news item is merely a report, and does not propose to be a full account. Would it not have been a good thing, before calling upon Dr. T. T. Shields to produce proof for his statements, to have ascertained whether or not such proof had already been given?

The fact of the matter is that Dr. Shields has given abundant proof of every statement he has already made. Anyone who is even casually acquainted with his publication, *The Gospel Witness*, will know that no utterance has been made without substantiation. Is it that *The Free Press* has not taken the trouble to find out if such proof as it clamours for has been given or not? If not, then let it keep silent until it has. Or is it that it is blind to the true conditions in Canada to-day? Surely not! There was no attempt made in your editorial to refute what statements are attributed to T. T. Shields—perhaps you have found them incontrovertible. Surely you do not think that having dubbed T. T. Shields a notorious trouble-maker and a Quebec-hater that you have made any serious contribution to Canada's war effort, or either proved or disproved anything. If what he says is not true, why are you so troubled about it?

If this war continues much longer, and there is every likelihood that it will, conscription must come, and it will

come, just as it did in the last war. It is the only way of ensuring that each one will take his share of the load fairly. From all appearances, before the final victory is won, England will need every man it can muster; and we should be preparing for that day now. If Quebec is not ready to follow, then let the rest of Canada at least go on without it.

You need not trouble yourself unduly with what the government should do with T. T. Shields. If it felt that there was any cause for alarm it would have taken the necessary steps against him long ago. But perhaps it has found his arguments as unanswerable as you evidently find them, and so there is not much that can be done.

JOHN B. CUNNINGHAM.

Winnipeg, June 12, 1941.

Editor's Note: We hope that no Canadian—including our present correspondent—will follow the leadership of Dr. Shields.

## Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 5 Third Quarter Lesson 27 July 6, 1941

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

### THE BIRTH OF SAMUEL

Lesson Text: 1 Samuel 1.

Golden Text: "Therefore also I have lent him to the Lord; as long as he liveth he shall be lent to the Lord"—1 Sam. 1:28.

I. Prayer and Devotion—verses 1 to 19.

Samuel was born of Godly parents. In an age of confusion and idolatry Elkanah and his wife Hannah worshipped God faithfully, year by year travelling to Shiloh that they might share in the united prayer and testimony of Israel before the tabernacle of the congregation (Exod. 23:14; Josh. 18:1; Judg. 18:31; 21:9; Lk. 2:41). The grace of God can help us to overcome handicaps of heredity and environment, but it is a great advantage for a child to be brought up in a home where God is given His rightful place (Gen. 18:19; Josh. 24:15; Prov. 22:6). Example as well as precept will help to mould his life (Psa. 101:2; 2 Tim. 3:14, 15).

Hannah suffered cruelty at the hands of a jealous woman who was a member of the same household (Gen. 16:1-6; Matt. 10:34-36). Persecution is the common portion of all God's children, and they must expect to encounter difficulties and trials (Matt. 5:10-12; Acts 14:22; 1 Pet. 4:12-14). Hannah maintained her testimony in the time of suffering, and she bore her trial without retaliation or reproach (Rom. 12:12; 1 Pet. 2:20-23).

Hannah sought refuge in the Lord and poured out her soul to Him in prayer. She had discovered the secret of comfort; she knew where to go for aid when tempted, troubled, tried and dismayed (Psa. 50:15; 62:5-8; Matt. 11:28-30; 1 Pet. 4:19).

Vows should not be lightly undertaken, nor should they be lightly broken (2 Cor. 1:15-17). A vow is a voluntary covenant, and when once contracted, should be strictly performed (Deut. 23:21-23; Eccl. 5:4, 5). Hannah promised that if the Lord should give her a son, she would undertake to raise him as a Nazarite, one wholly separated unto God (Num. 6:1-8; Judg. 13:7).

It is so easy to misunderstand one another; circumstantial evidence may be entirely misleading. Therefore we must be careful not to make hasty and final judgments concerning others (Matt. 7:1; Rom. 14:10-13; 1 Cor. 4:5). Hannah was well-nigh beside herself with sorrow, but not crazed with drink, as Eli thought.

Hannah's countenance was no longer sad after Eli had prayed for her and pronounced a benediction upon her. To cheer and comfort the sorrowing is an inconspicuous ministry, yet one which brings untold blessing. We have the Word of God which will give light to the perplexed, hope to the downcast, courage to the defeated and strength to the weak. The world is full of aching hearts and we may point these weary souls to the Lamb of God.

Eli's sympathy gave the sorrowing woman fresh confidence in God and new faith to believe that He would hear her prayer. There is such a thing as an atmosphere of faith, created by the Holy Spirit working through believers. There are some people in whose presence it becomes easier to believe God and to rest in His promises. Such people refresh our spirits and quicken our faith (Prov. 27:17). May all of us who know the Lord be such a means of blessing to other souls!

## II. Praise and Dedication—verses 20 to 28.

The Lord remembered Hannah (Gen. 8:1); He is ever mindful of His children (Exod. 2:23-25; Psa. 115:12). He granted the request of Hannah, and Samuel's name, which means "Asked of God", would be a perpetual reminder to him, to his parents, family and friends that God hears the prayer of His children.

As God remembered Hannah, so also did she remember her vow to the Lord (verse 11). She returned to Shiloh to give thanks publicly for the grace which the Lord had shown unto her (Psa. 50:14; 116:14; Mal. 3:16; Lk. 17:12-18). Thanksgiving is an integral part of prayer; in fact, very frequently it is synonymous with prayer (John 11:41, 42; 2 Cor. 1:11; Phil. 4:6; 1 Tim. 2:1).

In the early days of Samuel's childhood Hannah began to make preparations to carry out her vow and dedicate him to the service of the Lord (Lk. 2:22-24). The work among the young children is exceedingly important. Happy the children whose parents and whose Bible School teachers recognize the solemn responsibility of bringing up the little ones in the nurture and admonition of the Lord (Eph. 6:4)!

Samuel, young as he was, entered the service of the tabernacle willingly and joyfully. He worshipped the Lord there (1 Sam. 2:18; Lk. 2:46-52). Let us endeavour to bring the little ones to the Saviour Who loves them, that they may early learn to trust and to serve Him. (Matt. 19:13-15; Mk. 9:42; 10:13-16; Lk. 18:15-17).

## How Standards and Values Change

We have before us an interesting account of the bombing and burning of Spurgeon's Tabernacle, in *The Christian Herald* of June 19th, which we shall hope to reproduce in part next week. One item in the report struck us with peculiar force. We are informed that the total cost of the Metropolitan Tabernacle was £31,332, according to the rate of to-day's sterling exchange, approximately \$140,000. The reconstruction of Jarvis St. Church, after our recent fire, therefore, cost perhaps a little over twice as much as Spurgeon's Tabernacle cost for its original construction.

## Conscription

Speaking of conscription in Canada O. T. G. Williamson, in *Saturday Night*, recently said of the Prime Minister: "He was wrong when for political reasons he denounced conscription. He will be right if he now reverses his stand. He will also achieve true unity in Canada in place of the fictitious unity he now extols. To suggest, as was done in the House recently, that to propose conscription is to drive a wedge into Canadian unity, makes it more than ever necessary that our so-called unity be examined." In another place he makes pertinent reference to "the soporific effect of over twenty years of pacifism." His conclusion is that "conscription is not a wedge to split unity. It will provide the democratic unity we have never known in this war."

**SEND FOR EXTRA NUMBERS  
OF THIS ISSUE**

## NEWS OF CHURCHES

Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec  
337 Jarvis Street, Toronto 2, Canada.

REV. W. S. WHITCOMBE, *Secretary*.

### Ottawa Valley Association

The Ottawa Valley churches met together in Lachute and were royally entertained by the church there, assisted by the friends from nearby Dalesville and Brownsburg. Without previous planning all the messages conveyed on the necessity of missionary activity if the individual and the church is to fulfill its God-given task. Rev. Chas. Hardie was the retiring moderator and Rev. John Armstrong was elected moderator for the coming year.

### Campaign at Dalesville

Good attendances in spite of warm summer weather marked the week's special meeting conducted in the Dalesville Church by Rev. W. S. Whitcombe. The friends from Brownsburg and Lachute lent their warmest support to this special effort. The meetings will continue this week and the following in the Gospel Tent located in Brownsburg. The special preachers are to be Rev. J. Scott of Toronto and Rev. J. Armstrong of Snowden. We urge all our churches to remember these meetings in prayer. There are many young people in this rapidly growing town, who never attend church and it is good to see Pastor Hardie and his people anxious to proclaim the Word to them.

### Temple Baptist, Sarnia

Everyone who was at the service at Temple Baptist Church last Sunday could not help but experience a real blessing. We can all witness that the Spirit of the Lord was with us and His power was felt in every heart. The church was filled to capacity. In fact, it was necessary to bring in extra seats to accommodate the people. The baptismal Service was very impressive as three who had trusted Christ as their Saviour and Lord, were obedient unto His command to be baptized. We pray God's blessing on these who have followed Christ, and trust that their lives will be fruitful to the glory of His name.

—*Temple Tidings*, June 20, 1941.

### Orangeville

"I was much encouraged to have one walk the aisle on Sunday," writes Pastor Arnold Dallimore. "We are losing all our young people to the city, as they can earn so much more in war-time industries than in the mill in town." Two others also made public profession of faith on a recent Sunday when the male octette from Central Baptist Church, London, conducted special services. Fine progress has been made in the renovation of the building.

### Northern Association

The Northern Association of Churches will meet in Sudbury on July 1, 2 and 3. These local rallies have been a source of much blessing to our friends in the North who find themselves isolated by the great distances from Christian fellowship. It is also expected that a number of friends from the churches in the South will take the opportunity of sharing these meetings with the Northern brethren. Here is the full programme:

### TUESDAY

11:00 A.M. Prayer and Consecration Service led by Pastor W. C. Tompkins.

### Afternoon Session

2:00 P.M. Prayer and Praise Service led by Pastor George B. Hicks.

2:30 P.M. Opening Session—Chairman, Rev. H. C. Slade.  
Address of Welcome by Rev. J. R. Boyd.  
Reports from Fort William, Noranda and Timmins Churches.

4:00 P.M. Message by Miss L. M. Boyd, "Beckoning Hands of Our Dominion."

5:00 P.M. Fellowship supper for all delegates and visitors.

#### Evening Session

7:30 P.M. Praise Service led by Pastor W. R. Slade.

8:00 P.M. Rev. J. R. Boyd, presiding.  
Address by Rev. W. S. Whitcombe, Secretary of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec.

#### WEDNESDAY

10:00 A.M. Prayer and Testimony led by Pastor Wm. H. Frey.

11:30 A.M. Report from Geraldton Church.

#### Afternoon Session

1:30 P.M. Prayer and Praise led by Pastor V. J. Lehman of Kapuskasing.

2:00 P.M. Chairman, Rev. W. S. Whitcombe.  
Ordination Examination of Pastor W. C. Tompkins.

4:15 P.M. Ordination Sermon by Rev. H. C. Slade.

5:00 P.M. Canvass of City for personal contact with the lost in announcing the meetings.

#### Evening Session

7:30 P.M. Prayer and Praise led by Rev. W. J. Wellington.

8:00 P.M. Pastor W. R. Slade, presiding.  
Evangelistic message by Rev. H. C. Slade.

#### THURSDAY

10:00 A.M. Prayer and Testimony led by Mr. F. Bauman.

11:30 A.M. Report from Sudbury.

#### Afternoon Session

1:30 P.M. Praise Service led by Pastor W. C. Tompkins.

2:00 P.M. Pastor W. R. Slade, presiding.  
Reports from Kirkland Lake, Val d'Or and Kapuskasing.

4:00 P.M. Address by Rev. W. N. Charlton.

#### Evening Session

7:30 P.M. Prayer and Praise led by Pastor Wm. H. Frey.

8:00 P.M. Rev. J. R. Boyd, presiding.  
Election of Officers for coming year.  
Evangelistic Address by Rev. W. S. Whitcombe.

## HELP INCREASE THE GOSPEL WITNESS CIRCULATION

Hundreds of our subscribers in many parts of the world tell us their copy is mailed from one to another six, and in a few instances, as many as ten times. For this, we are glad and thankful.

We have been encouraged by many who have reported that **The Gospel Witness** in these dark days often proves a tonic to their spirits, and an inspiration to faith.

Will you therefore help us to increase our circulation and enlarge the ministry of **The Witness**? How?

In this way: Send us the names and addresses of as many of your friends as you think might be interested in the paper. It will cost you nothing but a postage stamp to do this.

On our part, we will send every one sample copies of the paper, with a covering letter soliciting their subscriptions. We will not mention your name unless you give us permission so to do.

Please help us in this way and—do it at once.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS,

130 Gerrard St. East,

Toronto, Canada.