

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. 40

TORONTO, FEBRUARY 5, 1942

Whole Number 1029

The Story of Malta

The following article is an excerpt from a book entitled, "The Roman Catholic Church in the Modern State" by Charles C. Marshall of the New York Bar with Preface by Isaac Foot, M.P. The book was published in 1931. The article following is taken from the FOREWORD. The case of Malta is cited by the author to illustrate Rome's method of using its religious authority to secure political ends. We may well ask, What would have happened in this war if Malta had fallen under the dominance of the Roman Catholic Church? Rome saw that the war was coming and sought to establish complete control there. No spot of earth had more air raids than Malta; but Malta stands. Here follows Mr. Marshall's story.

MALTA

Whatever its roots, the situation in Malta, in its ultimate development, results from the use by the Roman Catholic Church of the confessional as the means for coercing Roman Catholic citizens in the exercise of the electoral franchise.

Malta, long a British Colony with a population mostly Roman Catholic, was granted a Constitution in 1921 by Letters Patent of the British Imperial Government. That Government appoints the Governor. The Governor appoints the Ministers and designates the head of the Ministry. The Senate consists of ten special members, two appointed by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, two elected by the nobility, two by the University, two by the Chamber of Commerce, two by the Trades Union; the seven general members of the Senate and the thirty-two members of the Assembly are elected by popular vote. Extraordinary powers are reserved to the British Government. Full liberty of conscience and of worship are guaranteed, and all religious qualifications for the holding of office are prohibited. The Maltese Legislature has provided by Statute that, subject to the Constitution, the Roman Catholic religion shall be the State religion.

Under this form of government the situation in Malta has developed. The facts have now been put before the public in two publications: (1) the Blue Book en-

titled, *Correspondence with the Holy See relative to Maltese Affairs, January 1929 to May 1930, presented by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to Parliament by Command of His Majesty;*¹ and (2) the White Book entitled *Exposition of the Malta Question, with documents, (translation), February 1929 to June 1930, Vatican Polyglot Press.*²

In the following recital (except in respect to a few particulars stated in the *Blue Book*) we adhere to the story as set forth in the *White Book*.

It recites (p. 15) that religious peace, which had prevailed for a long time in the Island of Malta, commenced to be seriously disturbed in recent years because of the activities, against religion, of Lord Gerald Strickland, the President of the Council of Ministers, and the head of the Constitutional party.

It is well known that Lord Strickland is himself a member of the Roman Catholic Church. But he has been active in that party which has been out of favour with the authorities of the Roman Church. Protests on the part of the authorities of the Church against Lord Strickland's activities began October 25, 1921, in a letter by the Archbishop of Malta (W.B., p. 15). From that time on protests were made against the speeches and publications of Lord Strickland and the members of his party.

The *White Book* (p. 16) recites that, in the meanwhile, two incidents of a special gravity occurred which rendered the religious situation very delicate and obliged the Holy See to take some action."

One of these was the visit of three Bishops of the Church of England to the Island of Malta, on which occasion they were allowed by the Maltese Government to hold a series of conferences in the throne-room of the Governor, in the former palace of the Grand Master of the Order of Malta, which is the property of the people of Malta (p. 17). Lord Strickland, the head of the Ministry, suspended the sittings of Parliament so that he

1. Cited as B.B.
2. Cited as W.B.

and his colleagues might pay their respects to the visiting "Protestant" Bishops (p. 66). To the courtesies so extended the Vatican took grave exception (p. 123), and in a letter to the British Minister at the Vatican, dated February 23, 1929, Cardinal Gasparri, Papal Secretary of State, pronounced the incidents not only "particularly displeasing", but "offensive" to the Roman Catholic majority of the Maltese, because they constituted "a formal and official favouring of the Anglican creed" (p. 67).

In the same month that the visit of the Anglican Bishops to Malta so outraged the Holy See, another event transpired which the Vatican authorities gravely characterized as the "peak" of the controversy, and as containing, "questions far-reaching and fundamental, concerning the relations of independence of Church and State" (p. 89).

The Holy See asserted the right of its authorities to command a British subject of the Roman Catholic faith—a friar, the Rev. P. Guido Micallef—to leave Malta against his will and reside in another country (pp. 17, 127). Father Micallef was neither charged with nor guilty of any offence against the laws of Malta, or against the British Government, but he was disaffected toward his religious superior, a certain Father Carta, whose command to leave Malta and reside elsewhere he refused to obey (pp. 17, 127).

Lord Strickland, the head of the Ministry, was outspoken in his repudiation of the right of the ecclesiastical authority to deport Father Micallef against his will. He declared to the Maltese Parliament: "If an alien like Father Carta would be able to send a Maltese subject into exile against his will, public order would be imperiled" (p. 18).

The Government of Malta refrained from the coercion of Micallef, and on February 23, 1929, the Vatican advised the British Imperial Government:

"That the Holy See has learnt, with deep regret and surprise, what has taken place in Malta in connection with the measures adopted towards the Franciscan friar, Guido Micallef.

"For grave reasons of ecclesiastical discipline, the lawful Superior of the said religious, the representative, that is, of the Head House in Rome, had ordered Micallef to withdraw from Malta to another friary of the Order outside the Island.

"The latter, however, did not leave and found a pretext for his disobedience to the hierarchy of the Church in the order of the local Government authorities who prevented his departure and furthermore sought to justify before the public their attitude by alleging political motives which do not in fact exist." (p. 67.)

The British Imperial Government replied that "no obstacle is being put by the Maltese Government in the way of Father Micallef's departure", and added that "according to information from Malta, the condemnation of this priest, a British subject, to leave British territory at the command of Father Carta, a foreigner, has caused a certain amount of popular indignation, which has been a source of embarrassment to His Majesty's Government" (p. 69).

The contention of Lord Strickland and the Maltese Ministers seems to have been that although Father Micallef, a British subject, had, as a monk, taken vows of obedience to religious authority under the Pope, he had not lost the right vested in him by the British Constitution to reside where he pleased, and that neither dis-

affection toward his religious superiors nor flat disobedience to their commands forfeited in any way his civil rights as a British subject (p. 123).

The allegation by the Vatican (p. 18) that the Government "forbade" Father Micallef's departure seems to have meant nothing more than that, wishing to remain in Malta, he would not ask for his passport, and the Government would not issue the same, or support it with the necessary coercion, at the request of the authorities of the Church.

Thus the Maltese Ministry and the British Imperial Government, sustaining Lord Strickland, repudiated the authority claimed by the Pope to deprive a British subject of his civil rights.

Father Micallef continued to reside in the place of his selection, and the action of Lord Strickland and the Ministry confirmed the historic lines of England's poet, a century before:

"Slaves cannot breathe in England;
They touch our country, and their shackles fall."

But the controversy was not ended. Each side framed and presented further issues involving other considerations than those of the Micallef case. The British Government alleged that the root of the trouble in Malta was the intense participation of Maltese priests in local politics and invited the Holy See to restrain its priests in their political activities (pp. 70, 126, 133). This request was refused (pp. 139-140).

The Vatican, on its side, held that the source of the troubles in Malta was the political and anti-"Catholic" activities of Lord Strickland. It accused him, among other things, of injuring the Roman Pontiff in pamphlets and speeches, of favoring Freemasons, of insolence toward the Pope and the Vatican Government, of exciting animosity against the Pope, of allowing "Protestant" Bishops to hold conferences in the Government palace, and fomenting discord between the Government and the Roman Catholic Bishops of Malta and of Gozo in questions of the jurisdiction of Church and State.¹

On the basis of these charges the Vatican, in a communication to the British Government pronounced Lord Strickland *persona non grata* to the Holy See (pp. 95, 98, 102, 155). The British Imperial Government strenuously protested this action as an interference in the politics of a British Colony (p. 155).

On May 1, 1930, the Maltese Bishops issued to the Roman Catholics of Malta a *Pastoral Letter* (p. 134), calling attention to the State election then approaching and declaring:

"Know, therefore, as Catholics:—

"1. You may not, without committing a grave sin, vote for Lord Strickland and his candidates, or for all those, even of other parties, who in the past have helped and supported him in his fight against the rights and the discipline of the Church, or who propose to help and support him in the coming elections.

"2. For even stronger reasons you may not present yourselves as candidates in the electoral list proposed by Lord Strickland or by other parties who propose to support him in the coming election.

"3. You are also solemnly bound in conscience in the present circumstances to take part in the elections and to vote for those persons who, by their attitude in the past, offer greater guarantee both for religious welfare and for social welfare.

1. See *Pro-memoria on the activities of Lord Strickland, White Book* pp. 113-123.

"In order, then, to prevent abuses in the administration and reception of the Sacraments, we remind our priests that they are strictly forbidden to administer the Sacraments to the obstinate who refuse to obey these instructions."

The *Pastoral Letter* precipitates a grave civil crisis. The Maltese Government was paralyzed. The Roman Catholic citizens of Malta were deprived by the Letter, of freedom of conscience and reason in the exercise of the electoral franchise conferred on them by the State. It was grave sin if they refrained from voting, and grave sin if they voted in a manner forbidden by the Bishops, and the penalty was the deprivation of those Sacraments on which, in their minds, salvation depended. The religious coercion, by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, of citizens in the performance of civic duty and the exercise of civil privileges was obvious, and furthermore it was supported by thirteen affidavits from Maltese Roman Catholic citizens, filed with the British Imperial Government with a report by the Maltese Minister for Education (B.B., pp. 68-79). They are all to a similar effect. Giuseppe Bondi, Doctor of Laws of the University of Malta, and practicing barrister deposed in substance as follows:

I went to St. Francis Church, and accosted Fr. Mariano Zerri of the Franciscans and asked him to receive my confession. As soon as I knelt down, he said to me:

"Excuse me, advocate, but we have received orders to put this question to the penitents before they start their confession: 'What party do you belong to?'"

I replied: "I side with the Constitutionals or Strickland's party."

He said: "I am very sorry, but in these circumstances we have orders to refuse absolution, so it is of no use your confessing."

I remarked: "Am I to understand then, that if I simply said that I would change my party you would absolve me?"

He replied: "I understand what you mean; no, it is not enough to say so, but you must promise and do so."

In these circumstances I told him I would withdraw, which I did.

Michael A. Borg, Police Inspector, deposed:

I went to the Church of St. Francis to confess before the Easter Communion. After I had finished my confession the priest, Fr. Egidio Vella, said:

"Now I am bound to ask you, in fulfilment of orders I have received from the Church authorities, what party you belong to, and if you side with Strickland's and do not change your opinion I cannot give you absolution."

I replied: "These matters are purely temporal and have nothing to do with spiritual affairs. I therefore refuse to reveal to which party I propose to give my vote at the next election."

He replied: "My orders are precise and preclude me from absolving you."

Luigi Gauci, aged 19, farm labourer, deposed:

I went to confession to the Rev. Michael Vella. He asked me to what party I belonged and on my replying that I was a Stricklander, he warned me that I incurred mortal sin. On my remarking that I was not even an elector as I was under age, he said, "It does not matter, as the order is general and applies even to women and children."

The British Government in a statement dated May 9, 1930, advised the Holy See that the course of the ecclesiastical authorities at Malta was, in its opinion, in the highest degree reprehensible, and that it felt compelled to authorize the Governor of Malta to exercise his reserved powers and to suspend the elections in the Island (W.B., pp. 141-142). By a *Pro-memoria* dated May 19, 1930, the Holy See sustained the ecclesiastical authori-

ties in Malta, in their use of the confessional and declared the investigation of the confessional painful and seriously offensive to the Faith. "The Holy See", it said, "cannot refrain from lifting its voice and protesting in the most emphatic manner." (W.B., p. 145).

Political and religious feeling ran high, and on May 23, an attempt was made to assassinate Lord Strickland. The bullets miscarried. A number of the leading Maltese citizens addressed a letter to the Archbishop asking that he allow a special *Te Deum* to be sung in the Cathedral of St. John as a thanksgiving for the escape of Lord Strickland. This request was refused.¹ An attempt to storm the Roman Catholic Cathedral was made, and rioting followed in the streets.²

The Pope on August 22, 1929, received a company of the citizens of Malta, on a visit to Rome. Referring to the civil disturbances in Malta, he declared that to be with the Bishops and the Pope meant to be with Jesus Christ, of Whom they must think when they looked at a Bishop, and that "whoever is not under the protection of the Pope shall be overcome" (W.B., p. 105).

The British Government on May 16, 1930, made the continuance of negotiations with the Vatican "conditional upon orders being given by the Holy See to the episcopal authorities in Malta and Gozo which will restore to the electorate of the colony complete freedom to exercise their political judgment," (p. 142).

The Holy See refused the condition, again affirming that the Bishops were fully within their authority, and admonished the British Government that the Two Powers, the two complete societies, ecclesiastical and civil (none other than the Roman Catholic Church and the political State), were constituted by God Himself, and that the Roman Church no more than the State could renounce its essential rights (p. 151).

In the civil crisis thus created the British Government by Letters Patent suspended the Maltese Constitution; the impending elections were indefinitely postponed; the British Governor assumed full charge of Malta as a Colony of the British Crown; the expiring Parliament lapsed; the electoral franchise was put in abeyance. Such is the civic paralysis which has come about in Malta through the assertion by the Pope of his right to deprive a British subject, professing the Roman Catholic religion, of the civil liberty guaranteed him by the law of the land, and through the utilization by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of the confessional and the Sacraments to coerce the action of Roman Catholic citizens in an issue which the Holy See holds is religious and of the church, but which the British Government holds is political and of the State.

We quote the discriminating comment of an American editor:

"The issue in Malta may have once been confused. The action of the prelates has made it simple. It is whether a citizen is entitled to vote according to his own conscience in a democratic country. Unless that privilege is safeguarded, true self-government ceases to exist in Malta and political power passes from the people and their representatives to the priests."³

1. *The Times* (London), June 5, 1930.

2. *The New York Times*, June 9, 1930.

3. From editorial in *The Christian Science Monitor* (U.S.A.), June 2, 1930.

Malta During the War

From the foregoing story one can see how anxious the Vatican was to secure control of Malta; and the history of Malta during the war discloses the reason. Malta in Italian and then in German hands would have been a deadly obstacle to the control of the Mediterranean. Surely it was provisionally ordered that the Acting-Governor and Commander-in-Chief of Malta, at this time should be such an one as Lieutenant-General Sir W. G. S. Dobbie, K.C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O. General Dobbie's confession has appeared in several publications; the following is taken from *The Shantyman*:

MALTA'S MAN OF DESTINY

The magnificent defence of Malta has won the admiration of the world. Some one thousand air attacks, as well as naval attacks have already been made upon it. The papers prepare us for even greater efforts on the part of the Axis powers to lay this sentinel and key of the Mediterranean in ruin. The heart of the Commonwealth of Nations burns within it when viewing the courage of its soldiers and inhabitants and a Christian world remembers before God daily its gallant Commander and his forces.

What kind of man is this, who so nobly faces the utmost the Nation's enemies can do and victoriously thwarts their wicked plans?

Lieutenant-General Sir W. G. S. Dobbie, K.C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., Acting-Governor and Commander-in-Chief, has recently given in memorable words the secret of his ability "to face life." Writing to the paper "The Pilgrim" in South Africa, he says:

I gladly give my testimony to the saving and keeping power of God in Christ.

I came to know him as my Saviour forty-seven years ago, and all through my military service to the present day He has been my Saviour and Lord. Although I have often and often been unfaithful to Him, yet He has never been unfaithful to me, nor has He let me down. I have always been sensible of the fact that my sins, which were forgiven me when I first accepted Him as my Saviour, were blotted out once for all, and that in spite of my failures I have become "a new creature in Christ Jesus." That realization has given me a profound peace which none of the circumstances of army life in peace or war have been able to disturb.

I should also like to testify that to serve God and to follow Him is a very real and practical thing in the Army. The help that He gives is also real and practical, as I have proved times without number. I have made it a habit to bring all my problems to Him, both great and small, both professional and private, and I can testify that the help He gives is certain and convincing.

I have known Him now for forty-seven years, and I could not face life without Him. I pity from the bottom of my heart those who are trying to live without Him. They little know what they are missing—it is no small thing to know that all the past has been forgiven, that help from the hands of Almighty God is available for the present, and that the whole future for eternity is assured. I am not presumptuous when I say I know that, because it has all been given to me by His grace—apart from my own deserts. I commend such a Saviour to all.

An Address Instead of a Sermon

The weekly sermon is omitted from this issue because of the length of the address published in its place. This address has been issued in pamphlet form, and a limited number of copies are available for distribution at the following rates:

Single copy, .05; 6 copies, .25; 15 copies, .50; 40 copies, \$1.00.

Monday's Meeting

Monday was an unfortunate night for the meeting at which the address contained in this issue was delivered. The temperature was below zero. We heard a report that it was ten below. It may not have been quite so cold, but we should not have felt disposed to dispute the question with anyone had they announced it was forty below! The balmy breezes of a southern climate which have warmed us for the greater part of the winter found people as unprepared to meet the attack of Jack Frost as was the American Navy in Pearl Harbour. However, there was quite a large congregation, *The Globe and Mail* estimated four hundred. Others put the estimate much higher—it was several times larger than most political meetings. The address will be better understood in any event in its printed form.

Isn't This Lovely?

One scarcely knows whether to be amused or to be angry with news from Eire. Someone sent us a little clipping from one of the London papers the other day, quoting a typical Irish woman on a Dublin tram as gleefully saying to someone, "Thanks be to God, the English now are properly bate." In reply her friend said, "Yes, and I suppose the Germans will soon be landing in Eire." "Faith", she replied indignantly, "the English Navy would never allow such a thing, surely!"

Certainly the Irish mind is a thing apart. It is constantly declaring its enmity toward England, yet comfortably adopts a neutral attitude in the assurance that her worst enemy, Britain, will protect her.

Here is a gem taken from *The Winnipeg Free Press* of January 31st. (The emphasis is ours):

SEIZURE IS FEARED

By William King

Dublin, Eire, Jan. 30 (AP)—Official concern is felt here that the arrival of United States troops in Ulster may be preliminary to seizure of Eire's naval bases which the united nations need badly for the Battle of the Atlantic, an informed source said today.

"We are so keen on peace," said one Irishman, "that we will fight for it.

"Although I don't think it will come to that, any attack by Germany would not necessarily mean that we would call for help from anyone. *Foreign troops would automatically walk in to fight beside Eire's army.*"

This neutrality of Eire is strongly expressed both by officials and by the man on Dublin's streets.

Eire's 250,000 troops are not armed adequately, and *the government attitude is that they should be equipped by Britain.*

Officially, Eire feels no obligation to fight by the side of Britain even though she admits she is dependent upon Allied shipping.

**Subscribe for
The Gospel Witness**

Subscription \$2.00 per year

Premier King's Plebiscite Speech in Commons Analyzed

An Address by Dr. T. T. Shields

Delivered in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Monday Evening, February 2nd, 1942

I speak upon the subject announced for this evening's address because I believe the plebiscite proposal now before the Canadian Parliament has in it such dangerous potentialities as may seriously affect the peace of the Dominion. In my view the campaign preliminary to the vote, as well as the vote itself, whatever the result, must inevitably greatly retard, if it does not seriously impede the present war effort in which we are engaged. But in addition to that, it contains possibilities of disruption to our national structure as potent as are the explosives contained in a super-bomb for the destruction of the strongest building. I shall endeavour to restrict my discussion to the narrowest possible limits consistent with a fair exposition of the subject.

In his reply to the speech of the present Acting-Leader of the Opposition in Parliament, Mr. King said:

"In the political controversy which unfortunately has become so acute of late; which is obscuring the magnitude and balanced nature of Canada's war effort, and which, moreover, threatens to impair its efficiency, attempts are being made to confuse in the public mind three things which should be kept separate and distinct. With respect to each of these the Government's position is being misrepresented: The first relates to total effort to meet total war.

The second relates to national selective service as a means to this end.

The third relates to the application of compulsion without restriction of any kind; in other words, to conscription for service in the armed forces overseas.

As respects total effort to meet total war, that is and has been right along the policy of the present administration. As regards national selective service as a method of achieving a total effort, that too is and has been the policy of the Government. As respects the use of compulsion in applying the principle of national selective service, that, also, is a part of Government policy. In the case of compulsion only one definite limitation has been recognized and that is the limitation of the use of compulsion as a method of raising men for military service overseas."

No One Wants Confusion

Mr. King says: "Attempts are being made to confuse in the public mind three things which should be kept separate and distinct." I do not believe any responsible person, in Parliament or outside of it, in the press or on the platform, has any desire to effect confusion in the public mind. What we all desire is that such a clear win-the-war programme shall be set before us by the Government as to obviate all possibility of confusion. From the quotation I have made, it would appear that the only matter of controversy between the people and the Government—and I quote Mr. King—is "the limitation of the use of compulsion as a method of raising men for military service overseas."

By far the larger part of Mr. King's speech is occupied with a statement of what Canada has done in the production of ships, the enlargement of its navy, and more particularly the contribution it has made in food, munitions, and finance, to Britain. For all the Government has done in these particulars, it has, I am sure, the full appreciation of the entire nation. In these respects, what the Dominion of Canada desires is that the Gov-

ernment should make the largest possible contribution toward the maintenance of Britain in the war, of which Canada, by its utmost effort, is capable.

We agree with Mr. King that soldiers must be armed, and that both the fighting services and the civil population must be adequately fed. The utmost that Canada can do toward this end will not be too much. And no Government of Canada need fear that the people of this country will ever complain of its prodigality in these directions.

But if it be true that an army must be supplied with food and munitions, it is equally true that munitions without men can never win the war; and such dissatisfaction with the Government's effort as now obtains throughout the Dominion—and I believe it is very deep, that it is Dominion-wide, and that it is daily growing in intensity—is derived from the Government's failure to make the same total effort in the provision of men that it claims to be making in the supply of munitions.

Compulsion Already Applied

It is not necessary to discuss the principle of compulsion, for the Premier very properly admits that the principle of compulsion is not only embodied in the various war measures taken by the Government, but in the National Resources Mobilization Act of June 20th, 1940. In order that you may have the Premier's words clearly before you, and that it may be included in the record, I here make a further quotation from his speech:

"In the case alike of the mobilization of material resources and of manpower, some measure of compulsion is necessary, just as it is in the case of the mobilization of financial resources. The use of compulsion, or if you prefer the word 'conscription,' for the mobilization of material resources and manpower is not new. It has been approved by this Parliament. The principle of compulsion is embodied in the National Resources Mobilization Act, which was enacted on June 20, 1940. This act gives the Government very wide powers to mobilize, for war purposes, both the material resources and the manpower of the country. . . .

Already the rationing of some commodities for civilian use has begun. If we are to achieve a total effort, far more drastic curtailments will follow.

The whole business of mobilizing material resources is not spectacular; it is far from pleasant; but it is the real foundation of a total war effort. The Government has never hesitated to take any of the necessary steps at the moment it was believed they were essential.

I turn now to the question of the mobilizing of 'manpower,' which term, by the way, when it is used without definite restriction, is intended to comprehend 'womanpower' as well. . . .

National selective service is the method by which the Government proposes to accomplish the mobilization of manpower on an extended scale. Let me define national service as it is understood by the Government. By national service is meant any form of service, either voluntary or compulsory, which contributes directly to Canada's war effort.

By national selective service is meant the selection of men and women for the various forms of national service according to the method or methods calculated to produce the most

satisfactory results. In order to be selective, national service does not necessarily need to be compulsory.

Voluntary service is also selective. The army, for example, does not accept every man who offers to enlist. In finding the right place for a man, no quality is likely to count for more than willingness to serve. Compulsion is only of value where it serves to ensure a greater total effort.

Employ It Where Needed

Wherever necessary and of value in increasing Canada's war effort, the Government is prepared to employ compulsion.

It would, however, be a waste of effort to engage a small army of officials to compel people to do what they are perfectly ready and willing to do without compulsion.

In announcing that national selective service is the method by which the Government proposes to accomplish the mobilization of manpower on an extended scale, the Government is not announcing a new policy. What we propose to do is to extend what, in fact, we have been doing right along, that is, to apply the principle progressively. In other words, we intend to continue to extend the application of national selective service to meet new needs as they arise."

Let us examine what Mr. King has here said. He first explains that the principle of compulsion has already been applied in the mobilization of manpower; and that the selective principle in national service applies both to voluntary and compulsory service. We all understand what that means, I suppose, but perhaps for the purpose of clarity it may be a little more explicitly stated. The principle of compulsion in the Mobilization Act is now applied exclusively for home defense. That is to say, men who are conscripted for the army by the limitational provisions of the Mobilization Act cannot be sent outside of Canada.

Mr. King says:

"What we propose to do is to extend what, in fact, we have been doing right along, that is, to apply the principle progressively. In other words, we intend to continue to extend the application of national selective service to meet new needs as they arise."

There is nothing in this to indicate that the Government proposes to apply the principle of compulsion for military service beyond the boundaries of the Dominion. All they will do is to apply the principle "progressively"; and inasmuch as the Premier includes in the phrase, "national selective service", both voluntary and compulsory service, the Government's announced proposal binds them to nothing at all.

Mr. King says:

"The policy also envisages improvement in the method of selecting men for compulsory military training and service."

But there is not a word here about compulsory service abroad.

Quebec Dictates Terms

I come now to a consideration of the Premier's statement in respect to the Dominion's decision "to stand at the side of Britain in the resistance of aggression, and the defense of freedom." Let me read this extraordinary statement:

"Every honorable member of this House knows that, except for the assurance that, in the event of a European war, there would be no conscription for service overseas, this Parliament would never have decided, in the immediate and unanimous manner in which it did, to stand at the side of Britain in the resistance of aggression, and the defense of freedom.

Honorable members are also aware that if, at the time when Canada's participation in the war was challenged in an election in the Province of Quebec by a Government professing a different political faith, a like assurance with

respect to service overseas had not been given in the name of the present Government by the late Rt. Hon. Ernest Lapointe, by the Minister of Public Works (Hon. P. J. A. Cardin) and other Liberal leaders and members of the House of Commons from the Province of Quebec, the verdict of the people of that Province might have been wholly different.

When, three months later, the direction of the war effort of Canada by the present Administration was challenged—though from an opposite extreme—by a resolution of the Legislature of the Province of Ontario, and the Administration appealed to the people of Canada in a general election, the Government gave the assurance that, if returned to power, it would continue to maintain the policy of no conscription for service overseas.

Not only the Government, but the then Leader of the Conservative Party—a party disguised, it is true, for the time being, as the National Government Party, took an equally strong stand in opposition to conscription for overseas service.

The candidates, not of one political party only, but the vast majority of candidates in the general election, gave their constituents to understand that they were opposed to a policy of conscription for overseas service. . . .

Outside Parliament altogether, the political skies now have become so overcast with controversy, promoted by high-pressure methods and highly financed publicity, that the nature and extent of Canada's war effort is not only being obscured, but is in danger of being seriously impaired."

Mr. King admits that standing "at the side of Britain" is to engage "in the resistance of aggression, and the defense of freedom"; and yet he says that but for his pledge, "there would be no conscription for service overseas, this Parliament would never have decided in the immediate and unanimous manner in which it did, to stand at the side of Britain in the resistance of aggression, and the defense of freedom." That is to say, Mr. King tells us that the Canadian Parliament would never have agreed that this country would take its place "in the resistance of aggression, and the defense of freedom" if the price of such resistance and defense was conscription for service overseas.

Did Quebec Serve Notice on Premier?

How does Mr. King know that to be a fact? Such a proposal was never submitted to the House of Commons. He must have been informed by certain elements in the House that the price of their acquiescence in Canada's participation in the war was a pledge that there should be no conscription for service overseas. What was that element then which had so clearly indicated its determined stand to the Prime Minister?

Mr. King goes farther and tells us that it was because "a like assurance with respect to service overseas" had been given to the people of Quebec by the late Right Honourable Ernest Lapointe, and the Minister of Public Works, Honourable P. J. A. Cardin, that the people of Quebec defeated the Provincial Government of that time (Duplessis' régime), and elected instead the present Government, which as we all know, is headed by Premier Godbout.

Quebec Dictated

It must surely be admitted on the ground of Mr. King's own statement, therefore, that the Province of Quebec, a minority of the people of this Dominion, dictated the Government's policy; and that only in consideration of the pledge made in Parliament by the Prime Minister, and made to Quebec through Mr. Lapointe and Mr. Cardin, did the people of Quebec consent to Canada's participation in the war; for the Prime Minister said that had not these pledges been made in Quebec, "the

verdict of the people of that Province might have been wholly different". And had not the assurance been given in the House of Commons that there would be no conscription for overseas service, the House of Commons would not have voted "in the immediate and unanimous manner in which it did."

The Prime Minister informs us that the consent of Parliament for Canada "to stand at the side of Britain in the resistance of aggression, and the defence of freedom" was secured by this assurance, and the inevitable implication of his statement is that this assurance was given to secure the consent of the Province of Quebec.

Premier Godbout in 1940

More than a year ago we printed an extract from a report of a speech delivered in Plessisville, Quebec, on November 17th, by Mr. Adéland Godbout, Premier of Quebec, and contained in the issue of *l'Action Catholique*, of November 18th, 1940, in which he was reported to have spoken as follows:

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

"I hope 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.")

We learn, therefore, from Mr. Godbout that the Mobilization Act was passed, not to give any additional authority to the Government, but for the sake of the restrictive clause forbidding compulsory military service for overseas. Mr. Godbout says:

"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."

We have quoted Mr. Godbout many times in the interim to the effect that Quebec, through a little handful of French-Canadians in the House of Commons, led by M. Ernest Lapointe, had dictated its will to the Country. This is now confirmed by the Prime Minister's speech in the House of Commons.

A Correspondent of "Le Devoir"

As throwing further light on this matter I make a quotation which also I published more than a year ago from an article from Mr. Léopold Richer, Parliamentary correspondent of *Le Devoir*, which appeared in the issue of that paper, November 2nd, 1940, entitled: "An Inacceptable Pretext". The excerpt is as follows:

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

"National Unity"?

For a long time now we have been urged, entreated, cajoled, and threatened, to be careful of our speech, lest we disturb "national unity". Mr. King now admits tacitly that there never has been any true national unity; that we have been spared the open opposition of the Province of Quebec only because Quebec was allowed to have her own way, or in the words of Premier Godbout, was allowed to dictate her will to the country.

I have foreseen from the very beginning of the war that inevitably sooner or later we should reach a crisis in our Canadian affairs which would force us to decide whether Canada is to be governed by a minority or by the majority.

Let us now pause to consider for a moment this fact that at the outbreak of the war, and subsequently, Quebec has steadfastly set itself against conscription for overseas service. What is involved in this determined policy of the Province of Quebec? We may for a moment think of the principle of conscription *per se*. Quebec has not objected to compulsory military service. The principle of compulsion is already in operation. Quebec objects only to compulsory military service for overseas.

"Aggression" and "Freedom" in Canada

The Prime Minister admits that standing at the side of Britain is to stand against aggression, and for the freedom of the world. But is Quebec prepared to stand against aggression, and for the defense of freedom, only within the Canadian boundaries? The sinking of the *Lady Hawkins*, a Canadian ship, with the loss of hundreds of lives, somewhere off the Canadian coast, surely proves that aggression and human freedom in Canada cannot be opposed or defended, respectively, by fighting only within the Canadian boundaries.

Is Quebec neutral in respect to aggression and the destruction of freedom anywhere and everywhere but in Canada itself? If it be replied that many from the Province of Quebec have enlisted for overseas voluntarily, and that some of them have already paid the price of their zeal for the world's freedom in Hong Kong, and that many others are equally ready to do so when the tide of war requires, and are even now awaiting the call of duty in Britain—what then? The question immediately arises, to say nothing of Canadians from the rest of Canada, have a sufficient number of men from the Province of Quebec enlisted voluntarily to guarantee that Quebec units in the war zone will not be left without adequate reinforcements?

How About the United States?

And what shall be said to the objection to conscription as such? The United States forces have been raised,

so far as they are raised, and are now being raised, by conscription. Presumably, the American contingent, inasmuch as it is made up of trained men, now in Northern Ireland, was conscripted by the United States Government for service in the United States only. But after thus being enrolled and trained, these men are, by Government authority, whether they like it or not, sent for service in Northern Ireland.

The British Army has been mobilized for service anywhere by conscription. The same was true of the armies of France, and Belgium, and Italy, and Greece, and Germany, and Russia, and we presume, of Roumania, and Bulgaria, and Japan. Thus all nations recognize the principle that in the defense of a country, and of all that citizenship in that country involves, all the energies of the nation, in materials and finance and manpower, must be compulsorily employed. Upon what ground and for what reason, does Quebec choose to repudiate that universally-employed principle of national defense?

I think I know the reason. I fear we shall never effectively deal with the national problem which Quebec's attitude presents, until the fundamental reason for Quebec's unalterable insularity is officially recognized and acknowledged. But on this occasion, I shall not name the reason for this opposition, but content myself with an examination of the fact, and its implications.

Conscription Not An Issue In Last Election

The Prime Minister in his speech in the House, as I have already shown by my quotations from it, makes it perfectly clear that the Government, and the party it represents, and the Leader of the Conservative party, at the last election, as well as the candidates for both parties, committed themselves to a policy of opposition to conscription for overseas service. I think there will be no question as to the accuracy of the Prime Minister's contention in respect to this matter. But if it be admitted that all parties had agreed to a policy of no conscription for overseas service at the last election, and if also it is admitted—as it must be—that there must have been some issue before the people who at that election divided their votes among several parties, it must surely be acknowledged that the issue before the public must have been something other than that of the principle of conscription for overseas service.

An Ontario Parallel

I find an exact parallel in principle in the action of the Liberal and Conservative parties in the Provincial election of 1934. Before that election the then Conservative Government passed a measure for the selling of beer and wine by the glass. It might even be called, for clearness of understanding, a measure which authorized the opening of the beverage-rooms. Mr. Hepburn, who was Leader of the Liberal Opposition, at the outset declared that if he were elected he would not rescind the measure of the Henry régime, but would proclaim it. Thereafter speakers of both parties contended that that action had taken the liquor question out of politics, and that it was not an issue in the election. The people were given no opportunity to vote either for or against the beverage-rooms in that 1934 election because both parties had committed themselves to it.

So in the last general Dominion election, in obedience to the demand of its Quebec following, the Liberal party committed itself to a policy of "no conscription for overseas service". The Conservative party, under Dr.

Manion, hoping to win some support from Quebec, committed itself to the same policy. But in the adoption of that policy by the Liberal party, the people were not consulted. Neither were they consulted in the adoption of that policy by the Conservative party. The electorate of the Dominion of Canada have never had the opportunity of expressing themselves either for or against conscription for overseas service, for the reason that no party offered itself to the Canadian electorate approving conscription for overseas. Surely it must be admitted that the Government received no mandate whatever for a no-conscription for overseas policy. It announced that that was its policy, but no alternative policy was offered by either party.

For Mr. King, therefore, to assume that he is bound by the vote of the people to a "no-conscription policy", is to impugn the intelligence of the electorate to which such a submission is addressed.

What If Premier Did Pledge?

But let us, for the sake of argument, assume that Mr. King is justified in feeling that the vote at the last election was a no-conscription vote, I do but remind you of what everybody knows, that the world in which Mr. King pledged his no-conscription policy has passed away. This is an entirely different world. Since that time all the nations of Europe have fallen under the power of the dictators, and more than two hundred millions of people have been reduced to a form of slavery the degradation of which has never been surpassed in the world's history. Since that time Japan has actively engaged in the war against the world's liberties. Japan has manifested surprising strength; and it is scarcely too much to say that at the moment—but temporarily only we believe—she is virtually mistress of the Pacific. There is good reason to believe that her armed forces have been operating not far from the Pacific Coast of this Continent, and I have already remarked on the activity of the enemy on the Atlantic seaboard. Surely it must be generally admitted that the world of to-day is entirely different from the world as it existed at the last Dominion general election.

The Example of President Roosevelt

In proof of that change I need only cite the example of the United States. President Roosevelt had gone much farther than Mr. King. He pledged himself not to send an American Expeditionary Force overseas. The question whether such a Force was conscripted or voluntarily enlisted was not raised. The American Government again and again committed itself to a far more extreme position than that of the Canadian Government. They undertook to lend every assistance to Britain "short of war". But how long did it take President Roosevelt and the American Government to change their minds? After Pearl Harbour, Mr. Roosevelt did not ask Congress to authorize a plebiscite to give the American people an opportunity to say whether they would release him from his pledge. He paid the American people the compliment of assuming that they had a little intelligence; and that the Japanese assault on Pearl Harbour had changed the whole world-situation, and that what might have been a reasonable policy two years ago, could not be maintained in the face of the new situation. Mr. Roosevelt asked the Congress so to amend its laws as to permit him as Commander-in-Chief

to send the American army anywhere. Nor has he lost any time in putting that changed policy into effect, for even at this hour an American Expeditionary Force is stationed in Northern Ireland.

Restrictive Clause in Mobilization Act Should Be Rescinded

I venture the assertion that if the Government were courageously to do what it ought to do, and rescind the restrictive clause of the Mobilization Act, for that is all that is necessary, and take to itself full power to conscript everything and everybody in Canada for such service as they may be able to render anywhere, the Government would meet with no opposition, I venture to believe, in the whole Dominion, outside of Quebec.

An Unworthy Insinuation

But let me repeat a sentence which I have already quoted from Mr. King's speech. He says:

"Outside Parliament altogether, the political skies now have become so overcast with controversy, promoted by high-pressure methods and highly financed publicity, that the nature and extent of Canada's war effort is not only being obscured, but is in danger of being seriously impaired."

The only skies which Mr. King sees to be overcast outside of Parliament are the "political skies." Apparently Mr. King has been so long a politician rather than a statesman, and has so habituated himself to acting from political motives, that he seems to be incapable of crediting anyone with sincerity. He attributes ulterior motives to all his critics. Mr. King at this point seems to disclose the workings of his own mind. Does he not know that millions of Canadians do not care the proverbial "continental" for politics as such? Does he not know that there are millions of people who are desirous only of seeing Canada wisely and justly governed, and all her energies employed in defence of the world's freedom; and that these millions do not care who the Government may be, whether Conservative or Liberal or C.C.F. so long as they do the job well? While the world is on fire Canada cannot afford to spend her energies discussing petty party politics. I refuse to believe that the great mass of the Canadian people now demanding that Canada should spare neither time nor effort to win the war, are actuated by political motives.

Mr. King complains that the controversy is "promoted by high-pressure methods". Surely in the history of this country no such high-pressure methods have ever been used for the purpose of accomplishing political ends as have been employed by the King Government. Every department of Government, the Post Office, the Department of Public Information, the Radio, National Service, have been employed as propaganda agencies for the Liberal party in general, and for the glorification of Mr. King in particular. It is surely unworthy of Mr. King to complain that his critics were resorting to "highly financed publicity." Where is it? I have heard nothing of it. On the other hand, Mr. King and his party have had control of the Government treasury, and have poured out money like water, the people's money, in promoting the interests of the party in power.

Does Parliament Monopolize Canadian Intelligence?

I come now to another matter: Mr. King says that: "If the issue of conscription for service overseas is to

be fought out, the place for it to be fought out is on the floor of this Parliament."

Could anything be more inconsistent? Let me anticipate what I must discuss in detail a little later by quoting the formal question which is to be asked in the plebiscite. Here it is:

"Are you in favour of releasing the Government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?"

How is it possible for the electorate to vote intelligently on such a question without discussing the question involved? And that question is one of conscription for overseas service. In general, in a democratic country any subject that may legitimately be discussed on the floor of Parliament may be discussed by the people whom Parliament represents. But Mr. King apparently would have us vote on the question submitted without discussing its merits, and then after that, if the issue is to be discussed, "the place for it to be fought out is on the floor of this Parliament". If this question is forced upon us Mr. King will force us all to discuss it.

Premier Uses Any Tool For His Purpose

But Premier King seems to be able to use almost any tool for his purpose. When it suits him he magnifies Parliament above the Government, and obsequiously insists that the Government is only the servant of Parliament, and can do only what Parliament tells it to do. Again, if it suits him he can prorogue Parliament, govern the country by order-in-council, and act as though he were a dictator, treating Parliament and the people with equal contempt.

Again, when he has reason to fear public discussion of his measures, he would restrict, at least by suggestion, the discussion to Parliament in which he has a majority of obedient followers. If Parliament should seem to be a little too obstreperous, Mr. King can suddenly become the most docile and obedient servant of the people.

Premier King's War-Record

Let us examine Premier King's war record to throw a little light upon these tendencies. Mr. King was wedded to the trans-atlantic telephone, and insisted that he could confer with the British Government, and transact his business just as effectively by telephone as he could by going to England. He held to that position for a long time, until at last, under public pressure, and when it became apparent that the Leader of the Opposition was going in any case, Mr. King flew to England. But when he was there he had no independence at all. He told the people that he could do nothing at all without consulting his colleagues. One might assume it was not possible for him to come to such an understanding on the collective attitude of his colleagues as to be able to represent them, and speak for them. Mr. Churchill has said that he is the servant of the King and of the Parliament, and the Parliament is the servant of the people. Yet it was possible for Mr. Churchill to meet Mr. Roosevelt on the Atlantic and later to go to Washington, and actually to commit the British Government and people to such measures as he and the President jointly agreed upon.

Then again, the Government, by order-in-council, declared war on Roumania, Hungary, and later on Japan, without consulting either the people or Parliament. Mr.

King knows very well that no voice of protest against the Government's action in these particulars was heard anywhere in Canada. In these matters the Government did what any Government ought to have done in the circumstances, and the Government is unanimously supported in these measures not only by Parliament but by the people.

Why, then, is Mr. King so sensitive about his alleged pledge? Why can he act with such indifference toward Parliament and the people in some matters, and in this major question insist that he is bound by his pledge to the electorate?

The Government Already Free

I quote again from Mr. King:

"Quite apart from the controversy which has arisen, there are the strongest of reasons why the Government should, at this time of gravest crisis in the world's history, possess complete freedom to act in accordance with its judgment of the needs of the situation as they may arise, subject only to its responsibility to Parliament. . . .

"In a world situation so involved, with enemies on every front, with no one able to say what the outcome of battle in other parts of the world may bring of immediate and increased danger to our own land, the Government feels strongly that it should be perfectly free to recommend to Parliament whatever course of action it deems essential to the security of our own country, and to the preservation of freedom in our own and other lands. . . ."

No one in his senses will dissent from Mr. King's position at this point. A war cannot be conducted by referendums and plebiscites. A Government must have freedom of action. It has such freedom. The only criticism of the country is that the Government won't exercise the freedom it has. Mr. King reminds me of an authentic story from the west, of a benighted traveller, who drew up at an isolated house on a stormy night, and knocked loudly at the door. Presently an upper window was opened, and a gruff voice inquired: "Who is there? What do you want?" To which the traveller replied that he was a stranger, could find no place to stay, and he said, "I wondered if I could stop here for the night." The reply came: "Sure; stay right there. Who's a-hindering you?" And the window was shut. Mr. King wants freedom, liberty of action. We answer him: "You have it. Use it. Who is hindering you?"

Mr. King's "Firstly", "Secondly", and "Thirdly"

Mr. King is somewhat like certain old-fashioned preachers. He seems almost incapable of stating a position without his "firstly", "secondly", and "thirdly". And here we have it:

"There are, as I see it, three means by which this release could be obtained:

"The first would be by means of a general election. In a general election at this time the issue of conscription for service overseas would become one of the issues and, in existing circumstances, would almost certainly be the main issue. . . .

"The second would be by means of a referendum solely with reference to the question of conscription for service overseas.

"The third would be by means of a plebiscite, not to obtain a decision with respect to conscription, but solely with the object of releasing the Government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service. . . .

"The Government is of the opinion that neither a general election nor a referendum on the question of conscription is either advisable or necessary."

Condensed, the three means are: *a general election, a referendum, or a plebiscite*. What an extraordinary position! Mr. King is dealing with a pledge which now

he tacitly admits ought never to have been made, and actually suggests that one means of correcting his mistake would be a general election. Considered in the abstract, the calling of a general election now would be little short of a crime. Surely Canada has something else to do than that! And yet, if we are to be perpetually bound to the political chicanery of the King Administration, I conceive of that as an even greater burden than a general election. A referendum would specifically commit the Government to the position approved by a majority vote of the electors. A plebiscite would merely release the Government from its former commitments, and give it a free hand in respect to the method of raising men for military service. A referendum would be a popular demand, the other only an opinion. We agree with Mr. King on the whole that neither a general election nor a referendum should be thought of.

But let me quote further from Mr. King's speech:

"As for a general election, apart from the fact that the Government has every reason to believe it continues to possess the confidence of the country, it would not, we believe, be in the interest of the people themselves, in the existing crisis, to leave the country without a Parliament for the time which it would take to hold a general election.

"Moreover, other issues entering in, it would not be possible to say that the verdict of the people, whatever it might be, had related solely to the issue of the application of conscription for overseas service."

Mr. King thinks the Government still enjoys the confidence of the country, and that it would be unwise to leave the country without a Parliament for the time it would take to hold a general election. We subscribe to the latter contention, but not to the former.

Wanting in Frankness

The further quotation from Mr. King's speech which I now make is anything but frank:

"The objection to a referendum on conscription is that far from freeing the hands of the Government it would be a specific request of the people to make a decision with respect to conscription. As I have already said, the proper place to debate the question as to the extent to which conscription should be applied is on the floor of Parliament. . . .

"A plebiscite differs from a referendum in that a plebiscite is taken to ascertain the views of the people, whereas a referendum is a request for a decision by the people on a specific plan or project.

"The Government does not believe that it would be fair to the people to ask them to make military decisions. It is, as I already have said, not possible, in wartime, to make public adequate information on which wise judgments can be made.

"In consulting the people by plebiscite, the Government is not throwing on the people the responsibility of making a military decision. It is asking the people to give the Government full power and full responsibility to take whatever military decisions the Government, in the light of all its knowledge, believes to be necessary. In consulting the people, therefore, we are not shirking responsibility, we are asking for full responsibility."

The referendum is objected to because it would not free the hands of the Government, but compel them; and that it would be "a specific request of the people to make a decision with respect to conscription"; and that the proper place to debate the question as to the extent to which the conscription principle should be applied should be on the floor of Parliament.

Mr. King's Illogic

How very considerate of Mr. King to relieve us of the responsibility of making such a decision! Does Mr. King forget that his whole contention is based on the assumption that the people have already made a decision

in respect to conscription? Has he not told us that he specifically said there would be no conscription for overseas service, and that that specific pledge was specifically endorsed by the people? Have the people of Canada lost their intelligence since the last election? It is insisted that the electorate has already committed itself to "no conscription": now Mr. King will not submit a referendum because that would require the people to make a decision!

Surely in that case the rule works both ways, and if at the last election we voted, "No conscription", we are just as competent now to vote for conscription.

The plebiscite is to be adopted because "the Government does not believe that it would be fair to the people to ask them to make military decisions." But voting for conscription would not be making a military decision. It would be merely voting for a principle by which an army could be mobilized. The public will already have been adequately informed on the question of conscription. We know that a vast army is necessary. We cannot have too many men. It would be better to have too many than too few. And it is upon that question only that we should be asked to decide: that we want the biggest army which Canada can mobilize, and that the best way to do it is by a form of conscription.

Political Subtlety

Such a conscription vote would still leave the Government free to apply it "progressively." No conscription measure calls up everyone subject to its provisions, at once. And the Government would still have full liberty to act as the exigencies of the hour might require. We must express our recognition of, if not our admiration for, the political subtlety involved in the words I have just quoted.

Gross Mismanagement

Mr. King endeavours to defend his record of the past by the remark,

"It has not been necessary, nor would it indeed have been helpful, at an earlier stage to make demands upon the nation such as the Government has in contemplation."

I am of the opinion that the Government has been guilty of the grossest dereliction of duty in its handling of the whole military situation. I doubt whether in any administration of the past, Ottawa has ever known such an aggregation of governmental ineptitude as is represented by the King administration.

The People the Premier's Political Pawn

I quote again from Mr. King:

"A course completely different from any one of the three I have mentioned has been suggested. It is that the Government should ignore commitments altogether, refrain from any consultation with or reference to the people, and here and now immediately put in force conscription for service overseas.

"I am perfectly sure that were any Government to proceed in any such arbitrary manner, completely disregarding the will of the people as expressed in the past, or as it might be expressed in the present, it would find any such attempt effectively thwarted by the people's representatives in Parliament.

"Personally, I reject as unworthy of consideration, any course of action by this or any Parliament which ignores the authority from which Parliament and the Government alike derive their power. I reject as still more unworthy the suggestion that the Government should break the solemn pledges given and repeated time and again to the electorate. . . ."

This passage confirms my remarks of a little while ago in which I said that Mr. King could use any tool for

his purpose. Coming from a man who has shown for the last year at least, such contempt for the institution of parliament, and the rights of the people, it is impossible for me to regard this statement as being anything other than a piece of political subterfuge.

But I must continue my quotation of the Premier a few sentences further:

"Perhaps I should add that yet another course of action has been suggested. It is that I should resign and advise His Excellency the Governor-General to call on some other person to form a Government which would ignore all past commitments and undertake to enforce conscription without any prior consultation with the people. In other words, I am being asked to "sell my birthright for this mess of pottage," and to destroy whatever confidence the people of Canada may possess in my honor as a public man, and, in doing so, also to destroy the confidence they possess in the honor and integrity of the Government."

Premier Should Know Bible Better

Mr. King is never more unfortunate than when he refers to Scripture in support of his position. Of the suggestion that he should resign he says, "I am being asked to sell my birthright for this mess of pottage." We have long thought Mr. King believed in the divine right, if not of kings, at least of King! His Premiership he regards as his birthright! His resignation would be selling his birthright for a mess of pottage!

Identify "Birthright" and "Mess of Pottage"?

The allusion is to the action of Esau who, for the temporary gratification of his appetite, surrendered his position as the firstborn, and with it all the rights of primogeniture. For what mess of pottage does Mr. King hunger? The Premiership he has: what would he gain by resigning it? Nothing but release from office, and perhaps retirement to obscurity. We are sure Mr. King is not hungering for that. We believe there is no Book which statesmen may more usefully quote than the Bible; but they had better understand it a little more thoroughly than Mr. King does if they would quote it without making themselves ridiculous.

We are of the opinion that if Mr. King were thus to make way for another, he would give the finest exhibition of good judgment he has ever manifested in his whole political career. He seems to think that such action would destroy whatever confidence the people of Canada have in his honour as a public man. Did President Roosevelt forfeit the confidence of the people, or jeopardize his honour, by facing the facts of the case, and acting accordingly? Certainly not! But Mr. King has not even yet told us why the Government had decided upon such a policy.

The Plebiscite Question

With these words the report of Mr. King's speech concludes:

"Are you in favor of releasing the Government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?"

"It will be seen that in seeking freedom for itself to act on all matters pertaining to war in accordance with its judgment, the Government is taking a course which will remove all legitimate excuse for controversy, and the course best calculated to maintain the unity of the country in this time of war.

"In the presentation of the plebiscite to the electorate the desire of the Administration to possess complete freedom of action will, of course, receive the vigorous and wholehearted support of all members of the Government. It will, I hope,

receive the support of every member of Parliament and will I believe, receive the support of the Canadian people."

This course, Mr. King says, is a "course which will remove all legitimate excuse for controversy, and the course best calculated to maintain the unity of the country in this time of war." I may be very blind, very obtuse, but I can think of no course more likely to provoke controversy, and no measure better calculated to destroy the unity of the country.

Canadian Manhood Not Unwilling to Serve

I resent the idea that any considerable portion of the manhood of this country needs to be compelled to military service. Of course there must be some shirkers here as everywhere, but the great majority of our men have not only been willing, but anxious to serve. We need conscription for their direction, and because it is the only method by which equality of service can be guaranteed. To my certain knowledge there are parts of Quebec and of Ontario largely populated by French-Canadians subject to the same influence which makes conscription unacceptable to Quebec as a whole. In these sections there are many men who would have enlisted long ago, but they could see no justice in their voluntarily vacating good positions to which they had risen through years of faithful service, to have their places filled by others who were deliberately shirking their duty, and waiting to occupy their places. Other men, torn between conflicting interests, would welcome any directive authoritarian principle that would help them to decide. From my own experience with, and observation of, men during the war, I blame the Government for a wretched bungling of the voluntary system.

Distinction Between Military Service and Other War Efforts

Before discussing the effect of a plebiscite, I would call attention to the difference between military and all other forms of war effort. In agriculture, munitions, and finance, those engaged receive adequate remuneration, and their lives are placed no more in jeopardy than in ordinary peacetime pursuits. In military service men yield their lives on enlistment; and those who thus offer their blood, give more than all others. If the Government have accomplished much in agriculture, munitions, and finance, they have only extended the business of the country, which has been relatively easy, because it has occasioned no sacrifice on the part of any one. But in its handling of the problem of securing adequate manpower, we may say to the Government, "Ye have not yet resisted with blood". And to Quebec in respect to its no conscription attitude we may say, "Ye are unwilling to resist with blood".

This distinction between military service, and other forms of war-effort gives special significance to this whole discussion.

The Question of the Plebiscite

But now to the question of the plebiscite: What effect will the answer produce? There can be only one of two answers—either Yes, or No.

What If Vote Negative?

Let us consider the possibility of a negative answer first of all. What if the majority, including Quebec, should refuse to relieve the Government of its alleged "no conscription" pledge? That would bind the Government negatively as effectively as anything could. No

Government could thus defy such an expression of the popular will. In that event the only increase of the present army would have to be by voluntary enlistments.

Moreover, a negative vote, with an almost unanimous negative vote from Quebec, would inevitably have a deadly influence upon the voluntary principle. It would make it impossible to secure recruits on the conscription principle and almost impossible by voluntary enlistments. What then, would follow? We should have no means of reinforcing the army already overseas. Mr. Godbout has said that Britain has already plenty of men. If that be so, why was an American contingent sent to Ireland?

What of the Future?

But we must not judge of this matter by the present situation. Assuming the best, that we should be victorious at last, in Europe, then an enormous army will be required for continental operations. The Canadian divisions now there would most certainly take their part. But how could our Canadian army be reinforced? Should we be under the necessity of filling up our depleted ranks with soldiers from an American conscript army? Or should we have to let our men fight it out without sending them help? If some great emergency should arise, either through the invasion of Britain, or the decimation of our ranks by an invasion of the Continent, necessitating the reinforcement of our armies, is it to be supposed that the rest of Canada would stand idly by, bound by Quebec's veto? And if not, what would be the alternative? We should then, under still more difficult circumstances, have to face a conflict which had better be faced now. But in any event, one requires but little prescience to see that a negative vote would almost certainly utterly destroy the unity of the country.

What of An Affirmative Vote?

On the other hand, let us assume the plebiscite to result in an affirmative vote, giving the Government a perfectly free hand to apply conscription for overseas service or not as they deem wise. Let us assume the Government might feel it necessary to apply the principle of compulsory military service for overseas—what then? Is there any likelihood that Quebec would withdraw its opposition, and accept and obey a conscription law?

Premier Godbout only on Monday last made a very clear statement on the subject, a statement which was all the more convincing because it was undesigned and unpremeditated. An expression was forced from him by organized demonstrators, many if not most of whom were students from Montreal University, students subject to the influences against which we have done our little best to warn the country now for two years. While this matter was before Parliament, and in all probability at the very time when the Prime Minister was making his speech allegedly in the interests of the preservation of national unity, a company of students compelled an expression on the question of conscription, from the Prime Minister of Quebec.

And what did Mr. Godbout say? He said 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."

Mr. Godbout's speech gives us a fairly accurate rule by which to measure the probable result of a plebiscite vote in Quebec. Mr. King, in his speech, intimated that the present administration in Quebec was much more favourable to our participation in the war than the administration that preceded it. In other words, Mr. Godbout's view is the view of the moderates and not the extremists in Quebec; and yet Mr. Godbout says, "Conscription would be a crime." We may rest assured that the other potent influences which determine the attitude of the Quebec people would not be less pronounced than Mr. Godbout. It would not be too much to say that even though the vote in Canada as a whole on the plebiscite would be an affirmative one, it is almost certain that the Quebec vote would be overwhelmingly negative.

Mr. Godbout said, "If the majority answered in the affirmative, Mr. King would have to enforce conscription, or else resign." Mr. Godbout in that goes farther than Mr. King does. We do not believe Mr. King would either resign or enforce conscription, even if he were given an affirmative vote.

But Mr. Godbout further anticipates Mr. King's political subtlety when he says:

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

And further he said:

"England has no need of men. 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."

But suppose an affirmative vote should be given in eight Provinces only—what then? Would this make for national unity? We understand that Mr. King has intimated that the vote will not be published sectionally, but only the totals. Just as now the Government will not give us the exact total of enlistments and discharges by provinces—they dare not do so.

Premier Anticipates Contrary Quebec Vote

So Mr. King already anticipates a contrary vote in Quebec. But he will conceal the facts from the electorate by publishing only the totals. Are we to be treated like children? And does the present Government conceive its special function to be to conceal the disloyalty of a section of the population?

But whether the rest of us are allowed to know what Quebec's vote is, Quebec itself will know. And I repeat, Quebec's determined opposition is a foregone conclusion. What will the Government do then? There is a Scripture which says, "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey?" Mr. King has appeased and spoiled and coddled Quebec for so long that we may be certain if the electorate were to give an affirmative vote, Mr. King would interpret it merely as a vote of confidence in him, and his Government; and he would not apply conscription in such a way as to include Quebec.

Conscript Eight Provinces and Exempt One?

Could he apply conscription to eight provinces, and exempt Quebec just as Ireland was exempted from conscription in the last war, and is exempt in this? What a disgrace that Northern Ireland should be occupied by a conscript American army, when conscription was not

applied in Ireland either North or South out of deference to the people who are subject to the same authority as the people of Quebec! In view of this, an affirmative vote practically would be the same as a negative vote.

Australia Made No Mistake

Mr. Godbout implies that it was a mistake for Australia to send her men to Libya, and Greece, and Malaya. Had she not done so, in all probability the Japanese would long ago have invaded Australia itself. That the Australian Government was eminently wise in endeavouring to stop the enemy as far from her own shores as possible, no person of ordinary judgment will deny.

But I leave Mr. Godbout and return to Premier King, and his plebiscite. I have been assuming an affirmative vote freeing the Government from its alleged "no-conscription" pledge.

Majority or Minority Rule

The Government, being thus freed by an affirmative vote, would face the dilemma of having to allow at long last the majority of the Canadian people to rule; or otherwise to take no action on the matter under dispute. In either case "national unity" so-called, would be shattered beyond repair, or perhaps more accurately, would be revealed beyond all possibility of further concealment. In such a situation it is easy to visualize such an emergency as would produce a political earthquake in the Dominion of Canada.

But Mr. King proposes to leave himself free from all commitments, to act according to his own sweet will. My prediction is that if he were given an affirmative vote on this plebiscite, he would then rescind the restrictive clause of the Mobilization Act, and proclaim some sort of conscription for overseas service. He would then almost certainly put the administration of the law into the hands of a French-Canadian; or otherwise under some Conscription Commission which would be dominated by French-Canadians. And so the rest of Canada would have voted for conscription, and Quebec, which had voted against it, would be authorized to enforce it on the rest of us.

How Shall We Vote?

I imagine my hearers, or readers, will reasonably ask, How shall we vote if this plebiscite law is passed? My answer is: I see nothing but confusion and near-ruin in either case. Whichever way we vote we shall be like the commercial traveller who, when asked by another which of two hotels was the better in a certain village, said, "It makes little difference. Whichever one you go to, you will wish you had gone to the other."

An Appeal to All

What, then, ought to be our course? We had better start a prairie backfire to meet such confusion half way. I appeal to my brother-ministers. I am aware that no man, who has found it necessary to stand resolutely against the tides of appeasement, politically and religiously, which have been running so long, can hope to be popular. All that I ask my brethren to do is to forget that my name is associated with this address, if they are specially prejudiced against it, and let them read the address for what it is worth, and judge the argument of it on its merit. I make the same appeal to churches, and to lodges, and to all other organizations

of every sort, as well as to the press: LET THE OPPOSITION TO THIS DISRUPTIVE, IF NOT UTTERLY DESTRUCTIVE PROPOSAL, BE MADE ARTICULATE—INDEED, LET US MAKE IT VOCIFEROUS. LET THE OPPOSITION OF THE COUNTRY SPEAK SO LOUDLY TO THIS PLEBISCITE PROPOSAL BEFORE THE PLEBISCITE IS ORDERED AS TO COMPEL SUCH A DIVISION IN THE HOUSE AS WILL DEFEAT IT.

And what then? In the emergency preceding Dunkirk, in England, the Chamberlain Government had an overwhelming majority. But so many of them refused longer to support Mr. Chamberlain that he was compelled to hand over the reins of government to another, and neither a general election, nor a plebiscite was ordered. Surely Mr. King has shown that we can hope for no total war effort as long as he remains Premier. LET THE MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT DISREGARD THEIR PARTY, AND ASSERT THEIR INDEPENDENCE, AND BY THEIR VOTE IN PARLIAMENT, PREVENT THIS POLITICAL CRIME WHICH MOST CERTAINLY WOULD DISRUPT THE COUNTRY IN SUCH A WAY AND TO SUCH AN EXTENT THAT ONE TREMBLES TO THINK OF WHAT MIGHT BE THE ULTIMATE RESULT.

A Summary of the Whole Matter

So many have already called attention to the time element in this proposal that I have laid no emphasis upon it; but if conscription must wait for this method it could not become effective for perhaps many months, perhaps a year. Meanwhile voluntary enlistments would be at a standstill. If the city were on fire, we should hardly expect the City Council to authorize a plebiscite in order that the people might decide whether the fire-fighting apparatus should be called out to extinguish the flames.

What is needed in this matter is immediate action. It remains only for me to ask, What if all efforts being made throughout the country and on the floor of Parliament to bring the Government to a better frame of mind should fail? What if the Government goes forward with this plebiscite proposal, and it becomes a matter of necessity for every citizen to decide whether he shall vote yes or no, or not vote at all? If the country should vote, No, that would put an end to the conscription proposal, and would leave our men to fight on as long as there were any left, without reinforcement. But in that case, the Government would lay all the responsibility upon the people. If, on the other hand, a majority of the electors were to vote, Yes, while it would commit the Government to no definite course in the matter, it would at least not put, but leave, the responsibility where it properly belongs, upon the shoulders of the Government.

And such an affirmative vote, let it be remembered, would not only free the Government—although we insist it is free already—but it would leave the electorate free to continue to bring pressure upon the Government to introduce compulsory selective military service for overseas.

Electors who refuse to vote at all would, by their action, strengthen the position of those who vote in the negative. I repeat, whatever the vote, the plebiscite is bound to produce national confusion, and not national unity; and for that reason we should make every possible effort to dissuade the Government from its purpose. But if we fail in that, and the plebiscite vote is eventually ordered, ALL THINGS CONSIDERED, IT SEEMS TO ME THAT EVERYONE WHO WANTS TO SEE THIS WAR THROUGH TO A FINISH, SHOULD VOTE, AND SHOULD VOTE, YES.

"National Unity" Exemplified

When facing an issue in which the Roman Catholic Hierarchy is involved, it is impossible to discuss its religious aspect without becoming immersed in politics; and it is equally impossible to discuss the politics of the case without dealing with the religious influences at work. THE GOSPEL WITNESS is not less religious because it finds itself forced to discuss political matters. Our understanding of the gospel compels us to insist upon freedom of conscience, and such a principle inevitably brings us into conflict with Romanism.

For a long time Premier King has spoken of "national unity" as though he were providentially ordained to effect and maintain it. Any criticisms of his policies were said to threaten "national unity." This paper has long contended that "national unity" does not exist in Canada; and that Mr. King's pious assumption of the special guardianship of that precious principle is, and has been, nothing less than a piece of political camouflage.

That our contention was always justified is now becoming increasingly apparent. We have before us a report of a speech by the Honourable Louis St. Laurent, Minister of Justice in the King Government in succession to the late Mr. Lapointe. The speech was given at the opening of his campaign in the by-election of Quebec East. For the almost universal Canadian demand for conscription for overseas service, in true Quebec style Mr. St. Laurent blames some unidentified "Toronto group." Among other things he says this Toronto group—

"continues to whip British sentimentalism and to shout that Canada is not doing its part because England has conscription for anywhere, and because the U.S. has conscription for everywhere and we have not. And by continuing to shout this group hopes to win over from the King government the English-speaking supporters by making them doubt the adequacy of our efforts, and the French-speaking partisans by making them fear that the King government will go too far."

Thus this new Minister of Justice would seek to promote "national unity"! And then he says further:

"I know the word conscription brings you back to 1917. Do not put us in a position where a Meighen (Conservative Leader Meighen) government will come and impose it (conscription) on us with bayonets and machine guns.

"The U.S. and we are engaged in a war on which the future of this continent depends."

So far as the report shows, this new Minister of Justice has not a word to say about Britain's participation in the war. He says, "The U.S. and we are engaged in a war on which the future of this continent depends." But in the paragraph above quoted, this Minister of Justice, in effect, tells the people of Quebec that unless they support him and the King Government there will be something like civil war; and that conscription will be forced on them with "bayonets and machine guns".

Is this the way to promote "national unity"? This Minister of Justice was counsel to the Commission responsible for the infamous Sirois Report which proposed to mortgage the whole Dominion in the interests of the Roman Catholic Church. Two other candidates are

running in Quebec against Mr. St. Laurent, and he apparently is the best of the three. One of them proposes absolute separation from the Empire. But we wonder what would be said about anyone in Ontario who urged the people to vote in a given way as an alternative to "bayonets and machine-guns"?

Our readers may be interested to know that another French-Canadian, Mr. Lacroix, Quebec-Montmorency, introduced a Bill on January 26th, which would authorize the provision of a particular flag for Canada. One need not discuss the merits of the Bill itself, but surely at a time like this when the whole Empire should be acting together, no one interested in national unity, one would suppose, would propose such a matter for discussion. Surely the Union Jack will do, at least until the war is over. But here is the Bill, with its explanation, standing in the name of this French-Canadian member from Quebec-Montmorency:

3rd Session, 19th Parliament,
6 George VI, 1942

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS
OF CANADA

BILL 3

An Act to provide for the Flags
of Canada

His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

1. This Act may be cited as The National Flag Act 1942.

2. (1) The Governor in Council may make orders and regulations respecting the designs of a national flag or flags for Canada, and, subject to the approval of His Majesty the King, for the authorization and adoption of such flag or flags.

(2) The Governor in Council may also order and regulate the time when, the location where, the manner in which, and the purposes for which the said flag or flags may be flown.

3. All orders and regulations made under the authority of the preceding section of this Act shall be published in the Canada Gazette.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The purpose of this Bill is to empower the Governor-in-Council to create a national flag for Canada, the only nation in the world which does not possess or fly a distinctive national flag. Our country is voluntarily doing its full share in this war, and doing so as an independent and sovereign nation. Therefore, the time has come for a flag that will express the sovereignty of the Canadian people and the Canadian Parliament, just as the Union Jack represents the sovereignty of the United Kingdom, in other words, of the Parliament of Westminster.

A Canadian flag will stand for national freedom, Commonwealth fellowship, national unity and be a rallying force in the defence of the nation. Furthermore, it is a natural consequence of the adoption of the Statute of Westminster, ten years ago, by which Canada was designated a sovereign nation.

We publish these things only to let our readers see that national unity is not being disturbed by "a Toronto group". The exigencies of the war situation have compelled the consideration of the principle of compulsory military service for overseas, and that has led Quebec to throw off its disguise and to show what it actually is.

The Annual Report of the Timmins Baptist Church

It is exceedingly difficult to obtain news for these columns from some of our pastors and churches, not because they have nothing to tell but because they are anxious to avoid the sin of boasting. The Timmins Church is one of the churches of this sort, and for that reason we were happy to see a copy of the annual Financial Statement for the year 1941. As this report is printed we venture to share it with our readers who have heard so little from this spiritual power-house in the gold mining district of the North Country.

In the Foreword, from which we quote, the pastor, Rev. H. C. Slade, gives his people the following message:

"In order that every member of our church may have in his or her possession the scripture basis, upon which the First Baptist Church of Timmins was organized, we present, with this year's financial statement, our 'Declaration of Faith.'

"It is abundantly evident to us all, that any church adhering strictly to these principles is certain to enjoy the blessing of Almighty God.

"We feel it most fitting to acknowledge the great service rendered by the twenty-five persons who composed the membership of this church at the time of organization in the year 1922.

"It was their honour and responsibility to give to those who follow proper leadership, and to lay a solid foundation upon which to build. The articles of faith, and the conduct of the charter members, some of whom are still with us today, show us that they have not failed in their careful planning. Their Biblical and spiritual leadership is most worthy of our emulation.

"We invite you to read these articles carefully. They clearly define our position as a church and remind us of our God-given obligation both to defend and to propagate His truth."

This financial statement is of special interest as it shows a balance in every account except the Missionary Account. There is no balance in this fund as all monies have been forwarded in full. The total income of the church was \$6,240.00. Of this approximately \$1,000 was given for missionary purposes in addition to \$600.00 which the church paid for the regular Sunday morning broadcast of its preaching service, a truly missionary undertaking in that needy country. The pastor, Rev. H. C. Slade, is affectionately known as the "Bishop of the North" because of his untiring and unselfish interest in the missionary causes and pastors throughout the vast territory that we know as "the North", and none of our Home Mission pastors have had a warmer friend or a deeper interest than they have always found in the Timmins Church and its great-hearted people. On several occasions the Deacons of the church have gladly released the Deaconess, Miss Leila Boyd, to give a helping hand in French-Canadian work in other districts. Items of this sort cannot be placed in the financial statement but have meant much to our Union churches and the missionary work they have undertaken.

Some twenty-two members have been received into the church during the year, most of them by baptism, as the tide of English Protestant immigration is now away from the North, while almost all newcomers to the district are French and Catholic. The Timmins Church, we understand, has in the armed forces some 25 representatives. A number of these young men were liberal supporters of the work and it speaks well for the spiritual life of the church that it is able to fill up the ranks of those who are absent and thus continue to fight the good fight on the home front, while its fine contingent of Christian young men bear their testimony by word and deed in the army.

Annual reports cannot depict the life of a church, though they do indicate some important facts in its life. The church at Timmins has a spiritual atmosphere that is reflected in this splendid financial statement but which must be experienced in order to be fully appreciated.

That such a church should spring up in the course of a brief period of twenty years is, under the hand of God, largely due to the two pastors, really the only ones that the Church has known: Rev. Morley Hall, now of Calgary, Alberta, and Rev. Harold Slade, the present leader. We thank God for the vision and devotion of these two men and feel confident that as they see the fruits of their labours

Short Title.

Governor in Council may make orders and regulations.

Publication.

in the Timmins Baptist Church they must exclaim with the Apostle Paul, "Ye are my joy and crown!" The spirit of the North is vastly different from that of the South; the presence of large numbers of men and women of foreign birth, as well as the large proportion of French-Canadians causes that. But everyone in Timmins knows the Baptist Church and its pastor and what they stand for, and throughout the entire North this church has made a deep impression. We thank God for such leaders and those faithful men and women whom God has raised up to testify to the Grace of God.—W.

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 6 First Quarter Lesson 7 February 15, 1942

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

THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF FAITH

Lesson Text: Romans 10.

Golden Text: "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved"—Romans 10:13.

Reading: Romans 9, 11.

I. Its Message—verses 1 to 13.

It is the task of the prophet of the Lord "to justify the ways of God to men". The Hebrew and the Gentile Christians of the Apostolic era wondered why the Jews had not inherited all the promises made to their fathers, and why the Gentiles, rather than the Jews, were being given prominence as guardians of the truth of the Gospel. These questions are answered in Romans 9-11. Chapter 9 deals with God's judgment upon Israel in the past; chapter 10 describes God's dealings with Israel in the present, and chapter 11 declares God's promises to Israel for the future. Thus the righteousness of God in history is vindicated.

The Apostle Paul longed with a passionate desire to see his fellow Hebrews saved (Rom. 9:1-3). The Holy Spirit will give to teachers a burden for the souls of their scholars, for without such a burden all Christian work is mere mockery.

When the soul's sincere desire is in accordance with the will of God it becomes prayer, for prayer from one standpoint is a reaching out after God. The Holy Spirit plants within our hearts holy desires, creating faith that God will hear (Matt. 21:22). He prays through us, presenting our petitions to God (Rom. 8:26, 27).

Zeal is of no avail unless it be focussed on the right object. There is a mistaken idea abroad to the effect that as long as a man is sincere in what he says or does, nothing else matters. Men do not take this attitude in practical affairs. One may strive with great zeal to reach a certain point, but if he be headed in the wrong direction, every step will take him farther away from his goal. It is possible to be sincere, and at the same time to be sincerely wrong. The Israelites of Paul's day were intensely earnest in their search for righteousness, but they rejected Christ, the embodiment of that righteousness (Matt. 5:17; Acts 21:20; 1 Cor. 1:30; Gal. 1:14). They were trusting in their own piety and good works to make them acceptable before God (Lev. 18:5; Gal. 3:11, 12). Many in our day have a religion of works. Expose the insecurity of the position of those who depend on supposed good works to save or to keep them (Rom. 3:9-20; Gal. 3:3). Their anchor will not hold in the time of storm (Heb. 6:18, 19). Those who seek admission to the Kingdom of God must abide by His conditions (Matt. 18:3; John 3:3, 5, 7).

Submission to the Lord is the core of the matter. He asks us to give up our own way and accept His way (Isa. 53:6; 55:6, 7), to give up our sins and accept His holiness (Psa. 103:12; Isa. 38:17). The Pharisee sought to justify himself and went away condemned; the publican humbled himself before God and went to his house justified (Lk. 18:10-14). The Pharisee represents the one who follows after the righteousness of the law, while the publican represents the one who accepts the righteousness of faith (Rom. 3:21, 22; Phil. 3:8, 9; Tit. 3:5-7).

The righteousness of faith is the right standing before God which is given to sinners when they believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. They are counted holy in His sight. The righteousness of faith is described in a four-fold manner: (1) as a reaching out after God, the desire for a personal Saviour (verses 6, 7; Acts 17:27); (2) as a revelation of the nearness of Christ, the One right beside us, a glorious, living Reality (verse 8; Deut. 30:11-14; Acts 17:28; Rev. 3:20); (3) as a reception of this Christ, a heart-belief that Christ is God, that He died for us, rose again and lives for us (Acts 4:12; 1 Cor. 15:1-11; Heb. 11:6); (4) as a response. I am to confess Christ not merely as a Saviour but as *the* Saviour and as *my* Saviour. I acknowledge His authority over my life and confess Him as my Lord and Master by word, by baptism and by life (Matt. 10:32; 16:16; Acts 8:35-38; 9:6; Gal. 3:27). Let us not be ashamed to own that we are soldiers of the King of kings (Psa. 119:46; Isa. 28:16; Rom. 9:33; 2 Tim. 1:8; Rev. 3:8).

The message of the Gospel may be expressed in simple language which all can understand (Isa. 35:8). The one who would be saved may lift his soul to the Lord and call upon Him humbly, sincerely and believingly (Psa. 145:18; Joel 2:32; Matt. 15:25; Mk. 10:47; Acts 2:21). Salvation is available to all who will take the Lord at His word (John 3:14-16; Rev. 22:17).

II. Its Method—verses 14 to 21.

The Apostle Paul sets forth in logical order the steps leading to salvation. The Gospel is preached (1 Cor. 1:21-24); it is heard (Matt. 11:15; John 5:24); it is believed (verse 17; Rom. 3:22); and finally, it is obeyed when the individual calls upon the Lord to save him (Matt. 7:24-27). These are the steps on the human side. But salvation is by grace as well as by faith; it is the gift of God (Eph. 2:8-10). God chooses (Acts 9:15; 26:16-18), calls (Acts 13:2) and sends forth those who are to preach the message of righteousness by faith in Christ (Isa. 52:7; Nahum 1:15; Matt. 9:38; Acts 10:36; Eph. 4:8-11). Without the consciousness of the seal of God upon us we dare not preach or teach His word (Jer. 14:14, 15; 23:21, 22; 29:9).

The unbelief of Israel was not due to any lack of opportunity (verse 18). God had sent to them His messengers, and the Gospel had been preached, but they had turned away from the truth (Psa. 19:4; Heb. 2:2, 3). Many had heard the Gospel, but not all had heeded it (Matt. 22:14; John 13:17). It was like a warning transmitted by a broadcasting station, picked up at the outposts, but disregarded. The Israelites, like many others, had not believed the report, although it came from an authorized source (Isa. 53:1; 65:2-7; John 10:37-40). We are to take heed what we hear and how we hear (Matt. 10:14-17; Mk. 4:24, 25; Lk. 8:18). Many who have heard the Gospel repeatedly are not yet saved, and they will be held responsible for their unbelief (Rom. 1:20; 2:1).

Nor was the unbelief of Israel due to lack of knowledge (verse 19). God had spoken to them through the prophets (Matt. 21:33-45; 23:37; Acts 7:51, 52). Many of the Gentiles, although they were without the special privileges of Israel (Rom. 3:1, 2; 9:4, 5), had heard and obeyed the Gospel (Isa. 65:1; Rom. 9:30). They had become the children of God by faith in Christ (Gal. 3:26; 1 Pet. 2:9, 10). But the sight of the Gentile believers did not make the Jews take their rejection to heart (Deut. 32:21; Rom. 11:11). God was acting in righteousness when He set them aside as far as being His peculiar witnesses was concerned. In the plan of God their rejection was to be neither complete nor final (Romans 11). Many individuals remained true to Him, and God would over-rule their stumbling to His own glory. God has given us the Bible, and we may know His will. The unsaved have only themselves to blame. There is such a thing as wilful ignorance (Rom. 1:28; 2 Pet. 3:5).

God is always righteous in every action (Rom. 3:4). The Israelites had failed on their world mission because of their own unbelief and disobedience. God's word can be effective only as we receive and obey it (Heb. 4:2). He is the Sovereign Lord, and His will is above any human standard. He acts always in accordance with His own transcendent holiness. This section of the Epistle closes with a song of praise to God for the wisdom and knowledge He displays in governing the universe according to His holy laws (Job. 11:7; Psa. 36:6, 7; Isa. 40:13, 14; Jer. 23:18). He is the Creator and the Supreme Ruler of the world (Rom. 11:33-36).