

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. 33

TORONTO, DECEMBER 18, 1941

Whole Number 1022

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

"The Sound of the Trumpet, The Alarm of War"

United States Now in War "All Out": What About Canada?

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Canada, Sunday Evening, December 14th, 1941

(Stenographically Reported)

"My bowels, my bowels! I am pained at my very heart; my heart maketh a noise in me; I cannot hold my peace, because thou hast heard, O my soul, the sound of the trumpet, the alarm of war."—Jeremiah 4:19.

Many people go to church to hear that which is agreeable to them, and are disinclined to listen to anything from which they dissent. It is possible I may say some things this evening with which you will not agree. I may even magnify my office at the outset, and it may sound to you almost egotistical. Men who see a little farther than some others, are likely for a while to be opposed by the many, until they are forced at last by the logic of circumstances to acknowledge that the prophet was right.

Jeremiah lived in a day of general apostasy, and amid a people who, though having a form of religion, had largely forgotten God. He knew that a storm of judgment was brewing; but he observed that the people were not only unaware of its approach, but were disinclined to give heed to any warning. He cried, "The lion is come up from his thicket, and the destroyer of the Gentiles is on his way; he is gone forth from his

place to make thy land desolate; and thy cities shall be laid waste, without an inhabitant. For this gird you with sackcloth, lament and howl: for the fierce anger of the Lord is not turned back from us."

The text is rather a strange expression. Some things may be known by the understanding. Tidings of impending events may be heard and appraised by human judgment. But of some things a man may be sure, though he cannot define them, nor frame any verbal formula that can adequately express his fear or his joy. We have a saying, which may vary as to the tense of the verb, to the effect, "I can feel it in my bones." And that is not an expression of the thoughtless; but like many other proverbial sayings, being born of experience, it has much of truth in it.

Jeremiah's state was something like that. He was as a highly-sensitive receiving-station. Not his mind only, but his whole being vibrated to the coming storm. Al-

though all about him men seemed to hear and feel nothing, he was agonizingly aware of impending disaster.

The text is a somewhat archaic form of expression, and yet it is still strikingly realistic. You may have felt just such a disturbance at the receipt of some shocking piece of news—not your mind only, but your whole physical frame shared in the horror of it. Let me dare to quote it just as it is written, and give you a translation slightly different from our Authorized Version: "My bowels, my bowels! I must writhe in pain! The walls of my heart! My heart moaneth in me!"

Note that the prophet writhes with an inward pain; the walls of his heart seem as though they would burst; he hears his heart moan within him; and he exclaims, "I cannot hold my peace, because thou hast heard, O my soul, the sound of the trumpet, the alarm of war."

What has he heard? With his ears, he has heard nothing at all. What tidings have been brought him? None at all. No visible messenger has come to his door; notwithstanding, attuned to the infinitely sensitive constitution of the moral order, his soul has heard "the sound of a trumpet, the alarm of war."

Please do not charge me with egotism when I declare to you that that is my feeling to-day. Certain things I know, as anyone who reads and observes must know; but as Kipling says,

"A man's mind can tell him more
Than seven watchmen sitting in a tower."

And I dare to say that beyond all that, I know, and I feel that we are facing grave peril. "My heart moaneth unto me, because thou hast heard, O my soul, the sound of the trumpet, the alarm of war."

But why trouble about these things? I know the senseless insouciance which counts it the highest wisdom to leave all worries to others. There is a common saying, a slang expression void of all grammatical justification, and yet when uttered with a shrug of the shoulders, or written with an exclamation-mark, expresses the senselessness of the popular mind,—"I should worry!"

I.

There were millions of such people in Europe—in all the countries of Europe—who, when their ship of state had to thread its way among the rocks, were content to go to bed and sleep with a captain half drunk upon the bridge.

Nor for years was Britain any better off. Ramsay Macdonald was worth thousands of bombing-planes to Britain's enemies. So was Mr. Stanley Baldwin. He did one thing well; for which the Empire will always be grateful to him—I refrain from naming it; but beyond that, I know of nothing of real and abiding value he ever did. No doubt he was a man of unimpeachable integrity; and it is not necessary to impugn his patriotism. But he allowed Britain to drift toward the insatiable maw of destruction, while he leisurely smoked his pipe!

Premier Chamberlain

Mr. Neville Chamberlain was no better. I refuse to believe that he was ever actuated by any but the worthiest motives: he was simply a well-intentioned captain who knew nothing about navigation. He might have passed muster as an inconspicuous, average Prime Minister in peacetime; but he was utterly devoid of the

discernment and foresight which were indispensable to the Empire's safety at such a time as that in which he was Premier. His yielding of the Irish ports less than a year before the war, was in its effect tantamount to handing over a large part of Britain's fleet to the enemy. His later blunders, culminating in Munich, in their essential mischievousness, could not have been surpassed by the worst traitor.

Though Chamberlain's Munich Pact was acclaimed by the thoughtless multitude, his entire Premiership reduced the more sensitive part of the Empire to the verge of nervous prostration. I must confess that for many dreadful months I had not a night's sleep, because my soul could hear "the sound of the trumpet, the alarm of war."

The United States

The United States also had many blind and deaf men in official positions. There were the Wheelers, and the Nyes, and the Fishes, and others in Congress; and Father Coughlin and Lindbergh without. If only they had been as dumb as they were blind and deaf, they would not have been such a blight upon their national life. I am aware that all those I have named with the exception of Coughlin have now completely reversed their positions, and have declared their support of the Government in the war against the Axis powers. That of course is what one might have expected; but surely their judgment must be for ever discounted. Who now can care for the opinion of men who proved themselves incapable of seeing anything in advance of the event? A prophet, whether of purely religious, or of political or other events, must be rated by his ability to see things in advance. Any simpleton, without even the most elementary meteorological knowledge, can remark after rain has begun to fall, "It is a very wet day."

Jeremiah saw and felt things in advance. Perhaps some of you may challenge my competence to speak on such matters as now give me anxiety. I may be told to leave such matters to the "experts". Personally, I should be glad to do so if I knew who and where the experts are. It seems to me inconceivable that greater blunders could have been made by anyone than were made by British and American and Canadian statesmen so-called. We left our affairs to men who were supposed to be experts—and now we find ourselves in the midst of a world on fire.

Our Testimony For Years Past

I asked my office to give me the last nine volumes of THE GOSPEL WITNESS. I thought I might quote a few things as my credentials, but as I turned the pages I found there was too much. Going far back before the annexation of Austria, for years I have seen it coming—indeed, ever since the last war; and have been saying so. And have sometimes wondered if it was any use saying so, because so few seemed to believe or care. I remember that most of our Canadian newspapers justified Munich, and lauded Mr. Chamberlain as one of the greatest statesmen of all time. I found it impossible to agree. I have noticed recently that Thyssen, in his account of events in Germany, now being published, declares that Munich lifted Hitler to the pinnacle, established him in the confidence of the people, and gave him the green light to do as he liked—or words to that effect.

February, 1938

Greatly daring, I quote from the last sermon preached in the old church, February twenty-seventh, nineteen hundred and thirty-eight; and published in THE GOSPEL WITNESS March third—the day before the fire, and more than six months before Munich:

"For some years now, Hitler and Mussolini have been allowed to bully the world. Hitler has violated practically every article of the Treaty of Versailles. He re-occupied the Rhineland, rearmed the nation, and rebuilt the army, repudiated all his obligations, and is now laying his heavy hand on Austria—like a modern Sennacherib. He is an unprincipled, unmoral tyrant. I wish I could make him hear what I say.

"But Britain was not ready! Do you know why she was not ready? Because the modernistic preachers in the pulpits throughout the land—that land and ours—had been preaching the anti-authoritarian philosophy of Modernism, by which I mean the denial of all objective authority, which in the last analysis, is lawlessness and anarchy. Nearly twenty years ago I said from this pulpit that Modernism would prove itself to be the enemy of the home, and of the state; and that it spelled confusion for the whole world, should the nations whose life was salted by the gospel lose their savour. Not the Great War only, but the pacifism which was the legitimate issue of modernistic anti-supernaturalism created a public opinion which compelled disarmament, and left Britain with no surplus strength which would enable her to do more than defend her own interests . . .

"In the Hoare-Laval case, it was proposed to partition Ethiopia, and make Haili Selassie a puppet Emperor, giving the bigger share to Mussolini. The conscience of Britain was so outraged by the proposal that almost with one voice it demanded the resignation of Sir Samuel Hoare, and temporarily he retired from office. Now, a little more than two years later, when Mussolini has taken not half, but all of it, apparently he demands that he be allowed to keep it, and that we approve of the robbery. Could a more unethical proposal be conceived?

"But now we have new friends. Let me introduce you to them. Meet Adolph Hitler! You remember his blood purge? Can you not see him literally dripping with blood? 'He shed the blood of war in peace.' He is a common murderer, who ought to be hanged by the neck until he is dead—he deserves nothing better; with whom no self-respecting man or nation should ever strike hands. Mussolini is no better; but, if possible, still worse . . .

"I say, with a full knowledge of all that is involved, for myself—you speak for yourself, I speak for myself—were I young enough to enlist, and could I know that as a result of it I should spend the rest of my days blind or maimed and in excruciating agony; or did I know that instead of that I should find an early grave, I would choose either of them before I would choose to be under the heel of Hitler or Mussolini. I would rather die a free man than live to be under a tyranny of that sort. That is the issue . . .

"What is the use of trying to reach an agreement with men having records like Hitler and Mussolini? It would not be worth the paper it would be written on. There would be no security. Sooner or later the break would come.

"What am I protesting against this evening? I will show you before I get through that I am not beyond my province, that I am preaching the gospel. What is the Prime Minister's* plan? Do not misunderstand me. It is not submission either to Hitler or Mussolini. Still less would he assume an attitude of subserviency. It is a proposal to talk things over, to try to reach an agreement. Doubtless the Government, with every Britisher, deploras the spirit and record of both Germany and Italy as we do. But they say they must deal with realities, with facts as they are, because we cannot deal with ideal conditions such as we desire. As I thought of that this afternoon, I said to myself, I have seen a parallel of that in Toronto. There were some men who

kidnapped a certain man and stated their terms. The late Mr. A. Orpen gave them a very valuable ring as a pledge of good faith, then took them to a bank and drew out and gave the kidnapers the money they asked. Mr. Orpen was quite sure of the honour of the kidnapers, and that in due course they would return his ring. But he died without getting it back.

"Does anyone suppose that Mussolini would return Mr. Chamberlain's ring after he got his price? Can he be depended upon? Or Hitler either? What is Mussolini's price? Among other things, it is said to be the recognition of his conquest of Ethiopia. That, we may reasonably assume from despatches is one of the terms. If that be so, what about the Hoare-Laval proposal? If Sir Samuel Hoare was driven from office for consenting to Mussolini's having part of Ethiopia, what shall be done with those who submit to his having all of it? . . .

"It is even suggested that Mussolini may ask for the neutralization of Gibraltar! If by any means he could secure that, I suppose by and by he would propose the neutralization of London! You laugh at that? The mere suggestion is absurd. Yet I must admit that, with some little knowledge of British history, and of the British spirit, if anyone had told me five years ago that any British Government would conduct its Foreign Affairs as the Baldwin and Chamberlain Governments have done, I should have thought such an one was demerited. It would have been unbelievable. On the principle that it is more blessed to give than to receive, the British Government ought to be supremely blessed! But I do not believe that any British Government would do anything of the kind. I do not believe Mr. Chamberlain's Government could last a week if he even entertained such proposals as are now mooted. Nor can Mussolini expect it. He is the champion bluffer of the century."

On the occasion of the preaching of that sermon, the congregation authorized, by standing vote, the sending of the following cablegram:

"To the Right Honourable Anthony Eden,
House of Commons,
London, England.

"A congregation of fifteen hundred assembled in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, express appreciation of your refusal to compromise on the principle of the un-wisdom and unrighteousness of seeking agreement with covenant-breaking dictators unless and until they furnish proof of good faith, and some guarantee of their future good behaviour; and of the folly of assuming security can be established on unrighteous foundations (stop) While unauthorized to speak for any but ourselves, we fear present course of British Government will do more to diminish British prestige built upon her quondam devotion to righteousness, and will more seriously impair the respect of lovers of righteousness for Britain than any or all attacks upon British honour from without (stop) In the confidence that time will vindicate the wisdom and righteousness of your present stand, this message is sent from a congregation which gave three hundred men to the army in the Great War, every one a volunteer, to maintain the sacredness of international obligations and the human right to life and liberty (stop) For your comfort and inspiration we respectfully suggest Isaiah, chapters thirty-six and thirty-seven as appropriate to the present international situation.

(Signed) T. T. Shields."

October, 1938

In a sermon preached in Massey Hall, October twenty-third, 1938, and published October twenty-seventh, I ventured the opinion that Munich was not a mercy, but a judgment. People prayed for peace instead of righteousness—and they had peace without righteousness. In that sermon I said further:

"Why should men be so foolish as to believe either Hitler or Mussolini, when they openly boast that they

*Mr. Neville Chamberlain.

are guided by principles of untruth? I read to you the other night of Hitler's prophecy of what he would do—and he has done some of it. He said he would take Austria—and he has. He has said he will have Rumania and Yugoslavia, and Belgium, and all the lesser European countries; then France, and after France, Britain. He has said it, and so far as his own programme is concerned, he has carried it out thus far. What strange delusion has come over us? What fatal judicial blindness has come upon the statesmen of Britain, that they would actually believe Hell's proudest product, and accept his word as though it were trustworthy? 'No more territorial ambitions in Europe!' You wonder sometimes if some of these men ought not to be examined to see if their heads are right; who could believe such a thing? . . .

"What further surrender have we made? We have not actually yielded our liberties; but like Israel, who proposed to reverse the record of their progress from national slavery to national sovereignty, we have taken a course which may conceivably result in our being carried back to the Egypt of barbarism as represented by Nazi rule."

September, 1938

In an editorial in *THE GOSPEL WITNESS* of September fifteenth, nineteen-thirty-eight, we wrote as follows:

"Greatly daring, we would venture to say what we should propose were we Prime Minister or a member of the British Government! In the confidence that there must be millions of people who 'are peaceable and faithful' in Germany, we would announce a definite policy toward that nation in some such terms as these:

"His Majesty's Government deems it wise to issue a statement to all the nations of the world by which it proposes its future actions shall be bound. This Government is determined, so far as it may be possible in agreement with principles of truth and righteousness and judgment, to live on terms of peace and amity with all the nations of the earth. It believes that the people of Czechoslovakia should be permitted to settle all the internal affairs of that nation in their own way, and to their own satisfaction, without interference from anyone from without; but in view of the relation of Czechoslovakia to other nations, and of the effect which would inevitably be produced in Europe by Germany's interference with the domestic affairs of Czechoslovakia, this Government stands uncompromisingly with France in its determination to use all its resources to prevent Germany's setting Europe ablaze by interference with Czechoslovakia's domestic affairs.

"His Majesty's Government refuses to believe that any civilized nation can approve of Chancellor Hitler's war-mongering proclivities; and His Majesty's Government here announces that, in view of Chancellor Hitler's declaration that his leadership of Germany is 'quite absolute', if Germany should invade, or attempt to invade Czechoslovakia, by force, His Majesty's Government will hold Adolf Hitler personally responsible for the crime. In such an event, being forced to make common cause with France and Czechoslovakia, in defense of national rights in the latter nation, and for the prevention of the enslavement of the rest of Europe by German Nazism, when once war is begun, His Majesty's Government here lays down at the outset the irreducible terms upon which peace may be restored. The British Government will never discuss terms of peace with Germany unless and until the person of Adolf Hitler shall be delivered for trial to a court constituted of nations in alliance against Germany, for judgment as a common murderer; or otherwise, unless and until it shall be assured that the judgment of death has been executed upon the said Adolf Hitler by German authorities."

And in the issue of October sixth, an editorial in these words appeared:

"'And when the sun was going down, a deep sleep fell upon Abram; and, lo, an horror of great darkness fell upon him.' Millions of people must have experi-

enced a similar horror of great darkness since the news of the abject surrender of Britain and France to Hitler and Mussolini at Munich, was given to the world. Earl Baldwin has spoken in the House of Lords in support of the Chamberlain policy, and said that it seemed as though the finger of God were tracing a new rainbow, and renewing His covenant with the children of men.

"To associate God with such a movement as that in which Mr. Chamberlain participated, it seems to us, is little short of blasphemy. There was a circle, but it was not a rainbow, nor was it traced by the finger of God. It was a new shackle forged by the enemy of all human liberty, for the further enslavement of the human race. It was not surprising that Lord Baldwin should support Mr. Chamberlain, for Chamberlain fell heir to the fruits of the unparalleled ineptitude shown by the British Foreign Office during Lord Baldwin's entire régime.

"If Czechoslovakia, forsaken by Britain and France, should now throw herself into the arms of Hitler, if Yugoslavia and Rumania should follow suit, if Germany and Mussolini, given a new lease of life, were to press their advantage in Spain to the overthrow of the Loyalist Government and the establishment of Fascist régimes in Spain and Portugal, and if France and Britain should then find themselves without a friend in Europe, who would be to blame but Neville Chamberlain?

"If the present course of the British Foreign Office is pursued, we can see the inevitable disintegration of the whole Empire. We may well pray that Chamberlain's power may be broken, and that he and his short-sighted colleagues may speedily be replaced. We do not impugn his motives—probably they were of the highest—but we do discount his mentality. We believe the day is not far distant when liberty-loving people throughout the world will mourn the day in which Neville Chamberlain was born."

Chamberlain and Churchill

I have already remarked on the period of blind statesmanship in Britain. Mr. Chamberlain, I remember, said in his last speech which was a most pathetic pronouncement, but which showed that notwithstanding his blunders, he was a noble-hearted man—in that speech he said something to this effect, that he had done everything humanly possible to avoid war, but that when at last it came he had sought to wage war with all his might. I have no doubt he did, but his might was not enough. He made way for someone who could unite all parties.

Then followed Mr. Churchill. Mr. Churchill had been sneered at by most of the midget-politicians who had managed to establish themselves in high places. He had been called a "war-monger", and an "extremist"; by some it had been said that he was "too brilliant". Of course he was! He was head and shoulders above all of them. That is why he was not included in the Cabinet of Ramsay Macdonald, or Stanley Baldwin; or Neville Chamberlain either, until the war broke. They knew that he would dwarf every man in the council-chamber as soon as he entered. But when at last Britain saw that it was a question of life or death, survival or destruction, they turned to the one man who for so long had heard "the sound of the trumpet, the alarm of war." Then he had to speed up Britain's rearmament under a rain of bombs; but that one man has been the inspiration of free men all over the world.

II.

LOOK NOW FOR A MOMENT AT THE UNITED STATES. In some respects the United States was more fortunate than Britain. In the last war President Wilson con-

tented himself with writing letters, until the United States was actually forced into war. He seemed to think a typewriter might prove an effective substitute for a machine-gun; and when at last war came in nineteen-seventeen, it found the United States utterly unprepared. Indeed, when the Armistice was signed, she had not an airplane overseas, nor a field piece that she could use. General Pershing himself said not so long ago that he was sent to Europe in command of an army without arms. But Mr. Roosevelt had heard "the sound of the trumpet, the alarm of war." He heard it before any of his fellow-countrymen heard it. He began the enlargement of the American Navy eight years ago, and ever since has done all in his power to prepare the country for war.

President Roosevelt's One Mistake

Mr. Roosevelt made some mistakes. One was to declare that he would never send an American expeditionary force overseas. I venture the opinion that it is dangerous in such circumstances for a statesman to say in advance of the event what he will do and will not do. It is better to wait until one reaches the bridge before attempting to cross it, or before declaring that it never shall be crossed. Notwithstanding, President Roosevelt was never an appeaser: he was a wise and patient statesman who rightly looked upon war as the last resort of reasonable men. But all the time he made what preparation he could in the event of the nation's having to resort to war.

The American Congress

The American Congress as a whole was as blind as the British Parliament which cheered Chamberlain after Munich. No one, I think, would be bold enough to attempt to justify the folly or wickedness of the Neutrality Act. For myself, I never admired the United States' C.O.D. principle in relation to Britain's orders for munitions. We accepted it, however, and paid in gold for most of what we have received as yet. It is not difficult to understand anyone's dread of war. We all dread it. An American writer describing Mr. Roosevelt's appeal to Congress for a declaration of war upon Japan, said, "They had said he wanted war because he saw it coming." No one wanted war outside of Germany and Italy—and ourselves least of all. Right up to last Sunday it was difficult for a Briton to excuse, or at least to understand many things about the attitude of the United States, and indeed difficult to be patient in view of the appalling world-situation.

Anyone of course ought to be forgiven if and when he repents or changes his mind. I am ready to forgive a man any time who will acknowledge his fault. But that does not mean that I am thereafter justified in trusting his judgment. If I were riding with a man who drove his car into a tree or a ditch, and yet escaped destruction; and if after the car was put back on the road he were to say—if it were still able to run, "Will you drive, or shall I?" I think I should be inclined to say, "I think I will drive the rest of the way."

Men Disqualified For Leadership

So there have been men in Britain and in the United States who have proved themselves to be devoid of that judgment, that discernment and foresight, necessary to enable one to anticipate events; and therefore they ought not to be put in responsible directive positions.

They are as disqualified as a near-sighted man would be for the position of pilot of an airplane.

Charles A. Lindbergh

Mr. Charles A. Lindbergh has proved that he is without the first qualification for real statesmanship, but he is a good aviator. The octogenarian General Pershing has offered his services to the Government. Lindbergh has said that everyone ought now to line up behind the Government. We should like to see Mr. Lindbergh make another flight over the ocean, and lead a squadron of bombers over Berlin. Then perhaps he might recover something of what he has lost. But until, within the range of his ability, he brings forth fruits meet for repentance, no one ought to trust him.

President Roosevelt a Safe Guide

But what I am coming to is this, that *President Roosevelt on the other hand has proved himself to be a safe guide of the nation*. Others have been surprised at recent events—but not the President. Many in Britain were blind and asleep up to a point; drugged with the poison of pacifism, religious and political; but when Britain really awakened, and changed her mind, she did not have an election: it was not necessary. Parliament itself changed leaders. It established a worthy precedent. They told Mr. Chamberlain that they could support him no longer. Then the erstwhile neglected Churchill was called in. Mr. Churchill united the country by putting country and cause above party; and incalculably increased Britain's productiveness overnight. Now the whole world trusts him.

Understanding The United States

Let me suggest that *we must resolve to understand the United States*. I remember a saying of Ian Hay, whom I met in England during the war, the author of, "Kitchener's First One Hundred Thousand". In a little book written to interpret Britons to the Americans, and the Americans to Britons, he said to the Britons, "You must always remember that when you meet an American you meet a man who believes profoundly that he is a citizen of the greatest country on earth; and he will not have talked with you for three minutes without telling you so." Then to the Americans he said, "And when you meet a Briton, you must remember that you are talking to a man who also believes that he is a citizen of the greatest country on earth—but he will never tell you so. He will silently assume that every intelligent man knows that."

So you have your choice between American assertion and British assumption; for myself, I do not know which of the two is the more palatable—or indeed the less! Be that as it may, we need to cultivate that attitude of mutual forbearance in this war. Already I have heard many American speakers who seemed to assume that they are the saviours of the world's liberties. Some of them seem to think that the war began last Sunday morning when Japan attacked Honolulu. They seem to forget that Britain has been bleeding for more than two years; and for the greater part of that time has had to stand absolutely alone. I would venture to say to my American friends who are disposed to talk in that strain that they had better remember that had not Britain stood against fearful odds, had not her air force, her navy, and her soldiers, acquitted themselves as they have done, there

would have been no liberty left in the world for anyone to conserve.

Only Few United States Isolationists

On the other hand, let us remember that only a few Americans have talked thus foolishly. A very large part of the people of the United States were ready for war from the beginning; and had they been free to do what they believed ought to be done, they would have been with us the moment Germany invaded Poland. So in your appraisal of the American character and attitude, while appreciating all those who do boast a little, let us especially remember men like the President, and Secretary Cordell Hull, and Assistant-Secretary Sumner Wells, and Senator Pepper, Wendell Willkie, and a great host of others. There have been men whose eyes and ears and minds were open to the peril both in Britain and the United States from the very beginning. Surely everyone must admire the wisdom and patience of President Roosevelt. Isolationism, non-interventionism, were prevalent in the United States. It was a plague which first spread in Britain, and Britain herself was cured of it only by shell-shock. The same was true of the United States as a whole. But now we shall do well to let the dead past bury its dead. Britain and the United States are now wide awake.

Japan's Suicidal Attack

Japan's suicidal attack—for such I am positive it will ultimately prove to be—upon the United States unified that great nation in an hour; and now we are able to rejoice that both Britain and the United States are united under the dynamic leadership respectively of Churchill and Roosevelt. Therefore for myself, I am now "all out" against Germany, Italy, and Japan; and I am equally "all out" for the United States.

While the war lasts, I shall be as loyal and enthusiastic to and for the United States as for Britain and Canada. Until Hitler and Mussolini and Tojo are dead and buried, and the system of each is utterly destroyed and expunged from the earth, we must all think and speak and act as one.

III.

BUT WHAT OF CANADA? I am of British birth; but I am wholly Canadian—and have been for many years. I believe there is no more favoured land on earth than the Dominion of Canada. I would take second place to no one in my appreciation of the noble qualities of Canadian citizens. No one among all the Allies is more loyal to the cause for which Britain and her Allies are now fighting, than the Canadian people. Nor am I in the least disposed to discount Canadian achievements: they have been very great. We have done much in sending food to Britain; we have done well in developing our factories for the production of munitions; and the Empire air-training scheme in Canada has done a work the value of which cannot be estimated. Personally, I think that in nothing have we done better than in the development of our naval power. It is not great now, but we had practically nothing to begin with. All honour to the men who have been responsible for leadership in that department. And with all other Canadians, I am proud of our Canadian soldiers. I believe there were no finer soldiers in the Great War than those who composed the Canadian Corps. I am certain there are no finer soldiers under the

British flag than the soldiers that have gone, or are ready to go, from Canada in this war.

Scant Credit to the Government

But candor compels me to say that Premier King's Administration deserves scant credit for any of these achievements. The Government has had to be driven by public opinion to do whatever it has done. Mr. King stood in the way of establishing Empire-training air-schools when the proposal was made before the war. The Empire's air-training scheme at last was adopted by the Canadian Government when the logic of events compelled it. But our air-training scheme should have been miles ahead—and would have been but for Premier King's opposition. The Canadian Air Force is what it is, and the Empire air-training scheme is what it is, not because of Government initiative, but in spite of the Canadian Government, because Canadian public opinion compelled it.

Thousands Frustrated by Government

The mobilization of men for the army has been a shameful failure. I have had some opportunity to judge of these matters. I have been petitioned by hosts of men—how many I cannot say—who have come to me asking if I had any "pull". When I asked them what for, they said, "To get us into the army. Can you do anything to open a door so that we can enlist?" Hundreds of thousands of men tried again and again to enlist; but were turned back heartbroken by a sense of frustration. In the meantime many of them have married, or have found other positions. The manhood of Canada has been like two great Clydesdale horses harnessed to a heavily-laden wagon mired to the hubs. Their driver has coaxed, and whipped, and done everything; and they have strained magnificently at their harness. But, finding it was impossible to move the wheels held fast in the mire, they at last settled back and ceased to pull.

That is the picture of thousands of men in Canada. And for that Premier King and his inexcusably incompetent Government are responsible. The Premier has never denied the allegation made by one of the leaders of the Canadian Legion that the British Government was asked at the outset of war to make a declaration to the effect that they did not need men from Canada, but only machines. In the beginning the Minister of Munitions said it was not possible to make tanks in Canada. He was like a boy who does not want to go to school, who multiplies excuses and says, "I can't do this", and, "I can't do that." The incompetence of Mr. Howe's department is little short of a national scandal.

Premier Godbout of Quebec

Premier Godbout, in November, nineteen-forty, disclosed the reason for the Government's attitude toward the raising of men for the armed services. We have quoted him again and again, but here repeat the quotation. Speaking at Plessisville, Quebec, he said:

"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.")

Why Conscription Is Opposed

But why are the French-Canadians so opposed to conscription? Personally, I do not like to lay the responsibility upon Quebec as a province; nor yet upon the French-Canadians as a race. But our difficulty is that while everybody knows the reason, pulpit and platform and press are all afraid to name it. The hindrance to the raising of a large army in Canada, and especially to the principle of conscription, is the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. In a recent address Professor Kirkconnel, as reported in the press, said that he "felt certain that by 1971 the French-Canadians alone would outnumber the Canadians of Anglo-Saxon origin if conditions in the Dominion continue as they are at present. He cited the Dionne quintuplets as a symbol of this change in the constitution of our population." Professor Kirkconnel said, "The French of 1931 comprised 31 per cent of the country's population, but were responsible for 38 per cent of the total births. The figures quoted by Professor Kirkconnel were as follows:

"French-Canadian population: 3,500,000. There are 2,500,000 new Canadians who had immigrated here from the various countries of Europe, and only 5,500,000 Canadians of Anglo-Saxon descent. Among the new Canadian group are 600,000 people whose ancestors were German, 300,000 of Ukrainian origin, 250,000 from the Scandinavian countries, 160,000 of Jewish origin, 150,000 of Polish origin, 100,000 of Italian origin, 80,000 of Russian origin, 40,000 of Czecho-Slovakian origin, 30,000 of Rumanian origin, and 10,000 of Greek origin."

I must repeat the same thing over and over again in order to drive it home. The Roman Catholic Hierarchy are determined to keep their men at home to breed their kind. They are quite willing that the potential fathers of Anglo-Saxon origin, and of non-Romanist faith, should be killed off.

But Dr. Kirkconnel said another thing, that he thought there was little hope of a large tide of British immigration after the war, as the people of Britain would have to stay at home to rebuild the country. The implication is that the immigration will come from countries in Europe which are Catholic countries; and we may be sure that the Roman Catholic Hierarchy will spare no pains to secure control of the Immigration Department of the Government, so that they may flood this country with Roman Catholics. And if, added to the wastage of war of potential Protestant fathers, the Roman Catholic birth rate is kept at high tide, and is augmented by Roman Catholic immigration, Protestants in this country will be in a minority long before 1971, or in much less than thirty years from now.

Ottawa Dominated by Italian Church

The simple fact is that the Roman Catholic Church is in the ascendancy at Ottawa. We might almost as well have an out-and-out Roman Catholic Government there. Roman Catholics are employed in all branches of the Civil Service in far greater proportion than their share of the population; and important positions in the Army Services are also held by Roman Catholics. The stationary personnel in many of the camps consists of Roman Catholics, many of them French. The fact is, they are establishing themselves everywhere.

R.C. Church Real Fifth Column

We have said it before, we say it again—and expect to continue to say it: the Roman Catholic Church is the real Fifth Column in Canada. There is not a paper in Toronto that will editorially place the responsibility for this condition of things where it belongs, upon the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. I feel it is much fairer to charge it to the Roman Catholic Church, where it belongs, than to blame Quebec as a province, or the French-Canadians as a race.

In a recent editorial *The Globe and Mail* appealed to the Liberal members of Parliament from Ontario to break their party ties, and assert themselves. I suppose if all the members of Parliament outside of Quebec were to unite in opposition to the Government, they could defeat the Government in the House. But why is it that the fifty-seven Liberal members of Parliament from Ontario are just as docile and just as obedient to the party lash as the Liberal members from Quebec? Why are they like dumb driven cattle in this hour of national crisis? The fact is, the papers, knowing how they would be visited with chastisement by the Roman Catholic Church, are afraid to tell the truth. Many of the Liberal members from Ontario owe their election to the Roman Catholic vote just as surely as do the Liberal members from Quebec. I insist, *it is not merely the Quebec Hierarchy as such, but the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in Canada as a whole, that is standing across our path, and preventing a larger war effort.*

What About Premier King?

But what shall we say of Premier King? The war threatens to come to our shores. Already they have had several blackouts in Vancouver and Victoria, and it is reported authentically that enemy planes have been over the mainland in California. We are told that the whole Province of Ontario will be put on a war footing as of December twentieth. Then we are to be prepared for blackouts at any hour. Well, it is a wise precaution. I hope we shall never actually need it—I question whether we shall; but whether or no, we must take the precautions. Mr. Churchill, as First Lord of the Admiralty at the beginning of the war, said that half the precautions the Admiralty felt obliged to take might, in experience, prove to have been unnecessary. But he said, "We must take such precautions, for we dare not take the risk of failing to do so."

So then, let us accept our lot. We go on a war footing as of December twentieth. I hope no compulsion of any sort will be necessary to secure one hundred per cent co-operation in all the provisions which the authorities may make.

Premier's Unfitness for War-Leadership Demonstrated

But all this suggests the nearness of our peril. The question I am forced now to ask is whether Mr. William Lyon Mackenzie King has changed his mind? His record so far is one of which no patriot could justly be proud. I do not desire to question his patriotism. His heart may be sounder than his head. But now that this special emergency has arisen, and we have an enemy at our back door—or at least at our Western door—there is no indication that the Premier has changed his mind, or that he is capable of doing so. He still puts party above country, and apparently thinks more of his political interests than of the safety of the people whose servant he is. He manifests not even an infinitesimal disposition to sacrifice anything for the country's good. The speech reported last night as made by Mr. Power, Minister for Air, in Montreal, is the usual stereotyped pronouncement. There is to be no conscription for military service. It is another sedative designed to drug the people of Canada into acquiescence with the *laissez-faire* of the King Administration.

What conclusion must we reach from all this? Britain changed its leadership because Mr. Chamberlain proved incompetent—and they changed it by the action of the elected members of Parliament without a general election. It was not necessary for the United States to change its leadership because President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull, Assistant-Secretary Sumner Wells, the Secretaries of the Navy and of the Army, were all thoroughly awake to the dangers of the international situation; and when the crisis came all the isolationists and non-interventionists changed front, and lined up behind the Government, and within four days a measure was passed by Congress which extended the service of the conscript army for the duration of the war, and made the armed services available for any war front anywhere in the world. Conscription is now the law for military service anywhere in the United States as in Britain: but not in Canada.

Canada Needs New Leader

Canada has been at war for over two years, and still the Premier tells us that he will never be a party to passing a conscription measure. To put the matter plainly, Mr. Mackenzie King has absolutely demonstrated his unfitness for leadership in time of war. Canada will never be capable of an "all out" war effort so long as Mr. King remains Premier. He is utterly incompetent for the task. He is as much a slave of the Hierarchy as was Lapointe. He has filled Mr. Lapointe's place with another French-Canadian from Quebec who was the Counsel for the Sirois Commission which framed the iniquitous proposals contained in the report and recommendations bearing that name. When Pontifical Mass was celebrated on Parliament Hill, Premier King, although it is by no means his habit to attend Church Sunday morning, on that day by his own initiative, he read the Scripture lesson in St. Andrew's Church, and thus used the Lord's Day, and the Lord's House, and the Lord's Word to play politics.

But now let me say something that may shock you. Mr. Lapointe is gone. I frankly and publicly declare that I have often asked the Lord to remove him. I stand on scriptural ground. The Bible does not make a saint of a man after he is dead. I believe Mr. Lapointe was the

chief evil genius of the King Administration. For myself, I say publicly, that it is my daily prayer that God, in mercy to Canada, will take Premier King out of the way. A stupendous miracle might create in him a capacity for war leadership which he has never yet displayed, but that is not usually the providential method. I think we have New Testament warrant for praying for the removal of men whose influence is against the interests of the kingdom of God on earth. One thing of which we may be sure: a just God will not answer an unjust prayer; but for myself, I here and now publicly announce, that in view of his record, I have no hope whatever of Mr. King's ever being anything but a hindrance to Canada's war effort; and therefore I am going to pray daily that God will do something with him to take him out of the way. And I invite those of you who know how to pray, if the Lord should lay it thus upon your hearts also, daily to pray that the Lord would clear the way for an "all out" Canadian war effort. This is my testimony at least: "I cannot hold my peace because thou hast heard, O my soul, the sound of the trumpet, the alarm of war."

Let us pray:

Thou knowest, O Lord, we are in sore need, surrounded by dangers which are far greater than some have yet realized. Do Thou cover us with Thy feathers, and cause us to trust under Thy wings; make Thy truth to be our shield and buckler. We believe, O Lord, that Thou wilt yet give us complete victory. We pray that Thou wilt help us here in Canada, that we may worthily play our part in this great world-struggle.

Deal, we pray Thee, with all our Legislators, with every member of the Canadian House of Commons, with every member of the Senate. Thou hast heard what we have said; and, O Lord, we cannot but feel that we have said that which is in accord with the righteous principles revealed in Thy word. If it could be possible that Thou couldst make this man over again, and give him a capacity for leadership which he has never yet displayed, if Thou wouldst make him a man of conviction and courage instead of a man of compromise we will praise Thee—but if not, lay Thy hand upon him and in Thine own way rid this country of the obstacle of his premiership. We do not say how: Thou knowest how; but do, we beseech Thee, give us deliverance so that the untapped resources of this great Dominion, in men and material, may be drawn together and mobilized for this great war against evil.

Hear us in this our prayer; and in Thine own time and way, for the sake of Him Who is first King of righteousness and after that King of peace, grant us our request. We ask it in His name, Amen.

AN ONTARIO FRENCH-LANGUAGE PAPER

(The following gem is from an Ontario Roman Catholic French-language paper translated by Rev. W. S. Whitcombe, M.A.)

From *La Feuille d'Erable*.

"In Toronto the good, Citizen Shields continues to fulminate against all that is Catholic and French. It seems that the church in which he holds his discussions overflows and that the flood of his fanatical auditors makes its way towards other places of worship where the same oratorical menu is served to their heated spirits. The austere Knox Presbyterian Church has now become the arena where the same red rag is flourished to excite the people against the papacy and the "interference of Rome" in Canadian affairs. And all that in the name of national unity!!! Would it not be possible, however, even in Protestant places of worship, to say something once in a while of social righteousness and of the Christian faith? . . . And since when has the Gospel of Christ, which these gentlemen claim as we do, become a Gospel of hatred and discord."

—Jean de Fierbois.

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.")

Why Conscription Is Opposed

But why are the French-Canadians so opposed to conscription? Personally, I do not like to lay the responsibility upon Quebec as a province; nor yet upon the French-Canadians as a race. But our difficulty is that while everybody knows the reason, pulpit and platform and press are all afraid to name it. The hindrance to the raising of a large army in Canada, and especially to the principle of conscription, is the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. In a recent address Professor Kirkconnel, as reported in the press, said that he "felt certain that by 1971 the French-Canadians alone would outnumber the Canadians of Anglo-Saxon origin if conditions in the Dominion continue as they are at present. He cited the Dionne quintuplets as a symbol of this change in the constitution of our population." Professor Kirkconnel said, "The French of 1931 comprised 31 per cent of the country's population, but were responsible for 38 per cent of the total births. The figures quoted by Professor Kirkconnel were as follows:

"French-Canadian population: 3,500,000. There are 2,500,000 new Canadians who had immigrated here from the various countries of Europe, and only 5,500,000 Canadians of Anglo-Saxon descent. Among the new Canadian group are 600,000 people whose ancestors were German, 300,000 of Ukrainian origin, 250,000 from the Scandinavian countries, 160,000 of Jewish origin, 150,000 of Polish origin, 100,000 of Italian origin, 80,000 of Russian origin, 40,000 of Czecho-Slovakian origin, 30,000 of Rumanian origin, and 10,000 of Greek origin."

I must repeat the same thing over and over again in order to drive it home. The Roman Catholic Hierarchy are determined to keep their men at home to breed their kind. They are quite willing that the potential fathers of Anglo-Saxon origin, and of non-Romanist faith, should be killed off.

But Dr. Kirkconnel said another thing, that he thought there was little hope of a large tide of British immigration after the war, as the people of Britain would have to stay at home to rebuild the country. The implication is that the immigration will come from countries in Europe which are Catholic countries; and we may be sure that the Roman Catholic Hierarchy will spare no pains to secure control of the Immigration Department of the Government, so that they may flood this country with Roman Catholics. And if, added to the wastage of war of potential Protestant fathers, the Roman Catholic birth rate is kept at high tide, and is augmented by Roman Catholic immigration, Protestants in this country will be in a minority long before 1971, or in much less than thirty years from now.

Ottawa Dominated by Italian Church

The simple fact is that the Roman Catholic Church is in the ascendancy at Ottawa. We might almost as well have an out-and-out Roman Catholic Government there. Roman Catholics are employed in all branches of the Civil Service in far greater proportion than their share of the population; and important positions in the Army Services are also held by Roman Catholics. The stationary personnel in many of the camps consists of Roman Catholics, many of them French. The fact is, they are establishing themselves everywhere.

R.C. Church Real Fifth Column

We have said it before, we say it again—and expect to continue to say it: the Roman Catholic Church is the real Fifth Column in Canada. There is not a paper in Toronto that will editorially place the responsibility for this condition of things where it belongs, upon the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. I feel it is much fairer to charge it to the Roman Catholic Church, where it belongs, than to blame Quebec as a province, or the French-Canadians as a race.

In a recent editorial *The Globe and Mail* appealed to the Liberal members of Parliament from Ontario to break their party ties, and assert themselves. I suppose if all the members of Parliament outside of Quebec were to unite in opposition to the Government, they could defeat the Government in the House. But why is it that the fifty-seven Liberal members of Parliament from Ontario are just as docile and just as obedient to the party lash as the Liberal members from Quebec? Why are they like dumb driven cattle in this hour of national crisis? The fact is, the papers, knowing how they would be visited with chastisement by the Roman Catholic Church, are afraid to tell the truth. Many of the Liberal members from Ontario owe their election to the Roman Catholic vote just as surely as do the Liberal members from Quebec. I insist, *it is not merely the Quebec Hierarchy as such, but the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in Canada as a whole, that is standing across our path, and preventing a larger war effort.*

What About Premier King?

But what shall we say of Premier King? The war threatens to come to our shores. Already they have had several blackouts in Vancouver and Victoria, and it is reported authentically that enemy planes have been over the mainland in California. We are told that the whole Province of Ontario will be put on a war footing as of December twentieth. Then we are to be prepared for blackouts at any hour. Well, it is a wise precaution. I hope we shall never actually need it—I question whether we shall; but whether or no, we must take the precautions. Mr. Churchill, as First Lord of the Admiralty at the beginning of the war, said that half the precautions the Admiralty felt obliged to take might, in experience, prove to have been unnecessary. But he said, "We must take such precautions, for we dare not take the risk of failing to do so."

So then, let us accept our lot. We go on a war footing as of December twentieth. I hope no compulsion of any sort will be necessary to secure one hundred per cent cooperation in all the provisions which the authorities may make.

Premier's Unfitness for War-Leadership Demonstrated

But all this suggests the nearness of our peril. The question I am forced now to ask is whether Mr. William Lyon Mackenzie King has changed his mind? His record so far is one of which no patriot could justly be proud. I do not desire to question his patriotism. His heart may be sounder than his head. But now that this special emergency has arisen, and we have an enemy at our back door—or at least at our Western door—there is no indication that the Premier has changed his mind, or that he is capable of doing so. He still puts party above country, and apparently thinks more of his political interests than of the safety of the people whose servant he is. He manifests not even an infinitesimal disposition to sacrifice anything for the country's good. The speech reported last night as made by Mr. Power, Minister for Air, in Montreal, is the usual stereotyped pronouncement. There is to be no conscription for military service. It is another sedative designed to drug the people of Canada into acquiescence with the *laissez-faire* of the King Administration.

What conclusion must we reach from all this? Britain changed its leadership because Mr. Chamberlain proved incompetent—and they changed it by the action of the elected members of Parliament without a general election. It was not necessary for the United States to change its leadership because President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull, Assistant-Secretary Sumner Wells, the Secretaries of the Navy and of the Army, were all thoroughly awake to the dangers of the international situation; and when the crisis came all the isolationists and non-interventionists changed front, and lined up behind the Government, and within four days a measure was passed by Congress which extended the service of the conscript army for the duration of the war, and made the armed services available for any war front anywhere in the world. Conscription is now the law for military service anywhere in the United States as in Britain: but not in Canada.

Canada Needs New Leader

Canada has been at war for over two years, and still the Premier tells us that he will never be a party to passing a conscription measure. To put the matter plainly, Mr. Mackenzie King has absolutely demonstrated his unfitness for leadership in time of war. Canada will never be capable of an "all out" war effort so long as Mr. King remains Premier. He is utterly incompetent for the task. He is as much a slave of the Hierarchy as was Lapointe. He has filled Mr. Lapointe's place with another French-Canadian from Quebec who was the Counsel for the Sirois Commission which framed the iniquitous proposals contained in the report and recommendations bearing that name. When Pontifical Mass was celebrated on Parliament Hill, Premier King, although it is by no means his habit to attend Church Sunday morning, on that day by his own initiative, he read the Scripture lesson in St. Andrew's Church, and thus used the Lord's Day, and the Lord's House, and the Lord's Word to play politics.

But now let me say something that may shock you. Mr. Lapointe is gone. I frankly and publicly declare that I have often asked the Lord to remove him. I stand on scriptural ground. The Bible does not make a saint of a man after he is dead. I believe Mr. Lapointe was the

chief evil genius of the King Administration. For myself, I say publicly, that it is my daily prayer that God, in mercy to Canada, will take Premier King out of the way. A stupendous miracle might create in him a capacity for war leadership which he has never yet displayed, but that is not usually the providential method. I think we have New Testament warrant for praying for the removal of men whose influence is against the interests of the kingdom of God on earth. One thing of which we may be sure: a just God will not answer an unjust prayer; but for myself, I here and now publicly announce, that in view of his record, I have no hope whatever of Mr. King's ever being anything but a hindrance to Canada's war effort; and therefore I am going to pray daily that God will do something with him to take him out of the way. And I invite those of you who know how to pray, if the Lord should lay it thus upon your hearts also, daily to pray that the Lord would clear the way for an "all out" Canadian war effort. This is my testimony at least: "I cannot hold my peace because thou hast heard, O my soul, the sound of the trumpet, the alarm of war."

Let us pray:

Thou knowest, O Lord, we are in sore need, surrounded by dangers which are far greater than some have yet realized. Do Thou cover us with Thy feathers, and cause us to trust under Thy wings; make Thy truth to be our shield and buckler. We believe, O Lord, that Thou wilt yet give us complete victory. We pray that Thou wilt help us here in Canada, that we may worthily play our part in this great world-struggle.

Deal, we pray Thee, with all our Legislators, with every member of the Canadian House of Commons, with every member of the Senate. Thou hast heard what we have said; and, O Lord, we cannot but feel that we have said that which is in accord with the righteous principles revealed in Thy word. If it could be possible that Thou couldst make this man over again, and give him a capacity for leadership which he has never yet displayed, if Thou wouldst make him a man of conviction and courage instead of a man of compromise we will praise Thee—but if not, lay Thy hand upon him and in Thine own way rid this country of the obstacle of his premiership. We do not say how: Thou knowest how; but do, we beseech Thee, give us deliverance so that the untapped resources of this great Dominion, in men and material, may be drawn together and mobilized for this great war against evil.

Hear us in this our prayer; and in Thine own time and way, for the sake of Him Who is first King of righteousness and after that King of peace, grant us our request. We ask it in His name, Amen.

AN ONTARIO FRENCH-LANGUAGE PAPER

(The following gem is from an Ontario Roman Catholic French-language paper translated by Rev. W. S. Whitcombe, M.A.)

From *La Feuille d'Erable*.

"In Toronto the good, Citizen Shields continues to fulminate against all that is Catholic and French. It seems that the church in which he holds his discussions overflows and that the flood of his fanatical auditors makes its way towards other places of worship where the same oratorical menu is served to their heated spirits. The austere Knox Presbyterian Church has now become the arena where the same red rag is flourished to excite the people against the papacy and the "interference of Rome" in Canadian affairs. And all that in the name of national unity!!! Would it not be possible, however, even in Protestant places of worship, to say something once in a while of social righteousness and of the Christian faith? . . . And since when has the Gospel of Christ, which these gentlemen claim as we do, become a Gospel of hatred and discord."

—Jean de Fierbois.

EDITORIAL NOTES

The Papacy and Japan

It is most interesting and instructive to observe that every nation whom the Pope blesses, soon shows itself an enemy of Britain and the United States. Elsewhere in this issue, under the caption, "Echoes of the Ottawa Meeting", we reproduce a letter from an Ottawa paper, written by a Roman Catholic priest of that city. As usual, he lectures on the necessity of promoting national unity; but now a new problem emerges in the international sphere.

Japan is at war with the United States, and with the British Empire; and now is acting in full military co-operation with Germany and Italy. The Pope has repeatedly blessed Italian soldiers. He blessed the Italian rape of Ethiopia. He has given his blessing to German soldiers. The leaders of nearly all the countries at war with Britain are Roman Catholics. That is true of Roumania, and we believe of Bulgaria, of that part of Yugoslavia which is cooperating with Hitler, of Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, of course of Italy, of Vichy France, and the traitor Leopold of Belgium, of the benevolently neutral Franco.

But what of Japan? In THE GOSPEL WITNESS of April 10th, 1941, there appeared an article by Rev. W. G. Brown, M.A., entitled, "The Pope, THE GOSPEL WITNESS, and *The Globe and Mail*." In that article Mr. Brown said in part:

On the C.B.C. noon broadcast of Wednesday, April 2nd, we were told of the hour's audience (to be exact, 65 minutes) the Japanese Foreign Minister, Matsuoka had with the Roman Pontiff. A later conference of 45 minutes with the Papal Secretary of State is also reported. According to the broadcast, the Pope said:

"I have sent the apostolic blessing to your dear far off country."

Pope Blesses Birds of Prey

Under the title, "Pope Blesses Birds of Prey", and as a last minute article, we changed the make-up of THE GOSPEL WITNESS last week to insert the report of the Pope's benediction. We said, in part:

"Father Lanphier and Father Battle are constantly telling us over the Catholic Hour broadcast by the Radio League of St. Michael that Roman Catholics are praying and working for British victory, yet these Reverend Fathers owe supreme allegiance on earth to one whom they call His Holiness and believe to be the viceregent of Christ. . . ."

"Will Father Lanphier or Father Battle, or whatever Father broadcasts next Sunday, please explain the apostolic blessing upon the eastern vulture?"

Pontiff Compliments Matsuoka

THE GOSPEL WITNESS appears on Thursday, and on Friday morning *The Globe and Mail* had a leading 14-inch editorial beginning:

"MEASURE OF STATESMANSHIP"

"The despatch from Rome attributing highly complimentary remarks by His Holiness to the Japanese Foreign Minister Yosuke Matsuoka, must leave the intelligent world bewildered. Matsuoka went to the Italian capital as the representative of one angle of the Axis, after visiting Moscow and Berlin, a tour manifestly not concerned with the welfare of peoples who believe in liberties, either religious or political. He is reported to have had a sixty-five minute private audience with the Pope and a later conference lasting three-quarters of an hour with the Papal Secretary of State. The Pontiff is alleged to have expressed pleasure with the audience, called Matsuoka a great statesman and given Japan his blessing.

"The Vatican has not been blessing totalitarian nations and giving cheer to their emissaries."
No reader of THE GOSPEL WITNESS; we presume, at least no regular reader, would be "bewildered" by the "highly complimentary remarks by His Holiness".

The editorial continues:

"The Vatican has not been blessing totalitarian nations and giving cheer to their emissaries."
This, of course, has not been the position taken by THE GOSPEL WITNESS. See such editions as the following:

"The Pope's 'Fine Italian Hand' in Petain's Treachery"

"The Pope's Fifth Column—Everywhere"

"Why Should the Pope Help Hitler?"

"How Hitlerism and the Papal Inquisition Confirm the Historical Truth of Scripture"

"The Religious Significance of the Rout of the Papacy's Italian Allies"

"Can We Believe the Pope?"

We shall not here repeat all that was said there, but shall be glad to supply back copies, as far as possible, to those desiring them.

Romanism and Freedom

Further on in this editorial, *The Globe and Mail* remarks:

"The Pope is respected by fair-minded people of all creeds, Protestant as well as Catholic. As the head of a great Church his word is final with millions around the earth. There are more than 20,000,000 faithful Catholics in the United States, a country insulted right and left by Japanese statesmanship. There are millions of devout followers in Canada. What effect is such valuation likely to have on them?"

"We cannot think of freedom to worship apart from democracy".

Mr. Brown then discussed the remarks of a Reverend "Father" Battle who had spoken in the Catholic Hour on C.B.C.; and continued:

Tell It to the Marines!

Father Battle also said last Sunday:

"No political significance is ever attached to any blessing upon any country."

He said that all kinds of people were very cordially received by the Pope at all times, and he prays for the spiritual welfare of all peoples.

Even *The Globe and Mail* attached some political significance to the blessing given Japan, and, according to the reports, "His Holiness" said "Mr. Matsuoka is a great statesman." To reply that

"no political significance is ever attached to any blessing upon any country"

is quite inadequate. Tell that to the marines!

Who Are the Bigots?

Here is Father Battle again, and this paragraph is what led us to assume, though wrongly, according to our later information, that he was speaking against THE GOSPEL WITNESS, for surely he would not accuse *The Globe and Mail* of bigotry! Judge for yourself!

"We are sorry that religious bigotry did not pass away with the horse and buggy. . . . To me bigotry has always been not only an evil thing, but the silliest of things. The relations between Catholics and Protestants have improved. . . during the last sixty years. Only some come along to upset the applecart."

Talk about religious bigotry always comes strangely from a Roman Catholic priest. Rome is the most bigoted church in the world. They believe they are the only church; that all who are not members of that church will be eternally lost. Through the ages they have burned millions of people for daring to differ. The doctrine of intolerance, the right to burn heretics, is still part of Rome's doctrine. And yet they talk to us Protestants about bigotry! Father Battle may be a very fine man, and may have had amicable relations with Protestants, and may desire to continue them, but for someone to point out the way in which Rome is not only failing to stand against evil, but is taking sides with evil, is surely not bigotry.

Thus it appears that the Pope's blessing bestowed upon any nation indicates that nation's agreement with

Rome's political programme. We were informed only yesterday of a matter that had escaped our observation in the press to the effect that while Protestant missionaries had left Japan, Roman Catholic missionaries were permitted to remain;—and that the Japanese Government had some time ago accorded some sort of recognition to the Roman Catholic Church. We shall endeavour to publish further verification of this report later.

When we count our blessings, and name them one by one, in the list let us not forget to include the fact that the Pope has not yet sent his blessing to Britain, or the Netherlands, or Free France, or to Greece, or to China, or to the United States. In our opinion the benediction of the Pope, if it has any effect at all, is about as desirable as an attack of typhus or yellow fever. Happily, his anathemas are quite innocuous.

Buchmanism or "Oxford" Groupism

Eight years ago we gave an address on the above subject, in which we showed its unbiblical, and non-Christian character. Not a few earnest souls were offended by our strictures, others were forewarned and avoided it. The address was published as a booklet and 30,000 copies were sold throughout the world. Since then many have discerned the true inwardness of the movement, and its utterly deceptive character. We print some press reports about it. One from *The Sunday Chronicle* of Manchester, England, October 26th, 1941, and the second from the magazine *Time*:

BUCHMAN GOES ON TOUR

NEWS—at last Dr. Frank Buchman, Oxford Group leader.

After the debate on exemption from war service of Oxford Group evangelists; after the challenge to Buchman to recant his statement: "I thank God for Hitler"; after Buchman's mysterious disappearance and refusal to answer any question on his attitude to the war, an anxious world is told what the doctor has been up to.

Yesterday the London headquarters of the Oxford Group issued this "accurate information from Augusta, Maine"—which, of course, is in the U.S.A.:

"Dr. Buchman has completed a tour of New England under the sponsorship of the governors of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Rhode Island and Maine. He has been assisting the governors in their defence programme."

Visions of the great moral rearmament leader turning his attention to the practical question of rearmament with tanks and guns are dispelled by the vagueness of the doctor's aims. Frank Buchman had a four-point programme on his tour:

1.—To conquer civilian apathy.

The group add no comment. Apathy about what? Their reaction to Buchman's belief in Hitler or his remark that "Himmler is a great lad?"

2.—To anticipate the strategy of subversive forces and create the community spirit in which these forces find it impossible to work.

It all depends on what you call subversive forces, doesn't it, brother?

3.—To create sustained co-operation between management and labour in the defence industries.

Will either workers or employers welcome the social programme of Dr. Buchman, who has been called by Mr. A. P. Herbert, M.P., no true friend of Britain?

4.—To prepare the country to face shortage of raw materials and scarcity of foodstuffs.

The doctor's programme, we are also told, "provides for the establishment of home defence schools for civilian morale."

We suggest that civilian morale might be improved if the founder of the schools defined his own attitude to the war against which the defence is being prepared.

LESS BUCHMANISM

From *Time*, November 11, 1941

Buchmanism's recent disastrous decline in both Britain and America was highlighted this month when it lost both its U.S. headquarters and its chief U.S. exponent. Rector Samuel Moor Shoemaker of Manhattan's Calvary Episcopal Church did this double job of ousting the cult from his parish house and declaring that "after careful thought and prayer" he himself had quit the movement because of his "increasing misgivings."

Dr. Shoemaker's misgivings are not the first that have been felt about tony Evangelist Frank Nathan Daniel Buchman, who has led a series of hit-&-run house-party revivals, known successively as "Buchmanism," "A First Century Christian Fellowship," "The Oxford Group" and "Moral Rearmament (MRA)." All have a free-&-easy panacea, best summed up in MRA's California drive last year: "You don't join anything, you don't pay anything, the idea is that you begin living the MRA standards."

One of these standards, "absolute honesty," British Humorist A. P. Herbert hoisted with devastating effect in the House of Commons last month by quoting Frank Buchman's varying entries in *Who's Who* between 1928 and 1939. Sample Buchman claim he riddled: "studied at Cambridge University 1921-22." That debate was a Waterloo for Buchmanism. Its 172 followers in Parliament (the fruit of two years' intensive lobbying) were all set to protest Labor Minister Ernest Bevin's refusal to exempt the Group's lay evangelists from military service. When Herbert and Bevin got through, not one of the 172 cared to reply.

Since then, secessions from the Group have landslided in Britain. Example: Sir Patrick Joseph Henry Hannon, industrialist, member of Parliament, ardent Group sympathizer. Last week Sir Patrick derided Buchmanite claims to have settled three impending work stoppages in the Midlands by urging Buchmanite principles on management and labor. Sir Patrick investigated, decided that the trouble had been cured by "sordid means like better pay and better hours."

In the U.S. Evangelist Buchman is losing followers not only through this recent setback in Britain but because many Buchmanites, including Dr. Shoemaker, now believe that he wants to form an independent sect. He has abandoned his onetime claim that Buchmanism simply makes Baptists better Baptists, Catholics better Catholics, etc. Result: he is rapidly losing the active churohmen he had in his ranks, recruiting few new members from the churches.

One tip-off on the Group's tobogganing is that publicity-wise Groupers, who for years not only welcomed but pursued the press, have lately avoided reporters like the plague both in Britain and the U.S. Evangelist Buchman, who is now trying to convert Maine to MRA, last week dodged correspondents everywhere he went. MRA has had little luck in Maine since its advent there last June. The general Down East reaction to its smooth, eupeptic preachers: "What's the catch?"

A WORD ABOUT L. H. SAUNDERS

Sec.-Treas. of THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE

In what we are about to write, we are breaking new ground for THE GOSPEL WITNESS. Mr. Saunders is known to many of our readers as the virile Editor of *Protestant Action*. When THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE was formed, we seemed to turn instinctively to Mr. Saunders, as the logical man for Secretary-Treasurer. We have found already that no mistake was made.

Mr. Saunders has made himself an expert in his knowledge of the relation of the Public School System

to the Separate School. He served three years on the Board of Education, heading the polls in 1940, and elected by acclamation in 1941. He served six years as Alderman in the city of North Bay. He served in the Great War, and was wounded at the age of seventeen. Mr. Saunders is a forceful speaker, fearless in debate, and independent in politics and in action.

Mr. Saunders is a candidate for Alderman in Ward One in Toronto. We mention him because he is being opposed by a Roman Catholic. It should be remembered by Toronto citizens that nearly all the beer-parlours are run by Roman Catholics; and Roman Catholics are trying to secure control of affairs in the City of Toronto, as elsewhere. We would venture therefore to suggest to all our readers who live and vote in Ward One in Toronto, that if they want a representative after their own mind, they should vote for L. H. Saunders. Were we a resident of Ward One, we would even "plump" Mr. Saunders—by which we mean, we would vote for him alone; and thus give him a lead by so much in the Aldermanic race.

Roman Catholicism is primarily a political organization. It furthers its interests by political means; and for this reason Protestants cannot alienate themselves from political matters. We think it would be of great value to the City of Toronto to have a man of unquestioned integrity, who is an independent, fearless Protestant like Mr. Leslie H. Saunders, in the City Council.

The Canadian Protestant League

Our readers will be glad to know that interest in THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE seems to be mounting day by day. The mail is quite heavy, and is representative of the whole Dominion.

THE LEAGUE is planning to hold meetings all over the country, like the one recently held in Ottawa. It is definitely arranged, of course, that there will be a monthly public meeting in Toronto, which will be held in different churches. There will be one address at each meeting; and the addresses will constitute a series of related subjects. Each address will be published in booklet form, and will be available for the entire membership of THE LEAGUE. We can promise that the work on these addresses will be very thoroughly done, so that they may be used by groups of LEAGUE members as subjects of personal study. We are convinced that the best way to awaken Protestants to this Italian menace in Canada is to inform them as to what Roman Catholicism really is:

In addition to our monthly meetings in Toronto, we propose at a not very distant date to hold meetings in Kingston, another in Ottawa, and in all Ontario cities. Already THE LEAGUE has received invitations from the Maritime Provinces, which we expect to accept; and we shall endeavour also to arrange a meeting of THE LEAGUE somewhere in Montreal. Already we have substantial groups of LEAGUE members in all the Prairie Provinces; and west to Vancouver and Victoria. And we hope before the summer is ended to have covered the entire Dominion. We shall be glad to hear from our LEAGUE members on the matter of holding meetings anywhere throughout the Dominion.

French-Canadian "Solidarity" and "National Unity"

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation refuses to allow English-speaking Protestants in Toronto the use of the air-ways for the broadcasting of religious programmes that embody controversy. That is the policy of this government body when it has to do with English-speaking Protestants in Toronto. But in the Province of Quebec, and in the Federal capital of Ottawa, which politically appears to have been annexed by the French-speaking province, another policy is followed. As evidence of this we submit to our readers the following translation of extracts from the text of a radio talk given by a French Catholic priest over C.B.C. The title of the radio talk was "Solidarity Condition of Survival." The survival under discussion was that of French and Catholic Survival in America; for "French" and "Catholic" in the minds and in the speech of the great majority of French-Canadians are identical. The priest who gave the talk is a member of the "Permanent Committee for French Survival in America". If the following extracts from his speech broadcast at public expense over C.B.C. are not examples of controversy, then we should like the governors of that body to tell us what they mean by the word "controversial".

"The third group is that of the French in Ontario. There are now more than 300,000 of them, all children of old Quebec, manifesting an activity that is more and more effective, more and more fruitful for the maintenance of French Civilization in this country. They are *valiant fighters*, they have to *combat adversaries* that are powerful, clever, and stubborn. But the French in Ontario, strong in their national, historical, and constitutional rights, *organized the resistance*, and thanks to their Association, to their leaders, and to the spirit of justice of the best elements of the English majority, have succeeded in *upsetting the plans of the enemies* of their language and their culture; it was thus they obtained, for example, the abolition of the famous Regulation XVII, and gained more and more of the sympathy of their fellow-citizens and of the authorities of the Province. But it is still true that they live in unfavourable circumstances, and that *certain fanatics of the type of Pastor Shields are constantly trying to deprive them of their rights.*" (Emphases are ours.—G.W.)

Here is a French-speaking priest of the Roman Church who boasts of the conquests of his church over "adversaries that are powerful, clever, and stubborn." And who are the adversaries? They are the English-speaking citizens of the Province of Ontario. Is this the National Unity of which the present partisan government at Ottawa boasts?

It is of special importance to note that this French priest was not only allowed to speak on a controversial subject in an offensive manner, but he was actually permitted to cast a slur on Dr. Shields, whom he mentioned by name and described as a fanatic. But let Dr. Shields ask for the privilege of purchasing time over the C.B.C. to reply to this slur. He would have received a suave letter from the offices of the C.B.C. informing him that no controversy is permitted over the air in Canada. The government radio system ties the hands of Protestants while it goes through their pockets to relieve them of a fee for the maintenance of a powerful radio system that Roman priests and their agents employ to abuse them.

The president of the "Permanent Committee for French Survival in America" of which this priest is a member has for its president a certain Mr. Adrien Pouliot. And this Mr. Pouliot is also a governor of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Thus does the solid block in Quebec control governmental agencies for the ends of the Roman Catholic Church.—W. S. W.

An Illuminating Letter

The following letter is most illuminating: Mr. Phillipps claims to have "knowledge of the mutual bitterness and intolerance of long ago." But it is quite evident Mr. Phillipps has no knowledge of the Church's present attitude, and is quite unaware that it is the Church's constant boast that she never changes. It may interest Mr. Phillipps also to know that the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, at a recent gathering in the United States, reaffirmed its adherence to the Papal doctrine of the two swords—that perhaps not much more than a month ago.

It is such men as Mr. Phillipps who are the Fifth Columnists within Protestant ranks, and who open the door for Roman Catholic influence to affect the disintegration of Protestant bodies. When we say that Mr. Phillipps' attitude is that of a Fifth Columnist, we would have our readers carefully to observe that we say we are speaking of the Fifth Column principle within Protestant organizations, and that it has no reference to a man's loyalty to his country.

With all respect to the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, we do not agree that his official position necessitates any such action as is here announced. The Lieutenant-Governor is a representative of His Majesty, King George, and His Majesty is sworn to uphold the Protestant religion "as by law established." We cannot conceive of His Majesty the King attending a Roman Catholic Mass; and if the King himself never does so, his representative, whether in Manitoba, Ontario, or elsewhere, is under no obligation to do so.

Poor blind Mr. Phillipps is utterly unaware that the Roman Catholic Church is the most divisive force in human society anywhere. What nonsense to talk about national unity or religious tolerance! The Roman Church divides maritally, educationally, politically, industrially. It insists no one is married unless a priest has married them. It insists on its own Separate Schools. It insists on its own separate chaplain service in the army—not only its individual chaplains, but a special and separate Chaplain-General. It has its own labour organizations, its own financial organizations. Its recently organized Sword of the Spirit Movement, which was hailed by short-sighted Protestants in England as a movement in which all could unite, at its first annual meeting excluded from active membership all but Roman Catholics.

Not only so, but for Mr. Phillipps' information, we may say that the Roman Church still teaches and insists that it is absolutely indispensable to salvation that every human creature shall be subject to the Roman Pontiff. That is the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church on this 17th day of December, 1941. So that from the cradle to the grave—and beyond the grave: at the judgment-seat—the Roman Catholic Church still divides; and the condition of entrance to heaven is submission to the blasphemous pretender who calls himself the vicar of Christ.

We publish Mr. Phillipps' letter to show how credulous uninformed non-Catholics can be.

Hugh Phillipps, K.C.

Winnipeg, Canada.
December 15th, 1941.

Dear Sir:—

I thank you for publication of my letter of 3rd ultimo. You did not, however, send me a copy of your observations thereon. I have been otherwise acquainted therewith.

You must not assume I have no knowledge of the mutual bitterness and intolerance of long ago; try and remember we have all made much progress since those days and, urged by the preachings of our Ministers of the Gospel, have softened our prejudices and developed a spirit of mutual tolerance and brotherly respect towards our fellow-man.

You are not serving any useful purpose by trying to stir up ancient bigotries, try and bend your efforts to promoting national unity and a spirit of mutual tolerance and respect for our fellow Canadians who are just as good Christians as we are, though our forms of worship and beliefs may differ; you gain nothing by insulting their beliefs.

We live harmoniously with our Roman Catholic friends in the West, we respect them and they us, as you may gather from an article in our daily paper which I quote, our respected Lieutenant-Governor being a member of the United Church—

"McWilliams to Attend High Mass Sunday"

"Hon. R. F. McWilliams, Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba and Mrs. McWilliams will be present at High Mass next Sunday morning in the Parish Church for Italian people in Winnipeg. The following statement was issued from Government House: In recognition of the loyalty of Canadians of Italian origin in these difficult times, the Lieutenant-Governor and Mrs. McWilliams will attend divine service in Holy Rosary Church Sunday at 11 o'clock."

Our Lieutenant-Governor is highly respected and is doing a wonderful work in promotion of national unity and religious tolerance; try and follow his good example and forget the worn-out prejudices of ancient days. I would be glad if this may be published by you.

Yours faithfully,
HUGH PHILLIPPS.

T. T. Shields, Esq.,
Editor, The Gospel Witness,
130 Gerrard Street E.,
Toronto, 2, Ontario.

"The Roman Catholic Question"

(How Thomas Carlyle illustrated "The Roman Catholic question", "Disestablishment of the Irish Church". From the Book "Some Personal Reminiscences of Carlyle" by James Andrew Symington, Page 90.)

"I come into my room, said he (Carlyle) and find it all overrun with rats. They are swarming over the floor, the chairs, sofas—rats hungry and ravenous; rats here, there, and everywhere! Wishing to live at peace and be on good friendly, or at least neighbourly terms, I make a proposition to them in this style: Rats, say I, here is my cheese, and here is my bacon. I wish to do fairly by you. Suppose we come to an understanding. I shall cut the cheese and the bacon, each right down the middle. The one half shall be yours and the other half mine; no objection is offered and the paction is made and Ratified. (Carlyle very seldom condescended to a pun.)

"The rats speedily devoured their share; but when that is done they immediately proceeded to eat up mine, and if this kind of thing be allowed to go on, they certainly

will not stop till they have finished all the cheese and bacon, but have picked our skeletons clean into the bargain. That is what the rats are bent on doing. It is not a share they want but *all*; and the disestablishment of the 'Irish Church' is a breaking down of barriers, a making way for 'The Rats'; and consequently, tends to sweep away religion itself, *where, a little more of that preserving salt is needed at the present time.*"

Echoes From The Ottawa Meeting

From a Civil Service Worker

Ottawa, Dec. 15, 1941.

My dear Dr. Shields:

I am enclosing a clipping in the form of a letter to the "Citizen" about the Protestant Rally. I regret that I had to work until ten o'clock that night, and when I got to the Hotel the crowd was so dense in the lobby that I could not get near the door to hear anything you said. Is there not a church that is brave enough to invite you to speak where we can all hear? Surely Rome has not got a strangle hold on the so-called Protestant Ministry?

At the Protestant Rally

Editor, Citizen: In the welter of lies which inevitably accompany modern warfare it is refreshing to find an occasion when one may listen to some good, wholesome truth.

I am therefore grateful to the organizers of and to the speakers at the recent rally of the Canadian Protestant League held in the Chateau Laurier.

It was nice to learn that one of the speakers, the Rev. T. Christie Innes, is one of my own countrymen. I was glad to find that he possessed the courage and intelligence for which we are truly famous.

The other speaker, the Rev. T. T. Shields, is a typical John Bull; he is emotional, aggressive, and has an abundance of shrewd common sense.

I hope to be privileged to attend more of such rallies.—

JOHN LYONS, Ottawa, Dec. 11, 1941.

From Ottawa Journal, December 16, 1941

The Journal has received a number of letters discussing the recent public address in Ottawa of Rev. Dr. Shields of Toronto, but does not propose to publish any of them. Dr. Shields' meeting, which was attended by some hundreds of people, was reported adequately, and that was the duty of a newspaper. But obviously no good purpose could be served by opening our Letters column to an angry controversy.

Father Saint-Denis Replies

Editor, Citizen: At the same time as a notorious Protestant minister was blasting at the Catholic Church, the Japanese were sinking two of Britain's finest battleships. Yet some people persist to consider the Pope a worse enemy than the Japs and the Nazis. Such morbidity, such phobias cannot be cured by any appeal to reason, but deserve our sincere pity.

Instead of dividing Canadians, at this hour of trial, why does not that loud reverend preach Christian unity and charity? Is it impossible to have a Protestant rally without indulging in vile abuse against the Church from which Luther and Henry VIII broke away—HENRI SAINT-DENIS, Ottawa, Dec. 10, 1941.

R. C. Priest's Oath

From a United States paper of forty-five years ago.

CONCERNING OATHS

G. A. Hubbard Adds a Few Words to the Controversy

One of the latest phases of the discussion is the reference to oaths, and upon this question G. A. Hubbard writes as follows:

OFFICE AMERICAN PATRIOT, 819 Market street, Dec. 18, 1895.
Editor Call—DEAR SIR: On Tuesday last you gave Peter C. Yorke space to publish what he claims to be the oaths taken by members of the American Protective Association in

defense of this country as against the claims of that un-American doctrine—Papal infallibility. We are not averse to the publication of the A. P. A. oaths. In fact, we prefer that they should be given to the public.

Let us see if P. C. Yorke entertains the same opinion in regard to publishing the oaths taken by priests and Jesuits (and the authority therefor) as printed in the American Patriot of August 3, 1895, which are herewith furnished you, and which we believe you are fair enough to publish. The said oaths are as follows:

Priest's Oath

I, —, now in the presence of Almighty God, the blessed Virgin Mary, the blessed Michael the Archangel, the blessed St. John the Baptist, the holy apostles St. Peter and St. Paul and the saints and the sacred hosts of heaven, and to you, my Lord, I do declare from my heart, without mental reservation, that the Pope is Christ's vicar-general and is the true and only head of the universal church throughout the earth, and that by virtue of the keys of binding and loosing given to his Holiness by Jesus Christ he has power to depose heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths and governments, all being illegal without his sacred confirmation, and that they may safely be destroyed. Therefore to the utmost of my power, I will defend this doctrine and his Holiness' rights and customs against all usurpers of the Protestant authority whatsoever, especially against the now pretended authority and church in England and all adherents, in regard that they may be usurpal and heretical, opposing the sacred mother of the Church of Rome.

I do denounce and disown any allegiance as due to any Protestant king, prince or state, or obedience to any of their inferior officers. I do further declare the doctrine of the Church of England, of the Calvinists, Huguenots and other Protestants to be damnable, and those to be damned who will not forsake the same.

I do further declare that I will help, assist and advise all or any of His Holiness' agents in any place wherever I shall be, and to do my utmost to extirpate the Protestant doctrine and to destroy all their pretended power, regal or otherwise. I do further promise and declare that, notwithstanding I may be permitted by dispensation to assume any heretical religion (Protestant denominations) for the propagation of the mother church's interest, to keep secret and private all her agents' counsels as they intrust me, and not to divulge, either directly or indirectly, by word, writing or circumstances whatsoever, but to execute all which shall be proposed, given in charge or discovered unto me by you, my most reverend lord and bishop.

All of which I, —, do swear by the blessed Trinity and blessed sacrament which I am about to receive, to perform on my part to keep inviolably, and do call on all the heavenly and glorious host of heaven to witness my real intentions to keep this my oath.

In testimony whereof I take this most holy and blessed sacrament of the eucharist, and witness the same further with my consecrated hand, in the presence of my holy bishop and all the priests.

Evangelizing Romanists in Sudbury

Rev. J. R. Boyd of Sudbury writes:

One of the most appreciated experiences of my ministry was found in the three weeks I spent recently ministering, in company with Rev. T. Carson and Rev. W. S. Whitcombe, in the French-Canadian homes and communities, where we have sent the word of God in response to the many requests we have received for French New Testaments. The history of these three weeks, in which we travelled almost fifteen hundred miles, would rival even the best of fiction; but I wish to mention only one sad incident which lingers in our minds like a dark and hideous dream.

The Master said, "It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it unto the dogs;" but we were slow to learn, and saw why, "It is not meet" only after witnessing the robbing of a hungry child whose mother took the Bread of Life from her own son and did with it what is not meet.

It happened thus. We called to see the mother in the morning, and enquired if she had received "The Little Book" (the New Testament) for which she sent. She answered, "Yes" but said she had not read it yet, because she feared it was not good. "My boy has read some though

and likes it very much." She said again, "And my married daughter wants one if the priest admits it is good." We then did our best to show her it was God's Word, which He gave to all to study, and which should be known by all. But the Word, though sharp and mighty, fell like feathers, and unchanged she still insisted she would not dare to touch it until the priest had put his blessing on it. So at last we consented to her persistence and said that we would return at three o'clock to hear the priest's verdict, and to give her daughter a New Testament if she wished to have it.

Alas, "It is not meet!" We came back alright, only to be greeted by two hundred pounds of feminine indignation armed with a broom for battle. No, we did not go too close. The broom and tone of voice were quite suggestive as we heard that our Testaments were no good and must not be read no matter what God said about blessing those who do so. Then as the voice rose higher and the broom moved faster she announced she had been told to burn the Testament and when I begged her not to burn it but return it, she, with triumph, cried, "I've done it! He said, 'Burn it' and I have done it, so there is no use talking now." No, there was not much use in talking though we spoke the plainest language. She had done a "holy duty", and was ready to perform still another, with the full strength of her broom.

So in 1941, in this land which men call Christian, we found this and other homes where men and women had received the Word of God and burned it as an act of righteousness which their priests insisted on their doing. And the children who had sent for it, and read the Word with joy, are left without the "children's bread." We are glad that hundreds of others are still reading and rejoicing as they slowly learn the truth; but may the saints of God arise to guard against the increase of the stark and dreadful spectacles these children-robbers make.

A Letter *The Globe and Mail* Would Not Publish

The Editor,
Gospel Witness,
130 Gerrard St. East,
Toronto, Ont.

Dear Sir:

I am following step by step your controversy with Rome. I note that you have charged *The Globe and Mail* with closing its columns to Protestant apologists, but it has remained for me to discover that its pages cannot be trespassed upon either by those who have been brought up to or have embraced the Catholic tradition, unless they are prepared to be ultramontanes.

Early last month I sent a letter to *The Globe and Mail* as follows:

"I have read a number of editorial comments that you have printed of late on the Rev. Dr. T. T. Shields' strictures upon the Roman Catholic Church. The reverend gentleman has stated, according to a report in your paper, that he has refrained from writing replies to your criticism of his position because you would not print them. He also accuses *The Globe and Mail* of a studied refusal to open its Letters to the Editor column to Protestant apologists. I, who for years have been a defender of the Catholic Church's teaching and practice against the tirades of uninformed, so-called, militant Protestants, want you to demonstrate that you are really the champion of toleration and the national newspaper you boast of being by publishing what I am about to write.

"In order that there may be no misunderstanding, let me state at the outset that I accept without reservation the articles of faith and practice which the Catholic Church demands of its membership but I do not accept a great body of what otherwise devout, practising Catholics have mistakenly assumed to be part of the deposit of faith.

"No one who has read the history of Christianity, pre-Reformation or post-Reformation, can be very proud of a number of things that have been done in the name of Christ whether the nefarious record is that of the gloomy chapters in the history of Eastern Orthodoxy, Western Catholicism, Laudian Anglicanism, Cromwellian Nonconformity, or New England Puritanism. With few exceptions the various professing-Christian sects have much in their past and present

of which they may be heartily ashamed. In fairness to my friend, Dr. Shields, I want to say that (as in the case of the Brethren, the Quakers and some other denominations) I cannot unearth anywhere in my study of comparative Christianity examples of Anabaptists engaging in active, physical persecution of those who differ from them. The Greek Church, the Roman Church, the Lutheran Church, the Church of England, and a number of non-episcopal Churches have on occasion resorted to violence to coerce minorities within and without their folds.

"When writing from the Roman Catholic or any other standpoint, a sincere Christian is conscience-bound to confess that the record of the Church with whose claims and performance the Pastor of Jarvis Street is at the moment dealing has frequently in the past and all too-often in the present been such as to cause its thoughtful defenders many disquieting moments.

"In spite of all that the apologists have said, I cannot look with equanimity upon the Church's record in Italy, in Spain, in Central America, Mexico and South America, not to mention the late Pope's acceptance of the rape of Ethiopia, not to mention the record of Father Coughlin and his Canadian admirers, and much of what goes on in the Province of Quebec. I want to state emphatically for the good of Catholics, clerical and lay, that without any further procrastination and equivocation, in relation to this present world conflict the Pope, even at great personal and institutional risk, must go on record, shortly, or else never, as putting Christian idealism before the preservation of ecclesiastical endowments and privileges.

"In spite of what is popularly believed about the necessity of maintaining English-French unity and the inadvisability of controversy, the Reverend Dr. T. T. Shields is in my considered judgment doing contemporary Roman Catholicism and lukewarm religious individualism (which is about all much that goes by the name of Protestantism amounts to) a distinct service."

The above letter has not been printed and I shall be surprised, if, at this late date, it ever is. It is too long for the *Star*, even if the *Star* would print it, which I doubt. The *Telegram* never seems to print anything longer than 325 words, so I haven't submitted it there. Perhaps the GOSPEL WITNESS, whose pages I have perused ever since its inception, will find a place for it.

I hope Dr. Shields goes on with his Protestant League Crusade. The world is ripe for a second Reformation. The moral reformation of society is even a greater issue than the War; it's at the basis of the world's trouble. The proclamation of truth, whether it stings or not, can serve none but a useful purpose. Many Catholics are sick of an ultramontane College of Cardinals (packed with Italians and Spaniards). There has been but one English pope, a few French and German. Would to God the American Hierarchy would insist on better representation for the English-speaking, Democratically-minded nations and thus convert an Italo-Hispanic Church into something which reflected a Universal, Catholic religious consciousness.

Yours in Christ,

ARTHUR SLYFIELD.

Chipmunk Lodge,
Columbus, Ont.
November 2, 1941.

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 5 Fourth Quarter Lesson 52 December 28, 1941

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

CHRIST THE BELIEVER'S JOY

Lesson Text: Philippians 4.

Golden Text: "Rejoice in the Lord alway: and again I say, Rejoice"—Phil. 4:4.

I. Joy and Unity in the Lord—verses 1 to 3.

As true joy is one of the fruits of the Holy Spirit (Gal. 5:22), it is not surprising that those to whom the Holy Spirit has spoken through us should be linked to us with the bonds of holy love and joy (Phil. 1:8; 2:26; 1 Thess. 2:8; 3:9). The

Apostle described his spiritual children as his joy and his crown, since they were the occasion of his deep happiness and the reward of his faithful service. What inexpressible joy we shall experience in the presence of the Lord when we behold the faces of those whom we have introduced, as it were, into the court of heaven (2 Cor. 1:14; 1 Thess. 2:18-20; Jude 24)!

The exhortation to stand fast in the Lord is repeated in many forms in the Epistles (1 Cor. 16:13; Gal. 5:1; Phil. 1:27; 1 Thess. 3:8; 2 Thess. 2:15). Many begin well, but fail to continue with equal zeal (1 Cor. 9:24; Gal. 5:7; Heb. 6:11, 12). The steadfast Christian soldier is the only one who is dependable (1 Kings 20:11; Eph. 6:11-14). The arm of flesh will fail us and we dare not trust our own, but we can stand fast in the Lord, since He is our defence and our strong support (Psa. 60:10-12).

Euodias and Syntyche had failed to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace (Eph. 4:3; Phil. 2:1-4; 3:15, 16). The work of the Lord may be seriously hindered by the lack of co-operation on the part of a very few. How serious to hamper the working of the Holy Spirit! The church would be of one mind if all had the mind of Christ, the mind of lowliness and self-forgetfulness (Phil. 2:5-10).

II. Joy and the Peace of the Lord—verses 4 to 9.

Christians may at all times rejoice in the Lord—in His power, love and faithfulness (Phil. 3:1). Such joy of the heart is independent of all outward circumstances, and it is the secret of the Christian's triumph in the time of trial and tribulation.

Believers can afford to show gentleness or "sweet reasonableness" in view of the coming of the Lord, Who will vindicate the righteous and judge the wicked oppressor (Rom. 13:11; 1 Cor. 16:22; 2 Thess. 1:3-10; Jas. 3:17; 5:7, 9). The Lord is at hand also, in the sense of being ever present to cheer and strengthen (Matt. 28:20).

We should not give way to anxious care, to that distracting anxiety which is the opposite of loyal trust (Psa. 37:1-7; Matt. 6:25-34; 1 Pet. 5:7), for in the time of distress we may repair in safety to the mercy-seat, approaching the Lord with thanksgiving, humility and confidence (Heb. 10:19-22). As we bring our requests to Him in faith a deep tranquillity of spirit will be ours. Our hearts will be garrisoned with the peace of God, so that the enemy will be unable to invade the citadel of Mansoul and take our thoughts captive at his will

(Col. 3:15). Christ is our peace (Eph. 2:13-17); He made peace for us by His cross (Rom. 5:1; Col. 1:20-22); and He gives peace, peace which is beyond the power of the world to give, to take away, or even to comprehend (John 14:27; 16:33).

The importance of the thought life can hardly be overestimated. In these days we are seeing the fruits resulting from thoughts of pride, cruelty and unlawful ambition. Let us urge the young people to bring every thought into the captivity of Christ (2 Cor. 10:5).

Wholesome doctrine should be accompanied by wholesome deeds. It is true that we are not saved by good works, but it is also true that we have been saved unto good works (Eph. 2:8-10). Our safety and salvation do not depend upon our conduct, but our enjoyment and blessing do. We are to trust, and also to obey (Tit. 3:8). Paul had taught the Philippians not merely the way of life, but also the way to live (Phil. 3:17; 2 Thess. 2:15). By following the Apostle's instructions and example they would be assured of the presence in their midst of the God of peace (Rom. 15:33; 16:20; 1 Thess. 5:23; Heb. 13:20, 21).

III. Joy and the Grace of the Lord—verses 10 to 23.

Paul rejoiced in the salvation of the Philippians to whom he was writing (verse 1), and also in their growth in grace as evidenced by their continued regard for his welfare (2 Cor. 9:6-15). This was not the first occasion on which they had sent a token of their affection (2 Cor. 11:9).

Grateful as the Apostle was for their fellowship and liberality, he had learned to be content with what he had (2 Cor. 9:5; 1 Tim. 6:6-8; Heb. 13:5, 6). He could rejoice in the Lord, whether he had much or little of this world's goods. He had learned to be content in whatsoever state he should be placed (Lk. 22:42). Without Christ he was impotent, but with Christ he was powerful (John 15:5; 2 Cor. 12:9).

Since the believer is a priest (1 Pet. 2:5; Rev. 1:6), he has the privilege of offering unto the Lord acceptable sacrifices; his body (Rom. 12:1), his praise (Heb. 13:15) and his gifts (Heb. 13:16). Because of their liberality in Christian giving the saints at Philippi would find their own needs supplied (Psa. 23:1; 2 Cor. 9:8).

The letter concludes with a salutation and a benediction. Certain members of the Imperial household in Rome had been saved (Phil. 1:13), and these joined in the Christian greetings to their fellow-believers in Philippi.

Presents That Will Do Lasting Good

1. **SUBSCRIBE FOR THE GOSPEL WITNESS** for a friend as a Christmas present.

2. Subscribe as above for three of your friends. We will deal with each as in No. 1 at a total cost to you for the three of five dollars. Of course, this rate will apply to six (\$10.00) or as many more as you can afford at \$5.00 for every three subscriptions.

3. We will send *The Gospel Witness* for a year, and any one of the three books listed below to each new subscriber for \$2.50.

4. **THREE BOOKS BY THE EDITOR AT ONE DOLLAR EACH**

"OTHER LITTLE SHIPS," is a volume of 14 selected sermons, 261 pages, beautifully bound in blue cloth with gilt lettering.

"THE PLOT THAT FAILED", is a volume of 376 pages strongly bound in blue cloth, with gilt letters.

This volume tells the story of Dr. Shields' pastorate in Jarvis St. from 1910 to 1937.

"THE ADVENTURES OF A MODERN YOUNG MAN" is a volume of eight sermons on the parable of the prodigal.

Address: **THE GOSPEL WITNESS,**
130 Gerrard St. E., Toronto.

GOSPEL WITNESS SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSON OUTLINE

JANUARY TO DECEMBER, 1942

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

- Lesson 1—January 4—THE NEED OF RIGHTEOUSNESS.
Text: Romans 1:1-20; 2:1-16. Golden Text: Rom. 1:16.
Reading: Rom. 1:21-32; 2:17-29.
- Lesson 2—January 11—JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.
Text: Romans 3. Golden Text: Rom. 3:24. Reading:
Rom. 4.
- Lesson 3—January 18—THE RESULTS OF JUSTIFICATION.
Text: Romans 5. Golden Text: Rom. 5:8.
- Lesson 4—January 25—RESURRECTION WITH CHRIST.
Text: Romans 6. Golden Text: Rom. 6:23.
- Lesson 5—February 1—THE WEAKNESS OF THE FLESH.
Text: Romans 7. Golden Text: Rom. 13:14.
- Lesson 6—February 8—VICTORY THROUGH THE HOLY SPIRIT.
Text: Romans 8. Golden Text: Rom. 8:32.
- Lesson 7—February 15—THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF FAITH.
Text: Romans 10. Golden Text: Rom. 10:13. Reading:
Rom. 9, 11.
- Lesson 8—February 22—CHRISTIAN SERVICE.
Text: Romans 12. Golden Text: Rom. 12:1.
- Lesson 9—March 1—THE LAW OF LOVE.
Text: Romans 14. Golden Text: Rom. 14:12. Reading:
Rom. 13.
- Lesson 10—March 8—CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP.
Text: Romans 15. Golden Text: Rom. 15:13. Reading:
Rom. 16.
- Lesson 11—March 15—DAVID'S LAMENT.
Text: 2 Samuel 1. Golden Text: 2 Sam. 1:27. Reading:
1 Sam. 31.
- Lesson 12—March 22—DAVID BECOMES KING OVER ISRAEL.
Text: 2 Samuel 5. Golden Text: 2 Sam. 5:10. Reading:
2 Sam. 2, 3, 4.
- Lesson 13—March 29—DAVID BRINGS THE ARK TO JERUSALEM.
Text: 2 Samuel 6. Golden Text: Psalm 132:8.
- Lesson 14—April 5—THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.
Text: John 20. Golden Text: Rev. 1:18.
- Lesson 15—April 12—THE HOUSE OF THE LORD.
Text: 2 Samuel 7. Golden Text: 2 Sam. 7:22. Reading:
2 Sam. 8.
- Lesson 16—April 19—THE KINDNESS OF DAVID.
Text: 2 Samuel 9. Golden Text: Eph. 2:8. Reading:
2 Sam. 10.
- Lesson 17—April 26—DAVID'S SIN.
Text: 2 Samuel 11. Golden Text: Psa. 51:4.
- Lesson 18—May 3—DAVID'S REPENTANCE.
Text: 2 Samuel 12. Golden Text: Psa. 32:1.
- Lesson 19—May 10—THE RECALL OF ABSALOM.
Text: 2 Samuel 14. Golden Text: 2 Sam. 14:28.
- Lesson 20—May 17—ABSALOM'S REBELLION.
Text: 2 Samuel 15. Golden Text: 2 Sam. 15:15. Reading:
2 Sam. 16, 17.
- Lesson 21—May 24—THE DEATH OF ABSALOM.
Text: 2 Samuel 18. Golden Text: 2 Sam. 18:33.
- Lesson 22—May 31—DAVID RETURNS TO JERUSALEM.
Text: 2 Samuel 19. Golden Text: 2 Sam. 19:10. Reading:
2 Sam. 20.
- Lesson 23—June 7—DAVID'S SONG OF DELIVERANCE.
Text: 2 Samuel 22. Golden Text: 2 Sam. 22:31. Reading:
2 Sam. 21.
- Lesson 24—June 14—DAVID'S LAST WORDS.
Text: 2 Samuel 23. Golden Text: 2 Sam. 23:3.
- Lesson 25—June 21—DAVID'S SIN IN NUMBERING THE PEOPLE.
Text: 2 Samuel 24. Golden Text: 2 Sam. 24:10.
- Lesson 26—June 28—DAVID EXHORTS THE PEOPLE.
Text: 1 Chron. 29. Golden Text: 1 Chron. 29:13.
- Lesson 27—July 5—THE BIRTH AND CHILDHOOD OF CHRIST.
Text: Luke 2:1-40. Golden Text: Lk. 2:11. Reading:
Lk. 1.
- Lesson 28—July 12—CHRIST IN THE TEMPLE.
Text: Luke 2:41-52. Golden Text: Lk. 2:52.
- Lesson 29—July 19—THE BAPTISM OF CHRIST.
Text: Luke 3. Golden Text: Lk. 3:22.
- Lesson 30—July 26—THE EARLY MINISTRY OF CHRIST.
Text: Luke 4. Golden Text: Lk. 4:8.
- Lesson 31—August 2—THE POWER OF CHRIST.
Text: Luke 5. Golden Text: Lk. 5:26.
- Lesson 32—August 9—THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.
Text: Luke 6. Golden Text: Lk. 6:36.
- Lesson 33—August 16—CHRIST RAISES THE DEAD.
Text: Luke 7:1-18; 8:40-56. Golden Text: John 11:25.
Reading: Lk. 7:19-50; 8:1-39.
- Lesson 34—August 23—THE TRANSFIGURATION.
Text: Luke 9:1-43. Golden Text: Lk. 9:35. Reading:
Lk. 9:44-62.
- Lesson 35—August 30—THE GOOD SAMARITAN.
Text: Luke 10. Golden Text: Lk. 10:27.
- Lesson 36—September 6—THE TEACHING OF CHRIST ON PRAYER.
Text: Luke 11:1-32. Golden Text: Lk. 11:1. Reading:
Lk. 11:33-54.
- Lesson 37—September 13—SEEKING FIRST THE KINGDOM OF GOD.
Text: Luke 12:16-48. Golden Text: Lk. 12:31. Reading:
Lk. 12:1-15, 49-59; Lk. 13.
- Lesson 38—September 20—THE LOST FOUND.
Text: Luke 15. Golden Text: Lk. 15:10. Reading:
Lk. 14.
- Lesson 39—September 27—FORGIVENESS AND GRATITUDE.
Text: Luke 17. Golden Text: Lk. 17:5. Reading: Lk. 16.
- Lesson 40—October 4—ENTRANCE INTO THE KINGDOM OF GOD.
Text: Luke 18. Golden Text: Lk. 18:16.
- Lesson 41—October 11—CHRIST ENTERS JERUSALEM.
Text: Luke 19. Golden Text: Zech. 9:9. Reading: Lk.
20, 21.
- Lesson 42—October 18—THE LAST SUPPER.
Text: Luke 22:1-30. Golden Text: Lk. 22:20.
- Lesson 43—October 25—THE AGONY, DENIAL AND BETRAYAL OF CHRIST.
Text: Luke 22:31-71. Golden Text: Lk. 22:42.
- Lesson 44—November 1—CHRIST BEFORE PILATE.
Text: Luke 23:1-26. Golden Text: Lk. 23:4.
- Lesson 45—November 8—THE CRUCIFIXION OF CHRIST.
Text: Luke 23:27-56. Golden Text: 1 Cor. 15:3.
- Lesson 46—November 15—THE RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION OF CHRIST.
Text: Luke 24. Golden Text: Lk. 24:34.
- Lesson 47—November 22—THE INHERITANCE OF THE CHRISTIAN.
Text: 1 Peter 1. Golden Text: 1 Pet. 1:5.
- Lesson 48—November 29—THE CONDUCT OF THE CHRISTIAN.
Text: 1 Peter 2. Golden Text: 1 Pet. 2:7.
- Lesson 49—December 6—THE TESTIMONY OF THE CHRISTIAN.
Text: 1 Peter 3. Golden Text: 1 Pet. 3:15.
- Lesson 50—December 13—THE TRIALS OF THE CHRISTIAN.
Text: 1 Peter 4. Golden Text: 1 Pet. 4:14.
- Lesson 51—December 20—THE WORD MADE FLESH.
Text: John 1:1-34. Golden Text: John 1:14.
- Lesson 52—December 27—THE SERVICE OF THE CHRISTIAN.
Text: 1 Peter 5. Golden Text: 1 Pet. 5:6.