

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. 45

TORONTO, MARCH 12, 1942

Whole Number 1034

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

WHY ONLY A MILITANT PROTESTANTISM CAN KEEP CANADA BRITISH

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, March 8th, 1942

(Stenographically Reported)

"The just shall live by faith."—Romans 1:17.

It is said that the great W. E. Gladstone on one occasion remarked to the effect that he felt his sense of responsibility to God was the supreme consideration in life. Every other matter was subordinate, and subject to that primary principle. Belief in God, belief in another life, the instinctive—all but universally instinctive—belief in the immortality of the soul, and its corollary, man's answerability to God, either consciously or subconsciously, underlies all human thought and activity, and it is the basis of all religions.

Every question, in the ultimate analysis, is a religious question; because this life is only a part of life, it is but a segment of the circle. Whether we seek one yet to come or not, "we have no continuing city" here. A very wise observer, who had had large opportunity of observation, remarked simply and yet profoundly, "The living know that they must die." No argument is necessary to establish the truth of that confession: we all know it. The question that we must all ask is, What after that?

You may perhaps have read the story of the man who came to his Hindu priest, having been taught to believe in the transmigration of souls, that is, that the soul passes into another form of existence, wrapped with another animal nature, and so passes from one form to another—to ask the priest what he would probably become after death. His priest—I suppose making a guess at it—told him he would become a horse or dog or something of the sort. Then said the man, "And what after that?" The priest hazarded another prediction that he would become something else. "And what after that?" The priest made another shrewd guess. So the man plied the question again and again, "And what after

that?" At last the priest said, "You have taken me now too far; I cannot tell you what after that." "Oh well," said the man, "all these intermediate states are of little consequence; I want to know *what after that*, what is to be my final state."

That is the supreme consideration with every thoughtful man or woman at some time or another. Though he may for the-time-being be enamoured of these visible and tangible temporalities, and fascinated with the glare and glitter of the world about him, and forget that it is only transient, at some time or another every thoughtful person must ask the question, What after that?

It is because of that that every question is a religious one. To say that religion cannot be, and must not be, mixed with business, or with politics, or with any human interest or activity, is to show that one has but a very superficial idea of what religion really is. Mark, I do not say Christianity: I mean merely that conviction of another life and of an abiding relationship of some sort to a supreme Being. That conviction lies at the basis of all religions.

This is a religious war. Nazism is fundamentally a religion. So is Fascism. A few weeks ago I had an extended conversation with a very keenly intellectual man who had spent many years in Japan. He said to me, "There are few people who understand the Japanese question, for the reason that it is impossible to understand it apart from the religion of Japan. Shintoism and its religious philosophy are at the basis of it all. The Emperor is a son of the gods, and all his people children of the gods; and therefore foreordained to rule over others."

Yet there are people who try to understand the problems of to-day to the utter exclusion of all religious considerations. I do not know whether anyone would think, from the announcement of my subject, that I intended to discuss a political question. Please try to remember once and for all that I am a preacher of the gospel. This pulpit exists for the exposition of the great principles of revealed religion. But those principles, in my concept, apply to everything, to every part of life; and I hold that it is impossible to understand the problems of our day, and rightly to interpret current history, apart from religion.

I.

We have a problem in Canada. It is very difficult to awaken people to a recognition of that fact. I remember a printer telling me a story of an apprentice coming in one Wednesday morning, a couple of hours late. His foreman said to him, "What makes you late?" "Well, in my boarding-house I sleep in a room the window of which faces toward the east, and as soon as the sun lifts itself above the horizon, very early in the morning, it shines on my eyes and wakens me an hour or so before I need to get up. I got some lampblack and painted the window over so that the sun could not shine in. It had the other effect: I overslept." "Yes", said the foreman, "but what were you doing all day yesterday?"

It seems to me that a great many Canadians have painted their windows with lampblack; for supposedly intelligent people will not wake up. They will wake up after a while! They will wake up—or their children will—when it is too late. Our great problem in Canada is not whether or not we are going to have conscription, whether the vote on the plebiscite will be yes or no, whether we shall have a Liberal Government or a Conservative Government, or a C.C.F., or a Social Credit Party Government: the great and abiding problem of this British Dominion is the Province of Quebec. It is there, and it is a problem that affects the life of the whole nation, and every part of the life of the nation.

And it is not a racial problem. We need not complain of the French-Canadians. They are every whit as good as we are: "God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." Racial distinctions and antipathies are utterly un-Christian. I have no sympathy with them. The problem of Quebec is not a racial but a religious problem; and it will never be settled, or amicably adjusted, by political means.

The problem of Quebec is a religious problem which must be solved religiously, and until it is so solved it will not be solved at all. I have frequently to remind you that public men and the moulders of public opinion—or the followers of public opinion—are afraid to mention the Roman Catholic question. They fight shy of it always. But dodge it as you will, it will never be solved until we face the question boldly and frankly, that the great problem of this Dominion is a religious one.

I do not know of any great denomination in Canada that is even trying to solve it—not the Anglican, not the United Church, nor the Presbyterian, nor the Baptist. We, in our new Convention, are trying to do what little we can; but I know of no religious body that, as they say in England, is "facing up" to the problem, and, saying, We must address ourselves to its solution.

That Quebec is anti-British I think now nearly everyone believes. If you do not, you must be either deaf

or blind. The riotous conduct of students of the Catholic University of Montreal—which city is perhaps less Roman Catholic than some other parts of Quebec—and the whole attitude of Quebec's public men, their representatives in the House of Commons, go to show that there is a very large anti-British sentiment in Quebec.

The Premier of Australia said last week that the basic principle of the policy of the Australian Government is the assumption of the indissolubility of the British Empire. Said he, in effect, We Australians believe that the British Empire is one, and that it must remain one. That is not the assumption of public men of Quebec, but the very opposite. There is a very large separatist movement in Quebec, not always articulate—although it expressed itself in no small way in the recent election, in Quebec City, when the Minister of Justice had but a small majority over the man who advocated the absolute withdrawal of Canada from all British connection. Quebec is only halfhearted in the war, in spite of what the newspapers try to make out. She is behind in everything—behind in the Victory Loan, behind in recruiting, behind in everything but in the contracts she receives: in that she has the major portion. That is true of Quebec in spite of the contributions made by a considerable Protestant element in that province.

The Government of Canada, to say the least, is conciliatory toward that element in Quebec. I am not subject to an obsession: I am simply ringing the alarm bell as often as I can—not only from this pulpit, but that it may go into print and reach to the uttermost part of the country, to try to wake people up to a recognition of the truth that back of it all is this Italian church that is in league with our worst enemies. The Roman Catholic Church, beyond all question, is the Fourth Axis Power that is every whit as much at war with the British Empire as Italy, or Japan, or Germany. And it is not in Quebec only: it is in Ontario, in the United States, in England, in Southern Ireland.

I want you to follow me this evening. I hope you are in a thinking mood, so that we may get down to the underlying, basic, principles of this whole matter.

The Roman Catholic Church is anti-British because it is anti-individualistic. I published some months ago an excerpt from a speech by the Papal Delegate to Ottawa in which he said:

"The great enemy of Christianity and of all that we call Christian civilization, has always been and is yet, individualism which is in open opposition to charity which from the point of view of morality should direct the activities of concrete beings and act as a rule of life for collective entities.

"Individualism in religion has resulted in the divisions of the Christian family by a 'reformation' which has made the individual, master of his 'credo', consequently of all his errors.

"In the social order, individualism has opened the way to all extremes which conduce directly or indirectly to liberalism as a social programme opposed to the Church.

"In order to combat these errors and disasters caused by individualism, we exhort all Catholics to rally under the directions of the hierarchy and collaborate closely and intimately with it, in the defence of their heritage against all innovations and dangerous deviations and to organize and consolidate a social order in full accord with the doctrine and directions of the Church."

The religion of Jesus Christ provides a salvation for individuals. It saves men, not in the mass, but one by one. The shepherd left the ninety and nine and went

out after the one lost sheep until he found it. The woman swept her house until she found the one lost piece of money. The father mourned until his one lost son had come home again. The Lord Jesus said, "How much then is a man better than a sheep?" Jesus Christ places a value upon you as an individual, and upon me as an individual. "So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." We are personally, individually, responsible to God. The father cannot believe for the son, nor the mother for the daughter: we must believe each for himself; and we must individually each be born again. God's programme in the beginning was the making of men. When He had made this world, last of all He said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." That was His greatest work; and Christianity is nothing but a revelation of God's way of re-making individuals. The Roman Catholic idea is that Christianity is represented by a great organization in which the individual is merged in the mass, and that the great divine objective is the building of a great institution which even claims to be a political state; and all individual interests must be subordinated to that supreme end.

Roman Catholicism, like Nazism and Fascism, is a totalitarian system. It brooks no opposition. It is not only totalitarian, but it is authoritarian. It commands. It gives men a catechism. It asks a question—but it supplies the answer. It provides all the answers! That psychology is the secret of its whole system. The Hierarchy, the priesthood, the Papacy, will do your thinking for you, and prescribe what you are to believe, and command you to believe it, and to submit to that authority. You have no individual freedom and no individual rights.

That is why in the war, the Roman Catholic Church, by the operation of the principle that "birds of a feather flock together", is in sympathy, not with us, not with any form of government or any constitutional state that is based upon the fundamental doctrines of the rights of the individual—that is alien, foreign, to the whole Romanist conception. This country, the United States, Great Britain, the British Commonwealth of Nations, are based upon that assumption. They are aggregations of free people. They are associations of free individuals, every one thinking for himself, believing for himself, free to act for himself within the limits of other people's freedom. He must not infringe or trespass upon other people's liberty. I must stand for my liberty, you for yours; but my liberty must not be made a cloak whereby I impose my will upon yours. We must be free men together. Do not get too close to me, but leave me a little elbow room—and I must do the same for you. We are free men. That is the genius of the democratic system. We are not bound by an iron-clad, verbal constitution, but our system of government is based upon experience "broadening down from precedent to precedent", and so what has proved experimentally to be possible and for the general good, becomes at last a practice and a law.

All this is contrary to the very genius of Romanism, which insists upon submission. We are going to have a plebiscite. I am not going to vote, Yes, to set Mr. King free: he is as free now as he ever will be—and no one knows better than Mr. King that he does not need a vote to set him free. He has done as he liked anyhow. Frankly, I have absolutely no confidence in the sincerity of the leader of our Government. In all

probability, he is already assured of a practically solid negative vote from Quebec—and he is assured of a practically solid negative Roman Catholic vote everywhere. *But I am going to vote, Yes, notwithstanding—not to set Mr. King free, but to keep myself free.* If I were to vote, No—and you will hear me say this many times; and I hope you will say it to everyone you meet—I should say to the Government, I will not release you from your foolish promise—not to enact conscription. Then, no matter what should happen thereafter, our hands would be tied. We could do nothing. The Government would say, "You told us not to do it." But if we vote, Yes, and cut all hands, we are free, either to argue with them, or to kick them out, right to the end. *I am going to vote, Yes, in order to maintain my own freedom of speech and action.* I suggest you do the same.

I do not know whether you hear "Amos and Andy": I do occasionally. You may be shocked, but I think it is a bit of good wholesome humour. The other day I got an idea, I said to myself, I have found the exact counterpart, Premier Kingfish and his Cabinet, the Mystic Knights of the Sea, including all kinds of fish from the "Kingfish" down—not excluding the lobster and the shrimp; and of course, "Andrew H. Brown, President"! And "Lightnin'" and "Henry VanPorter." All the schemers are there. But my analogy fails at one point: I could find no one to supply the wholesome, homely, practical wisdom of our good friend Amos. It is *Andy without Amos*—and, as Andy says, They have got us into a pretty "jam".

There is a movement in Quebec to alienate that Province, not only from the British Empire, but if necessary, from the rest of the Dominion. I know they are not unanimous, but some of the more moderate ones are only more moderate because they think that the time is not yet ripe. But their insistence upon the French language everywhere is most significant. I have no objection to French—the more languages we learn and can speak, the better off we shall be. But this is an English-speaking country; we belong to an English-speaking Dominion. French is a secondary language constitutionally; but now it is thrust upon us over the radio and in every possible way. There are sections of Ontario that are becoming exclusively French-speaking. Quebec is overflowing into Ontario. The French language is a barrier which is being deliberately erected by the Hierarchy. A few men in Quebec are speaking against it. Even the Premier of Quebec has insisted that young men in the schools of Quebec ought to receive an education that would fit them for something other than being priests. He has insisted that the present educational system is designed for nothing else, and that it is far below anything else in this country. There is a larger percentage of illiteracy in countries where Roman Catholicism holds sway than anywhere else in the world, and that is emphatically true of Quebec.

There was a motion passed in the House of Commons expressing disapproval of the granting of English titles to distinguished Canadians. A knighthood can no longer be conferred upon a Canadian. If you want to be a knight, or a peer, you will have to go to England and establish your domicile there, as Lord Bennett did. That is a small matter—who cares anything about a title in a democratic country? But if you look into the origin of

that matter, I think you will find it emanated from Quebec. This I know that when Lord Willingdon was Governor-General, at some social occasion His Excellency addressed the Premier, and asked, for his own information, if the objection to recognition by the King of Canadians for distinguished service was general throughout Canada, and the Premier answered, "I do not know about that; but I do know that Quebec is against it." Quebec has long been seeking, by every means, to break every tie that would bind this country to Britain, and to the Empire. Yet we owe our very existence to the Empire; we could not last any time of ourselves.

After the war, the balance of power will rapidly be re-adjusted. Over forty-one per cent of the population is Roman Catholic now, and with whatever policy of immigration is adopted, the importation of Catholics will very rapidly overtake that. Statistically, even by natural increase, without immigration, by nineteen hundred and seventy—twenty-eight years from now—the Roman Catholics will be in the majority in this country—and then look out! If you know anything about history, you know what will happen when that day comes.

II.

What I ask this evening is, HOW IS THAT TO BE COMBATED? WHAT ARE WE TO DO AGAINST IT? Nothing politically. What do politicians care? It is probable we have more political Quislings in Canada than were found in any European country. Quebec can be dealt with only on religious grounds.

What religion? The religion of the Modernist? Romanism is politically akin to Fascism and Nazism in its fundamental principle, in its totalitarianism. What is Modernism? A denial fundamentally of the authority of the Bible, a denial of its divine inspiration, of its supernatural character. There are degrees of Modernism, but it finds its ultimate expression at last in the utterances of such a man as Harry Emerson Fosdick in whose conception it is the substitution of human authority for divine authority, human works for the righteousness of Christ. Modernism is the substitution of a doctrine of salvation by works for salvation by grace.

At that point it is akin to Romanism. The Modernist does not wear the robes of the Roman priest, nor perform his ceremonies; but his authority is other than that of Jesus Christ as expressed in His Word. It may be his reason, his religious consciousness, some form of subjectivism, some authority which he sets up within himself as the norm; but he denies the authority of the Bible. Poor blind leaders of the blind are they.

How was Roman Catholicism dealt with in the time of Luther, and before? What was it that struck that great church like a mighty sledge-hammer, and broke it in pieces? "Is not my word like as a fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?" Luther turned aside from the authority of the Church to the authority of God's holy Book. Going up the steps, doing penance, trying to make himself worthy, he heard a Voice from heaven whisper in his heart, "The just shall live by faith." "*The just shall live by faith.*" It was Luther's emphasis upon the doctrine of justification by faith, with all its implications—the sufficiency of the sacrifice of Christ, His death and resur-

rection and intercession in our behalf, the whole scheme of redemption of which justification by faith was but one element—it was that which effected a religious revolution and produced the Reformation which re-formed the life of England, and I have no hesitation in saying, laid the foundations of the British Empire. There would have been no Empire but for that. Asked the secret of England's greatness, Queen Victoria took the Bible and said, "That is the secret of England's greatness." She was right!

What we need in Canada is not merely a change of Government, but a mighty shaking of the Spirit of God. What can we hope for from preachers who do not believe the Bible? I do not want to be critical of other preachers. But I am torn between two loyalties. No man on earth would prefer more than I to be on amicable terms with every man who calls himself a minister of Jesus Christ; but I care not who he is, Baptist, Presbyterian, Anglican, United Churchman, the man who undermines people's faith in the divine inspiration and authority of the Bible is no friend of mine. I will not recognize him as a Christian teacher. I will not give him the hand of fellowship. The man who offers men some other salvation than that which may be obtained only through the precious blood of Christ, and by the abounding grace of God, I care not what they call him, a chancellor, a professor having all the degrees that all the universities on earth could confer upon him, if he does not believe and teach salvation through the blood, which is another way of saying salvation by grace, and by grace alone, he is not a Christian teacher. He is a teacher of heresy, and his teaching is akin to that of the Church of Rome.

Nothing but the gospel of grace can offer a real barrier to Rome. What we need is a great evangelical revival, such a revival as came through the Reformation; such a revival as came in the days of Wesley and Whitfield, and saved England from the horrors of the French Revolution.

Depend upon it, God has not left us without a guide. A young man came to see me the other day, for the discussion of these things. He is doing graduate work in Toronto University, and we had a very interesting discussion about some of these matters. I ventured to say to him, "It would be strange if the Lord Who made the seven seas, and gave to the waters His decree that they should not pass His commandment, the Lord Who piled the mountains, Who filled this earth with beauty and fruitfulness, and then for our guidance that we might know our way about, established the magnetic pole and the north star—the star which when the compass is out, guides the mariner. The captain takes his time at sea at high noon, not by his watch, but by God's clock, taking his bearings; if by any means his compass is out of order, he is still not left without a star to steer by. It would be strange if God Who made man in His own image and likeness should set him forth to sail an uncharted moral and spiritual sea, without a polestar, without a guide; if He should make a soul in His own image and likeness, and then cast him adrift to go on the rocks. As surely as He gave us in nature a norm, a standard, by which we could regulate our conduct and measure our time, so in the spiritual realm He has given us this great light by which we may find our way from earth to heaven, in the light of which we may test all things that claim to be true, and weigh

them in the balances of the sanctuary to determine whether or not they are true."

Do you think that these religious matters are of no importance? If I were to say some extraordinary, extravagant thing about someone or something, it might, if there are representatives of the press here, find a place in the papers to-morrow; but when I discuss these great principles that are fundamental to human life and destiny, that are inseparable from the soul's welfare, and absolutely indispensable to a right relationship to God, people sleep on and no one cares. Then at last, when it has undermined the foundations of society in Canada as it has done among other peoples of the world, Canadians may begin to rub their eyes—but too late.

Modernism leads to bankruptcy and ruin. It always does. There is no weapon that we may use against Romanism—which is only one of the errors—and against all errors, but the Word of God "that liveth and abideth for ever." You have heard of the "sword of the Spirit movement"? The Roman Catholics have dared to call a movement that is an agency of Roman Catholic propaganda, "the sword of the Spirit movement". A device of the devil is what it is. This Book is the sword of the Spirit; the only sword of the Spirit is the word of God. If Roman Catholicism would turn that loose, if they would use the sword of the Spirit instead of all their sacramentarian abominations, and call people back, not to penance, but to repentance; we could join such a movement.

But we must begin somewhere. Do you believe the Bible? What is it to you? Is it the Word of God "that liveth and abideth for ever"? Is it to you the absolutely final revelation of God, the record that God has given to us of His Son, nothing more to come, the last word spoken? "Last of all he sent unto them his son." Is that what the Bible is to you—a deposit of truth, a summary of everything that God has ever said, the record of the Word that was made flesh?

Are you prepared to believe it? Do not say you believe the Bible "from cover to cover" if you have not read what is inside. You may theoretically hold that truth—but find out what is inside. Do you believe it? Do you rest upon it? Are you willing to cast yourself upon it?

It is a blessed thing to be a Christian. It is a great thing to know that the salvation of the soul is settled. It is a great thing to know that you have God's last word. Then you may say, "For that I will stand without alteration, without compromise. By it I will stand, and for it I will contend if the very heavens fall." That is what we need, so that we can say like Luther when we have given our testimony, "Here I stand, I can do no other; so help me, God."

Let us pray:

We seek Thy blessing upon our meditation this evening, O Lord. We ask Thee in Thy grace to equip us with the Christian panoply. Enable us to take unto us the whole armour of God, that we may be able to withstand in the evil day. Bless any who have not yet given themselves to Christ, any who may be in uncertainty, in whose minds there may still be some doubt. Bring all such to complete repose and rest and establishment of soul upon the Word of God Who cannot lie. For Thy name's sake, Amen.

THE WITNESS

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

HEAR ROMANISTS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES

It is surely not unfair to let Romanists speak for themselves. For ourselves, we are always willing to accept responsibility for what we deliberately say or write. We believe it would be a wholesome thing for Protestants to hear what Romanist priests actually teach.

A report was brought to us within the last few months of what a priest said to a company of nine hundred women, but it was so vile we dare not print it. Now there has been forwarded to us a verbatim report of a sermon by a Roman Catholic priest, delivered, not in Italy, not in South America, nor even in Quebec, but in Scranton, Pa. The report says that "before a capacity congregation in St. Patrick's Church yesterday morning at 11 o'clock Rev. John Joseph O'Brien was ordained to the Roman Catholic priesthood Saturday in St. Peter's Cathedral celebrated his first high mass." The date of the report is March 2nd, 1942, so this is not an ancient document: it is right up to the minute. And it represents what Roman Catholics believe and teach to-day.

The sermon was preached by Rev. Father O'Rourke, and was as follows:

"Thou has made him a little less than the Angels, Thou hast crowned him with glory and honor, and Thou hast placed him over the works of thy hands." (Psalm 8, 6.)

Yesterday in this city, in the Cathedral of this diocese dedicated to Saint Peter, Prince of the Apostles, there took place the colorful and awe-inspiring ceremony of ordination—a ceremony first performed by Christ Himself—in which is handed down in an unbroken line the same power which Christ gave to His first priests. During that ceremony six young men, among whom was Father O'Brien, walked up to the altar, received the imposition of hands from their bishop and their souls were sealed for all eternity with the seal of the eternal priesthood.

To understand what a priest is one must remember what Christ is because a priest is in truth another Christ. Christ is the mediator between God and man. He alone could be the mediator because a mediator must have something in common with each of the parties between whom he mediates and Christ alone is by nature a combination of humanity and divinity, God and man. As the one perfect go-between He is the only way through which man and the things of earth can go to God and through which God and the things of Heaven can come to man. By offering to His Eternal Father prayer, penance and sacrifice Christ takes man to God, and by bringing into the world blessings, grace and salvation, He brings God to man. Christ stands before the throne of God to make intercession for us, but to have visible representatives on earth to perform that office for Him, Christ chose men to be priests, to be intercessors with Him between God and man. The men Christ chose were by their nature only human and if they were to mediate between God and man they must needs in some way partake of divinity. Christ therefore gave to His priests His own divine powers. The priest then is a union of human nature and divine power. While ever remaining human, he exercises powers that are absolutely and truly divine. The powers which Christ gave to the priest to enable him to perform his divine office were the awful powers to consecrate the most holy sacrament of the altar, and to forgive sin, in other words the power to offer to God a pleasing sacrifice and the power to give grace to man.

Identified With Christ

This first divine power the priest exercises at the altar when he pronounces the words "This is my body and this is my blood." At that moment he is completely identified with Christ. He does not say "this is the body of Christ"; he says "this is my body" and the living body of Christ becomes present in his anointed hands. It is with holy amazement

and reverential awe that the priest pronounces these words, words that equal the divine words of creation, "Let there be light"; words that stand next in order to words of the Angel Gabriel to Mary at the incarnation and to Mary's answer, "Be it done unto me according to thy word." They are equal to the words of creation because their first effect is the exact opposite; they are next in order of omnipotence to the words of the incarnation because their second effect is the renewal of the incarnation. The words "Let there be light" created something; the words of consecration, in the first place, annihilate something, that is, they make the substance of the bread and wine cease to exist; and in the second place they bring into the world the living Jesus Christ which is actually a renewal of what the Holy Ghost did at the incarnation. But where as Christ came only once through Mary, He comes into the world daily through the divine power of the priest at the moment of consecration.

No less divine, no less omnipotent is the power of the priest to forgive sin. It is recorded in the Gospel that when Christ said to the paralytic at Capharnum, "Son thy sins are forgiven thee," the Scribes said "He blasphemeth, who can forgive sin but God only?" The Scribes were right in believing that the power to forgive sins is divine and proper to God alone, because sin is an offense against God and only He can pardon that offense. But Christ had that power because He was God. The priest has that power because Christ gave it to him. " whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven and whatsoever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven . . . and breathing on them He said receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them and whose sins you shall retain they are retained." This young priest singing his first solemn mass this morning, yesterday at ordination received that very same power handed down in an unbroken line of succession from the Apostles. Even as Christ said "Thy sins are forgiven thee," the priest can say "I absolve thee" and even though the soul before him be steeped in sin, as red as scarlet and as numerous as the sands on the seashore, the priest by those words can wash that soul white as the newly fallen snow. By the power of those words, a power which not even the angels possess the priest can snatch a soul from the brink of Hell and lift it into Heaven. Truly God has created the priest in his human nature a little less than the angels, but has crowned him with glory and a divine power above that of the angels and has set him over the works of His hand. He created him a man, but He has given him Divine power and authority.

God has been good to this parish in choosing from it young men to be His priests. I congratulate you who are the friends and relatives of Father O'Brien. But there are two persons above all whom I would like to congratulate today; two persons who, are first in this young priest's mind and deepest in his heart. One is here, the other is absent; but I am sure that neither one is missing the full joy of this day, the greatest day in the life of their son. On Good Friday when Christ offered to God from His cross the sacrifice that saves the world, His faithful mother was present before that cross-altar. But who could believe that St. Joseph was unaware of what was happening on Calvary. He knew and was glad. And who could believe that Jesus and Mary were not thinking of him then? Surely in the union of their silent hearts they had not excluded Joseph. We can not help feeling that the little trinity of Nazareth was reunited in spirit on Calvary before being reunited forever in Heaven. Today as this other Christ offers from the altar the same sacrifice of Calvary, his mother is here before the altar, taking her quiet part. And we can not believe that Heaven is so far away that his father is unable to see and share that joy. This first solemn mass is another reunion of a little trinity and is a sign of a greater reunion still to come.

To this priest's mother, here, and to his father, there, we offer our feeble congratulations—feeble in comparison to those which Almighty God is extending to one, through faith and to the other (please God) through glory. We say to you that God has honored your house exceedingly in calling your son to be a priest, another Christ. He has made you to be as it was, another Mary and Joseph in another Holy Family. Today your son stands in glory before God and man, and much of the credit is yours, for it was you who first fostered his vocation and helped him to reach

his goal. It was you who first taught him to know God and from your good example the meaning of a good Catholic life. It was your countless and loving sacrifices through many years which have made his priesthood possible. Had I the fluent tongue of a Chrysostom or the inspired pen of an Augustine I could not hope even to fashion feebly the picture of those silent sacrifices. Only to God and the recording angel who writes in letters of gold are known the pains you experienced in parting with the son that you love, the loneliness of years of separation from him, the noble generosity with which you gave to God him who could have been the security and comfort of your declining years.

God Remembers Sacrifices

Today for joy you forget all these sacrifices, but God remembers them and Heaven smiles upon you. Your son too remembers. The memory of your self-sacrificing love will always be green, fresh and sweet in his priestly heart. All the honor and glory which is his today he lays as a loving tribute at your feet, with the willing promise that as often as he stands at the altar, yours will be the first name that he whispers to his God.

To you, Father O'Brien, I extend the hand of fellowship and friendship in the vineyard of Christ. You no doubt could have attained dignities and honors in other fields of human endeavor. You have done well to spurn these and answer the call of the Master "Come follow Me." There is no dignity or power under Heaven which can compare with yours. As the sun outshines in brilliance all the other stars of the heavens so does your dignity and power outshine all others. The greatest doctor in the world can preserve only the life of the body; you can give and preserve the life of the soul. The sentence of the highest judges stands firm only in the courts of his nation, yours bind in Heaven itself. Human is the dignity of the most noble born king; yours is divine. When he dies, his honors and powers forsake him, but your priesthood remains forever. The mightiest rulers on earth command only men, you command God Himself. They can imprison or free the body; you can bind or loose the soul. They may possess the treasures of the world and offer gifts of gold to one another; you can fondle in your hands the Treasure of Heaven and offer God to God. In a word they can do nothing save on earth, but you are mighty and powerful in Heaven. You have been given this power and dignity that you may represent Christ on earth. Throughout your priestly life so represent him that you may be joined with Him in Heaven. Let your constant prayer be that of Our Holy Father, St. Francis of Assisi: "Lord make me an instrument of thy peace: where there is hatred, let me sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; and where there is sadness, joy. O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console; to be understood as to understand; to be loved as to love; for it is in giving that we receive, it is in pardoning that we are pardoned, and it is in dying that we are born to eternal life."

The Editor's Engagements

Dr. Shields will preach Wednesday evening, March 18th, in Victoria Avenue Gospel Church, Hamilton, of which Rev. John Byers, who concluded a fourteen-year notable and successful ministry in Orillia in December, is now Pastor. Mr. Byers is a real workman, and we are anticipating our visit to his church with great pleasure.

On March 31st the Editor is scheduled to preach in the Bible Baptist Church, Jamestown, New York, of which Rev. Gordon Houser is the Pastor. April 5th, 6th and 7th, the Editor will speak at a three-day Conference in the King's Memorial Baptist Church, Leaksville, North Carolina; and for two weeks beginning April 12th he will conduct an evangelistic and Bible-teaching mission in Calvary Baptist Church, Miami, Fla.

FIFTH COLUMNISTS AT WORK IN MONTREAL

The second meeting of French-Canadian Roman Catholic anti-conscriptionists took place at Maisonneuve Market in Montreal a week ago last Sunday evening. English language papers did not give detailed accounts of this meeting and we feel it would be a real service to our readers to translate excerpts from the very full account of this gathering which appeared in *Le Devoir*, Catholic Action daily of Montreal. The following paragraph from this paper will give an idea of the temper of the meeting and the spirit of its sponsors:

"To the tune of God Save the King"

"Before, during and after the meeting, outside the market and even in the street cars on Ontario Street, and later on St. Denis Street, groups of good natured young men sang 'A bas la conscription' ('Down with conscription') to the tune of 'God Save the King'. As can be seen it does not require many words to make this couplet:

'A bas la conscription,
A bas la conscription,
La conscription!
A bas la conscription,
A bas la conscription,
A . . . bas la conscription
La conscription.'

Another song which enjoyed popularity was composed to the air of 'Malborough s'en va-t-en guerre':

"L'Angleterre est en guerre,
Mironton, mironton, mirontaine,
L'Angleterre est en guerre,
C'est pas de nos affaires. . . ."

Without attempting to rival the original style of this latter poetic attempt we translate it literally as follows:

"England is at war
Trala la trala la la,
England is at war
And that's none of our business. . . ."

Unlike the first meeting of this anti-conscriptionist league which ended in mob violence (see GOSPEL WITNESS of February 19) this second meeting was not marked by any disturbance except when a young woman of twenty-seven years of age, Miss Preston, heckled some of the speakers in their own language. One of the speakers declared there was no danger of an invasion of Canada. In reply to this stupid remark the young woman shouted: "Did Hitler tell you that?" A little later, police escorted her from the hall and sent her home in a taxi.

Le Devoir, whose account of the whole meeting is manifestly partial to the anti-conscriptionists, suggests that this young woman was merely the tool of certain unnamed interests outside French-Canadian Roman Catholic circles.

The news account of *Le Devoir* reads as follows in part:

"The Preston incident appeared to be all planned in advance and its trickery was evident. The representatives of the English press, particularly those from Toronto, were there in numbers in contrast to their absence at the former meeting in St. James' Market. Several of them were worried about missing their train for Toronto. The interruption of Miss Preston took place at the expected hour which suited them. . . . For the impartial but informed observer the whole business was manifestly all prepared and planned to assure a sensation for newspaper readers in Toronto, New York and Chicago, at the expense of the good people of Quebec who do not wish conscription for overseas service. The interruption of Miss Preston did not assume the proportions that were planned. . . ."

The above is taken from what purports to be news report but which is highly coloured. The following is part of the editorial comment from one of the editors of this paper, who is also a director of the League which sponsored the meeting. This is the editorial comment:

"The anti-conscriptionist meeting at Maisonneuve Market took place quietly in spite of certain manoeuvres of organized provocation. To provide for the success of this organized provocation there were massed (on what secret orders we do not know, but have our suspicions) numbers of sailors, airmen and soldiers in steel helmets and a large number of mounted police in mufti. . . . The crowd more or less aware of these preparations gave no pretext for intervention to these brutal agents of disorder and so made the plot fail. The military authorities of the district had, however, been warned by the organizers of the meeting of their categorical desire to avoid any disorder and they requested military authorities not to allow soldiers to be about in the neighbourhood. But soldiers were there. What were they doing there, only a few hundred paces away from the Maisonneuve Market, while a meeting was in progress in which acts of provocation were attempted. Who were disappointed? The conscriptionist press both of Montreal and of the rest of the country. And after this that same press will cry out for national unity and against the insolence of the French-Canadians, but where is the insolence found? Not on our side."

This same French paper comments on the presence of five or six Air Force boys in uniform in the following terms: "Were they commissioned to play the rôle of 'agents provocateurs'?"

Apparently in the view of this Catholic Action daily men in uniform ought not to be allowed the liberty of speech that young French-Canadians opposed to conscription claim and exercise.

The above translations from the Catholic *Le Devoir* will reveal the bigoted intolerance of its sectarian spirit. It employs the same tone that Hitler's propagandists used to whip up the racial hatred of the German minority in Czecho-Slovakia and its distortions of the facts are just as evident. Toronto dailies are accused of paying a young woman to interrupt the meeting; the military authorities were hoping for a riot because they took steps to prevent one.

It is to be specially noted that the instigators of this movement who claim full protection for liberty of speech did not limit their discussion to anti-conscriptionism. Mr. Bourassa speaking at their first meeting pled for a popular movement looking toward making peace with the enemy. A man may discuss conscription without being branded as a traitor, but those who now advocate peace movements with Hitler or those who parody, "God Save the King" with the words used by the young French-Canadians at Maisonneuve Market brand themselves as Fifth Columnists beyond all mistake.

Le Devoir carries another announcement in large type to the following effect:

"Anti-conscriptionists at Radio Station 'CKAC'"

"A series of regular broadcasts for the League for the Defense of Canada. After Tuesday, March 3rd, the League for the Defense of Canada will make regular broadcasts from station 'CKAC'. These broadcasts will take place twice each week, Tuesday and Thursday evenings at 7 o'clock. Tuesday evening the President of the League Dr. J. B. Prince will open the series of anti-conscriptionist addresses."

The Canadian radio is at the disposal of anti-conscriptionist, anti-British Isolationists, Fifth Columnists in Canada, after nearly three years of war. What do

Australian and New Zealand aviators training in Montreal think of all this while their own homes are under the rain of Jap bombs? But more important is what do Canadians think of it? *Le Jour*, a French-Canadian paper of a different tone from the Catholic Action papers, made the following remark in an article written before it became known that the radio was to be placed at the disposal of the so-called "League for the Defense of Canada":

"If this movement is allowed the use of the radio we shall commence to believe that the Fifth Column has some connection at Ottawa."

Who can doubt that we have a Fifth Column at work in Canada? The words and deeds of the sponsors and advocates of such a meeting as that described above identify them as belonging to the band of Lindberghs, Wheelers, Pétains, Quislings and other instruments of the Axis powers of darkness.

We call attention to the fact that such tools of our mortal enemies are to-day doing their deadly, devious work in Canada. But it is of still more urgent importance to note whom these Fifth Columnists recognize as their immediate masters. If it could have been proved a year ago that the notorious woman isolationist recently arrested in the United States was then in the pay of the German Government, it would have discredited her at once. But the proof came only after the United States was at war with the Axis. But to the discerning, her actions proclaimed it long before the detailed evidence was produced. That she did the work of Hitler was evident to all who observed affairs. In the same way the members of the French-Canadian League are doing the work of Hitler, Mussolini and their yellow friends in the East. Whether or not they are paid by them and in what coin does not interest us in the least. The manifest fact stands out for all to see—they are accomplishing Hitler's designs in Canada.

But if we lack proof of their connection with enemy propaganda departments their official positions as Roman Catholic leaders leaves us in no doubt as to their complete identification with the Roman Catholic Church and its schemes in the Province of Quebec.

Among the directors of the League are Mr. Georges Pelletier, Managing Editor of Catholic Action *Devoir*, Maxime Raymond, Member of the House of Commons at Ottawa, and Mr. André Laurendeau, editor of *L'Action Nationale*, still another Catholic monthly. *Le Devoir* describes the official positions of two of the four speakers at the recent meeting as follows:

"Mr. Phillipe Girard, president of the Central Council of National Catholic Unions."

This means that Mr. Girard is the leader of a powerful Catholic Action labour group or in other words he is the accredited leader of a Roman Catholic Church organization designed to control the working class for the Church of Rome.

Another speaker is described as "Mr. L. Athanase Fréchette, General President of the St. John the Baptist Society of Montreal." This is another important Catholic organization wholly under the control of the Roman Hierarchy.

Protestants do not realize how closely Catholic Action co-ordinates all the various Roman Catholic groups and societies. The key word of the whole scheme is obedience to the hierarchy. No new organization may be commenced, however well-intentioned its aim and

motives, without the express consent of the higher ecclesiastical authorities. In this way every group, every class of society, each individual, is to be a submissive cog in the great machine which plans to take complete direction of every aspect of life: in short Catholic Action is ecclesiastical totalitarianism, with the Pope as the final and infallible authority.

We stress this fact in order to make clear that the leaders of this isolationist, anti-conscriptionist movement in Quebec act with the consent of the Roman Catholic authorities. The fact that the Hierarchy has not rebuked them, together with their official position in the high places of Catholic Action makes it evident that their movement is no squib set off by immature and misguided boys: it is tantamount to the official expression of the highest Roman Catholic authorities.

That such a movement is possible in Canada is most unfortunate. That it received the consent and tacit approval, if not the active direction of the Roman Hierarchy, is a still sadder fact though it is perfectly evident to all who have eyes to see.—W.S.W.

NEWS OF UNION CHURCHES

A Preacher on Skis

At the beginning of this winter we published in these pages an appeal for funds to purchase skis and equipment for one of our missionary pastors. This young man travels an average of sixty miles a week on backwoods tracks that are often not broken. In response to our appeal several gifts came in immediately and best of all another of our pastors remembered that he had a pair of skis lying idle at home in Ottawa. He at once sent them on to Pastor Vaughan for use in his pioneer work in the district of Norland. The following note has just come to hand from this faithful servant of the Lord. He writes:

"I received a pair of skis from Brother T. Carson of Verdun. They are a good pair with poles, boots and stockings. This has been a great winter, the happiest I have had in the work here. This church building is worth all the effort I have put into its erection. The pleasure and enjoyment we have had in worshipping in it have certainly given us a new interest in this work. Let me mention first the wonderful provision of the Lord. We needed the log siding and He sent in the money. You will recall we said at the opening service we needed \$150.00. Since the opening we have received \$144.00, and adding the \$50.00 from the opening services it makes a total of \$194.00: 'enough and to spare'.

"Since we opened the church, up until the present, our attendance at the evening service has been well over forty, more than the attendance for the same period last year. The Sunday School has shown a similar improvement. The offerings here at Norland have been far above previous years. The attendance at the outside places has certainly not diminished, and we are glad to say that we have missed very few at these services."

Brother Vaughan is one of our missionary pastors who has made one dollar do the work of ten and we remind our readers that "enough and to spare" applies only to this particular job on hand. He has asked us to express his grateful appreciation of the help received from *GOSPEL WITNESS* readers, for no outside help is received on this field apart from special gifts.

Calvary Church, Ottawa

From several quarters we have received good reports of the progress of the work in Calvary Baptist Church, Ottawa under the pastorate of Rev. Frank Wellington. We are informed that at a recent business meeting the church reaffirmed its affiliation with the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec, and its full fellowship with the Union in its missionary endeavours. We rejoice in this good news from the capital city.

McMaster, The Bible Society, and Dr. Fosdick

Our article of last week entitled, "What Communion Hath Light with Darkness?", was written with much reluctance. It was written because numerous reports were reaching us which began to look like an insidious propaganda effort to the effect that there was no real difference between the positions taken by the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, and that of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec. We entertain the hope, however, that these reports were not part of such a propaganda movement, but rather emanated from churches and ministers who really do not know what McMaster University is teaching.

We suggested in the article of last week that the Convention of Ontario and Quebec might serve itself by cutting McMaster adrift, and letting it go its own way. We fear, however, that there is little prospect of any such action being taken. Therefore, while the Old Convention—as we have become accustomed to call it—maintains any sort of organic connection and fellowship with McMaster University, the Union of Regular Baptist Churches will be forced to keep as far from it as possible.

To show that we are not sounding a false alarm, we publish below the testimony of one who was present at the Annual Meeting of the Upper Canada Bible Society recently held. The Chancellor of McMaster University was to have been the speaker, but his place was taken by Professor H. S. Stewart, Dean in Theology of McMaster University. The letter which follows will give our readers the opportunity of knowing what sort of theological training students are being given in McMaster University. If the Dean in Theology could be guilty of such drivel, what better could be expected of any other member in the Faculty of Theology? In order that our readers may know what Dr. H. E. Fosdick really teaches, we republish an article from our issue of June 8th, 1933. And thus we are publishing the article for the third time since it was first printed in our issue of June 10th, 1926. The reason for its second publication was that the Principal of the Theological Faculty, the late Dr. John MacNeill, had just preached in Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick's pulpit.

Most of our readers will know that Tom Paine was reckoned to be an arrant infidel; and his book, *The Age of Reason*, was at the time of its publication looked upon as an attack upon the very foundations of revealed religion. But the Dean in Theology has the temerity to tell the Annual Meeting of the Upper Canada Bible Society that they ought to bind up the teaching of Fosdick with the Bible, so that ordinary people could understand it.

We intend no reflection upon the Bible Society, one of the most important societies in the world, except to say, that we agree with our correspondent that in future they must be more careful in their selection of speakers.

In the sermon appearing in this issue, we have pointed out the philosophic kinship of Modernism with Roman Catholicism. Indeed, it might be said of all errors as Christ said to His critics, "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." Roman Catholicism tells us we cannot understand the Bible without the authoritative interpretation of the Roman Church. Christian Science tells us that in order to understand the Bible, we must have the Christian Science text book, the printed lunacy known as, *Science and Health*. Russellism tells us that in order to under-

stand the Bible we must have the writings of Pastor Russell and Judge Rutherford. Mormonism tells us that the Bible must be supplemented and really complemented by the *Book of Mormon* and the *Doctrines and Covenants*. And now a Dean in Theology of a Baptist university tells the more-than-a-century-old Bible Society that its principle of publishing the Bible without note or comment for more than a hundred years has been all wrong, and that in order to understand it they should bind up with every copy, Fosdick's infidel book, *The Modern Use of the Bible*.

What more need be said? We publish below the letter of one who heard the remarks of Professor Stewart, followed by the article containing the teaching of Tom Paine and Fosdick in parallel columns, with such remarks as we made at the time the article was published.

A Startling Letter

Dear Dr. Shields:

I was interested in your article in the last issue of THE GOSPEL WITNESS entitled "What Communion Hath Light with Darkness", particularly in your reference to McMaster's new chancellor, Professor George P. Gilmour. The reason for this interest is this. A week or two ago I attended the annual meeting of the Upper Canada Bible Society and the British and Foreign Bible Society at the headquarters on College Street. There was an excellent attendance of men and women, most of them no doubt firm believers in the Bible as the infallible Word of God. It was announced by the new President that the address of the evening was to have been delivered by Professor Gilmour, but, as he was unable to be present he had sent as his deputy Professor H. S. Stewart, Dean in Theology, in McMaster University.

Professor Stewart had not been speaking long before signs of uneasiness and unrest were apparent. His theme was the interpretation of the Bible, and he labored long to show that the ordinary man or woman was incapable of understanding the Scriptures without some one to interpret them. Now that would have been all right had he proceeded to point out that the Holy Spirit was the Inspirer and Interpreter of the Word of God. But we heard nothing about the Holy Spirit, indeed there was not the slightest suggestion that the third person of the Trinity had the remotest connection with the matter. What we were told, incredible though it may seem to your readers, as it was to many of those present that night was that Dr. Fosdick's "The Modern Use of the Bible" should be bound together with the Word of God for the guidance of readers. It seems to me, as it must have seemed to others, that Modernism, if not blasphemy could hardly go further than this.

To say that many of those present at the meeting were shocked is to put it mildly. They were flabbergasted and saddened to think that any speaker could stand up at such a meeting and tell the Bible Society it should scrap the basic rule of its constitution which is the circulation of the Scriptures "without note or comment". And then to suggest that the notes of a man such as Fosdick should be added was about the last straw. I do believe it was men with Fosdick's views of the Bible who have been primarily responsible for the state Germany is in today. When Fosdickism has brought forth its fruit we call it Hitlerism, and that is the state to which he and others of his ilk would bring America today could their views prevail. If what Professor Stewart told the Bible Society is representative of the teaching of McMaster all that you have said of the Modernism there and a great deal you have left unsaid would be justified. I can say that quite freely since I am not a Baptist, and have neither prejudices nor predilections against McMaster or in favor of it.

The Bible Society I know cannot be held responsible for the views set forth by such speakers, but it certainly is a puzzle to many of its friends and supporters why people of such views should be selected to address an annual meeting. It is safe to say that by far the majority of those present rejected in toto the views set forth by Professor Stewart. At the same time it makes one tremble for the souls of those who have to imbibe such deadly poison.—ONE WHO WAS THERE.

Dr. Fosdick, Tom Paine, and McMaster

In our issue of June 10th, 1926 (Volume 5, number 5), we quoted at length from a pamphlet entitled, "The Deadly Parallel", by George H. Dowkontt, M.D. The booklet was a comparison of Tom Paine's, "Age of Reason", with Harry Emerson Fosdick's, "Modern Use of the Bible". It may be that many of our present readers missed that issue; therefore for their benefit we reprint the extracts printed in THE GOSPEL WITNESS at that time:

The Devil was Imported

PAINÉ

"Gentile."
"The Book, of Job does not belong to the Bible . . . It has been translated from another language into Hebrew, and the author of the book was a *Gentile*; that the character represented under the name of Satan . . . does not correspond to any Hebrew idea" (p. 112).

"The Christian *Mythologists* tell that their Satan made war against the Almighty, who defeated him, and confined him afterwards, not under a mountain, but in a pit. It is here easy to see that the first fable suggested the idea of the second; for the fable of Jupiter and the Giants was told many hundred years before that of Satan" (p. 13).

"Mythology."

FOSDICK

"Persian."
"He [Satan] never appeared in the Old Testament until after *Persian* influence had begun its work, and then he was spoken of in three connections: Job. 1: 6-12; 2: 1-7; Zech. 3: 1, 2; 1 Chron. 21: 1" (p. 119).

"Unembarrassed by any intellectual difficulty . . . Satan and his satellites were supposed to work miracles continually" (p. 137).

"Having frankly recognized, therefore, the *outgrown* nature of the category [demonology] we need not be troubled by it when we read the Bible" (p. 121).

"Outgrown."

What these Unbelievers Think About Miracles

PAINÉ

Not "Credible."
"The advocates for the Bible have no claim to our belief of the Bible because that we believe things stated in other ancient writings; since that we believe the things stated in these writings no further than they are probable and *credible*, or because they are *self-evident*" (p. 77).

"Since appearances are so capable of deceiving, and things not real have a strong resemblance to things that are, nothing can be more inconsistent than to suppose that the Almighty would make use of means, such as are called miracles, that would subject the person who performed them to the suspicion of being an imposter, and the persons who related them to be suspected of lying, and the doctrine intended to be supported thereby to be suspected as a fabulous invention" (p. 62).

"Self-evident."

"Fable."

FOSDICK

"Incredible."
"Credence of ancient miracles in the Bible or out of it is not properly a matter of faith; it is a matter of *evidence*" (p. 162).

"No kind of miracle is related in Scripture the counterpart of which cannot be found and found repeatedly in the records of other religions" (p. 151).

"This endeavor to believe in miracles and to make faith in them significant, when all the time we are thinking of miracles as indissolubly associated with ancient ignorance and as vanishing when intelligence arrives, is not Christian faith at all. . . . Biblical miracles will more and more become unreal *ghosts* lost in antiquity and, gradually becoming dimmer, will disappear in utter incredulity" (p. 157).

"Certainly I find some of the miracle-narratives of Scripture historically *incredible*. Others puzzle me. I am not sure about them" (p. 164).

"The whimsicalities and the irregularities of the age of miracle makes the narratives of miracle unreal to the modern man" (p. 155).

"Evidence."

"Ghosts."

The Morality of the Bible

PAINÉ

"Shocking."
"There are matters in that book [the Bible] said to be done by the *express command* of God, that are . . . shocking to humanity, and to every idea we have of moral justice" (p. 74).

"It is because ye are sunk in the cruelty of superstition that ye listen to the horrid tales of the Bible, or hear them with callous indifference. The evidence I have produced . . . will free them from all those hard thoughts of the Almighty which priestcraft and the Bible had infused into their minds, and which stood in everlasting opposition to all their ideas of his moral justice and benevolence" (p. 100).

"Could we permit ourselves to suppose that the Almighty would distinguish any nation of people by the name of *his chosen people*, we must suppose that people to have been an example to all the rest of the world of the purest piety and humanity, and not such a nation . . . that had distinguished themselves above all others, on the face of the known earth, for barbarity and wickedness. If we will not stubbornly shut our eyes and steel our hearts, it is impossible not to see, in spite of all that long established superstition imposes upon the mind, that that flattering appellation of *his chosen people* is no other than a lie which the priests and leaders of the Jews had invented to cover the baseness of their own characters" (p. 102).

"Shocking."

FOSDICK

"Shock."
"Ethical conceptions of Jehovah in the Old Testament *shock* the modern conscience." "Deeds in the Old Testament which from our youth have *shocked* us by their barbarity" (pp. 5, 13).

"Start now with this beginning in the Old Testament a God from whom one would wish to stand far off in awe and fear, a God localized so that his spiritual Presence is not available in secret prayer, a God who does not even care for individuals save as they are temporarily members of the social group" (pp. 17, 18).

"The idea of God in the earliest writings of the Bible was such that few would desire to have intimate fellowship with him" (p. 15).

"Again read the ninth chapter of Esther, where the writer rejoices in a vengeful massacre; or the closing words of the 137th Psalm, which even Gounod's glorious music cannot redeem from brutality" (p. 14).

"The ruthless extermination of the Amalekites—both man and woman, infant and suckling" (p. 14).

"That the sun and moon stood still at Joshua's command, or that God sent she-bears to eat up children who were rude to a prophet, or that saints long dead arose and appeared in Jerusalem when our Lord was crucified? . . . SUCH BALD LITERALISM" (p. 181).

"Shocked."

They Treat the Gospels Alike

PAINE

"Presuming."

"The story of the angel announcing what the church calls the *immaculate conception* is not so much as mentioned in the books ascribed to Mark and John and is differently related in Matthew and Luke" (p. 147).

"Mark, in detailing the circumstances of the crucifixion, makes no mention of any earthquake, nor of the rocks rending, nor of the graves opening, nor of the dead men walking out" (p. 149).

"Matthew says there was darkness over all the land from the sixth hour unto the ninth hour; that the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, that there was an earthquake; that the rocks rent; that the graves opened; that the bodies of many of the saints that slept arose and came out of their graves after the resurrection, and went into the holy city and appeared unto many. Such is the account which this dashing writer of the book of Matthew gives, but in which he is not supported by the writers of the other books" (p. 149).

"The *presumption* is that the books called the Evangelists, and ascribed to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were not written by them but that they are impositions. . . . The silence of one book upon matters related in the others, and the disagreement that is to be found among them, implies that they are the production of some unconnected individuals, many years after the things they pretend to relate, each of whom made his own legend; and not the writings of men living intimately together, as the men called apostles are supposed to have done; in fine, that they have been *manufactured*, as the books of the Old Testament have been" (p. 147).

PAINE

"Absurd Stuff."

"According to the Christian trinitarian scheme, one part of God is represented by a dying man, and another part called the Holy Ghost, by a flying pigeon, it is impossible that belief can attach itself to such *wild conceits*. . . . Acts 2: 3 says that it descended in a mighty rushing wind and in the shape of cloven tongues; perhaps it was cloven feet. Such *absurd stuff* is only fit for tales of witches and wizards." "The belief of a God is a belief distinct from all other things and ought not to be confounded with any. The notion of a trinity of gods has enfeebled the belief of one God" (pp. 181, 183).

PAINE

"The book of Matthew goes on to say (chap. 28, ver. 2), 'And behold, there was a great earthquake, for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it.' But the other books say nothing about any earthquake, nor about the angel rolling back the stone, and sitting upon it; and, according to their accounts, there was no angel sitting there.

"Matthew says that the angel that was sitting upon the stone on the outside of the sepulchre told the two Marys that Christ was risen, and that the women went away quickly. Mark says that the women, upon seeing the stone rolled away, and wondering at it, went into the sepulchre, and that it was

FOSDICK

"Wondering."

"Comparing Mark and Matthew, we find that in the earlier Gospel there are no birth stories while in Matthew Jesus is virgin-born and the star of Bethlehem miraculously leads the Magi to the manger" (pp. 146, 147).

"Mark recorded no other marvels at the crucifixion than the rending of the temple veil, but that Matthew added the resurrection of many bodies of the saints that had fallen asleep; who entered into the holy city and appeared unto many" (p. 147).

In John "we face a heightening of the miraculous element. In particular, among miracles that the Synoptists do not mention, we find some of the most astonishing wonder works" (p. 148).

"Wherever we possess successive renditions of miracle workers' lives we find this tendency to give entirely explicable events a miraculous twist, to *heighten the effect* of marvels by astonishing additions, and to *invent miracles* of which the earlier records bear no trace. . . . Nor is it surprising that men should turn to the Bible, *wondering* if the same process is at work there" (pp. 144, 145).

"When we compare Mark and Luke we get the same impression of heightened effect, and added detail. In Luke, though not in Mark, are the stories of the virgin birth and the angelic apparition to the shepherds.

"In Mark, where 'one of them that stood by drew his sword, and smote the servant of the high priest, and struck off his ear,' no miracle is recorded. In Luke, however, the ear is restored—the only example in Scripture of the restoration of an amputated member. Luke is especially rich in *dramatic additions* to the narrative" (pp. 147, 148).

FOSDICK

"Arithmetical Absurdity."

"Consider the doctrine of the Trinity. Many are puzzled by it, and who can blame them? As preached in our Protestant churches the Trinity has often been little more than a mathematical formula about three being one and one three. Let it be said to the credit of the early fathers who introduced the church to the philosophical treatment of the Trinity, that they did not deal in such *arithmetical absurdity* as has characterized our modern pulpits in their identification of one person with three persons. If, then, any one is troubled about this formula of the Trinity, the *liberal prescription* is familiar: translate the formula back into the experience from which it came. The Trinity that matters is the Trinity of experience" (p. 188).

"The 'divinity of Jesus' as a formula . . . is not in the New Testament" (p. 187).

"Yet the God who was in Jesus is the same God who is in us. You cannot have one God and two kinds of divinity" (p. 272).

"They take a phrase such as 'Jesus is God,' not to be found either in the Scriptures or the creeds, and set it up as a standard of regularity in doctrine. But to suppose that the phrase 'Jesus is God' is an adequate expression of the Christian faith even in its creedal forms is to display *abysmal ignorance* of what the church has stood for. That statement alone is not orthodoxy; it is *heresy*" (p. 257).

The Angels an Outworn Category

FOSDICK

"When we turn to the New Testament, angels are the common phrasing of God's ministry to man. They form an innumerable host; they serve men by causing useful dreams, by strengthening the spirit in temptation, by opening prison doors, by giving peace and power in time of stress. Not only do they surround the heavenly throne and attend the divine Majesty, but they appear corporeally on earth" (p. 124).

"This need of angels—The Master, for example, so far as we know never spoke of his experience in terms of their ministry" (p. 125).

"Gabriel has no real place in our explanation of events. We cannot think with Jude of Michael and the devil *fighting*

the angel that was sitting within on the right side that told them so."

"It is not uncommon to relate stories of persons *walking* after they are dead, and of ghosts and apparitions of such as have fallen by some violent or extraordinary means; and the people of that day were in the habit of believing such things, and of the *appearance of angels*, and also of devils" (pp. 152, 166).

Jesus Christ was only a man like other men.

PAINÉ

"Jesus Christ founded no new system. He called men to the practice of moral virtues, and the belief of one God. The great trait in his character is philanthropy" (p. 24).

"He was the son of God in like manner that every other person is—for the Creator is the Father of All" (p. 24).

"That such a person as Jesus Christ existed, and that he was crucified, which was the mode of execution at that day, are historical relations strictly within the limits of probability" (p. 12).

FOSDICK

over the possession of Moses' body. We do not practically ascribe helpful dreams or anything else to the beneficent activity of individual angels. Indeed, we must confess that as a category of scientific explanation actually applied to daily life we are not Biblical in our thinking about angels" (p. 125).

"We are not clear gainers by our shift of thought away from angelic categories. *We cannot go back, to be sure*" (p. 128).

"Wherever you look at the underlying presuppositions of men's thinking about God to-day you find, not the old dualism against which the ancient church had so long and fierce a conflict, but a gladly recognized affinity between God and man. In *our* theology no longer are the divine and the human like oil and water that cannot mix; rather all the best in us is God in us. This makes faith in the divine Christ infinitely easier than it was under the old regime" (p. 266).

"Yet the God who was in Jesus is the same God who is in us. You cannot have one God and two kinds of divinity" (p. 272).

"The historic Jesus: he has given the world its loftiest ethical ideals" (p. 226).

"To be ourselves of such a spirit that God can work his victory in and through us; to persuade others to be transformed by the renewing of their minds; to strive for the better organization of society that the divine purpose may be furthered, not hindered, by our economic and political life; and then to await the event in his way and time—such have been *our* attitude and *our* preaching, and they have seemed to us Christian" (p. 110).

(It "*seems Christian*," but it is not!)

"Surely this is clear in the Gospels. The Master's body was normal like our own . . . it suffered and *it died like ours*" (p. 253).

The Future Life

PAINÉ

"I trouble not myself about the manner of future existence. I content myself with believing, even to positive conviction, that the power that gave me an existence is able to continue it, in any form and manner he pleases, either with or without this body; and it appears probable to me that I shall continue to exist hereafter" (p. 67).

FOSDICK

"Personally, I do not pretend to know the details of the future life. I am sufficiently sense-bound so that I do not easily imagine a completely disembodied existence. I wonder just what we mean by the persistence of personality" (p. 102).

"I believe in the persistence of personality through death, but I do not believe in the resurrection of the flesh".

The Indispensable Item—the Acid Test!

PAINÉ

"I now come to the last scene—that of the ascension into heaven . . . It was necessary that this last scene should preclude the possibility of denial and dispute . . . at least it ought to have been as public as the crucifixion is reported to have been. . . . But the writer of Luke says that the ascension was from Bethany; that he (Christ) led them out as far as Bethany, and was parted from them there, and was carried up into heaven. So also was Mahomet; and, as to Moses, the apostle Jude says (v. 9) that Michael and the devil disputed about his body. While we believe such fables as these, or either of them, we believe unworthily of the Almighty" (pp. 156, 157).

FOSDICK

"In such an easily picturable [flat] world the farewell of Jesus to the earth could be *imagined* literally as a physical levitation until he was received into heaven a definite distance above the ground, and his return could be literally *imagined* as a physical descent from the place where he had gone. The marvel is not that such a picture of the Master's going and return should arise in the setting of such a world-view; the *marvel* is that after that world-view has been so long outgrown, after we have known for centuries that this earth is a globe whirling through space with no ups or downs any longer meaningful in the old sense, so that if one man ascend from Melbourne and another from London they go in opposite directions, many folks should still retain the old picture of our Lord's ascent and *descent from the sky* and should regard that picture as a *test* of a standing or falling church and an indispensable item in the evangelical faith" (pp. 104, 105).

The Bible and Science

PAINÉ

"It is, I believe, almost impossible to find in any story upon record, so many and such glaring absurdities, contradictions, and falsehoods as are in those books [the four Gospels] . . . The Bible and the Testament are impositions upon the world . . . all fabulous inventions, dishonourable to the wisdom and power of the Almighty" (p. 158).

FOSDICK

"The strange ways of thinking that the Bible contains" (p. 35).

"The science of the Bible is not our science" (p. 53).

"We know now that every idea in the Bible started from primitive and childlike origins" (p. 11).

"In the Scriptures the flat earth is founded on an under-

"There was no moral ill in believing the earth was flat . . . any more than there was a moral virtue in believing that it was round like a globe . . . When a system of religion is made to grow out of a supposed system of creation that is not true, and to unite itself therewith in a manner almost inseparable therefrom, the case assumes an entirely different ground. It is then that errors, not morally bad, become fraught with the same mischiefs as if they were. It is then that the truth, though otherwise indifferent itself, becomes an essential, by becoming the criterion that either confirms by corresponding evidence, or denies by contradictory evidence, the reality of the religion itself" (pp. 43, 44).

lying sea; it is stationary; the heavens are like an upturned bowl or canopy above it; the circumference of this vault rests on pillars; the sun, moon, and stars move within this firmament of special purpose to illumine man; there is a sea above the sky, 'the waters which were above the heavens' and through the 'windows of heaven' the rain comes down; within the earth is Sheol, where dwell the shadowy dead; this whole cosmic system is suspended over vacancy; and it all was made in six days, each with a morning and an evening, a short and measurable time before. This is the world-view of the Bible" (pp. 46, 47).

Here they Sum up their Destructive Work

PAINÉ

"I know that this bold investigation will alarm many, but it would be paying too great compliment to their credulity to forbear it upon that account. The times and the subject demand it to be done. The suspicion that the theory of what is called the Christian church is fabulous is becoming very extensive in all countries" (p. 16).

"I have gone through the Bible, as a man would go through a wood with an axe on his shoulder, and fell trees. Here they lie, and the priests, if they can, may replant them. They may, perhaps, stick them in the ground, but they will never make them grow" (p. 141).

FOSDICK

"The position represented in this book will, of course, be *distasteful* to those bound by a theory of literal inerrancy in their approach to the Bible" (Preface).

"We have analyzed the Book into its constituent documents; we have catechized each fact that might bear witness to the truth about the ancient writings, their authors, times, and circumstances; we have let no sentiment of reverence, no time-sanctioned taboo deflect our search. We have gone at this investigation of our sacred books counting courage a duty and hesitant sentimentality a sin." That is "the *new approach* to the Bible" (p. 177).

Why These Extracts are Reprinted

Dr. Fosdick's views must be pretty well known to the majority of our readers, but we have printed these extensive extracts in order that no one may have ground for charging us with unfairness. Surely it must be admitted that Dr. Fosdick's religion is not the religion of Christ. It is not Christianity at all. There is not a single fundamental of evangelical faith which Dr. Fosdick does not repudiate—and we use the word "repudiate" advisedly; for Dr. Fosdick is not content to deny these principles of Christianity, but holds them up to contempt.

expelled from the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec for their protest against Modernism—although, be it said, it was always denied that there was any Modernism in the Convention against which to protest. Had McMaster University and the Convention admitted their Modernism, and attempted to justify it, one could at least have regarded them as sincere and honourable foes; but while Modernism was being taught in the classrooms of McMaster there was absolute denial of the fact on the floor of the Convention.

Of course we shall be charged with uncharitableness in even quoting what Dr. Fosdick says, but surely he is not ashamed of his own book, a child of his own brain. And any believer in the Christian revelation surely does well to be angry both on account of the words and the spirit of a man like Dr. Fosdick. If ever there breathed an implacable enemy of the Christian religion Harry Emerson Fosdick is such. How it is possible for any Christian believer to regard him as other than an apostate we cannot understand. Indeed, we do not think it would be uncharitable or extravagant were we to call Dr. Fosdick by the stronger name of reprobate.

What about Fosdickism in Canada?

Readers of THE GOSPEL WITNESS know that we have contended against the infidelity called Modernism through these pages for many years. We exposed it in McMaster University, and in the Baptist Denomination. There was never but one answer given to our charges: the enemy merely hissed out the ugly word, "Liar", in reply.

McMaster University deceived believers among Canadian Baptists from year to year by tacking on to the end of its report the Statement of Faith contained in the Trust Deed alike of McMaster University and Jarvis Street Baptist Church. But the doctrines there set forth had nothing whatever to do with the teachings of McMaster University.

Jarvis Street Church, and later other churches, were

BOOKS BY DR. T. T. SHIELDS

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

Address: THE GOSPEL WITNESS,

130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto, Can.

SUGAR, LIQUOR, AND WAR

At a time when Canadians are being urged to an all-out war effort, citizens of this fair Dominion are feeling more and more resentment at the appalling waste of \$200,000,000 per year for a population of about 11,000,000. The Gallup poll reports that sixty per cent. of our people are in favour of restriction on the sale of beer, and this in spite of all the encouragement given to the trade by the Ontario Government, for instance, and in spite of the increasing high pressure advertising flooding the country. Let it not be said that such advertising is prohibited in Ontario, for the prohibition, good as far as it goes, is evaded by the advertisers who print expensive and alluring descriptions of their wares in magazines published in Montreal, Quebec, and circulated in Ontario. Then too, American magazines must draw a large part of their money from liquor "ads.", they are so many and so striking in such a popular one as *Life*. Indeed, liquor interests have decided to make drinking "high hat" in the opinion of the unsuspecting public if they can. But in spite of all this pressure to increase sales of intoxicating liquors there is still in Canada a great body of people who not only resent the flaunting of this great evil everywhere and all the time, but realize that such waste—and worse than waste—during the most important and most expensive war the world has ever known, is suicidal.

When sugar rationing began in Canada, temperance people at once wondered about the consumption of sugar in the making of liquor. The last published official reports show the use of foodstuffs in the manufacture of liquor up to 459,946,305 pounds, of which molasses and sugar total 96,836,344 pounds. One radio speaker sought to comfort his listeners by remarking that, anyway, the supply of sugar to the breweries had not been cut. Knowing little about the process of brewing we wrote the Sugar Administrator of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board, and received the following not very enlightening letter:

437 St. James Street West,
Montreal

THE WARTIME PRICES AND TRADE BOARD THE SUGAR ADMINISTRATOR

February 26, 1942.

Jarvis Street Baptist Church,
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Sirs:—

We acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 24th, and for your information are enclosing a copy of Order No. 97 by which you will see that breweries are not included in the group of industrial consumers who are forced to reduce their consumption to 80% of that used by them last year.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) W. D. PURDY,
Chief Clerk.

Order No. 97 cut by twenty per cent. the supply of sugar to makers of wine, "pop", icecream, etc.

About that time, in London, Ontario, we heard from friends that a number of people had written to the papers, demanding that the supply of sugar to the breweries be reduced, in reply to which Mr. J. Labatt took plenty of space with a letter—did it occupy a whole page?—saying that no sugar is used in the making of beer. From other sources we are informed that a grade of molasses, not economically useful for sugar, is used for spirits.

But before this writer had found this out, thinking it best to ask those who are authorities on such matters,

he wrote the following note, on plain paper, without any prefixes or affixes to the signature of a very common name!

February 27, 1942.

Canadian Breweries, Ltd.,
297 Victoria St.,
Toronto, 2, Ont.

Gentlemen:

Relative to the manufactures made by you, I should much like to be informed to what extent sugar is used. This information would oblige

Yours truly,

(Signed) W. G. BROWN.

In reply we yesterday received the following abuse, and to-day we are sending along some practical advice in reply:

CANADIAN BREWERIES LIMITED

O'Keefe House
Victoria Street
Toronto—Canada

Executive Offices

March 9, 1942.

The Rev. W. G. Brown,
Professor to the Toronto Baptist Seminary,
Toronto 5, Ont.

Dear Sir:

Your letter addressed to Canadian Breweries Limited has been passed along to me, to reply to your enquiry with regard to the extent that Sugar is used in the production of our Company's products.

I am aware that certain sections of the United Church, such as the Middlesex Women's Missionary Society have called the attention of Donald Gordon, Chairman of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board to the tons of Sugar supposedly used by the Breweries in Canada, apparently, the statement given to the London Free Press, dated January 31st, 1942, by John S. Labatt, Esq., President of John Labatt Limited, Brewers, of London, Ontario, is still in doubt in the minds of your associates.

Without wishing to cast any reflection upon you Sir, I feel it would be a waste of time to endeavour to enlarge upon the factors so clearly portrayed in Mr. Labatt's news item upon this subject, except to endorse the statement most emphatically, that sugar is not used as an ingredient in the production of our products. Further, I believe that any information regarding the Brewing Industry supplied by Mr. John Labatt can be relied upon as being truthful and authentic.

Might I suggest that your Missionary efforts could more usefully serve Canada's part in winning this War, if those efforts were directed to more useful purposes, think of the extra socks and scarves, etc., those dear old ladies could knit in the useless hours spent in discussions of subjects which, rather are prone to a deterrence to our all out War effort. Give us something constructive and useful.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) FRANCIS N. WARD,
Superintendent of Production,
Canadian Breweries Limited.

FNW/C

TORONTO BAPTIST SEMINARY

337 Jarvis Street
Toronto 2, Canada

March 11, 1942.

Mr. Francis N. Ward,
Superintendent of Production,
Canadian Breweries Limited,
O'Keefe House,
Victoria Street,
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Sir:

Permit me to acknowledge yours of the 9th, received. I ventured to write a simple note asking for information. When I wrote, I did so because I was not informed on the matter. Nor had I seen the letter by Mr. Labatt to which you refer, though I later heard about it. A simple statement that sugar is not used in the manufac-

ture of beer would have been satisfactory on that point. I said nothing to you about missionary effort and your abuse in the matter is quite uncalled for. In the churches of this land are many "dear old ladies" who are interested in discussion of the welfare of the sons and daughters they have given this country, and who are consequently much concerned about the evident growth of the degrading liquor interests. Similar interest is shared by many ladies who are not "old" and by men both young and old. These people are doing their best to further Canada's war effort, many "dear old ladies" by knitting "extra socks and scarves, etc.", and many younger ones and their husbands, together with the "dear old ladies", in buying Victory Bonds, War Saving Certificates, etc., to the very limit of their ability, and beyond.

"Give us something constructive and useful." Thanks for the advice. That is what we are trying to do more and more. May I return your advice to you and say, Try that yourself. You, Sir, are the representative of organizations which according to the last published official reports used foodstuffs to the extent of 459,946,305 pounds, and caused the expenditure in this country with a population of less than 12,000,000 of no less than \$208,369,872.00, for what is waste and worse than waste. You, Sir, are the representative of organizations which are in no small way responsible for the increase between 1933 and 1940 of all minor offences from a total of 292,673 to 428,608, and of major crimes from a total of 39,942 to 48,107. "Give us something constructive and useful."

Believe me, Sir,

Very truly yours,

(Signed) W. GORDON BROWN.

CONGRATULATIONS, ALDERMAN SAUNDERS!

There is a scripture which says, "Benhadad was drinking himself drunk in the pavilions, he and the kings, the thirty and two kings that helped him." Such preparation for battle proved disastrous to Benhadad and his army; and intoxicating liquor is just as injurious to an army to-day as it ever was. The folly—nay, worse, the crime—of spending more than two hundred million dollars a year for liquor in Canada, in war time, must be apparent to the vast majority of the people of this Dominion.

We print below an account of a discussion of this question in the Toronto City Council, taken from *The Toronto Star* of March 10th. We congratulate Alderman Leslie Saunders on his leadership in this matter. And it is most gratifying to know that the resolution he proposed, carried eighteen to two. The two Aldermen, Balfour and Quinn, who voted against it, are Roman Catholics. That is not surprising, for rum and Rome have always been bosom friends.

Mr. Saunders' initiative in this matter is a striking illustration of what one man of conviction and courage can do. Religious bodies have since passed resolutions commending Mr. Saunders for his leadership. Surely it was most fitting that the City Council of the City of Toronto should make a pronouncement on such an issue. The whole discussion indicates that there is a real rising tide of indignation with which the Provincial Government will have to reckon sooner or later. The beverage-rooms of Toronto would be a disgrace to any city that claimed to be ordinarily decent anywhere in the world.

The correspondence of Rev. W. Gordon Brown on this matter, published elsewhere in this issue, shows that the liquor people are rather touchy. There is nothing they fear more than an aroused public opinion. We print the following report because many people throughout the Dominion, and many members of THE CANADIAN PRO-

TESTANT LEAGUE, will have no opportunity of reading this in a Toronto paper; and we want them to know what sort of man the Secretary-Treasurer of THE PROTESTANT LEAGUE is.

Here follows the report:

From The Toronto Star

City council last night, by a vote of 18-2, asked "restriction of the consumption of beer and the shortening of hours of sale." The request which will be forwarded to Premier Hepburn, was moved by Ald. Leslie Saunders and Ald. Donald Fleming. Dissenting were Aldermen Quinn and Balfour. Absent were Con. Hamilton, Aldermen Shannon and MacGregor.

The vote was taken at midnight after 14 members of council spoke on the motion. A delegation of women members and supporters of the Temperance Federation were present from the time council went into session at 2 p.m. until the vote was taken, a period of some 10 hours.

Ald. Saunders' motion read:

"This council notes with satisfaction the oft-repeated declarations of the premier of Ontario for an all-out war effort, and respectfully urges him to implement this timely and patriotic aim by taking under consideration the urgent need for restriction on the consumption of beer and the shortening of hours of sale.

"We humbly suggest that this can be greatly aided by discontinuing the operation of women's beverage rooms and by removing tables and chairs from the men's rooms. Believing that the so-called beverage rooms have never been in public favor, while not suggesting total prohibitory measures, we do most earnestly urge immediate and drastic action in this important and vexing problem which relates itself to the war effort in the waste of earnings and energies, and in the far greater interest of sobriety and of the youth and citizenry of our fair land."

"I am not surprised that there is some opposition to my motion, although I have not spoken to anyone about it until now," said Ald. Saunders. "I thought it should stand on its merits. It isn't drastic. If I voiced my personal feelings, I would make it much more drastic than I have written down here. I might be criticized by people of strong temperance views, that this motion is a milk and water thing. Some favor my motion, but are afraid of the consequences in their own ward. Some say, 'Oh, let it go. We did that before the war and look where we are now'.

"We could deal with the question of automobile accidents, of cases which come up in the courts and in which invariably evidence of liquor comes up. A tremendous amount of money is being spent. I am not satisfied with conditions. There is a great waste of human energy and money.

Ignores Threat

"I got a few telephone calls and I received an anonymous letter warning me, and the mayor, that we had better watch out or we would be thrown in the bay. That doesn't bother me, of course. The Gallup poll shows that 60 per cent. of the people favor some restriction on the sale of beer in wartime. There is a growing sentiment of dissatisfaction and of disgust in so many circles."

"I believe this will afford the premier an opportunity of showing that the directions he has given to others to advance the war effort are not mere words and that, in a matter within his own jurisdiction, he will do what is obviously required," said Con. Duncan. "The support of those who have the welfare of their country at heart will be overwhelming."

"A Great Curse"

"I am glad that my name is connected with the motion," said Con. Robert Saunders. "I congratulate the new alderman. I believe in equal rights providing no damage is done by those rights. From my experience in the courts I know that much injury, harm and damage is done to women of this city by the beverage rooms. They are a great curse. If anyone has any doubt, I would urge him to get in touch with the police attached to a morality squad. They will give him enlightenment. We know the people have made many pleas to the federal and provincial governments. We should place ourselves in the position of assisting these good people in the work they have been doing for years and years."

"I was in touch with a case very recently," said Ald. Rowntree. "Anyone who understood this case from where it began to where it ended would realize this is a wonderful motion."

"If you would take time to go to the juvenile courts some morning they would show you records which would startle you, due to persons using intoxicating liquor to excess," said Ald. Muir.

"I'm glad to have the opportunity of giving this my fullest support," said Ald. Fleming, "I congratulate Ald. Saunders for his courage in proposing it. It is a moderate proposal and based on our war effort. Canada is spending more than \$200,000,000 a year on liquor. Since the war started more than half a billion dollars has been spent on liquor and a third of that has been spent in Ontario.

The government can seemingly control everything but liquor. They can control rubber, sugar, but when it comes to liquor, hands off. It would be interesting to know what effect this is having on our industries, when you pass beverage rooms and see men guzzling beer before they go to work."

Ald. J. S. Simmons said, "I'm strongly in favor of the resolution. These are critical days. It seems to me wrong entirely to have other businesses closed up and let the liquor business go full blast. That money should be conserved to help us win the war. It is rather sad to hear of money spent on liquor. The beverage rooms are a shame. They are worse than the old bars ever were."

"It's up to council to bring such matters to the attention of the provincial government," said Ald. Muir. "If sufficient pressure is brought to bear, the provincial government, yes the federal government, will see that matters are righted. I know a family on relief for 21 years. They have cost the city over \$10,000 in that time and the other day I gave the man a dollar to get him out of my house because he was drunk."

"The great majority of women are against women's beverage rooms," said Ald. W. C. Davidson. "Even to shorten the hours of women's beverage rooms would strengthen our war effort. It is long past time when we can think our properties are not in danger from the enemy."

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 6 First Quarter Lesson 12 March 22, 1942

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

DAVID BECOMES KING OVER ISRAEL

Lesson Text: 2 Samuel 5.

Golden Text: "And David went on, and grew great, and the Lord God of hosts was with him"—2 Samuel 5:10.

Reading: 2 Samuel 2, 3, 4.

I. The King's Coronation—verses 1 to 5. Compare 1 Chron. 11:1-3.

After the death of Saul David had been invited by the elders of Judah to be their king, and he had reigned in Hebron for seven and one-half years (verse 5; 2 Sam. 2:1-4, 11; 1 Kings 2:11). Over the other tribes Ishbosheth the son of Saul ruled for two of those years (2 Sam. 2:8-10; 4:8-12), and his rule was characterized by jealousies, civil war, rebellion and bloodshed (2 Sam. 3, 4).

The elders of Israel, seeing the peace and contentment enjoyed by Judah, made an appeal to David to be their king also. Evidently they gathered in great numbers to him at Hebron (1 Chron. 12:23-40). Their appeal was three-fold, and the same conditions apply to the call of a pastor or leader. (1) The Jews were all of one blood; they were of one heart to make David king (1 Chron. 12:38). Spiritual unity is desirable in the church (Acts 1:14; 2:1; Phil. 1:27; 2:1). (2) David had already had experience as a leader. During the reign of Saul he had led the people out and in; that is, he had been their shepherd (1 Sam. 18:13; 2 Sam. 7:8; Psa. 78:70-72). The Lord prepares and trains those whom He would place in positions of responsibility. Think of Joseph, Moses and Paul. (3) The Lord had already called David to be king over Israel (1 Sam. 16:1). Similarly, it is His prerogative to call men into His service (Matt. 4:18-20; Acts 13:1, 2), and unless the call of men coincides with the call of God, it should be refused (Num. 22:2-22; Acts 16:6-10).

David and his people entered into a solemn covenant, the one to rule justly, the others to obey. At one point in the coronation ceremonies of the King of England the Archbishop faces north, south, east and west in turn, asking if the people accept the new king. Their shout signifies approval and support. In like manner, a pastor or Christian worker undertakes to lead, feed, teach, exhort and rebuke those placed in his charge (Acts 20:28; 1 Tim. 4:6; 6:2; 2 Tim. 4:2; 1 Pet. 5:2); while the people are under obligation to remember, esteem, support, obey and pray for those who are over them in the Lord (1 Thess. 5:12, 13; 1 Tim. 5:17, 18; Heb. 13:7, 17, 18).

Thus David was anointed king over all Israel, according to the word of the Lord through Samuel (1 Chron. 11:3). The oil was a symbol of the Holy Spirit (Zech. 4:1-7, 11-14), and even as the Holy Spirit rested upon Christ as He commenced His public ministry on earth (Matt. 3:16, 17), so, too, He will empower every one who seeks to minister truly for the Lord (Acts 1:8).

II. The King's Capital—verses 6 to 16. Compare 1 Chron. 11:4-9.

Jerusalem, the chief city of the territory belonging to the tribe of Judah, was inhabited also by people called Jebusites, whom Judah and Benjamin had failed to drive out (Josh. 15:63; Judg. 1:18, 21). On this occasion the Jebusites were so sure that David could not dislodge them from their stronghold on Mount Zion that they seem in derision to have placed blind and lame persons as defenders on the walls. But David captured the city and made it his capital.

Mount Zion is the south-west hill in the older and higher portion of the city. The hill was regarded as sacred from the time that David took the ark there (2 Sam. 6:17). Later, the term was used to cover also Mount Moriah, the site of Solomon's temple (Isa. 8:18; Joel 3:17), and it sometimes stood for the whole city and the people (2 Kings 19:21; Psa. 126:1). The establishment of Jerusalem, the city of David (1 Kings 2:10; 8:1), as the capital of the kingdom was an important step in the history of the Holy Land. The city still holds a position of great prominence.

David "went, going and growing" (verse 10, margin) and the Lord God Omnipotent was with him (1 Sam. 18:14). It is a joy to see believers making progress in the Christian life (1 Thess. 3:8; 2 John 4; 3 John 4). Every provision has been made whereby we may grow in grace and in the knowledge of the Lord's will (Eph. 4:13-15; Phil. 1:6-11; Col. 1:9-11; 2 Pet. 3:18), but many fail to go on with the Lord (Gal. 3:1; 5:7). We shall advance steadily to maturity if we take advantage of the help afforded us by the Saviour Who is ever with us in the person of His Holy Spirit.

Hiram, King of Tyre, proved to be a good neighbour to King David and to King Solomon (1 Kings 5:1-12; 9:10-14; 10:11, 22). The building of a new house for David had important consequences (2 Sam. 7:1-8; 1 Kings 5:3-5; 6:37, 38).

David traced the hand of the Lord in the establishment of his kingdom. He is a wise man who interprets the events of his life in the light of God's purpose and plan (Gen. 45:4-8; 50:20; 1 Chron. 14:2).

III. The King's Conquest—verses 17 to 25. Compare 1 Chron. 14:8-17.

When the Lord's people are making progress, Satan attempts to hinder them (Job 1:6; 2:1-6; 1 Cor. 16:9; 1 Thess. 2:17, 18; 3:5-8). We must ever be ready to resist him, steadfast in the faith (1 Pet. 5:8, 9), even as David immediately prepared to rout his old enemies, the Philistines.

Victory came to David in answer to his prayer, and as he went forth in obedience to the Lord's leading. The Lord God of hosts acted in behalf of His trustful servant (Exod. 14:13, 14; Josh. 10:14, 42; 2 Chron. 20:29).

But the enemy, although once beaten, returned yet again to the same valley of Rephaim. The Christian is often obliged to fight the same battles over and over again (Josh. 7:3, 4; 8:3-8), since Satan watches for a favourable opportunity to attack us when off guard (Lk. 4:13; the Greek phrase translated "for a season" means "until a timely occasion"). We dare not cease to watch, pray, trust and resist.

The Lord intervened and caused David to hear a sound as of a going in the tops of the mulberry trees, probably to suggest to him that the hosts of God were marching on his side (Josh. 5:13-15; 2 Kings 7:6). But David was told to bestir himself, to be sharp, to rush quickly. Divine aid and human co-operation are both essential to victorious living (Neh. 2:4, 5; Rom. 8:1-4; 13:14; Gal. 5:16).