

Canada Must Be On Guard—Page 6
Canada and Vichy—Page 7

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.
Telephone Elgin 3531.
Registered Cable Address: Jarwitsem, Canada.

Vol. 20, No. 26

TORONTO, OCTOBER 30, 1941

Whole Number 1015

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

THE GOSPEL OF GRACE, WHICH NEEDS NEITHER PRIEST NOR POPE

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, October 26th, 1941
(Stenographically Reported)

"For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;
"Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time."—I. Timothy 2:5, 6.

Before I come to the text, I must refer to some questions which have been submitted to me. Many people are finding it difficult to pray. I do not pretend to be able to relieve you of that difficulty: only the Spirit of God can teach us how to pray. A certain politician, a good many years ago, said rather facetiously of someone on the opposite side of the house, that he did not think it was possible for any man to be so wise as a certain honourable gentleman looked. There are people in times of perplexity who profess to have a solvent for all problems, and who speak with oracular authority on matters of which no one can be sure. I must prudently decline to be numbered among the oracles!

I heard of a certain religious body who professed to have recovered a lost office in the church, that of the oracle. At one of their conferences, their leading man was almost enthroned. He was plied with questions—the stock phrase being, "What have you for us on this?" The oracle replied immediately with more or less wisdom—generally, I think, with less.

There are people who assume to be able to fit every current event into an interpretation of Scripture that pleases them, and thus to imply that they know all about what is going to happen to-morrow. Many people ask me about these things, I can only confess that I do not know. I do not think you know—I do not think anyone knows. "We know not what a day nor an hour may bring forth." We may have our opinions—and your opinion is as good as anyone else's; and we may all be wrong.

Someone fears that Russia will be defeated: I do not believe she will be. I do not believe anyone can destroy two hundred millions of people. If you ask me whether or not Japan can defeat China, I should say she is more likely to defeat herself in the attempt. I do not think China can be defeated. It is said there are more children born every day in China than Japan can, by all her instruments of war, kill. You cannot destroy nor permanently subjugate a nation of four hundred millions any more than you can turn back the waves of the sea.

"If Russia is victorious, there is grave danger in that", someone says. I do not think that would necessarily be so. A new problem emerges, I grant you. But however it may be settled, they will both have been so badly mauled they will want to take a long vacation. I think God may be opening the way both in Russia and in greater Germany when the war is over, for a return to sanity, and freedom for the proclamation of the gospel.

I hate Prussianism, yet I gratefully remember that Luther came out of Germany. The Reformation brought liberty to Europe, and laid the foundations for Britain's greatness, and made the present Empire possible. Under God, Luther was the chief instrument of the Reformation, and I am persuaded that notwithstanding the general darkness—an almost complete "black-out"—God has His elect people in all these countries, and for their sakes, He will yet arise and bring deliverance.

We shall be far better occupied if we learn to pray reverently, "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." We can so pray because we

are taught to conclude that petition by saying, "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen." That is the safest way; and let us meet the day with what news it may bring us, with renewed faith in God. Even the statesmen and military experts are unable to determine what is going to be on the morrow—there is only One Who knows; and as we pray to Him, He will bring us out and set our feet in a large place. My confidence is in the sovereign rule of our gracious God; somehow or another, in His way, and in His time, all will be well.

I want to speak to you about the fundamental principle, the gospel of grace, which differentiates Protestantism from Romanism—and, indeed, from all other religions. The very best way for us to dispel the darkness of Romanism, while we must call attention to it and expose it, is to preach the gospel with all our hearts.

Frankly, I have no sympathy whatever with that attitude of mind that makes a man or a woman merely an anti-Romanist. I am sorry for Roman Catholics. In spite of all the darkness and superstitions of Rome, I am positive there are many in that great organization who have found their way to Christ, or rather have been found of Him. I have met Roman Catholics who pray to the saints and all the rest of it, who yet gave evidence that in their hearts their confidence was in the Saviour alone. Notwithstanding, I think they ought to be delivered from the bondage of Romanism. They ought to be set free by the gospel of Christ. Some Roman Catholics were here last Sunday evening, and talked with me after the service. I told them I could never be so uncharitable as to say that one who is a Roman Catholic cannot at the same time be a Christian; that though their Church teaches that there is no salvation outside of the Church, I would not reverse it and say salvation is impossible within it. Salvation is in Christ, and in Christ alone and if a man be really in Christ, though benighted to some extent, still perhaps in the darkness of Rome—if he be really in Christ he will be saved; but being saved his renewed nature, hearing the gospel, will respond to it, and he will come out of Babylon, and refuse to be partaker of their sins.

I am not battling Roman Catholics. I hate Roman Catholicism as I hate the devil because I am sure that it is of satanic inspiration. I hate the Papal institution as such because I think it is the Devil's masterpiece. But I trust I love those who are under its yoke, and would do anything in my power to free them from their bondage to fear and terrorism, and bring them out into that religion of love, that perfect love "which casteth out fear". Let us be careful, in doing battle against Romanism, to make people understand that we are concerned about the salvation of the individual, and that in all our warfare the love of Christ constrains us. We believe they need the Saviour; and that is why we so preach.

I.

"There is one God, and one mediator between God and men." THAT IS A FUNDAMENTAL OF THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION, THAT THERE IS BUT ONE GOD. Perhaps we need even to remind ourselves briefly of that basic principle, that there is One Who is the Creator, the one and only Source of life and light and law, one God over all blessed for ever.

There is no disagreement between that statement, and the further teaching of Scripture that the Godhead consists of what we usually describe as "three Persons in

one." It may be that the use of that term, *person*, to some minds may be a little confusing, but it is true that all the attributes of personality are in Scripture ascribed to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost is not spoken of as a mere impersonal influence, but as a person to be worshipped. So also is the Son; so also is the Father. And yet the three are One. It would be vain to attempt to define that mystery. It is with difficulty one can find any analogy that will even partially illustrate it. Joseph Cook, of Boston, the great Christian apologist of some years ago, used to speak of it as "three subsistences in one substance"; that while the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, together constitute the Godhead as revealed in Scripture, they are but three aspects, three manifestations, thus revealed of the one Person:

We may analyze the solar spectrum. We can take a prism and break the white sunbeam up into its constituents and say it is red, violet, blue, orange—and so enumerate the colours of the spectrum, which, blended together, are found in the white light of every beam that radiates from the sun. But you cannot take the violet out of a sunbeam, nor the red, nor any other colour: each colour is an inseparable part of it. You can analyze it, and so reveal it as to see what these different colours are; but together they constitute the pure white light.

It may be said, as Joseph Cook used to say, of the Persons of the Godhead: neither is God without the others; each with the others is God. The fact is, they are inseparable. "I and my Father", said the Lord Jesus, "are one." You cannot separate the Son from the Father, nor the Spirit from the Son. God cannot be separated from His own essence. He is "from everlasting to everlasting, God", the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and is revealed in this threefold character for our better understanding of this divine mystery: even as the Holy Ghost by Paul says, in this very epistle, "Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." The doctrine of the Trinity, I am persuaded, is clearly taught in the Word of God; and it is something to be proclaimed, though it cannot be explained. I heard a great preacher once say, "It is not the business of the preacher to explain miracles, but to proclaim them." He was speaking on the text, "Aeneas, Jesus Christ maketh thee whole." That is the gospel in which we rejoice.

Yet, *left to themselves, men multiply gods*; men worship the sun, the moon, and the stars; they bow down to stocks and stones; and to images made by their own artifice. Indeed, in a word they have "changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things." As though one God were not enough. And because men "did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient", and, left to themselves, they even made gods of creeping things.

That is common, nor is Romanism free from that sin. Romanism makes a god for itself, and bids people worship the consecrated wafer—but I leave that this evening.

II.

"There is one God, and ONE MEDIATOR BETWEEN GOD AND MEN." *What do we mean by a mediator?* A medi-

ator is one who goes between. He has a varied and multifold ministry in this case. The one mediator between God and men is "the man Christ Jesus". It is part of His mediatorial office to reveal God to men. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." When Philip said to the Man of Nazareth, "Shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us", our Lord answered, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip he that hath seen me hath seen the Father." We are to construe God in our thinking in terms of His revelation to us in the person of Christ.

It is very important that we should learn to think rightly of God. Paul said to the philosophers of Athens, "For as much then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device." Let me ask you, How do you think of God? Who is He? Who is this one God of Whom the Scripture speaks? Do you use a big word, and half-apologetically speak of "the Almighty"? Is He nothing more to you than an Infinite Spirit? Have you erected an altar, like the Athenians, with this inscription, "To the unknown God"? Or do you know God? How can we know God? Only through the mediatorial revelation of God by Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is the only God we know. God has never revealed Himself in any other way than through Jesus Christ. Whatever revelation of God there may be in nature, is a revelation of God through Christ; for He is the Creator: "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." "By him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Jesus Christ, whether as the Creator in nature, or as the incarnation of Deity walking among men as He did in the days of His flesh—Jesus Christ is the one and only disclosure of God, the revelation of God, the picture of God.

George Muller did not like photographs, and refused to have a portrait of himself published anywhere. He had a strange repugnance toward it—I wish more people had. I can never understand why some people are so anxious to have their portrait taken! Why any of us should want to stand before a camera except for purposes of identification, I do not know. George Muller did not like to have his portrait published, until a pirate publisher in the United States published one of Muller's volumes with what was alleged to be a portrait of Muller in the front of the book. It was not Muller's portrait at all, and after that he did allow his portrait to be published.

The Lord said, "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image." I think what He meant was, "You shall not try to paint my portrait. You shall not try to imagine what God is like. In due time I will show you what I am like." And at last He sent into this world One Who is the "express image of his person", the image of the invisible God. Jesus Christ said, "You ask what God is like? Think of God as you have seen God in me for he that has seen Me hath seen the Father."

Take that revelation of God in Christ, and you cannot put Jesus Christ into the Roman Catholic system. He is not at home in it. We have not a Christ on a cross. Mr. Barnes of St. Peter's Church told me a lovely story

last week. He said Bishop Ryle of Liverpool was his bishop when he was a boy,—he attended church in his diocese. When they built the Liverpool cathedral someone wanted to erect an image of Christ on a cross, but Bishop Ryle said, "Oh no, not that. If you want a picture of Christ ascending into glory, I have no objection; for the Christ Whom I worship is not on a cross: He is on a throne. He was dead: He is alive forevermore."

As we think of God, we are to think of Him as He is pictured to us in the person of Jesus Christ. Then we can love Him; then we can understand Him; then we can follow Him; we can go with Him to prison and to death. Jesus Christ is the Mediator in that sense, that He reveals God.

But He is the Mediator, too, in the sense that He is the channel, the medium of communication between earth and heaven. In the very beginning, in Genesis, we find people coming together and saying, "Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth." And God came down to see what the children of men builded, and He confounded their speech. That was the foundation of Babylon—Babel, Babylon. Yes, I verily believe "Babylon the great," "THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS" is still engaged in an attempt to build a city and a tower from earth to heaven, and by human effort to climb up to God. But it cannot be done.

Genesis records Jacob's dream: "And he dreamed, and behold a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven: and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it. And God stood above it and said." In a dream he saw and heard communication established between earth and heaven, with angelic messengers going up and down the golden rounds. When Jesus of Nazareth came He said to Nathanael, "Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig tree, I saw thee. Nathanael answered and saith unto him, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel. Jesus answered and said unto him, Because I said unto thee, I saw thee under the fig tree, believest thou? thou shalt see greater things than these . . . Verily I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man."

Jesus Christ is the fulfilment of Jacob's dream; He is the one and only Ladder that leads from heaven to earth. "No man hath ascended up to heaven", said the Lord Jesus, "but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." The Ladder came down from above; communication was established by the infinite stoop of the grace of God. We can pray through only one Mediator; He is the only postoffice where you can mail a letter with assurance that it will not be returned to you stamped, "Mail to this address prohibited." That way is always open, and we can pray to Him.

On the other hand, all grace comes through Him. He is "full of grace and truth." He is our Mediator, the channel through which we pray, through which grace descends to us.

But He is more than that. As part of His mediatorial ministry He exercises the office of an advocate: "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father; Jesus Christ the righteous." He is my Lawyer. He knows the law. He is my Advocate, my Representative, my Mediator. I love to think of that story in the Old

Testament where the great governor laid his hands upon Benjamin and said, "The man in whose hand the cup is found, he shall be my servant; and as for you, get you up in peace unto your father." But there was one there who had become surety for him, who had said to his father, "I will be surety for him; of my hand shalt thou require him: if I bring him not unto thee, and set him before thee, let me bear the blame for ever." When at last the stern-faced governor said of Benjamin, "He shall be my servant; and as for you, get you up in peace unto your father", Benjamin was silent; it is not recorded that he opened his lips; I think in that critical hour he looked to Judah, looked and listened, and waited for Judah to break the silence, as though he would say, "Judah, it is your turn." On the other hand, Judah may have signaled to Benjamin for silence, as though to say, "This is where I fulfil my office; I am the mediator; I am the surety." To the governor he said, "Thy servant became surety for the lad unto my father, saying, if I bring him not unto thee, then I shall bear the blame to my father for ever. Now, therefore, I pray thee, let thy servant abide instead of the lad a bondman to my lord; and let the lad go up with his brethren. For how shall I go up to my father, and the lad be not with me?"

Jesus Christ is the Surety, the Mediator of the new covenant. He is the Guarantor of the fulfilment of all its provisions, the Mediator between God and men.

And He is the only One Who is qualified to exercise such a ministry. Poor Job in the twilight looked forward and said, "I know that my redeemer liveth"—my vindicator, for that is what the Redeemer does, vindicates us as well as redeems us. He saw somewhere in the future there was One Who would stand for Him, but in his twilight gloom he said of God, "He is not a man, as I am, that I should answer him, and we should come together in judgment. Neither is there any daysman betwixt us, that might lay his hand upon us both." To him, God was so far away that he could not talk to Him, could not answer Him, or come before Him in judgment. There was no one to stand between God and Job as a mediator, to lay his hand upon both. But the Mediator, for Whose coming he looked, was really to come, and in the person of Jesus Christ there is a Man, the Man Christ Jesus.

"He is not a man as I am", said Job. But now He is. He is "bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh"; made in the likeness of man, having our nature, a High Priest Who is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, a Daysman to lay His hand upon both: with His Deity He lays hold of God, and with His humanity He lays hold of us. He is the *liaison* officer; He brings us together; He is the Mediator between God and man.

He is the only One Who can present a worthy plea, for it is written in the text, "Who gave himself a ransom for all." He paid the debt of all, and He pleads our cause, saying of every poor sinner who will trust in Him, "Deliver him from going down to the pit: I have found a ransom."

That is the gospel of the grace of God, and that excludes all secondary mediators. A church may have its place as a society of redeemed people, but for a church as an authoritarian institution, standing in God's place, between God and men—there is not a word in the Bible to support it. It is entirely contrary to Scripture, that whole conception of a church standing in God's stead, exercising divine power, and through its sacraments pre-

suming to minister the grace of God to men. I say that is not only an un-Christian, it is an anti-Christian conception. We do not need the church, the priest, the pope—"There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."

Nor do we need the Virgin Mary. We honour the name of Mary as one who was honoured above all other women in that she became the mother of Incarnate Deity, but we must leave Mary where Jesus Christ left her: "Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come." There is not a word in the Scripture to justify the introduction of Mary as an auxiliary mediator. Someone called my attention to a recent Roman Catholic publication which spoke of Mary as "co-redeemer" with Jesus Christ. "Co-redeemer"! What blatant blasphemy! There is no one who shares that honour.

"Such dire offences to forgive,
Such guilty, daring worms to spare;
This is Thy grand prerogative,
And in that honour none shall share;
Who is a pardoning God like Thee?
Or who has grace so rich and free."

We do not need the intercession of Mary. We do not need the intercession of the saints. There is nothing in Scripture to warrant the assumption that those who have gone hence may pray for us. Indeed, I do not know how they justify that theory to themselves: I do not know how they know whether the saints have yet arrived in heaven or are still in purgatory.

There is but "one mediator between God and men the man Christ Jesus."

A young man was here two or three weeks ago from a northern city, and he told me he attended a class in that city—I think in a secondary school of education, where a priest was instructing young men. The priest told them that it is absolutely necessary for salvation that they should be in the Roman Catholic Church, that the Church is the custodian of the grace of God, and that there is no way to receive it but through the Church. This boy raised his hand and said, "May I ask a question?" He was given permission, and asked, "Did not Jesus Christ die for us all?" "Yes," said the priest, "Is it not written in John fourteen, six: 'I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me?' That says nothing about the church. We come to God through Christ. Is not that the way?" "Yes," was all the priest could say. The others looked around, seeming to say, "He told us just now we must come to God through the church: now he admits we come to God through Christ."

That boy was sent away from the class, and his parents were advised that he was a disturber, and could not longer attend. That is Rome! There must be no discussion of the truth, but only the authoritative teaching of the Church, with every door and window shut lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ should shine unto them.

We come to God by Christ, not through any church, not through ordinances, not through a Baptist church any more than the Roman church; not through the Anglican, Presbyterian, or United church. There are thousands of people outside the Church of Rome who are depending upon a church to see them through to heaven because they are church members. You may be a member, in turn, of all the churches, and still go to perdition. There is no guarantee of salvation save through

Jesus Christ alone. "There is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."

III.

ALL THIS IS BETWEEN GOD AND THE INDIVIDUAL SOUL. The text does not say there is one mediator between God and man. That would be true, but it would be less specific. Note the number of the person: "There is one mediator between God and men"; that is, between God and every individual soul. Not one mediator between God and man in the mass, but between God and each individual soul.

Let me make it very pointed, and plain, and simple. I believe in a praying church. I believe we ought "always to pray, and not to faint". We ought to be always praying for the conversion of sinners. But no matter how a church may intercede, no church can save a soul. "There is one mediator between God" and the individual, and the individual soul must come into direct contact with that one Mediator. Some of us have had godly parents who have prayed for us—and for that we are profoundly thankful. Some man has been prayed for by a godly wife, or a wife by a godly husband, children by their parents, and sometimes parents by their children, friend for friend; but in the end, that naked individual soul must stand before Jesus Christ, and do direct business with him.

No one can repent for us. What a terrible doctrine is the doctrine of indulgences—that by the doing of certain things a man can obtain certain indulgences! There is not a word of truth in it, there is no support for it in the Word of God. The teaching of Scripture is that if you and I are to be saved, we must, each for himself or herself, repent of our sins. Not do penance, but repent, which is an inward quality. We must have a changed mind toward sin, sorrow for it, desire to be delivered from it. We must pray for ourselves: "Who-soever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." It is not enough that someone else should pray for us: you must pray for yourself, and the only way you can pray is through Jesus Christ the Lord.

You must believe for yourself. Baptism in infancy will not save you. Baptism in adult life will not save you. Coming to church will not save you. Reading the Bible, in itself, will not save you. That is a good thing to do, but unless you get through the Scripture to the living person of Jesus Christ, and come into personal converse with the one Mediator, you cannot be saved. We must come to Him, and through Him to God. If you do so come, and commit yourself to Him, you may be as sure of salvation this night as when you have been a million years in heaven.

How shall we get to God? Years ago I was Pastor in Hamilton—one of Toronto's suburbs! I was going along the street one day, and I saw a little girl trying to post a letter. She was standing on her tiptoes, trying to get that letter into a letter box, but she could not reach it. She jumped at it, but still she could not lift the lid and get her letter in. She tried several times, and then dropped her hands to her sides, and looked helplessly up and down the street.

Presently she saw me. I do not know whether she thought I looked as though I could reach anything, but she came running toward me and brought her letter in her hand. She said, "Please, sir, will you post my letter for me? I cannot reach." I took the letter from her

hand, saw that it was addressed and stamped, and said, "Come on, we will go back to the postbox." I let her see me mail the letter, then said, "You can tell mother it is posted, and on the way."

How shall I get my poor prayer before God? How shall I obtain salvation? I want Him to have mercy upon me. I want Him to save me. When I stand on tiptoe and lift myself by all the works of righteousness that I can possibly do, He is still the high and lofty One Who inhabiteth eternity, and I cannot reach! But this great Mediator stoops to my low estate and says, "Give me your prayer; I will post it for you." He takes my petition, and brings it before the throne, and for His sake my sins are all forgiven—and I am saved forevermore.

That is what I wanted *The Toronto Star* to say to people for me: "Come and hear about a gospel that does not need priest or pope"—but they would not say it. They would not allow me to say, even in a paid advertisement, that we need neither priest nor pope to be saved! But that is the gospel! It is the gospel of the grace of God. Thank God, many of us are saved by it. May the Lord help us to rejoice therein, for His name's sake!

DEFECTIVE COPIES

We regret that owing to a slip in the binding room, about one hundred and fifty copies of the paper last week were wrongly bound and pages did not follow in regular order. We do not know to whom they were sent. Please send post-card, and we will send you a correct copy by return.

BOOKS BY DR. T. T. SHIELDS

"The Adventures of a Modern Young Man" ..	\$1.00
"Other Little Ships"	1.00
"The Plot That Failed"	1.00
"The Oxford Group Movement Analyzed"05
25 copies	1.00
Russellism or Rutherfordism, (103 pages)35
"The Papacy—In the Light of Scripture"10
"Why I Believe the Rapture Cannot Precede the Tribulation." Also "The Meaning of the Parousia". In Booklet of 32 pages10
20 copies	1.00
War Sermons from "A Sword Bathed in Heaven" to the Sermon in this issue—postpaid, individual sermons, each05

There are also still available copies reporting the great Protest Meeting which inspired the organization of The Canadian Protestant League; and of other issues dealing with the Catholic controversy.

The Gospel Witness, published weekly, per annum

2.00

Address: THE GOSPEL WITNESS,

130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto, Can.

EDITORIAL NOTES

Canada Must Be On Guard

In an address delivered this week, reported in *The Globe and Mail*, Captain Van Wart, Consul to the Republic of Czechoslovakia, warned a Board of Trade audience that fifteen million European war refugees will be seeking admission to the Dominion. He is reported in part as follows:

"I am holding a brief for the old Czechs and Slovaks, not those who just happen to have Czech passports.

"Even in the admission of these, Canadians would have to face the problem arising from three shades of religion—Greek Catholic, Roman Catholic, and militant Protestantism—and cultures, the latter derived from the influence of the conquering races."

We have several times called attention to the fact that the Roman Hierarchy everywhere is more concerned about establishing itself in such a way as to have a large part in dictating terms of peace than in making any effort to help win the war for righteousness.

It appears to us that the Roman Church sees that Germany must be beaten in the long run, but it is apparently hoping and working to effect, if possible, the exhaustion of Britain and her Allies so that the Pope may more easily exercise a dominating influence at the Peace Conference.

A careful study of the utterances of Roman Catholic spokesmen will show that the Hierarchy is planning to try to effect such terms of peace as will give the Church a great advantage. We have no doubt that what the Consul for Czechoslovakia says is true. Millions of people, no matter what the terms of peace may be, nor how complete the victory over Hitler, will desire to escape from wartorn Europe to the new world if such escape should be possible. And of course the vast majority of such refugees will be Roman Catholics.

We venture briefly to recall to the minds of our readers a little Canadian history. Somewhere about eighteen hundred and ninety the Manitoba Legislature abolished Separate Schools in that province, not on religious but on educational grounds; because the schools, like similar schools in Quebec Province, maintained a very low educational standard. The Roman Hierarchy appealed through many courts for a redress of what was regarded as a minority grievance. At last the Privy Council gave judgment that under the British North America Act, the minority could appeal to the Federal power, and that the Federal power *may*, not *must*, enact remedial legislation, and force Separate Schools against the will of the Manitoba Legislature.

The Conservative Party, under Sir Charles Tupper, sought to make political capital of the issue, and win the support of Quebec by proposing in the House of Commons a remedial bill. Before the bill was passed, Parliament was dissolved. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Liberal Leader, had said he would not coerce Manitoba; that if they did not want Separate Schools, he would not force them upon them. Purblind Protestants throughout the Dominion hailed Sir Wilfrid as a liberated Romanist, who was a Canadian first and a Catholic afterward.

We ventured to tell someone at the time, though still in our 'teens, that the Catholic Laurier would ultimately give the Church more from principle than the Protestant Tupper proposed to give from policy. In nineteen hundred and four Sir Wilfrid Laurier erected the two

provinces, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and wrote into their constitution a Separate educational system from the primary school to the university. The proposal was modified somewhat, but the principle was allowed to stand.

We had a public controversy over the matter in London in nineteen hundred and four, and a by-election in which the Honourable Charles Hyman was the Liberal candidate, when he had been given the Public Works Portfolio on the death of the former Minister. We were then in London, and received a request from Mr. Hyman to discuss the matter with him. It was the first measure introduced by Laurier after his third election, and Mr. Hyman told us that Sir Wilfrid came into the Cabinet Chamber, and demanded the acceptance of this principle, of the Cabinet, threatening otherwise to resign. And so the devious principle of the Separate School was established in that vast empire of the two provinces. Laurier let the matter go in the little "postage stamp" province of Manitoba, having promised, beyond all doubt, that he would compensate the Church for its loss, by giving Separate Schools in the two new provinces.

And now for the sequel. In nineteen hundred and twenty-nine, on a voyage to England, we fell in with an official of the Canadian National Railways, from London, England. Although serving a Canadian company, he was an Englishman. He had been to the Pacific Coast on business, and was returning. He asked this Editor, if as a Canadian we could explain something he had never been able to understand. He spoke something after this fashion: "It is my duty to obtain business for the Canadian National Railways. (There was no restriction on immigration at the time, before the depression.) Our office is besieged with requests from people in England and Scotland and the North of Ireland, for passage to Canada; but your Government in Canada puts every obstacle in the way, and makes it almost impossible for them to come. On the other hand", he said, "we are encouraged to bring people from Southern Europe by the shipload, and no obstacle is put in the way."

We then explained to this gentleman the history of the Separate School matter in Manitoba, and the two new provinces. We repeat what we then said. The Roman Hierarchy is abundantly endowed with the wisdom of the serpent, but is an absolute stranger to the harmlessness of the dove. It takes a long view of things. It boasts that it thinks in terms of centuries. In order to win the election, and to deceive the Protestant people of the country, Sir Wilfrid Laurier raised the cry of "no coercion". And the same Quebec supported him against the public denunciations of the Bishops, but in obedience to the private instructions of the priests.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier fulfilled his promise. It then became the policy of the Roman Hierarchy to flood the Canadian West with Roman Catholics—in other words, to establish another Quebec in the Western Provinces. God in His mercy sent drought, and the depression, which halted immigration, and postponed Canada's enslavement. The Roman Church is busy, not only controlling the Government, but establishing its representatives in all key positions, and when the war is over, we predict there will be a great change in the immigration policy of the Government, as well as in the personnel of the Immigration Department. Every effort will be made to open the door wide to the inflow of a great Roman

Catholic tide of immigration, which will help to fulfil the dream of the Roman Hierarchy to make Canada a Roman Catholic country.

Put this copy of THE GOSPEL WITNESS away where you will not lose it, or forget it; and in time to come, you will be able to judge of the accuracy of our prophecy. What is needed in Canada is a great Protestant awakening, so that we may stand guard against the ever-increasing menace of Romanism in Canada.

Canada and The Men of Vichy

We publish below an article from *News*, Toronto, of October 25th. From the time of the collapse of France we have protested against the retention at Ottawa of M. Ristelheuber, the Vichy Minister. It was clear from the beginning that Marshal Pétain was nothing more than the Pope's puppet. He received the Pope's blessing immediately, and almost his first act was to restore to the Roman Catholic Church such special privileges as it claims, but which had been denied it by modern France. The Jesuits were given a position they had not occupied in France for a century, and were restored to their teaching privileges in French schools.

M. Ristelheuber made a speech not long after the collapse of France, in which he expressed the view that France's defeat was a divine judgment for its opposition to the Church. Although he had been accredited to Ottawa by the Government of Republican France, he immediately transferred his loyalty to the Vichy traitors by whom France has been—and is still being—betrayed, thereby showing that he was disloyal to the government which had appointed him.

Mr. Justice Survever of the Supreme Court of Quebec, shortly after France's fall, declared that the Roman Pontiff was the "only sovereign" in the world who could appreciate Pétain's action. The Vichy Minister was retained at Ottawa, it was said at the time, out of respect for the supersensibilities of the French-Canadian Roman Catholics. We have contended from the beginning that the Roman Catholic Church in Canada is a Fifth Column. If it is not helping Hitler directly, it is at least doing its utmost to defeat Britain.

And now a Roman Catholic priest is permitted to come from France, obviously with the consent both of the Germans and the men of Vichy, and no objection is offered to his entering Canada! We publish this as further proof that we have at Ottawa a Government that is in complete subjection to the Roman Catholic Church.

PASSENGER FROM PARIS STIRS SOME QUESTIONS (Montreal, Special to NEWS)

A visitor direct from Paris reached Montreal this week. He got in Tuesday morning, having come from Lisbon to New York by clipper. He is Canon Mieczka, head of the historic Stanislaus College.

It is unusual for visitors direct from Paris to reach Canada these days, and Canon Mieczka is a man of some importance in French affairs. It is reported that he is Marshal Pétain's own confessor. Yet his coming went unnoticed and he has given no interviews to the press. The story told inquirers is that Canon Mieczka is here on educational business which concerns the Montreal branch of Stanislaus.

Stanislaus College, Montreal, has a unique distinction among Canadian educational establishments. It is the only one to have been voted a grant from the Vichy Government since France fell. The grant was made shortly after the

capitulation on the order of Marshal Pétain himself and was for \$75,000. Hon. Raoul Dandurand, minister without portfolio in the Mackenzie King Government, Grand Officer of the Legion of Honour, and Government Leader in the Canadian Senate, is the chief patron of Stanislaus College.

Since it was established, shortly before the war, the Canadian branch of the famous institution of learning founded two centuries ago at Luneville by Stanislaus I of Poland, has been among Senator Dandurand's chief interests.

The coming of the war so soon after its opening and the turn of events in France, naturally put the future of the venture in some doubt. Like its parent school, among those most influential graduates are Darlan and Gamelin, the Montreal college is an institution of culture for the few rather than of instruction for the many.

In wartime such institutions are apt to suffer. Senator Dandurand made no secret of his deep solicitude for the college's welfare. His gratitude for the help that came from Vichy was little less disguised.

Some of those interested felt that the branch should not consider accepting the grant since all the funds at Vichy's disposal are not enough to supply the needs of the French people. But Senator Dandurand had no such feeling and his voice is decisive in the affairs of Stanislaus at Montreal. The octogenarian of Mr. King's Cabinet is beginning to show his years and has developed what amounts to a fixation on the Stanislaus matter. For him almost nothing matters compared with the college and the Pétain grant. The \$75,000 coming from the old man in Vichy has won all the sympathy of the old man in Ottawa.

This may or may not explain in some part the attitude of Ottawa towards Vichy.

The director-general of Stanislaus College, Paris, made the voyage from Paris to Montreal with a speed which no neutral diplomat could better, though he carries no diplomatic passport. His route took him from Paris to Vichy, from Vichy to Lisbon, where he caught the clipper, arriving in New York Monday. Tuesday he was in Montreal.

Canon Mieczka seems to have had no difficulty either with the Nazi Gestapo or with the heads of the German army of occupation when arranging for his voyage. Neither does the cost seem to have any consideration, though such a journey is not done on prayer, even when one is a canon. It is not apparent yet who paid the \$2,000 or \$3,000 the voyage must have cost. Neither is it clear what educational purpose will be served.

The authentic information an inquirer has been able to gather since Canon Mieczka's coming is not great, but is given here.

Dandurand himself, when he learned of the plan for Mieczka to come over, advised against it. But rather than intervene personally, he advised Abbe Lemoyne, head of Montreal Stanislaus, to oppose his superior's voyage from France. Lemoyne did nothing on his own responsibility, since he would have risked his position if he had. But he tried indirectly to get something done to prevent the visit.

Even Coursier, the Vichy consul at Montreal, counselled against letting Mieczka make the visit, recognizing that it would be a clumsy move and leave all the Vichyites wide open to accusation. But it seems that M. Ristelheuber, the Vichy Minister at Ottawa, did not back Coursier up.

The Canon is here, with all the latest news and messages from Paris and Vichy—all, that is to say, the Gestapo thinks it good for the eminent traveller to bring. For a Canon and the director-general of a famous school does not bring smuggled information with him when he leaves Paris and travels openly to Vichy and Lisbon. He comes with the consent of the occupying authority and the approval of the Vichy government and brings what their police approve.

Against the possibility that Canon Mieczka might grant an interview to the press, a list of questions was prepared. It was thought that the visitor's answers might interest *News* readers. Since the head of Stanislaus College, Paris, has not been available to interviewers so far, the questions, without answers, are given anyway:

Why did Canon Mieczka come to Canada?

Who authorized so long a journey at such great expense?

Who paid the clipper fare?

How were the German authorities persuaded to permit this voyage to America?

Why did Senator Dandurand, in spite of his preoccupation with the affairs of Montreal Stanislaus, feel obliged to advise against the Canon's plans for coming?

Why did not the Senator come out plainly and himself give advice which could have stopped the trip?

Why were the two Vichy representatives at cross-purposes over the visit; Coursier actively opposing it and Ristelheuber doing nothing to prevent it?

One more question, the main one: What is Mieczka here for?

It will be hard to convince the average Canadian that matters solely concerned with the instruction in a small Montreal college would require his costly wartime journey from occupied Paris. It may even be a little difficult to convince us that the Nazi authorities in Paris would give permission for the voyage out of pure interest in the welfare of higher education in Quebec Province.

—F.X.C.

The Privileges of Neutrals

Immediately after the outbreak of war the Pope conferred Vatican citizenship upon all members of the Papal diplomatic service in all countries. Thereafter these Italian diplomats throughout the world became entitled to diplomatic immunity which permitted them to hold communications both ways with the heart of Italy without any of their correspondence being censored, or even read. And all this was made possible by Mussolini's recognition of the Papal claims to temporal power, and hence, of the Vatican as a sovereign state. What colossal humbug!

And now the Pope is going to purchase a merchant navy. That will be "neutral" too! Where will he find his ships? That will be easy. Mussolini has kept most of his ships at home. The Pope can now lend him his flag, so that his ships can sail where they like in enjoyment of the same delightful immunity which has been Rome's throughout the war. The Pope may also acquire the Vichy navy! "His Holiness" ought to be able to man any number of submarines from the Jesuit order, for they are trained in all the black arts "the rulers of this world's darkness" can invent. The following dispatch appeared in the daily press a few days ago:

REPORT VATICAN PLANS GET THROUGH BLOCKADE

London, Oct. 22—Vatican City is considering purchase of a merchant navy, according to a Reuters Stockholm dispatch, quoting the Berlin correspondent of the newspaper *Dagens Hymeter*.

The dispatch said the ships would fly the Pope's flag and carry food supplies.

Romanist Propaganda

The Romanist press of Canada recently featured an article from the Romanist *Universe* of London, glorifying Leopold of Belgium as a great hero, and "a true son of the Church". But almost simultaneously the British Government published Lord Gort's account of the terrible days of May, 1940, when Leopold's surrender and France's collapse all but cost us the lives of about 400,000 men. By the miracle of Dunkirk 335,000 were saved. Lord Gort's account lends no support to the contention of the Romanist press that Leopold was a hero. It is our opinion that the events of those terrible days were no surprise to the Vatican. It is most significant that the Frenchman selected to negotiate an armistice with Hitler, and those who were later appointed to "collaborate" with Germany should have been so acceptable to the Vatican as to call forth the Papal benediction.

We are not surprised that the Romanist propaganda department should now, thus early, be engaged in elaborating a defence of all those traitors who brought

France to the brink of the abyss, and who did everything possible to drag Britain down with her. But even the cleverest criminal invariably leaves some bit of incriminating evidence somewhere. Lovers of freedom throughout the world will be well employed if they do everything possible to strip the mask from the faces of the villains of Vichy and the Vatican, that they may not be permitted so to influence the future Peace Conference as to leave the Papacy in possession of the chief spoils.

The Canadian Protestant League

THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE is now organized. It will take a little while, however, for its officers so to arrange their work as to be free to take this banner of liberty throughout the country. More than six hundred people in Jarvis Street Church alone have united with THE LEAGUE, and hundreds of others have done the same in other churches. We are not yet able to give any indication of the total number.

Last week's issue of this paper, devoted wholly to the interests of THE LEAGUE, is being mailed to every minister of religion in the entire Dominion of Canada; to all the newspapers; to the editors of all publications—daily, weekly, monthly; to every member of the nine Legislatures, and every member of both Houses of Parliament; and to some thousands beside. In this way we are endeavouring to bring to the attention of religious leaders throughout the country, the great matters which have necessitated THE LEAGUE'S organization.

Our readers will readily recognize that this has cost us a great deal of money. This has been done as a GOSPEL WITNESS enterprise, in order to lose no time in putting the matter before the people. We ask all our readers to do everything in their power to enroll new members of THE LEAGUE, and have them send their dollar membership fee to this office. As soon as Mr. Saunders is able to free himself from some of his out-of-town engagements, and take hold of the secretarial work of THE LEAGUE, we shall of course ask our friends to send their LEAGUE membership directly to him; but we desire to have as much money as we possibly can in the form of LEAGUE memberships and special contributions to THE LEAGUE, so that we may hand over to the Secretary-Treasurer a cheque for as large an amount as possible.

A Voice From Montreal

MR. KING APPEALS TO THE LADIES

(From the *Montreal Gazette*)

Because "young men will respond to an appeal made by women of this country," Prime Minister Mackenzie King asked the ladies Saturday night to encourage recruiting. Almost in the same breath, according to news reports of his speech, he asked "not only women but citizens as a whole to assume individual initiative and not depend upon the government to do everything for them."

The impulse to laugh, which is the average man's first reaction to this outburst, should be quelled. It is funny, but this is no laughing matter. When the leader of a nation which has been at war for twenty-six months, a leader who has repeatedly boasted that we are in this war "to the utmost of our strength," a leader who recently, in London, invited the United States to join us in an all-out struggle for freedom—when this man asks the women of Canada to coax into the army the men whom the government lacks courage to conscript, the spectacle is not comic.

As the Prime Minister himself remarked, "too few Canadians realize the full implication of the present conflict." And too few of those few are in the Federal Cabinet.

"God Save The King"—Not Quebec's Anthem

By Rev. W. S. Whitcombe, M.A.

If anyone should think the title of this article is not justified, we invite such an one to read the following note translated from the official Catholic daily of Quebec City, *L'Action Catholique*. We can see no other conclusion to be drawn from this slyly sneering editorial. Its tone is not the one that Cardinal Villeneuve employed when he spoke in Toronto not so long ago; but it is the tone constantly employed by his official organ in Quebec City. This is what *Catholic Action* has to say:

"Those who listened last evening to the first radio programme of the new War Savings campaign were disagreeably surprised not to hear our national anthem, 'O Canada'. A number of times the artists played several bars of 'God Save the King', the national hymn of England, but they forgot ours. Were they intentionally following the example given last year by the Parliament of Canada? No one knows.

"Public men tell us that it is Canada that is at war, that it is Canada that is in danger. Then, why do they not at least give to these propaganda programmes a more purely Canada character by putting our national anthem on the programme? 'O Canada' is to-day accepted by the great majority of the English element. One hears it not only in Quebec and Montreal, but also in Toronto, in Winnipeg, and in Vancouver. It was played at the time of the visit of the King and Queen. Only a few imperialists still maintain that we ought not to have any other than the English anthem. Why should we make that concession in the Province of Quebec?"

The songs a people sing are not unimportant factors in national life. There is much truth in the saying, "Let me make the songs of a nation, and I care not who makes its laws." If the "English element" referred to by *L'Action Catholique* would take the trouble to examine the French version of, "O Canada", they would not accept it so readily as they are said to do by this official Catholic propaganda sheet.

It is at once evident that the song was written solely for French-Canadians and Roman Catholics who live in the Province of Quebec. This it specifies by its reference to the "giant river"—the St. Lawrence—which is several thousand miles from Vancouver, and has no more national character than the mighty Fraser, or the frozen Mackenzie. The French Catholic attitude toward, "God, Save the King", is characteristic of all their thinking about this great Dominion: Canada, in their Provincial dialect and thinking, means nothing more than a little French and Catholic state on the banks of the St. Lawrence, a kind of French-Canadian Eire, to act as a thorn in the flesh of the rest of the Continent, where a few extremists can preen themselves that they are not as other men are.

The Globe and Mail Receives a Left-handed Compliment from *Le Droit*

By Rev. W. S. Whitcombe, M.A.

From time to time *The Toronto Globe and Mail* does penance for any suggestion of a strong clear statement it may have tried to infer in an indirect, roundabout fashion. One can be almost certain that if the issue of one day carries an editorial that might in any way be construed as a reflection on Quebec or its part in our war effort, the next day's issue will seek to offer some sort of atonement for its rashness in antagonizing the Roman Church. The total result is that neither Ontario nor Quebec knows which direction *The Globe and Mail* is seeking to travel.

The following comment on this vacillating policy from the French-Canadian, *Le Droit*, is clear evidence that the subtly-planned changeability of Canada's self-styled, "National Newspaper", is deceiving no one but itself. *Le Droit* translates part of the editorial from *The Globe and Mail* in which that paper sought to curry favour with the Roman Catholic element, by attacking Dr. Shields, and calling in question the wisdom of criticizing the war effort of Quebec, the Roman Catholics, and French-Canadians. Then follows this comment on *The Globe and Mail's* editorial:

"This declaration of principles gives us evident pleasure. But in practice it is not what *The Globe and Mail* usually inspires by its comments. If it has happened to show justice to French Canada, it is the exception rather than the rule. In any case, we are glad to observe that *The Globe and Mail* is commencing to see the light.

"Unfortunately *The Globe and Mail* is not consistent with itself. Thus on the day after it made this proclamation of principles, it published an advertisement which was insulting to the Apostolic Delegate. The advertisement had to do with the next harangue of the Rev. T. T. Shields, in which he announced that he would answer the editorial published the previous day by *The Globe and Mail*, and prove why the Apostolic Delegate should be expelled from Canada for 'subversive activities'. If *The Globe and Mail* condemned the action of the Rev. T. T. Shields as being harmful to our war effort, then why did it publish his advertisement?"

Dr. Shields and the Apostolic Delegate Divide the Honours of a Number of Resolutions in Quebec

By Rev. W. S. Whitcombe, M.A.

The French Catholic papers of the province of Quebec assure us unceasingly that only a few fanatics are at the back of the recent protests made against the increasing encroachments of the Roman Catholic Church in Canada. Nevertheless they seem to think that these "few persons" are important enough to be the subject of a number of resolutions by various French and Catholic bodies. We quote a few extracts from French Catholic papers which report some of these resolutions.

The SAINT JOHN THE BAPTIST SOCIETY of Ottawa, for instance, resolved as follows:

"It was moved that the SAINT JOHN THE BAPTIST SOCIETY meeting in annual assembly, should protest against the unjust attacks of which His Excellency the Apostolic Delegate to Canada has been the subject a little while ago, and that it should take this opportunity of assuring him of its deepest sympathy and admiration for the way in which he has acquitted himself of his duties as representative of the Holy See in Canada."

THE CATHOLIC ACTION congress also met in Ottawa and, according to the local French Catholic papers, "adopted various resolutions which were all of special importance at the present moment . . . They took the defense of His Excellency the Apostolic Delegate, unjustly attacked by certain fanatical elements in Toronto."

THE CATHOLIC UNION OF FRENCH-ONTARIO FARMERS (U.C.F.O.) made it their business to deal with Dr. Shields and the Apostolic Delegate as the first item on their agenda. *Le Droit* tells the story in this fashion:

"The first resolution adopted yesterday by the CATHOLIC UNION OF FRENCH-ONTARIO FARMERS was that 'the congress protest against the invectives (sic) of Pastor Shields against His Excellency Monsignor Ildebrando Antoniutti, Apostolic Delegate to Canada and Newfoundland."

These are but a few of the resolutions that have come to our notice in the French Catholic press of late. No doubt each society receives notice from headquarters—in this case Mgr. Antoniutti himself—that such resolutions are to be passed. It is interesting to note that the powers that be in the higher ranks of the hierarchy have thought that Dr. Shields protests were so important as to require such multiple and multiplied answers.

"TIME MARCHES ON" WITH US

Time is not a religious magazine, it publishes only news. Here *Time*, not *The Gospel Witness* says the Roman Catholic Church is largely anti-British and anti-American

Catholic Editors and the War From *Time*, October 27, 1941

Ninety per cent of the Catholic priests in the U.S. oppose (1) "a shooting war outside the Western Hemisphere," (2) aid to "the Communistic Russian Government." This was the result, announced last week, of a poll taken by the Catholic Laymen's Committee for Peace, an organization of out-&-out isolationists. Although the results were undoubtedly loaded by the form in which the questions were put, the trend of the results was vouched for by the attitude of the Catholic press.

Its 317 newspapers and magazines, which reach a Hearst-sized audience of over 8,000,000, bespeak the Church's mind more directly and potently than any other religious press. Since the Spanish Civil War, when it was credited with putting across the Church's campaign to keep the embargo against arms to the Republic, the Catholic press in general has been strongly isolationist.

Catholics point to a variety of attitudes in their press ranging from the socially radical *Catholic Worker*, to the liberal *Commonweal*, to the Brooklyn *Tablet*, and Father Coughlin's quasi-fascist *Social Justice* (the last two called by the *Florida Catholic* "the Brooklyn-Royal Oak Axis"). They point also to the pro-Roosevelt cast of such leading diocesan papers as the *Chicago New World*, the *San Francisco Monitor*, the *Pittsburgh Catholic*. But the influential Catholic newspaper—the *Brooklyn Tablet*—and the two most influential magazines—*America*, the *Catholic World*—are still isolationist. *Commonweal* (most widely read by non-Catholics) supported aid-to-Britain until the Nazi invasion of Russia, not long afterwards denounced the Fight for Freedom committee's appeal for Catholic support.

Rated No. 1 Catholic publication through its influence on teachers and clergymen, the Jesuit weekly *America*, edited by 52-year-old Francis Xavier Talbot, S.J., opposed the war and everything connected with it, including the draft. The *Catholic World*, a Paulist monthly edited by 64-year-old America-Firster Father James M. Gillis, is much more isolationist than *America*, though like almost every other isolationist Catholic publication it makes a distinction between national defense and intervention in World War II.

A major overall influence Catholic Welfare Conference News Service, founded (1920) and controlled by the Archbishops and Bishops of the U.S. Headed since 1924 by shrewd Editor Frank A. Hall, ex-city editor of the *Washington Post*, it is the world's biggest Catholic news bureau, has its own network of foreign correspondents, turns out an average 50,000 words a week. It furnishes the bulk of national and international news, features, pictures in the Catholic press; even sends out prefabricated editorials. Typical of N.C.W.C. News Service is its handling of the President's hopeful statement made this month about religious freedom in Russia. It sent out three stories: The first denounced the statement; three days later the N.C.W.C. News Service sent out a special communiqué by S.C.W.C. General Secretary Monsignor Michael J. Ready, commending the President's move to encourage religious freedom in Russia. Third story, three days later, again attacked the President's statement.

The editorial policy of the Catholic press generally is suggested in the statement of Catholic position by *America's* Editor Talbot: ". . . the American Catholic, enthusiastically affirming that the American Constitutional system of government is the best non-Catholic form yet devised . . . can declare in utter good faith that a government erected on the Leonine [Leo XIII] principles would be a more perfect instrument." In practice that policy means a complex reconciling of Church policy with U.S. foreign policy, of weighting loyalty to the Government with the anti-British attitude of many Irish and German Catholics and the anti-Communist attitude of the Church.

No poll of isolationist sentiment among practicing Catholics has yet been made. That it would run as high as Catholic clergymen's response to their poll is unlikely. Lay Catholics

include a strong group of Roosevelt supporters; they also read the secular press, which last week was 69% interventionist. Remembered last week was the discrepancy between the Catholic press and Catholics in the Spanish Civil War. After two years of nearly total pro-Franco sentiment in the Catholic press, a Gallup poll showed that one-third of U.S. Catholics were neutral, 43% were pro-Loyalist, less than 25% pro-Franco.

EVEN THE DIPLOMATIC MOODY MONTHLY SPEAKS

That *The Gospel Witness* is not the only journalistic "fanatic", "extremist", "bigot", etc., etc., the following articles from *The Moody Monthly* will show.

Protestants, Attention!

From *Moody Monthly*, November, 1941

Lest someone accuse us of attacking Roman Catholicism, we are going to refrain from all comment on the following. Remember these quotations are from a Roman Catholic source, a booklet entitled, *Babies—Not Bullets!* by William Thomas Walsh, published by the Paulist Press, New York. The booklet contains an introduction by the editor of *The Catholic World*.

We are not defending birth control (the central theme of this booklet) in quoting this attack on the evil. We are merely calling the attention of Protestants to the real attitude of the Church of Rome toward states and nations once considered Protestant. Here are the Quotations:

"Nevertheless, this tendency can be checked by wise and firm measures before it is too late. And we have meanwhile some highly suggestive examples at hand of what happens when Catholics resist the seductions of cowardice, sensuality, and snobbery, and follow the course of man's true nature. We have the example of the French-Canadians and the example of the Irish.

"The French-Canadians are not only increasing faster than their neighbours in Canada, but they have migrated to many of the northern states of the United States, and there, simply by virtue of natural increase, have begun to possess the land formerly occupied by dying stocks. There are so many French-Canadians in Maine that one of the indispensable requirements of a Catholic bishop there is a knowledge of French. Vermont and New Hampshire are gradually becoming French-Canadian communities. The French-Canadians already wield a powerful influence in Rhode Island.

"The birth rate of the Irish in America has fallen, but not so much as that of other stocks; and the population of Ireland is increasing too slowly because of the late marriages and emigration. But something very interesting is going on in England and Scotland. There the Irish have settled in most of the large industrial cities, and their birth rate has been so much higher than that of the English and Scotch, that Protestant ministers in Glasgow, Edinburgh, and other places have bitterly complained that the newcomers are crowding out the natives and possessing the land. Thus the Irish are making a peaceful conquest of their old conquerors, and this without bullets or bayonets, but simply by following the law of God. How long this healthy tendency can withstand the pressure of pagan ideas, of economic necessity, or of corroding ease remains to be seen. But this much is certain:

"If Catholics everywhere—Catholics in the United States, England, France, south Germany, Mexico, South America—if these Catholics are intelligent enough and self-sacrificing enough to follow the advice of the Church, regardless of what it may cost (and this is no more than our ancestors did, often under worse conditions than ours), *the West will become Catholic* in the course of a few decades. This is an obvious mathematical certainty. It is a consummation worthy of the greatest effort on the part of all Catholics from the hierarchy down to the humblest layman. The hand that rocks the cradle will indeed rule the world, and those who are meek enough to obey divine wisdom must literally inherit the earth."

The author has a footnote here:

"When this article (intended as a suggestion, not an exhaustive treatise) appeared in print, I realized for the first time that I had omitted mention of Italy, perhaps because it is so obvious that the Italians are one of the great healthy Catholic people that I took it for granted."

Our readers may be surprised just now to hear of the greatness of Italy!

The closing paragraphs of the booklet deal with a supposed substitute for birth control, and then closes with these illuminating sentences:

"Granting its efficacy, which is not at all certain, it may get a man into heaven at long last, so to speak, with his rump scorched, but it won't fill the earth with Catholics. And that is precisely what the world needs more than ever at this moment."

Protestants, Read This From *The Moody Monthly*

It is a sad spectacle when a so-called Christian leader wanders so far from the truth that a secular newspaper must call him to task. A New York daily paper reports and comments on a speech made at a conference on "Science, Philosophy, and Religion". Let us interpolate a condensation of the clipping. First some of the speaker's remarks:

"If Christians defend political rights they can do so only on the ground that in our actual order the best arrangement for all the people may thus be achieved. . . . Christianity cannot accept the concept of justice often associated with historic democracy because that is based on the doctrines of individual rights and of equality."

And now the secular writer comments:

"No, this was not as the reader might suppose the statement of a 'scientist' or of a philosopher, nor was it the statement of a socialist or a communist. It was the statement of a professor of the Andover Newton Theological School.

"The plain meaning of the words is unmistakable, as the press reports disclose by the reaction they produced. They mean that the 'individual' exists for the sake of 'society,' and not society for the sake of the 'person' and whatever else it is, this meaning is fundamentally unchristian and fundamentally in conflict with the American concept of civil society. That such a statement should come out of a professedly Christian school of theology is the interesting thing and it is profoundly significant of what has been going on in our schools and colleges for a number of years."

We do not expect many Christians to get warm over this. Some are so loyal to an organization that whatever is, is right. Others are so indefinite in their own convictions they haven't an opinion. Others are for peace at any price, even the price of disintegration. And there are still men of means who will give their money for the support of teachers who not only deny the Bible and Christ, but who would destroy the social system under which these men made their money.

Three Self-Explanatory Letters

October 28, 1941.

Miss _____,
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Madam:

Your letter to Dr. Shields, of October 25th, has been referred to me for an answer, the Doctor being particularly busy these days. Be sure we are glad to hear from you. I particularly note with pleasure the way you are reading and studying the Bible. I hope you have the good fortune to have one of the New Versions put out by the Catholic Church, based, not on the Latin Vulgate, as is the Douai Version, but on the original Hebrew and Greek.

You ask a question or two and make a suggestion or two in defence of the Roman Catholic use of the Apocrypha, Worship of Mary, etc.

As to the Book of Tobias (or Tobit) you ask why it was "thrown out" by the Reformers. Certainly not because of its moral teaching. The truth is it was never properly in Holy

Scripture. The Old Testament came to us from the Jews, and the Jewish Fathers never regarded the books of the Apocrypha, of which Tobias is one, as on equal footing with, and hence of the same authority as, the Old Testament, such as Genesis, Psalms, Daniel. Of course the Protestant is quite free to mention Tobias. I have read the work and should feel quite free to use it by way of illustration for moral teaching, but not as scriptural authority for a doctrine of angels. The existence of angels is taught elsewhere, in the Bible itself, and that is enough. We are, however, nowhere taught to worship them—such worship is expressly forbidden in Colossians 2:18—and so we cannot pray to them. No prayer to angels is recorded in Scripture. When we have Christ to pray to, why bother anyway praying to angels? If one may talk with the Master, why stop with lesser servants, even supposing they can hear?

Again, you refer to "the Queen of Heaven", by which you evidently refer to Mary, the mother of Our Lord. You say she "is degraded by non-Catholics, as they believe there were other children besides Jesus Christ."

First, take the phrase "the Queen of Heaven"? Do you know that this is a heathen phrase for a goddess? It is so used in Jeremiah 44:17, 25. The character of that goddess ancient research has shown to be, to say the least, exceedingly doubtful; so much so that I should be sorry to have it applied to any good woman! You think its use is justified by Psalm 45:10 (44:10): "The Queen (The Hebrew, of course, has no capital letters.) stood on thy right hand in gilded clothing, surrounded by variety", etc. Well, this verse does not say "Queen of Heaven". It does not say that "the Queen" was Mary. A careful reading by an open mind of the Psalm itself will show that the verse has nothing whatever to do with Mary. You refer also to Jeremiah 31:22, "A woman shall compass a man", but what has this to do with the use of the expression "Queen of Heaven" in regard to Mary? Protestants of the Evangelical faith believe in the Virgin Birth of Christ, by miracle, as the Romanists do. They know Mary was honoured above women in being the mother of Our Lord. They honour her as such. But that she was the mother of our Lord does not prove her sinless or to be worshipped or exalted as the "Queen of Heaven".

That Mary had other children besides Jesus Christ, is the plain fact of the case, as anyone may see from such Scriptures as Matthew 12:46; Mark 3:31; Luke 8:19; John 7:5; Galatians 1:19. These say the Lord had "brethren" after the flesh. No use is there in saying they were "cousins" of Jesus. Greek has a word for cousin, used in Colossians 4:10, but the Greek uses the ordinary word for brother of the relation of James and the others to Jesus. If Jesus had brothers, Mary had other children.

That this fact degrades Mary is a strange idea. I should think it would honour her to say she was the mother of the man who wrote the Epistle of James and of others who were present on the Day of Pentecost.

I respectfully suggest you use the references I have given for a further study of the facts about Mary and her divine Son. I pray that the Spirit of God may thus use the Word of God.

Believe me,

Yours sincerely,

W. Gordon Brown.

Toronto, October 28, 1941.

Canadian Broadcasting Commission,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Gentlemen:

On Sundays at 2:30 p.m., over a network of Canadian stations, including CFRB, Toronto, the Reverend Flannigan, of St. Peter's Seminary, London, Ontario, broadcasts a children's half-hour, called "The School of Christ". I presume this programme is paid for, and have no objection on that score. Roman Catholics have a right to buy time on radio stations and broadcast their religious philosophy.

In this case, last Sunday, we had definitely and distinctly Roman Catholic doctrine and practice set forth. There was, of course, mention of the use of crucifix and beads. Besides, the children were told it was right that they should pray each to his "guardian angel". Prayers to angels, crucifixes, beads, etc., are not only foreign to Protestants, they are to them grievous errors, the practice of which is religious abomination.

I am therefore writing to ask whether a Protestant is now to be allowed to buy time on a similar or the same radio network and plainly speak against the Roman doctrine taught by Father Flannigan. This, it would seem to me, would be only fair. Please let me know at your earliest convenience that this may be done, so that we may take the proper and necessary steps to put on such a distinctly Protestant programme.

Believe me,

Yours sincerely,

W. Gordon Brown.

Toronto, October 28, 1941.

Canadian Broadcasting Commission,

Box 500,
Toronto,
Ontario.
Gentlemen:

On Saturday last your newscast announced in its broadcast the inauguration in Canada of "The Sword of the Spirit" Movement. This is a Movement the membership of which is confined to Roman Catholics. It is a Roman Catholic movement, therefore.

Protestants do not object to announcement in news of Romanist doings. But I write to ask why there was no announcement in the news of the formation of the Protestant League. This was in the papers; why not on the air? We ask for fair play and British justice to both sides.

I remain,

Yours sincerely,

W. Gordon Brown.

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 5 Fourth Quarter Lesson 45 November 9th, 1941

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

SAUL SPARED A SECOND TIME

Lesson Text: 1 Samuel 26.

Golden Text: "Who can stretch forth his hand against the Lord's anointed, and be guiltless?"—1 Samuel 26:9.

For Reading: 1 Samuel 27.

I. Restraint—verses 1 to 12.

King Saul's repentance proved to be shallow and superficial (1 Sam. 24:16, 17). He was an impulsive man, quick to sin and quick to repent; at one time he loved David and at another time he hated him. A successful leader must be steadfast and dependable (1 Cor. 15:58; 1 Pet. 5:10).

David was learning by experience the art of war. In the days to come he would be called upon to lead the hosts of Israel against their enemies (1 Kings 5:3). The Lord will prepare His servants for the work to which He has called them (Gal. 1:11-24).

It is difficult to induce men to be enthusiastic in a wrong cause, since the motive power is lacking. Saul's followers were not faithful like those of David. Even Abner, the king's uncle, failed to guard him (1 Sam. 14:50, 51). A deep sleep from the Lord had fallen upon them (verse 12). When men persist in taking sides against the servants of God, they lay themselves open to His judgments as Pharaoh did when he hardened his heart against Israel (Exod. 7:13, 14; 9:12, 34, 35; 11:9, 10).

Abishai was David's nephew, being the son of his half-sister Zeruiah (1 Chron. 2:16). Abishai's brother Joab became commander-in-chief of David's army (2 Sam. 8:15, 16; 21:15-17). The other brother Asahel, fleet of foot, was also a devoted follower of David (2 Sam. 2:18, 24; 18:2). Abishai was courageous and skilful (verse 8; 2 Sam. 23:18); like Jonathan he was ready for any exploit which lay in the line of duty, regardless of the danger involved (Judg. 7:9-11; 1 Sam. 14:1).

David was tempted a second time to take matters into his own hands and slay the one who was opposing him. Once more it looked as though the Lord had delivered his enemy

into his hand (1 Sam. 24:4). But the child of God dare not be guided by appearances (Isa. 11:3, 4; John 7:24). The Word of God must be our guide. To harm the king would have been contrary to the will of God, as David knew it (verses 9, 11; 1 Sam. 24:6, 12; 2 Sam. 1:16).

David was confident that no one would be permitted to prevent the fulfilment of the Lord's purpose concerning him (Isa. 14:24, 27). Therefore, Saul would be removed by Divine intervention. He would die by the direct hand of God (1 Sam. 25:38), by the processes of nature (Job 7:1) or in the course of battle. David spoke prophetically, for Saul and Jonathan were slain on Mount Gilboa while fighting against the Philistines (1 Sam. 31:1-6).

David was contented to leave Saul unharmed, but he carried away with him the spear and cruse of water as evidence that once again the king's life had been precious in the sight of God and His servant (1 Sam. 24:11). This time he did not humiliate the Lord's anointed (1 Sam. 24:4, 5); he had learned the lessons of patience, self-restraint and forbearance (Eph. 4:1, 2; Col. 3:12, 13; 2 Pet. 1:5-7).

Let Saul's plight be a lesson to us. We must beware lest anyone come upon us secretly and deprive us of our spears. The Word of God is to be our trusty weapon, and there are those about us who would privily snatch from us our faith in that Word and leave us defenceless against our spiritual foes (Col. 2:8).

II. Rebuke—verses 13 to 25.

David's first words were words of rebuke to Abner for his carelessness. Failure to watch causes many a one to stumble (Matt. 26:41; 1 Thess. 5:6-8; 1 Pet. 1:13; 4:7).

Saul had shown himself to be vacillating in temperament, alternately repentant and defiant (1 Sam. 15:24-26). David realized that this was not the time for gentle pleading, and hence he spoke strongly and searchingly. He accused Saul of weakness, of being a follower instead of a leader. The cause of his unjust antipathy to the son of Jesse must be determined. If the Lord had stirred him against David, David would deal directly with his Master and make an offering to atone in case of sin (2 Sam. 16:11, 12). If men had incited the king, let them be accursed (1 Cor. 16:22; Gal. 1:8).

Surely Saul had not realized the results which would follow his course. David had been driven from abiding in the land of his inheritance (2 Sam. 14:16; 20:19; Psa. 120:5), and was in danger of death.

The king acknowledged his folly, but David did not trust him this time (1 Sam. 27:1).

The prayer of David (verses 23, 24) is significant in view of the circumstances, and it should have shamed the king into discontinuing his unreasonable persecution. David asked the Lord to reward every man according to his deeds (2 Sam. 3:39; Psa. 7:8; Col. 3:8; 2 Tim. 4:14), but King Saul had no regard for the future. Then he prayed that his life might be precious in the sight of the Lord and that he might be delivered out of all tribulation (Psa. 27:5; 32:7; 54:7).

Saul prophesied that David would do great things and would prevail, but showed no disposition to assist him. Jealousy is a cruel monster (Prov. 6:34, 35; Song of Sol. 8:6).

CIRCULATE EVERY ISSUE OF THE WITNESS

Single copies, 5c postpaid; Bundles of 25 copies or over sent to one address at the rate of three cents per copy postpaid.

APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE

I hereby affirm my agreement with Article II, defining the objects of the above LEAGUE, and desire to be enrolled as a member. I understand that within about two weeks of the receipt of this application, accompanied by \$1.00 membership fee, I shall receive a certificate of membership, including receipt of fee.

\$1.00 Membership Fee Paid: _____ Promised: _____

Name: _____ Telephone: _____

Address: _____
Church Affiliation: _____