

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. 39

TORONTO, JANUARY 29, 1942

Whole Number 1028

"Abhor"—"Cleave"—"Resist"—"Will Flee"

The Bible is the inspired record of God's revelation of Himself in Christ. The Lord Jesus Christ was never neutral because He was never doubtful nor uncertain. He said of Himself: "I am the way, the truth, and the life." He said also: "I am the light of the world." The Christian religion is a positive religion. It claims finality. It is God's last word. Those who receive it as the truth need never be neutral on moral questions. We are admonished to "abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good"; that is to say, our attitude toward both qualities should be positive. We are to resist the Devil, and we are promised that he will flee from us.

True Protestantism, the Reformed Faith, Evangelical Christianity, is always positive. Modernism has put a question mark after everything divinely revealed. It puts a question mark after the whole revelation of God in Christ. Modernism is negative, or, at best, neutral, toward revealed truth. Being itself error, it has no testimony against error. The so-called Protestantism of Modernism is a Samson shorn of his locks; a Sham-

gar without his oxgoad; a Gideon without lamp, pitcher, or trumpet; a Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-

nego avoiding the furnace by bowing to the golden image; a Daniel shunning the lions by shutting his window on a prayerless chamber. Such a Protestantism is without a protest. In an address in New York City twenty years ago we ventured to say that Modernism in churches and denominations of Evangelical names, was Rome's chief ally. The truth of that observation daily becomes more apparent. When Micaiah had faithfully delivered God's message to Ahab, predicting his death in his Ramoth-gilead enterprise, one of the four hundred prophets, who had unanimously promised Ahab success in his venture, "Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah went near and smote Micaiah on the cheek, and said, Which way went the Spirit of the Lord from me to speak unto

REFLECTION

The following is from the pen of a Bournemouth, England, clergyman:

"We have been a pleasure-loving people, dishonoring God's day, picnicking and bathing—now the sea-shores are barred, no picnics, no bathing. We have preferred motor travel to church going—now there is a shortage of motor fuel. We have ignored the ringing of church bells calling us to worship—now the bells cannot ring except to warn us of invasion. We have left the churches half empty when they should have been filled with worshippers—now they are in ruin. We would not listen to the way of peace—now we are forced to listen to the way of war. The money we would not give to the Lord's work—now is taken in taxes and higher prices. The food for which we forgot to say thanks—now is unobtainable. The service we refused to give God—now is conscripted for the country. Lives we refused to live under God's control—now are under the nation's control. Nights we would not spend in watching unto prayer—now are spent in anxious air-raid precautions. The evils of modernism we would not fight—now we see what Germany, the seat of this teaching, has produced."

thee?" Zedekiah's action is illustrative of the non-Romanist Modernist's attitude toward THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE; and, indeed, toward all who stand uncompromisingly for the authority of divine revelation.

The worst enemies of a virile, biblical, Protestantism are Modernist preachers, and worldly-minded church members in general. A really healthy body is physically positive, resistant and intolerant of everything that is alien and antagonistic to its life. Any degree of physical neutrality toward the enemies of the body rapidly induces a morbid condition which offers hospitality to the bacilli of all sorts of plagues. Thus the neutral states of Europe fell before the aggressor "one by one." Thus the derelict defenders of Pearl Harbour virtually invited the destruction of a large part of the American Navy. Thus the somnolence of a sleeping church and a sleeping ministry, invites the enemy to sow tares. Here is the biblical picture of an apostate church: "All ye beasts of the field, come to devour; yea, all ye beasts in the forest. His watchmen are blind: they are all ignorant, they are all dumb dogs, they cannot bark; sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber: Yea, they are greedy dogs which can never have enough, and they are shepherds that cannot understand: they all look to their own way, every one for his gain, from his quarter. Come ye, say they, I will fetch wine, and we will fill ourselves with strong drink; and tomorrow shall be as this day, and much more abundant."

"The Truth Will Out"

Some of our readers may have thought we were somewhat extreme in our attitude toward the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in Canada. Some may have believed we were unduly alarmed. There may be a few who have thought we have been unfairly suspicious; but for a long time now this paper has endeavoured to make clear the real attitude of Quebec toward the war. We have always insisted that our quarrel was not with Quebec as a whole, nor with the French-Canadians as a people, but with the Roman Hierarchy and its control of the affairs of the Province.

Premier Godbout, of Quebec, was brought to Toronto some months ago, and he made a speech on "national unity." His address was attractively printed by the Toronto clubs whose guest he had been, and it was widely distributed. Cardinal Villeneuve was also brought to Toronto by the same clubs, and while here indulged in a piece of very subtle Roman Catholic propaganda. Both these Romanists, lay and clerical, virtually offered us "national unity" on the condition that the Quebec minority should be allowed to rule the country.

We reproduce below an editorial from *The Toronto Daily Star* of January 27th:

THE GODBOUT SPEECH

Condensed reports of an address sometimes give an inadequate idea of its content. If first reports of Premier Godbout's speech at Montreal do adequately represent his attitude on overseas service, it can only be said that the speech is a disappointing one.

It appears from these reports that Mr. Godbout not only challenges conscription—and conscription is of course a debatable policy—but, by citing the example of Australia, subject now to attack and with part of her forces overseas, conveys the impression that units of the Commonwealth should not send their troops abroad.

In *The Star's* opinion, the question of sending men overseas is not one of "whether to," but one of "how best to." The fact that Canada's front line is where the enemy is making or likely to make his attack can hardly be challenged. The first step in the defense of Canada

is to send men to actual or threatened theatres of war. In sending them to Britain, Canada made no mistake. In sending hers to the Middle East, Australia made no mistake. The greatest possible error would be for the component parts of the Commonwealth to defend only their own shores and wait there until the enemy has picked off other nations one by one.

But one thing the Montreal meeting, with its outcry against conscription, does emphasize. And that is the unreliability of the suggestions so frequently put forward that Quebec province as a whole is reconciled to compulsory overseas service.

We call attention to *The Star's* belated recognition of what this paper in season and out of season has insisted upon: "And that is the unreliability of the suggestions so frequently put forward that Quebec province as a whole is reconciled to compulsory overseas service."

Quebec has failed in every way to pull its weight in Canada's war effort. The Godbout address contained in this issue was delivered Monday evening last, and it is but an incidental confirmation of our general argument.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS reaches many people in Canada and elsewhere, who will not have had the opportunity to read such reports of Mr. Godbout's speech as have appeared in the daily press. We have compared the reports in several papers, and they are substantially the same. We reproduce here the report as it appeared in *The Evening Telegram*, Toronto, January 27th:

Montreal, Jan. 27—Premier Godbout, of Quebec, told a public meeting here that Prime Minister Mackenzie King "has always been against conscription for overseas service, and with the example of Australia, who sent most of her troops outside of the country, he will not impose conscription."

"I think that conscription for overseas service actually would be a crime," he added. "The example of Australia proves that now."

Mr. King realized, the premier said, that Australia was to-day deprived of a large part of its army, fighting elsewhere while the enemy approached Australian shores.

Demonstrators Organized

Groups of student demonstrators, apparently organized, forced Mr. Godbout to make his declaration against conscription and in support of Premier King's stand at a Liberal rally.

When Mr. Godbout attempted to talk on other issues, the groups of French-Canadian youths booed him and made it impossible for him to speak. They shouted demands that he make his stand on the conscription issue clear.

Cries of "down with conscription," started by these demonstrators, interrupted the meeting from the first. Talking on other topics, Mr. Godbout was systematically heckled.

At the close of the meeting, the groups united in a crowd of over two hundred and continued the shouts of "down with conscription."

The demonstration was similar to those put on here by nationalist student groups during pre-war election campaigns.

Mr. Godbout spoke in French at the annual meeting of the St. Denis-Dorion Liberal Association. The hall, with a capacity of about 800, was crowded, with about 300 youths, including some students from University of Montreal, in the group. Loud speakers carried the address to a crowd outside the school hall where the meeting was held.

Police Keep Order

Mr. Godbout, who spoke in French, was interrupted many times by shouted questions, particularly in connection with conscription.

As the questioners, described by speakers at the rally as students, became more unruly, a dozen policemen moved through the crowd to keep order.

(Continued on page 10)

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

THE FOURTH AXIS POWER

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, January 25th, 1942

(Stenographically Reported)

"I will disguise myself, and enter into the battle; but put thou on thy robes."—
I Kings 22:20.

The text was addressed by Ahab, king of Israel, to Jehoshaphat, king of Judah. Ahab had virtually invited Jehoshaphat to unite with him in a campaign against Syria. The details of the story are not germane either to the principle of the text itself, or to the use I propose to make of it.

Ahab proposed that these two, while uniting for the achievement of a common purpose, should prosecute their endeavours under different conditions. Jehoshaphat was to fight in uniform, openly as a belligerent, easily identified; Ahab would merge himself with the thousands of the united armies, and fight under a disguise.

In the present war we know that we are fighting three Axis powers: Germany, Italy and Japan. They have entered into the battle wearing their robes. All diplomatic relations with these powers have been severed. Their Ambassadors are no longer with us, nor are ours with them. I propose to show you this evening that there is a fourth Axis power whose diplomatic representatives still hold their places in the respective capitals of the allied powers. With that fourth Axis power we are not formally at war; but factually, that fourth power has disguised itself, and has entered into the battle. To-day throughout the world that power is fighting against each and all of the Allied powers, fighting as strenuously as the other three, and with greater subtlety and cunning than any one of them. That is the picture I present to you, that we of the British Empire and its Allies are openly at war with only three Axis powers, while four Axis powers are making war upon us.

The Fourth Axis Power

What then is the fourth Axis power? That power is the ostensibly "neutral" state known as the Vatican. My thesis is that the Papacy is the fourth Axis power. At this point I must pause for careful definition. It would be folly to expect absolute unanimity in any human organization. There is substantial unity in each political entity of which we speak as the Allies. But even in Britain itself there may be found a few odd people, some who flatter themselves that they prove their intellectual and moral superiority by being always in a minority; and there will be found a few conscientious objectors; and, lending emphasis to the practical unanimity of the rest of the Empire, is Eire who is supposed to be part of the Empire, but is "neutral".

By the operation of the same principle, we may expect differing points of view and varying attitudes and actions within the Roman Catholic Church. For example, it is common knowledge that the Irish Catholics and French-Canadian Catholics are not passionately devoted to each other. An Irishman retains his inherent disposition to chronic belligerency even when he becomes a Roman Catholic; and no doubt between the many nation-

alities comprising the Roman Catholic Church throughout the world, there will be found differences of outlook and attitude which may be explained, in part, on racial and geographical grounds. But when we speak of the United States as an Ally, we mean that the Government, representative of the American people as a whole, is in alliance with the British Government, and with the other Governments of the British Commonwealth, who are also representative of their several peoples as a whole.

So when I speak of the Roman Catholic Church as a fourth Axis power, I speak of the governing body, commonly called the Papacy; or in its peculiarly political character, the Vatican State. And I affirm, and shall endeavour to prove once again—that the Papacy, the Vatican State, in its general attitude toward the Allied powers is as much an enemy as Germany, or Italy, or Japan. I grant you that there has been no declaration of war, and no open acknowledgment of belligerency; but it is my conviction that the Papacy has disguised itself, and entered into the battle against us.

A Few Contrary Voices

Nor is my contention disproved by a few contrary voices, whether they be of priests, or bishops, or archbishops, or cardinals, or a local hierarchy speaking through the Catholic press. The Papacy claims to be a catholic or universal church. It professes that its component parts are but members of one catholic body, subject to the control of one head. The Roman Catholic Church, therefore, must be judged by its general policies throughout the world. With these preliminary, precautionary, and definitive provisions, I may now ask you to view the worldwide actions of the Vatican State, or the Papacy.

Abyssinia and Spain

What was its attitude toward Mussolini's rape of Abyssinia? It certainly raised no protest against it, and at least tacitly consented to it; and when the murderers had completed their work, it took full advantage of its opportunity to claim special privileges. All religions other than Roman Catholicism were banned; and all missionaries other than Roman Catholics were expelled.

What was the attitude of the Vatican in the Spanish Civil War? I think it is not too much to say that there is *prima facie* evidence that the Spanish Civil War was instigated and largely financed by the Vatican; that priests were to be found on both sides does not invalidate that assumption, but is merely confirmatory of my preliminary suggestion that a few opposing voices, in any given case, must reasonably be expected. The fact that immediately following his victory, Franco restored to the Jesuits all the valuable estates from which they had

been expelled, and virtually banned all religions but Roman Catholicism, lends confirmation to the *prima facie* assumption.

The Papacy and France

What was the Vatican's policy in respect to France? Immediately following the collapse of the Republic, and the establishment of the Pétain *régime*, the Pope gave the new order his special blessing, expressing his own conviction that the Pétain *régime* would govern the affairs of France in agreement with the policies of the Church. Almost immediately thereafter the law respecting Catholic institutions was revoked; all the special privileges to which the Jesuit order laid claim were immediately restored to them; and the reformations of about one hundred years were largely nullified.

Belgium and Dunkirk

Nor was the influence of the Vatican in Belgium any less pronounced. The British Government, for a little while following Leopold's surrender, suspended judgment; but later unhesitatingly condemned his action. It is significant that the Roman Catholic press throughout the world has been busy during comparatively recent months in an endeavour to justify Leopold's surrender, and to make a hero of him. His treachery must be interpreted, not by the exigencies of the hour, but by his general attitude toward Britain and France for some years before the war. His action brought about Dunkirk, and but for the interposition of God Himself might well have effected the destruction of the British Empire.

Some years before the war, when Jean Louis Barthou was French Foreign Minister, and when he was endeavouring to build a Balkan dam to keep back the flood of Hitlerism from the Middle East, he and King Alexander of Yugoslavia were assassinated at Marseilles. The one who instigated the murder fled to Italy, and Mussolini refused his extradition. Subsequent events in Yugoslavia, the defection of Catholic Croatia, and the creation of a puppet Catholic king who was an Italian duke, together show "the fine Italian hand" in that inexcusable murder.

There can be no doubt of the lukewarm loyalty of Roman Catholics in Great Britain; and the general attitude of the Roman Catholic Church for centuries—and even for the past one hundred years in Britain—proves that the Vatican is no friend of the British Empire.

About Eire

Nothing has been more embarrassing to us than the attitude of "neutral" Eire. Everyone who has any acquaintance with Irish history knows that the root-cause of it all is far more religious than racial, though perhaps there is a considerable racial element in it. But Eire's maintenance of a so-called neutrality in respect to the Irish ports which, by reason of the extension of the field of naval operations from our British bases, has the effect of greatly reducing the efficiency of the Navy in the Atlantic battle, all bears the same stamp of Vatican influence.

Nor is Australia free from Roman Catholic influence in this war any more than she was in the last. In the United States, the Roman Catholic hierarchy has taken a foremost place in the leadership of isolationism and non-interventionism. While here and there Catholic voices have been raised in favour of the democratic cause, articulate American Romanism has been overwhelmingly on the side of the Axis powers.

I shall deal with Rome's influence upon our Canadian political and military situation later: let it be enough now for me to refer to the present South American situation in which beyond all possibility of doubt the Papacy has disguised itself, and entered into the battle. It is interesting to note that the chief objector to a united South American front toward the Axis powers was Buenos Aires, the constitution of which entitles it to a Roman Catholic President; and it was the President of Argentina who declared that he had already made up his mind.

And here I quote from an article in *The Reader's Digest*:

Mussolini's ministers in Latin-America are now acting in unison with Hitler's. In the southern provinces of Brazil are about 3,000,000 Italians, most of them with strong Fascist leanings. Like the Germans, they have their own schools and secret police. In Argentina there are 3,000,000. Uruguay and Paraguay are Italian strongholds. In Peru the Banco Italiano controls 50 per cent of the country's banking, and its head, Gino Salocchi, has such power that he is known as "the Viceroy." An Italian general commands the Peruvian police. In Brazil the Vargas Government is a copy of the Italian corporate State. AND TO THE PADRES OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN LATIN-AMERICA MUSSOLINI IS THE STRONG MAN WHO HELPED FRANCO AND THE CHURCH WIN BACK SPAIN. (*Emphasis mine*).

In this connection let me read an item I printed in last week's paper, from *The Ottawa Evening Journal* of recent date:

Canadian Catholics To Play Big Role in Pan-America

Canadian Roman Catholicism will have an important part to play in future Pan-American relations. Rev. A. L. M. Danis, O.M.I., told members of St. Patrick's C.Y.O. at their monthly breakfast in the church auditorium Sunday morning.

"Gradually", Father Danis explained, "we are likely to see Canada withdraw from the European orbit to establish political connections and diplomatic relations with South American countries in order to contribute to western hemispheric defence and solidarity.

"More than 90 per cent of the population of South American countries is Roman Catholic, and while there is considerable Axis penetration in some of these countries, that has happened because democracy in South American countries has too often been synonymous with Protestantism."

United States Roman Catholics as well as Canadian Roman Catholics have nearly always allowed others to take the initiative in the formation of external policies, with the consequence that the South American Catholic population has had the impression that United States was predominantly a Protestant country, the speaker explained.

"The people of South America know of Catholic Canada, particularly of French Catholics", Father Danis asserted. "Canada is 41 per cent Roman Catholic, and by 1970, everything being equal, the Roman Catholic population will be greater, and may well be in the majority", he predicted.

"With co-operation between the South American countries increasing; French and English Roman Catholics in this country along with the Catholics of the United States and South America will be able to establish an order based upon ideals and traditions of Christianity. We shall find a solution to our ills, see a change in society brought about by a Christian order for this hemisphere in accordance with the doctrines of Leo XIII and Pius XI", Father Danis concluded. He was introduced by A. W. Fogarty, treasurer of the C.Y.O.

At the time of France's collapse, I spoke of, "The Fine Italian Hand in Pétain's Treachery"; and later of the Roman Catholic Church "as a Fifth Column everywhere." In the light of subsequent events, I am con-

strained to say that I now see no reason for withdrawing a single word. I have no time to recapitulate the details of the story of Rome's intrigue in Europe generally, beyond what I have already said; and such references as I may yet make to it, will be made only in substantiation of the charge I make, that in the Pacific, and on this Continent, and specifically in Canada, the Papacy has "disguised itself, and entered into the battle".

The Vichy Régime

The view that Pétain *et al* merely tried to make the best of a bad job, in view of Vichy's subsequent record, I think cannot reasonably be maintained. On the contrary, evidence accumulates that Laval and others had long prepared themselves, not only for the betrayal of France, but for the betrayal of France's unsuspecting Allies. Over and above the infiltration of Nazi spies, I think it cannot be doubted that there was a Vatican Fifth Column in France which was the worm at the heart of the Republic that brought that proud cedar down.

We have only to remind ourselves of Pétain's breach of promise with the British Government in returning four hundred German aviators to Germany instead of delivering them to British custody as he had promised to do. One has only to think of the stern and unhappy necessity for action at Oran to see that the source of Pétain and his associates was actuated quite as much by their one internal disposition as by Nazi pressure.

It must always be kept carefully in mind that while the British Government recognized General de Gaulle and the Free French Movement as being truly representative of France, the Vichy Government has passed sentence of death upon General de Gaulle.

The St. Pierre Affair

I come now to speak of the St. Pierre affair, but before doing so I would remind you that the Vichy Government still has its diplomatic representative at Ottawa; and for the sake of emphasis I repeat that upon which I have several times remarked before: that the present Vichy representative, who was accredited to the Canadian Government, not by Vichy, but by Republican France, but who took sides, not with the Free French, but with Vichy, in a speech in Montreal not long after France's collapse, declared his belief that France's misfortunes were the judgment of God upon her because she had disobeyed the Church. Thus the Vichy representative showed that he was a traitor to the Republic which he came to Canada to represent; and at the time his retention was discussed, it was plainly declared at Ottawa that his retention was a concession to the Roman Catholic Hierarchy and the sensibilities of French-Canada.

The inside story of the St. Pierre affair has now been told by a man who was the only newspaper correspondent which accompanied the Free French expedition. I have on an earlier occasion called attention to the fact that the chief opponent to the occupation of St. Pierre by the Free French was the chief Roman Catholic prelate. The interesting sidelight on all this is that the whole enterprise was planned in Canada; and that the Vichy agents in Canada were very active. The correspondent says:

"Whether they had access to secret information or simply made a shrewd guess has not yet been ascertained. At any rate they seem to have cabled Vichy that Admiral Muselier was preparing to lead a Free French

naval force against a Vichy possession in the western hemisphere—either Martinique, St. Pierre or French Guiana."

When knowledge of the proposed enterprise came to the Canadian Government, conveyed to them it is said by the Free French Admiral himself, no objection was directly offered; but in keeping with its invariable habit of shirking responsibility in awkward situations, the Canadian Government suggested that Washington be consulted. When Washington objected, Admiral Muselier requested a visa for his chief-of-staff and Commander Quedrue to go to Washington to put the Free French side of the case to the State Department. The request was refused. The Free French are said not to have been surprised, for on at least one previous occasion an American consular agent in Canada had told them bluntly, "You are not French. You are rebels."

The Churchill Ottawa Speech

It was after all this that the Prime Minister of Great Britain spoke in Ottawa, and the newspapers said that the Vichy representative was within a few feet of him as he spoke. I quote from his speech:

"On top of all this came the great French catastrophe. The French army collapsed and the French nation was dashed into utter and, as it has proved so far, irretrievable confusion. The French Government had, at their own suggestion, solemnly bound themselves with us not to make a separate peace. It was their duty, and it was also their interest, to go to North Africa, where they would have been at the head of the French Empire. In Africa with our aid they would have had overwhelming sea power; they would have had the recognition of the United States, and the use of all the gold they had lodged beyond the seas. If they had done this Italy might have been driven out of the war before the end of 1940, and France would have held her place as a nation in the councils of the Allies, and at the conference table of the victors.

"But their generals misled them. When I warned them that Britain would fight on alone, whatever they did, their generals told their Prime Minister and his divided cabinet, 'In three weeks England will have her neck wrung like a chicken.' Some chicken! Some neck!

"What a contrast, Sir, has been the behaviour of the valiant stout-hearted Dutch, who still stand forth as a strong-living partner in the struggle. Their venerated Queen and their government are in England. Their princess and her children have found asylum and protection here in your midst. But the Dutch nation are defending their Empire with dogged courage and tenacity, by land, sea, and in the air. Their submarines are inflicting a heavy daily toll upon the Japanese robbers who have come across the seas to steal the wealth of the East Indies, and to ravage and exploit its fertility and its civilization.

"The British Empire and the United States are going to the aid of the Dutch. We are going to fight out this new war against Japan together. We have suffered together and we shall conquer together. But the men of Bordeaux, the men of Vichy—they would do nothing like this. They lie prostrate at the foot of the conqueror. They fawned upon him. And what have they got out of it? The fragment of France which was left to them is just as powerless, just as hungry, as, and even more miserable because more divided than the occupied regions themselves. Hitler plays from day to day a cat

and mouse game with these tormented men. One day he will let out a few thousand broken prisoners of war from the million and a half or million and three-quarters he has collected. Or, again, he will shoot a hundred French hostages to give them a taste of the lash. On these blows and favours the Vichy government have been content to live from day to day. But even this will not go on indefinitely. At any moment it may suit Hitler's plans to brush them away. Their only guarantee is Hitler's good faith, which, as everyone knows, biteth like the adder and stingeth like the asp. Some Frenchmen there were who would not bow their knees and who under General de Gaulle have continued to fight at the side of the Allies. They have been condemned to death by the men of Vichy, but their names will be held, and are being held, in increasing respect by nine Frenchmen out of every ten throughout the once happy, smiling land of France."

I am aware that Premier King has declared that Mr. Churchill approves of the retention of the Vichy representative, and he has now even gone so far as to say that he asked Mr. Churchill to allow him to say that he approved of it. That simple fact is enough to discredit the whole contention in the minds of those who know that it would have been quite impossible for Mr. Churchill to do other than acquiesce in Mr. King's proposal. Indeed, had he done other, the man who is so supersensitive about Canada's sovereignty, would have been the first to complain that Mr. Churchill was interfering.

War in the Pacific

And now we are at war in the Pacific. Two thousand of our men have been overwhelmed at Hong Kong. Has the Roman Catholic Church had anything to do with affairs in the Pacific? It is known to all of us that when oily Matsuoka visited Berlin and Rome not many months ago, he also visited the Pope. According to the CBC Broadcast, the Roman Pontiff told the Japanese Foreign Minister, "I have sent the apostolic blessing to your dear far-off country"; and he continued, "Mr. Matsuoka is a great statesman."

Now the United States, as well as the British Empire, has had opportunity of tasting some of the fruits of the "great statesmanship" of Mr. Matsuoka, and his "dear far-off country", to which the Pope sent his apostolic blessing. All this occurred last April, and at that time even *The Globe and Mail*, in an editorial had this to say:

"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."

But we are able to see something of the significance of these events in what has since transpired. There is some doubt as to the fate of Protestant missionaries. The whereabouts or condition of some may be known, but not all. But the Roman Catholic Missionaries are

perfectly safe. They had in advance agreed to bow at the Japanese shrines, and so to mix their paganism with the paganism of Japan.

In the last issue of *The Catholic Register*, Toronto, January 22nd, the following news item appeared:

"Montreal, Jan. 16.—The Quebec Foreign Mission Society, an institute of Catholic clergy bound together by ties of obedience to the superior and of zeal for mission work, announces that an official communication has been received stating that all the Canadian missionaries in the Japanese Empire and in Manchukuo have remained in their missions. Up to the present assurances have been given by the Japanese Government as to their well-being, it was stated."

I would not unduly emphasize another item contained in the same issue of *The Register*, but it is credited to the N.C.W.C. News Service, a Catholic News Service, and dated at Santa Cruz, Calif., Jan. 17, and headed, "United States Nun Anticipated Pearl Harbor—Californian Convent School Had Air Raid Shelter." This is what the item says:

Holy Cross School here was on an efficient air-raid precaution basis within a few hours after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

The reason was that its Superior, an American nun who had been in air raids on the European continent and was evacuated from Paris after the German occupation, acted in anticipation of Japanese action in the Pacific and began her preparations a week before the Pearl Harbor assault.

She is Sister Madeline, a Sister of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul. She went to Paris in 1928 as a representative of United States branches of the Congregation at its motherhouse there, and was there in September, 1939, when the war broke, and on June 14, 1940, when the German army entered Paris.

On June 15, Sister Madeline began in a crowded train a journey to Portugal that was harrowing even to one, like herself, who had experienced more than one air-raid and had seen a piece of anti-aircraft shrapnel fall a few feet from her when she emerged from a shelter.

On December 1, 1941, Sister Madeline decided war in the Pacific was threatening and began her preparations.

Perhaps she was the one person who exercised foresight at Pearl Harbor. On the other hand, her intimate acquaintance with affairs in Europe, and her presence in Hawaii may perhaps suggest that she had something more than foresight: perhaps she had foreknowledge.

Twenty-four Priests Released

I think I have established the fact that the Roman Catholic Church is singularly friendly toward Japan, the third of the Axis powers. But now we come to another matter. Some months ago we protested against the continued presence of the Apostolic or Papal delegate in Ottawa, on the ground of his anti-Canadian, anti-democratic, and clearly Fascist speeches. But here we have an item of news—also from the last issue of *The Catholic Register*:

NEWS REACHES VATICAN CITY OF RELEASE OF 24 INTERNED PRIESTS IN CANADA

By Msgr. Enrico Pucci.

(Vatican City Correspondent, N.C.W.C. News Service).

Vatican City, Jan. 17.—His Excellency the Most Rev. Ildebrando Antoniutti, Apostolic Delegate to Canada, has been able to effect the release of 24 priests of foreign citizenship who were being detained in internment camps in Canada, and has arranged for their distribution among various religious houses in that country.

This is revealed in news reaching the Vatican of the Christmas visits paid by Archbishop Antoniutti to prisoners of Italian, German and other nationalities confined to internment camps in Canada.

(This message, coming from Vatican City, does not say when the releases were obtained but it is known that some Italian priests arrested in Canada when Italy entered the war were released in a very short time).

The Apostolic Delegate visited the internment camps to convey to the prisoners tangible evidence of His Holiness Pope Pius XII's deep solicitude for the welfare of all his spiritual children. His Excellency distributed gifts, and for the Italian prisoners he celebrated Mass and addressed them in their own language. In Montreal gifts were also distributed to the families of the prisoners in the name of the Holy Father.

The camps located at more distant points, such as Calgary, Sault Ste. Marie and Saint John, were visited by the local Bishops, who conveyed to the prisoners the interest of the Holy Father.

In the same issue there is an item headed, "Japanese Broadcast False Message to Missionaries—Ruse to Obtain Cooperation with Invaders in Philippines." Why should the Japanese expect the cooperation of the Roman Catholic missionaries in the Philippines? That the broadcast got out necessitated its being labelled as being false; but we wonder whether or not it was false? At all events, I include the statement:

(By N.C.W.C. News Service).

An official Japanese radio broadcast saying the "Catholic mission" of Hong Kong had sent a message to certain missionaries in the Philippines expressing the hope that they would cooperate with the Japanese armies, is labelled as sheer propaganda without any basis in fact by those in the United States familiar with the Catholic missions in the Orient.

It is pointed out that the particular Catholic missionaries in the Philippines are not subject to anyone in Hong Kong, and that thus no person in Hong Kong would be competent to instruct, or indicate procedure to, the missionaries of the Order in the Philippines. Rather, it is the reverse, since the community's house in Hong Kong is under the jurisdiction of superiors in Manila.

It is further pointed out that in any case, 95 per cent of the members of the particular Order in the Philippines are Americans and hence subject to orders from the United States and not from anywhere else.

Another Falsehood

Those familiar with the missions also say that this patently baseless broadcast is of the same stripe with a palpably false report from Tokyo that the Archbishop of Manila and another Bishop pledged "whole-hearted cooperation" with the Japanese forces for the creation of a "new order" in East Asia.

It has been observed that Japanese propagandists have been attempting to persuade missionaries as well as all others that their best course is cooperation with the Japanese on the score that thus they would have an easier time of it than if they resisted. These reports are, in the judgment of students of the missions, linked with this propaganda.

It also has been observed that in recent official broadcasts, Japan's authorities have apparently been making serious efforts to "play up" religious angles in a manner that is so exaggerated that the broadcasts are obviously stamped as nothing more than propaganda. An instance was a recent broadcast alleging that U.S. troops desecrated church property in the Philippines. At the same time, the Japanese radio has been stressing freedom of religion in Japan.

There are other items in the same paper: one, "Seventy-two Jesuits safe on one of Philippine Islands"; another, "Priest on island where St. Francis Xavier died is held by Japanese." We may be sure that the Jesuit priest—and any other priests—will be perfectly safe wherever the Japanese are in occupation. The Japanese enter into the battle with their robes: the Vatican disguises itself—but is active in the same field of conflict.

Otto Strasser in Canada

Now we have still another item, in last evening's paper, by Mr. H. G. Wells. Certainly no one will charge Mr. Wells with having any pronounced religious sympathies one way or another. We supposed he was rather prejudiced against all religions. But the item is headed, "Wells Asks Why Strasser Leader of 'Free Germans' Not Behind Canadian Bars—Declares Otto Was Blood-stained Nazi Still Soaked with 'Germany-First' Ideas." We make one or two quotations:

"I met this remarkable man at the end of 1940 on my way back from America, where I had been lecturing.

"We shook hands—I knew very little of him then except as a distinguished German refugee from Hitler—and he knew still less about me—but as we talked the discord in our attitudes became apparent and our conversation warmed up. I realized he was quite insanely anti-Bolshevik and soaked to the marrow with the idea of the German people being first and foremost in Europe and the world. Most of his declarations of opinion conclude with, 'Hell Germany!'"

Mr. Wells quotes Otto Strasser as saying:

"It is my duty as European, as German, as Catholic, to demonstrate without relaxation that it will not suffice to conquer Hitler and Nazism. Prussianism also is execrable."

Otto Strasser's brother Paul, a Benedictine Monk, found asylum in the United States.

Roman Catholic Influence in Camps

I venture now to ask a few questions respecting the influence of the Roman Catholic Church in some camps of our country. Why is it that so large a part of the personnel of the permanent staffs of many camps are Roman Catholics? What would happen in an emergency? It is only a little matter, but why should a company of six hundred women in the Canadian Air Force, regularly enlisted, taking the same oath as the men, and subject to the same discipline, be confined to a diet of fish on Friday just because there is a considerable proportion of Roman Catholics among them? Why should it be that when Roman Catholics choose to have a church parade, non-Romanists are required to forego their leaves in the interests of the Romanists? Why indeed should Roman Catholics, whether men or women, be the pampered pets of the army? (At this point the preacher related a story of a certain camp which he omits from the record until such time as he has the complete documentary evidence.)

I shall not weary you by statistics of enlistments except to insert in the record the item as submitted in the House of Commons:

Ottawa, Jan. 22—Enlistments in the Canadian armed forces were detailed by provinces in a return tabled in the House of Commons in answer to a question by T. L. Church (Con. Toronto-Broadview).

Figures given for the army, navy and air force in the period from Sept. 1939, to Oct. 1941, totalled 293,717.

Enlistments of officers and ratings in the navy numbered 26,750 and were divided: Prince Edward Island, 707; Nova Scotia, 3,489; New Brunswick, 978; Quebec, 4,077; Ontario, 8,675; Manitoba, 1,747; Saskatchewan, 1,471; Alberta, 1,909 and British Columbia, 3,697.

Army figures which totalled 277,767 were given by districts:

No. 1, London, Ont., 20,946; No. 2, Toronto, 52,911; No. 3, Kingston, including the Quebec Counties of Gatineau, Pontiac and Temiscamingue, 28,389; No. 4, Quebec, 34,616; No. 5, Quebec, 12,940; No. 6, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, 23,030; No. 7, New Brunswick, 16,126; No. 10, Manitoba and the district of Kenora, Rainy River and Thunder Bay in Ontario, 23,915; No. 11, British Columbia and the Yukon, 24,501; No. 12, Saskatchewan, 18,021; No. 13, Alberta and district of Mackenzie, 22,372.

The 89,200 members of the Royal Canadian Air Force who enlisted during that period, including 236 members of the Canadian Women's Auxiliary Air Force, were divided:

British Columbia, 8,141; Alberta, 8,895; Saskatchewan, 9,445; Manitoba 10,238; Ontario, 36,277; Quebec, 9,632; New Brunswick, 3,298; Nova Scotia, 2,962, and Prince Edward Island, 812.

Here it is the same story: Quebec, 4,077 for the Navy; Ontario, 8,675. Quebec, 47,556 for the Army; Ontario, 102,246. It is the same everywhere.

But now let me leave these dry matters of statistics and quotations. I at least have not waited until now to urge the necessity for the mobilization of as large an army as Canada could possibly produce. I ventured immediately on the outbreak of war to say that steps should be taken at once to train an army of a million. I think it should have been done: it could have been done. Even if we had given them broomsticks for weapons, they would have had the rudiments of a military training.

What About Hong Kong?

What will the country say to the Hong Kong disaster? Our men at Hong Kong fought bravely, their leading officers dying in the fight. It would probably have been impossible to hold Hong Kong in the beginning under any circumstances, but why were untrained men sent overseas anywhere? Because others were not available? Then why were not trained men available? Even the Quebec regiment that was there was made up largely of Ontario men. Hong Kong alone ought to be sufficient to consign the Canadian Government to everlasting political oblivion. The Government was guilty of a crime for which it ought never to be forgiven, that ought to be punished with the obloquies such conduct deserves.

Ottawa has been playing party politics with the lives of men from the very beginning of the war, and has imperilled our whole position. Do you think I speak strongly? Well, when the lives of your boys, your husband, and sons, and brothers, are put in jeopardy, you will not think I speak too strongly. Look at the magnificent record of Australia. Proportionately, she has a far larger army than we have. She has sent her men freely to Africa, to Greece, and to Malaya. We were glad to know from Mr. Churchill that "the Canadian Government has imposed no limitation upon the use of the Canadian army whether upon the continent of Europe or elsewhere, and I think it extremely unlikely that this war will end without the Canadian army coming to close quarters with the Germans as their fathers did at Ypres, on the Somme, or on the Vimy Ridge."

The Government therefore consents to such army as we have fighting anywhere, and we are sure that they would—and will yet—prove themselves to be worthy of the best traditions of the Canadian army. But Australia now is in dire need. The country is threatened with invasion. Part of her island possessions are already occupied by the Japanese. The Australian Premier has said that Australia will fight as the British did, and that they are to consider every man, woman, and child, is now a soldier. But Australia is asking for help. Can we send them no help? Why can we not answer with several hundred thousand men? Because they are not ready. There may be some ready, I do not know but why are they not ready? They ought to have been ready. The Dominion Government has had plenty of time to get them ready, had Mr. King been so minded.

Premier King has never denied the allegation of the Canadian Corps' leader, that at the outbreak of war, he asked the British Government officially to say they would not need a Canadian army. I hope Mr. King can deny that he ever made a proposal which must, to every Canadian, be humiliating to the last degree. If Mr. King did not make such a request, he owes it to the country to deny the allegation of the leader of the Canadian Corps.

I charge that *the Dominion Government has not even made the best of the voluntary system*. I believe twice as many men could have been enlisted even on the voluntary basis if the Government had not put nearly every conceivable obstacle in the way. Why have they not been enlisted? There is but one answer, "I will disguise myself and enter into the battle." We have been prevented from having a large Canadian army by the disguised fourth Axis power.

Let me tell you *why I am for conscription per se*. It is the only fair plan. Surely the benefit of citizenship in any country should carry with it an obligation to defend that country; and any man in Canada, I care not who he is, who is not willing to give his life for the defense, not only of Canada geographically considered, but of that body of principles which make Canada a free nation—such an one does not deserve to be called a Canadian. In a total war, the only fair thing is for every citizen—man, woman, and child—to be built into the national defense structure. When I say defense structure, I do not confine it to the idea of a force sufficient to defend our shores: really to defend Canada, we must have a force sufficient to destroy those who would threaten our liberties—and that must be done, or ought to be done, far beyond the Canadian boundaries.

For myself, I am convinced that *conscription will be welcomed by tens of thousands of Canadian men*. I refuse to believe that conscription is now made necessary because of any unwillingness on the part of Canadian manhood to enlist in this fight. Canadians are not cowards, they are not shirkers; they are as ready to fight as their fathers were. I tell you a story which will illustrate what I mean. Immediately following the outbreak of war, I met a man in Timmins, Northern Ontario, a man barely past forty, who had served as a very young man in the last war, and was anxious to serve in this. He was in a very fine position, and he said to me, "I would not consider my position for a moment, I am ready to go; but there is a long queue of French-Canadian Roman Catholics waiting to step into my job, and into the mobs of all other men who are going into the army and leaving the country for their occupation."

It is for this reason that thousands of men have not enlisted—not that they were unwilling, but that they felt the whole arrangement was utterly unjust. I believe all such men will welcome a system of compulsory, selective service; for it must be remembered that many men are held by natural ties, by business responsibilities, and in some cases by contractual obligations from which they can be released only by some legal action.

Let me say further that *Mr. King's Government never received from the electorate of Canada a "no conscription" mandate*. Conscription was not an issue in the last election. I may cite a parallel case in principle. Before the nineteen thirty-four Provincial election the then On-

tario Government had passed a beer-by-the-glass measure for the opening of beverage-rooms. Mr. Hepburn, before the election, declared that if elected he would not rescind the measure but would proclaim it; so that we had no option. No matter which side one voted for, he had no opportunity of voting against the proposal to open beverage-rooms.

So before the last Federal election, the Roman Catholic Hierarchy cleverly manipulated the Conservative Party into a position which spelled inevitable political disaster. They secured the nomination of an Irish Roman Catholic as leader of the Conservative Party. They knew that that would kill him in a very large part of the Province of Quebec, and elect a Government completely subject to the control of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. But before that election, Mr. King declared that he would never accept responsibility for a conscription law. He was at least consistent with his record, for in the last war he betook himself to the United States for the greater part of the war, and came back only to join Sir Wilfred Laurier to campaign against the Union Government and the conscription measure—proposing thus to leave our men exposed to the German hordes, to die without giving them reinforcements.

Dr. Manion, on the other hand, had his eye on the Quebec vote and foolishly, almost stupidly, supposed that he had a chance of securing it. The idea of French-Canadian Roman Catholics voting even for an Irish Roman Catholic! He ought to have known better—but, having his eye upon that vote, he who had left the Liberal Party in the last war on the conscription issue, turned tail and declared himself as opposed to conscription. So that the people who went to the polls in the last Federal election were not asked to pronounce on the conscription measure. It was not an issue. One could not vote for conscription no matter which party he voted for.

I come now to ask, *What if, for the sake of argument, we concede Premier King's contention that he pledged himself against conscription: would any man in his senses hold a premier to such a pledge in view of the change that has taken place throughout the world since that pledge was made?* Look at Europe, look at Africa, look at Asia, at America. This is a different world. The whole world is on fire. Surely it is no time to discuss the technicalities of the question, as to whether the fire could be extinguished by a voluntary bucket brigade, or whether it is necessary to have the most improved and efficient fire-fighting machinery which science can produce.

It is amazing that any man in public life should seem to be so blind to the present perilous position. The Government ought now to enact a conscription measure, on its own responsibility. It ought to appeal to all parties in the House, and say to them—Liberals, Conservatives, C.C.F. members, Social Creditors, or what-not—"Let us have one policy and one principle: a one hundred per cent. Canadian war effort. Let that be our one, our supreme object until this war is won; and we can resume a discussion of the principles for which our respective parties have stood, when the fire is out, when the war is over." I am convinced that the people of this country are leagues ahead of the somnolent and utterly reprehensible Government.

Instead of taking such a stand, the Premier seems strangely concerned to know the people's will. No man has treated the people's representatives in Parliament with greater contempt than the present Prime Minister and his Government. Apparently Mr. King is incapable of putting the country's interests before those of himself and his party.

We do not know as yet what the plebiscite will be about. Will it be a simple question, for or against conscription, the carrying of which would obligate the Government to introduce such a measure? Or is the country to be put to this expense merely to give the Government a free hand to do as it likes? In the latter case, who would know how to vote? We could never vote to authorize the present Government to do whatever it likes; and if that be the proposal, it is an insult to the Canadian people.

But let us assume that it will be a straight vote on the question of conscription, *what about national unity?* Before the war we were virtually threatened with open revolt if a conscription measure was enacted. That is not democracy. Democracy implies the rule of the majority, with a recognition of the rights of the minority. But it is no part of the right of a minority to threaten to rebel unless it is allowed to have its own way.

But if the plebiscite should be taken in such a way as to involve a straight vote on the conscription issue, *what would happen if it should be defeated?* We can be sure that already the fourth Axis power has disguised itself, and entered into the battle. We shall have a few bishops and archbishops speaking in favour of conscription—but that will be only a blind. The fourth Axis power, we may be sure, is already as thoroughly organized as were the Japanese before Pearl Harbor; and we can be certain that the fourth Axis power will work against the carrying of any conscription measure. What then? Shall we forsake the men who have voluntarily enlisted? When the storm breaks, and they stand in the line of battle—whether it be in Great Britain, on the Continent of Europe, in Africa, or somewhere in the Pacific—and they cry for reinforcement, shall we stand by helpless and say we have no men ready to send?

On the other hand, can we hold up our heads in honour should we see the United States sending a conscript army to defend British territory, whether in the Pacific, in Asia, or Europe, or elsewhere? The idea seems to me intolerable. We value beyond estimate the tremendous reinforcement the cause of world-liberty has received by the coming of the United States into the war; but that great country has not come in that we may do less; they have not come to relieve us of our legitimate obligation. The simple fact is that we need an army double or triple the size of the army we have. If by secret opposition and subtle propaganda this fourth Axis power should succeed in defeating this measure, what is the alternative?

On the other hand, *what if it carries?* Shall we know in what territory the plebiscite carries if it be a vote for conscription? Shall we know in what territories the conscription principle is opposed? If so, what becomes of national unity? On the other hand, as has been suggested, that the total vote only is to be counted, and the people of Canada are to be treated like children, and not be allowed to know who and what people are voting—will that make for national unity? It is bound to breed suspicion.

If Mr. King had devised a scheme by which to bring to the surface all contrary elements, he could scarcely have found a better way than by the proposed plebiscite.

But again, if it carry, *will those who have opposed conscription hitherto submit?* And if not, what will they do? Shall we have open rebellion and revolt? Or shall we have a further proposal to apply the conscription law only to those territories which have voted in its favour? That would be imposing an injustice, or at least an inequality of treatment upon the minorities in those territories where the majority has favoured it.

And further, let us suppose this to carry and a conscription law to be enacted, the great question then is, *Who will administer it?* Could we depend upon a fair administration of the law in the province of Quebec? If the matter of enforcement were put into the hands of French-Canadian administrators, we should have the same glaring injustice which characterises their decisions in marriages and other matters—in fact, every matter where the interests of the Roman Catholic Church are at stake.

I affirm, in closing this address, that there are four Axis powers fighting against us, and the most dangerous of the four is the one that has disguised itself to enter into the battle, namely, the Papacy, the Vatican State, which is fighting against us, and on the side of the world's enslavement everywhere.

"The Truth Will Out"

(Continued from page 2)

When Mr. Godbout said that Prime Minister King was against conscription for overseas service, someone in the rear of the hall shouted "Yes, but he has already sent men overseas."

The youths kept up a continual cry of "Canada, Canada only." After the meeting broke up, they lined up in the street outside the hall, and marched away shouting "A bas, a bas, a bas la conscription." (Down, down with conscription).

Discusses Plebiscite

Discussing the proposed plebiscite, Mr. Godbout said that Prime Minister King could put the question this way: "Are you for conscription," or "Are you against conscription?"

"If the majority answered in the affirmative Mr. King would have to enforce conscription or else resign. If he resigns, another government, headed by Mr. Meighen (Conservative Leader Arthur Meighen) will take his place and will immediately enforce conscription.

"But, Mr. King knows that England doesn't need men, so he will not ask the question that way."

Mr. Godbout said he approved of the "defense of our country in our own land, but there are certain territories which must be defended to protect our own land." He mentioned Labrador and islands off the coast of British Columbia as places to be defended to protect Canada.

"England has no need of men," he said. "What England needs are munitions and food. That is where the industry and agriculture of our country can help.

"I am French. I want to remain French, and in remaining French I want to carry my head high. We can all be good French-Canadians, but let us be patriotic, let us be good Canadians."

We remind our readers that Premier Godbout is the man who, as long ago as November, 1940, said:

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

ANNIVERSARY BRISCOE ST., LONDON

"We had four large services on Sunday, January 18th, Bible School at 10 a.m., morning service at 11 a.m., afternoon service at 3 p.m. and evening service at 7 p.m. Although it rained all day, splendid crowds were present for all services. The morning service was broadcast over CFPL, (this is a monthly feature the third Sunday of each month). The Ambassadors from Royal Oak, Michigan, provided special music throughout the day.

"The evangelistic service at 7 p.m. was well attended, and a young lady responded to the invitation to accept Christ as her Saviour.

"Special offerings were received at all services for the purpose of renovation of our Church basement, which we plan to make more attractive and useful for Sunday School purposes. Our debt has been reduced to \$525.00."—R. D. Guthrie.

FROM A CHAPLAIN WITH THE TROOPS

Captain Bernard Jeffery writes from England:

"I am now in a private billet, with an English family, who also have a few evacuees. But I dine at the home of an old Lord, whose mansion is used as our Headquarters but he occupies one end of it. So we keep moving. This is my second move since coming to this unit. But I trust we shall soon be moving into action, although no word has come of it yet. Christmas was a fine day here with spring-like weather prevailing. Roses are in bloom in the old church yard where our services are held. (We hold the services in the church not the grave yard!)

We had turkey and the trimmings for dinner and then I spent the evening with the boys in the canteen where games and refreshments were enjoyed. The women over here do all possible for the men, in spite of rationing. I spoke in an Anglican church Sunday evening on John 3:7. The minister is an evangelical. There is no other church in the village."

A FRENCH-CANADIAN SOLDIER WRITES "THE GOSPEL WITNESS"

The following letter in French was received from a French-Canadian soldier on Active Service in England:

"I receive THE GOSPEL WITNESS, and after I have read it I pass it on to my patriotic friends and they read it with joyful hearts finding it most interesting. I am glad to know their confidence in Dr. Shields.

"Sometimes one gets a little bit homesick so far away from those he loves. I have met Mr. Jeffery who was my padre for several months. Next Saturday I am going to see Mr. Barham who lives at _____ I close these few lines praying that the Lord will bless you in all your undertakings and wish you a Merry Christmas and a very Happy New Year."

Signed "_____"

We print the above letter because it is often forgotten that there is a small though influential group of French-Canadian Protestants. The young man who wrote this letter is a member of the Jarvis Street Church, as is his sister. We are sure that his fellow-soldiers enjoy reading THE GOSPEL WITNESS, as does he, and pray that its message may lead some of them to a personal knowledge of the Lord Jesus as their Saviour.

ESPIONAGE?

We like the story of two Irishmen who sat at a bar in New York, listening to radio announcements of submarine activity . . . "Ireland hazsha greatesht navy in the whole world," proclaimed one with fitting Irish modesty . . . "Yeah, the Irish Navy can lick all other navies in the whole world," agreed his mate . . . "Is that so?" challenged a listener. "Name just one battleship owned by Ireland." . . . There was a shocked silence as the two men from the land of the Shamrock glared at him and then they chorused . . . "Spy, eh?"

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 6 First Quarter Lesson 6 February 8, 1942

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

VICTORY THROUGH THE HOLY SPIRIT

Lesson Text: Romans 8.

Golden Text: "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?"—Romans 8:32.

JUNIOR CLASSES:

One of the important lessons of this chapter is that the great eternal God, the One Who has all power in heaven and upon earth, loves each individual little child. Teach the children about the majesty and holiness of God, but do not forget to stress His tender compassion (Psa. 138:6; Matt. 6:25-34; 10:29-31). All who trust Him are forever secure (John 10:27-30).

SENIOR CLASSES:

I. Freed from the Condemnation of Sin—verses 1 to 4.

This wonderful chapter commences with a suggestion of the vital truth that iniquity must be pardoned before it can be removed; that justification must precede sanctification. In the best Greek manuscripts verse one ends at the word "Jesus". Deliverance from the penalty of sin and from the power of death has been made possible by the Lord Jesus Christ, Who was made "not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an indissoluble life" (Heb. 7:16).

The language of verses 3 and 4 suggests a court-room. The command was given that a man should live a holy life. Failing to do so he was pronounced guilty by the Judge. In the meantime the Judge's own Son has kept the law in its entirety, and fulfilled its just requirements (Heb. 10:5-10). The Son offers to take the prisoner's place, assume his guilt and serve the sentence, while the prisoner takes the Son's place as the blameless one (Acts 13:39). Another change takes place in that court-room. Christ judged sin, so that the sentence of condemnation which was formerly visited upon the sinner was now dealt to sin itself. Sin the complainant became the defendant, and man the accused, through his Representative Christ, became the accuser (2 Cor. 5:21).

II. Freed from the Control of the Flesh—verses 5 to 13.

The righteousness required by the law which could not be fulfilled by us may be fulfilled *within* us. God calls men by sovereign grace, regenerates and purifies their hearts by the power of His Holy Spirit so that they are given the strength necessary to obey His command that they should be holy (1 Pet. 1:13-16).

The Apostle Paul uses the word "carnal", meaning "fleshly", to describe the person who follows the dictates of his natural desires and appetites (1 Cor. 3:1-4). "Flesh" may be interpreted as "self" in many instances. Notice the contrast between the sphere of the flesh and the sphere of the Spirit (Gal. 5:17-23; 1 John 2:15-17), between the mind of the flesh and the mind of the Spirit (1 Cor. 2:16; Col. 2:8; Jas. 4:4), and between the walk which is according to the flesh and that which is according to the Spirit (Gal. 5:16, 25).

The Holy Spirit comes to dwell in the heart of every believer (1 Cor. 3:16). The body still has within it the seeds of death because of the working of sin; but the spiritual nature has been quickened into life (1 Cor. 15:45; 2 Cor. 4:16). The victory of the Spirit of life over the principle of death within the believer may be illustrated by the use of antitoxins in medicine. Disease germs destroy body tissues, break down the cells, poison the blood and cause weakness and decay. The injection of the antitoxin releases wholesome active forces which counteract the effects of the germs, restore and nourish the wasted cells.

We are commanded not to pamper or indulge the fleshly nature, but to keep it under subjection (Rom. 6:11-13; 13:14;

1 Cor. 9:27; Gal. 5:24; Col. 3:5). At the same time we are to yield to the Holy Spirit within us, Who longs to fill us with His own joy, peace and power (Eph. 5:18). "The life of self is death! The death of self is life!"

III. Freed from the Corruption of Death—verses 14 to 27.

Believing upon the Lord Jesus Christ gives one the right to be called the child of God (John 1:12; Gal. 3:26; 4:3-7; Eph. 1:5; 1 John 3:1). In the eyes of the Roman law the adopted son had the same standing as a son by birth.

The ceremony of adoption was similar in form but far different in spirit from the ceremony of enslavement. In both rites the father touched the candidate with a wand, but in the one case he said "I claim this man as my son"; in the other he said "I claim this man as my slave". As Christians we have not received the spirit of bondage but the spirit of adoption; we enter the family of God, not as slaves into the fear of a Master, but as sons into the love of a Father (2 Tim. 1:7; Heb. 2:11-15).

The Romans reckoned the child as an heir from the day of his birth or adoption. He had part in the responsibilities and burdens of an estate as well as its profits and bounties. We are heirs of God, and while we now suffer with Christ (Acts 14:22; 2 Cor. 1:7; 4:17; Phil. 1:29; 1 Pet. 4:13), we shall one day share His eternal glory (John 17:24; Eph. 1:13, 14; Col. 1:12, 13; 3:4; 1 Pet. 1:3-9; 1 John 3:2).

The full redemption of the believer is yet to come (Eph. 4:30). Christ will one day present us faultless before the throne of God, having redeemed our bodies as well as spirits and souls (John 5:21; Phil. 3:20, 21; 1 Thess. 5:23; Jude 24). The body, which is now subject to corruption, must put on incorruptibility (1 Cor. 15:49-57; 2 Cor. 5:1-4).

The liberty of the glory of the children of God will be accompanied by the lifting of the curse which was put upon the material earth for man's sin (Gen. 3:17-19; 2 Pet. 3:13). The intense longing is spoken of as a "groaning". The creation, the creature and the Creator, in the person of the Holy Spirit; all groan, striving toward the deliverance of the world from sorrow, decay and death.

While the Christian awaits the promised redemption the Holy Spirit gives Divine assistance. He is the Quickener of our bodies (v. 11), the Witness of our sonship (v. 16), the Surety of our inheritance (v. 23), the Interpreter of the will of God (v. 27) and the Helper of our weakness (v. 26). He is our Intercessor, the other Paraclete or Comforter (John 14:16), our Advocate, pleading God's cause with us as Christ pleads our cause before the Father (v. 34; 1 John 2:1).

IV. Freed from the Charges of Satan—verses 28 to 39.

God's eternal purpose for the sanctification of the believer is being carried out step by step until the supreme goal shall be reached—conformity to the likeness of Christ (2 Cor. 3:18; 1 John 3:2). God wills that the one who has been foreordained, foredestinated, called and justified shall be finally glorified, clothed with the perfection of Christ (Eph. 1:3-11). Therefore He will make all things work together for good to them that love Him, since He has called them according to His own unailing purpose. The Christian is hence secure from Satan's domination because all things are under the authority of the Lord, Who is great as well as gracious, mighty as well as merciful.

Satan, the accuser of the brethren, would also hinder our testimony by impeaching us before God the Judge. But his charges are not sustained because of the successful pleading of Christ our Advocate (Psa. 37:32, 33; Isa. 50:8, 9; 1 Cor. 6:11; Heb. 7:25; 9:24; Rev. 12:10).

Then again, Satan frequently tempts believers to doubt God's love when they are called upon to suffer trials and sorrows of any sort. God's love for us is not to be judged or misjudged by the untoward circumstances of life (Gen. 42:36; 45:5-8; 50:20; Rom. 5:8). We walk by faith, and we should trust where we cannot trace the hand of our faithful and loving Father. Nothing whatever has power to cause His love toward us to diminish in the least degree.

In Christ we have complete victory over our enemies; sin, the flesh, death and Satan (John 16:33; 1 Cor. 15:26; 2 Cor. 2:14; 1 John 4:4).

The Papacy

For a period of 150 years the state of the papacy was so immoral that even "cardinal" Baronius, a papist apologist, described it as "the Reign of the Harlots." The popes were created by rival mobs of the city of Rome, and for 19 years the "holy" popes were nominated by Alberic, the son of one of the harlots, while for 33 years they were chosen by robbers. Eight popes died violent deaths in 102 years, and eight of the "infallible" popes occupied the chair of papa within seven years. Pope John X. kept as his mistress the harlot Theodora, and was murdered by her daughter Marozia. John XII. was made pope by his father Alberic when only 19 years old and made the Lateran palace a brothel; he was killed by an injured husband. Benedict IX. was elected pope at the age of 12 and became a debauchee and murderer, and eventually sold the papacy to Gregory VI. In one year alone there were three rival popes living in Rome. The papist "cardinal" Baronius draws a terrible picture of the state of the "church" when he writes:—"Such was the unhappy state of the 'Holy' (1) Roman 'Church' at that time, that everything was managed by the will of that most powerful harlot Theodora the Elder. Sees ('bishop'-rics) were changed, 'bishops' appointed, and there were intruded into the See of Peter paramours, false pontiffs. . . For who can count as lawful pontiffs men of this kind, intruded into the See by harlots, without law?" Theodora, mentioned above by Baronius, and her daughter Marozia were the two most profligate women of that time, and these two disposed of "Peter's Chair" as they pleased. Theodora made her paramour first "bishop" of Ravenna, and then pope. He was put to death by Marozia. Marozia, on her husband's death, married his son Guy, and upon his death married his half-brother Hugh. She also had a son by pope Sergius III., whom Baronius described as "the slave of every vice, and the most wicked of men." This child she made pope as John XI. at a tender age.

Such are some of the "holy" popes, "Our Lord God Almighty" as papists blasphemously call them; in whose "infallibility," said one of themselves, all men must believe or have their eternal portion with devils in everlasting fire! If Romanists could only know the truth concerning their popes, they would throw off their shackles with disgust; the trouble is that they won't listen to Protestants who desire to inform them of this disagreeable truth about the "holy" humbugs and arch-hypocrites who keep them enslaved in superstitious fear.

How Rome Uses The Daily Press

In *The Ottawa Citizen* of January 3rd in a column headed "Questions and Answers"—presumably a regular feature, the following gem of misrepresentation occurs, not in a Roman Catholic organ, but in a daily secular paper:

Baptists and Pope

Q.—(1) Who founded the Baptist Church and in what year? (2) Please give the name of the first Pope of the Catholic Church. (3) In what year did St. Peter die? (4) Where was he buried?—I.B.

A.—(1) John Smyth and Thomas Helwys (England) in 1611. (2) St. Peter. (3) Died a martyr in the year 64. (4) Vatican, relics transferred to the catacombs in A.D. 258.

The Editor's Engagements

Dr. Shields will spend at least a week, beginning February 11th with the Community Church and Charlotte Bible Institute, 1033 Central Avenue, Charlotte, North Carolina, of which the Rev. G. H. Hendry is Minister and Principal. We presume—we have not just now particulars of the programme—there will be services each evening.

On April 12th Dr. Shields will begin a two weeks' evangelistic mission with Dr. A. E. Gammage of Calvary Baptist Church, Miami, Florida. GOSPEL WITNESS readers who may be within reach of either of these places will be most heartily welcomed.

An Example of Rome's Lawlessness

(The item below is from a Montreal paper of a week or so ago. It supplies a further illustration of how the Papacy exalts itself above the law of the land and above the moral law, and uses its deadly heretical sacramentarian authority to terrorize its dupes into submission.)

BARRED BY THE CHURCH

Excommunication of Those Who Sued Archbishop

Proclaimed by Rome

In a decree issued from Vatican City, Rome, all those involved or who concurred together in the civil suit instituted against Monsignor Georges Gauthier, archbishop co-adjutor of Montreal, and the Corporation of Archdiocese of Montreal to recover loans made to the parish of St. Etienne, were excommunicated by the Roman Catholic Church.

The decree was made public yesterday by Mgr. I. Antoniutti, apostolic delegate to Canada for the Holy See, though the ruling was anticipated locally for several months past. A total of \$260,000 in loans were made to the Corporation of the Parish of St. Etienne, and five or six note holders were concerned in the case, which will come before the courts February 1.

J. H. Michaud is appearing for these St. Etienne parish note holders, and last night he had no official statement to make in the matter.

Article 120 of Roman Catholic Church Law holds that any member of the church wishing to take civil suit against the church or any priest, must first have permission from the archbishop of the diocese. It is reported that the present ex-communicants did not secure this, and therefore, according to the decree "these persons are subject to all the penalties provided in such cases by Canon Law."

Henceforth, those named will not be able to attend mass, receive sacraments, or be buried in ground consecrated by the Roman Catholic church. Last night one of the plaintiffs stated that he had written to Rome five times for permission to sue, and the answers were indefinite, neither granting the request nor definitely refusing it.

BOOKS BY DR. T. T. SHIELDS

"The Adventures of a Modern Young Man" ..	\$1.00
"Other Little Ships"	1.00
"The Plot That Failed"	1.00
"The Oxford Group Movement Analyzed"05
25 copies	1.00
Russellism or Rutherfordism, (103 pages)35
"The Papacy—In the Light of Scripture"10
"Why I Believe the Rapture Cannot Precede the Tribulation." Also "The Meaning of the Parousia". In Booklet of 32 pages10
20 copies	1.00
War Sermons from "A Sword Bathed in Heaven" to the Sermon in this issue— postpaid, individual sermons, each05
There are also still available copies reporting the great Protest Meeting which inspired the organization of The Canadian Protest- ant League; and of other issues dealing with the Catholic controversy.	
The Gospel Witness, published weekly, per annum	2.00

Address: THE GOSPEL WITNESS,

130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto, Can.