

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. 21, No. 4

TORONTO, MAY 28, 1942

Whole Number 1045

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

Quebec Quislings And Their Papal Master

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, May 24th, 1942.

(Stenographically Reported)

"Thus saith the Lord, What iniquity have your fathers found in me, that they are gone far from me, and have walked after vanity, and are become vain?"

"Neither said they, where is the Lord that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, that led us through the wilderness, through a land of deserts and of pits, through a land of drought, and of the shadow of death, through a land that no man passed through, and where no man dwelt?"

"And I brought you into a plentiful country, to eat the fruit thereof and the goodness thereof; but when ye entered ye defiled my land, and made mine heritage an abomination.

"The priests said not, Where is the Lord? and they that handle the law knew me not: the pastors also transgressed against me, and the prophets prophesied by Baal, and walked after things that do not profit.

"Wherefore I will yet plead with you, saith the Lord, and with your children's children will I plead.

"For pass over the isles of Chittim, and see; and send unto Kedar, and consider diligently, and see if there be such a thing.

"Hath a nation changed their gods, which are yet no gods? but my people have changed their glory for that which doth not profit.

"Be astonished, O ye heavens, at this, and be horribly afraid, be ye very desolate, saith the Lord.

"For my people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water."—
Jeremiah 2:5-13.

"And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.

"For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities."
—Revelation 18:4, 5.

It is usually most agreeable to be with the majority, and able to keep step with those about one. Yet I dare to say that if one is to be true as a man of principle, and to stand for what he believes to be right, in any sphere of life, he is likely to discover that he has few with him—and occasionally he may have to stand alone. And the man who stands alone is looked upon as being rather peculiar, as being unfitted for social relationships, as one who fancies he is superior to others.

But if you glance over the pages of history, you will find that almost without exception the men who have made history; the men who have originated reform

movements; the men who have wrought, religiously or otherwise, for the betterment of their fellows, have been men who have been willing to stand alone.

Noah was one such—hopelessly in the minority in his day; but he was right, as God declared, and as all history has proved. Lot, though not all that we could have desired of him, is described in the New Testament as a righteous man who "vexed his righteous soul" because of the sin about him; and notwithstanding some early mistakes, he learned to stand alone. Joseph was regarded as rather the spoiled boy of the family. He had no sympathy from his brethren. They were all against

him. Yet, as the historical sequel proved, Joseph was right; and by the providence of God became the saviour of his family and of his people. Moses learned how to stand alone. "He supposed his brethren would have understood," but they did not; and their deliverance was postponed for forty years. But Moses was right, and those who misunderstood him were wrong. David was an individualist; and when two armies faced each other, each was afraid of the other until one man said, "Let no man's heart fail because of him." He went forth to the battle, and won a great victory. Eleazar, one of David's mighty men, was like his master; and when it had become the fashion for everyone to run away as soon as the Philistines appeared, he stood fast. One day when they came down on a foraging expedition, Eleazar stood in the midst of a plot of lentils. He stood alone, and unsheathing his sword, he slew them right and left; until Israel saw it was wrong to run, and that the proper thing to do was to stand and fight against the enemies of the Lord.

Micaiah was not a soldier: he was a prophet. When Ahab sent for him, the messenger told him that Ahab had already had a convention of prophets, no less than four hundred of them, and they had reached a unanimous decision. They had counselled Ahab in a certain direction. The messenger said, "Behold now, the words of the prophets declare good unto the king with one mouth: let thy word, I pray thee, be like the word of one of them, and speak that which is good." Micaiah replied, "As the Lord liveth, what the Lord saith unto me, that will I speak." Micaiah was in a minority of one against four hundred. He stood alone—but the four hundred were wrong, and Micaiah was right.

Daniel was a man of like calibre. He stood alone with God against everyone. And Daniel was right. We honour his name, his fidelity to truth, and to the Lord of truth. Samson, of an earlier day, was mighty just so long as he stood alone. When he became entangled with others, he lost his locks and became a prey to the Philistines. Jeremiah, from whose prophecy I read this evening, was a man of like quality. He received his message from God, and declared it; and was determined so to do, though the heavens fell. He stood alone.

Nor was it different in New Testament times. Peter and John were in the minority. They stood against the Sanhedrin and all the rulers of the Jews, saying, "We ought to obey God rather than man." Paul was never President of a Convention. He was never Moderator of a great church. He never would be elected as Archbishop of Toronto, or Moderator of the United Church, or of the Presbyterian Church, or President of certain Baptist Conventions. "Oh no!" they would have said, "he is too extreme, too unbending, too uncompromising!" You remember how he said, "At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me: I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge. Notwithstanding the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me; that by me the preaching might be fully known, and that all the Gentiles might hear: and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion."

And there will have occurred to your mind Another, the solitary Figure, grand and glorious in His solitariness, Who set Himself against the wicked world, and against all the religious leaders of His time, and fulfilled in Himself the prophecy, "I looked, and there was none to help; and I wondered that there was none to

uphold: therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me; and my fury, it upheld me." He trod the wine-press alone, and of the people there was none with him.

In standing for God, many have had to stand against the organized religion of their day. Moses met his severest opposition, not from the Egyptians, but from the very people whom he had come to save. And so of the others whom I have mentioned, their opposition invariably came from those who ought to have been with them. Our Lord was crucified at the instance of the religious world. The apostolic church was persecuted by the religious leaders of that day.

Nor has it been different since the closing of the biblical canon. Those principles still obtain. Most of the persecutions since have been instituted by religious people. The worst of all devils is a religious devil. The devil is never so dangerous as when he puts on an ecclesiastical gown, and assumes the right to rule and direct men in the name of religion.

Luther had to break away from the church. He was a Roman Catholic, but he had to sever all connection with that body and come out of it. There was no way to find liberty while he remained in it. Cromwell and the whole Puritan movement was a revolt against a dead religion, a religion of form that was devoid of vitality, destitute of any kind of dynamic. John Wesley was an Anglican. He never intended to be anything else, he loved his church. He hoped and prayed and wrought for a revival in his church. He wanted to see the Anglican Church a mighty power for God—but they would not let him stay in it. They put him out of it. There is a sense in which the Methodist Church was not formed by Wesley. Left to himself, he never would have formed it. He did not even call his groups of believers, churches: he called them "societies". He was jealous for the honour of the church, but the new wine burst the old skin, and necessitated a new bottle, and Wesley had to come out.

It has been ever thus. When the organization has taken precedence of the work the organization was designed to do, God in His providence again and again has smashed the machinery, the form in which it worked, in order that it might have freedom of expression. It is often so that the wine-skin dries up. There are people who attach more importance to the dead skin, than to the wine it was designed to contain. Our Lord said, "New wine must be put into new bottles." There is no room in the old bottles. Hence the New Testament church had to forsake Judaism. Christianity could not be grafted on the old tree. The new wine of the gospel had to have a new container.

Jeremiah complained to the people of his day—of what? "They have forsaken me the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water." In effect he said, "You have forsaken the Lord; you have repudiated your own supernatural history; you have actually forgotten the rock whence you were hewn, and the hole whence you were digged." Of their deliverance out of Egypt, Jeremiah said, "You do not speak any more of that deliverance of grace from which every blessing you ever had has flowed." He said that even the princes and the prophets were not one whit better; the priests did not speak about the Lord. They did not say, "Where is Jehovah?"

That has again become true; and therefore in my message to-night I shall have to say some things you may

not like. I would rather be able to speak in such a way that everyone would go away from here saying, "That was fine. I think I will go back next Sunday. I liked that." But I feel confident that before I have finished some will say, "That is the last time for me." We have had many people say that—but they did not always live up to their resolution. I would far rather speak comfortably to our modern Jerusalem, but I must do my duty.

These people outdid the heathen. "The heathen stick to their own gods", said Jeremiah, "but you do not. You have changed your glory into something that doth not profit." Then calling heaven to witness, he said, "My people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water."

That has been true of modern denominations. I am not now speaking of individuals. Thank God, He has His witnesses everywhere. I am positive I have known Roman Catholics who were born again, and were devout believers in the Lord Jesus Christ. We have all found some of the sweetest fellowships of life among people who belonged to other denominations than our own. In any criticisms I offer, I do not speak of individuals: I speak of the official voice and attitude of denominations, of religious organizations. For years I have travelled this Continent from one end to the other, and from the Gulf almost to the Arctic. I have had to do with all denominations all over the American continent; and I am forced to acknowledge that denominational officialdom, almost without exception, is accurately described by Jeremiah in the verses I have read.

It is especially true of Baptists. Some of the worst of false teachers in the world of which I know are called Baptists.

There is nothing to choose between the denominations. Death reduces men of all ranks to a common level. There is no difference when life has departed, between the body of the king and that of his humblest subject: in both death holds high carnival, and the worms will devour them both in the grave. And when spiritual death comes to a denomination, it makes no difference whether it be Anglican, Methodist, United Church, Presbyterian, or Baptist, it brings them all down to a common level of spiritual barrenness and uselessness.

Was the Protestant Reformation a mistake? Was Luther all wrong? Were all the Reformers, and the martyrs who sealed their testimony to Jesus Christ with their blood—were they all mistaken? Ought they to have received counsel from someone who would have advised them—as men and women are advised to-day—to take the line of least resistance, and tolerate everything?

What was the Reformation? The rejection of ecclesiastical authority. The repudiation of the authority of the Church and pope and priest, and the acceptance of the authority of the inspired Word of God. It was a return to the principle, "What saith the scripture?" It was the declaration of a positive, "Thus saith the Lord."

What else was it? A return to the doctrine of justification by faith. Luther learned from the Bible that a salvation had been perfected by Jesus Christ, that his debt had been paid, a righteousness had been wrought out for him, and now he had but to believe and be justified by faith. Was he wrong? Was he wrong in believing that a man is justified by faith without works?

Works are but a fruit of faith, and not the ground of it. The Reformation was a repudiation of the whole sacerdotal system, a setting aside of the doctrine of salvation by sacramentarian means for a salvation that is of the free and sovereign grace of God.

I am increasingly convinced that the Babylon of Revelation, the mother of harlots and of all the abominations of the earth, is the Church of Rome; and that out of her, as Luther and all the rest of them believed, the Antichrist will come. If Babylon was the mother of harlots, she has a numerous heretical progeny outside her immediate organization.

Who are they? Any Baptists? Plenty of them. There are people called Baptist who know nothing about sovereign grace, who are depending upon something they have done, or may yet do, for their salvation. You might just as well be in the Church of Rome, and have done with it: the principle is the same.

Any Anglicans? An Anglican said to me, "We had a man here not long since who preached an official sermon, and from foundation to topstone, it was a proclamation of the doctrine of salvation by character." It was the old heresy that a man, in whom the image and likeness of God have been destroyed, may himself, by his own power, make himself over again until he becomes like God.

Had I time to discuss the philosophy of it, I would show you that all these things have a direct affinity for that first cardinal lie told by the devil in Eden: "Ye shall be as gods." Men ever since have been apeing God, trying to do what only God can do; instead of saying there is but one God, one Saviour beside Whom there is none else. Such sermons could be preached by a Roman Catholic priest with equal appropriateness. Romanism is essentially a religion of works, effected by natural powers. The man does everything himself, by his sacraments and I know not what else.

Someone told me to-day of a priest who died last week in the Hamilton sanitorium. The proper authorities were not called to give him his passport into glory, and there was some sort of tempest in a teacup because the proper authorities were not there to administer extreme unction. What a horrible error that is, to believe that God has put into human hands the administration of any kind of rite which will determine a soul's eternal destiny! That is a delusion coined in hell itself, propagated by the Church of Rome—but just as deadly when propagated from a Protestant pulpit. I was in a city some years ago where I had a heavy Sunday. I was only a visitor there, but someone was anxious that I go to the outskirts of the city to see one who was dying. I went, only to discover that the dying man had been in a state of coma for a week; yet that person calling himself a Baptist had thought the dying man would be a little surer of a comfortable passage if a minister said a prayer over him!

I am not criticizing any one denomination, as such; I am dealing with principles, principles which are exemplified in all the denominations. Whoever denies the grace of God, by the substitution of works for grace, is the worst of all heretics. We are not saved by works: we are saved by grace. Works must flow from grace, and not grace from works. Those who deny the necessity of the new birth, in all denominations, are children of the mother of harlots, all related to Rome.

That is why so many so-called Protestants have more

in common with Rome than with biblical Christianity.

Am I singular? Conceited? Someone may say, "Who are you? Who are you to set your judgment against the majority?" I am just a poor sinner saved by grace, to whom God the Holy Ghost, through His Word, has spoken, assuring me of everlasting salvation through the blood of Christ; and I declare that any man who offers salvation to anyone on any other terms is a false prophet, whoever he may be. He is not a preacher of the New Testament gospel, call him by what name you will.

I lost my reputation as one who agrees with the majority quite a while ago, and have been free ever since. I heard a man say a thing I should not have said myself, but perhaps it will not be out of place if I quote another. He said he was very much interested in dogs, and had seen some dogs fight—and some trying to fight. He said, "When a dog who has a long caudal appendage tries to fight, he always goes around in circles looking after it; but when someone chops off his tail, so that he can face his foe, he can fight." Thus some people are so concerned about their reputation, about what people may say about them, they are afraid to fight. But when the devil has said all he can say against you, you are free to go ahead and get God's work done.

In diplomatic exchanges, before war was declared, how very careful the leaders had to be! Mr. Churchill was very careful to speak to the Italians before war was declared in the language of diplomacy; but when war was declared he was free and he spoke of "the jackal Mussolini", "That miscalculator Mussolini." Why should we not recognize that we are at war? We had Colonel Munro with us this morning, the officer who spoke here a few weeks ago, whose published address has been scattered by the thousand; and I repeat what I said to him. My good friend, Mr. dePendleton, a fine Christian man, minister of the Reformed Episcopal Church, who can say more in five minutes than some D.D.'s could say in an hour—and is not afraid to say it,—I am to speak for him to-morrow evening,—well, last night he advertised me as "the militant Pastor of Jarvis Street Church". I turned to Colonel Munro this morning and said, "Imagine anyone's saying of a man wearing the uniform of a British soldier, and holding His Majesty's commission, 'There is a militant soldier!'" What other kind of a soldier is any use? I always understood a Christian was a soldier, "a good soldier of Jesus Christ"; and I do not know how any soldier could be other than militant. Or a "militant pastor"? A pastor is a shepherd. David was a "militant" shepherd. He had to be to save his flock, because there were lions and bears about. Our Lord said something about shepherds: "I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. But he that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep. The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep." A pastor is useless unless he be militant.

Uniformed Soldier Who Stays At Home

A man came into my office one day and told me he was an officer of a certain camp, that when the men were finished their training there, they could not only drive a tank, but build one. One day they got word from Ot-

tawa to prepare a draft of forty-three men for overseas. The forty-three were selected, and were all "warned" for overseas duty. They could not leave camp without permission therefore: to do so would constitute desertion. A French-Canadian Roman Catholic said to his sergeant, "I am not going." "What!" "I did not join the army with any intention of going overseas; I am not going." "But you are. You have been selected, and are under orders." "But I am not going." "You dare to tell me that? Then I shall have to arrest you." He was placed under arrest, but still bragged to the men that he would show them. He went to his Roman Catholic padre, who in turn communicated with the Roman Catholic parish priest, who in turn, communicated with the Roman Catholic Member of Parliament; with the result that when the forty-three were paraded, within a short while before the time to leave camp, a telegram came from Ottawa, saying, "Exempt Private So-and-So from the overseas draft unless he volunteers." He stepped out of rank and said, "I told you I was not going."

We have preachers like that. I do not know why they join the Lord's army, for they run away home when the enemy sets the battle in array. We are here to contend for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints, and a preacher who is not a militant preacher is not worth his salt—no matter how small he takes.

In this place for years we have continuously and consistently warned people against the insidious inroads of the Church of Rome into every sphere of Canadian life. I repeat what in different ways I have said a hundred times, that Rome is our greatest religious menace. Others may, if they will, speak of Romanism as a form of Christianity, and regard the Roman Catholic Church as a Christian institution: I declare that Romanism for more than a thousand years has constituted the greatest of all perversions of the gospel of Christ. The Roman Catholic Church is not in any true biblical sense entitled to be called Christian. Romanism is paganism under a Christian name, and is as pagan as Babylon was pagan.

But I have also many times spoken against the Italian church as being primarily a political organization, a system of government as alien to our system of democracy as Fascism or Nazism, that it is in fact a politico-religious totalitarian state. It can no more legitimately claim, even as a privilege, to say nothing of right, establishment and recognition as an integral part of Canadian life, than Fascism or Nazism could legitimately claim such establishment and recognition.

The Roman Catholic Church is representative of a foreign political power, which claims the right to dictate in Canadian political affairs. And this is all the more serious because its capital, the Vatican, is situated in the heart of the capital of one of the nations with which we are now at war.

Our protestations have met with a variety of responses. By some, our contentions have been ridiculed as exaggerations beyond all factual substantiation. By others, our allegations of the machinations of Rome have been flatly denied. And by many others, our warnings have been treated with smugly complacent indifference. It is not very long since *Mein Kampf* was looked upon as the ravings of a mad man. Hitler was an extremist who had already spent a term in prison, and was likely to be confined to prison again.

I was told by a group of Norwegians connected with

Norwegian official life in this country, that for some time—I suppose some years—before the war, Quisling used to go roundabout the cities of Norway with a sound truck, harranging the people, very much like “Jehovah’s Witnesses” here. Decent, respectable, people paid no attention to him or his speech unless it were contemptuously to shrug the shoulders, treating him as some sort of political fool who could do no harm.

There was a Forster in Danzig; there was a Henlein in Sudetenland, and in Paris there was a man called Laval who was actually Premier of France. The first two were looked upon as disgruntled agitators. The last as a statesman of doubtful judgment. There were some who from the beginning recognized the menace of Hitlerism. A London friend reminded me that I had myself said in the summer of nineteen-thirty-three, that Hitler’s coming to power would mean that we should have to fight the Great War all over again. But most of the preachers and politicians of Great Britain ridiculed the idea that there could be another war. And in England for years the political leaders such as MacDonald and Baldwin and Chamberlain, agreed with them.

The same was true of religious and political leaders in Canada. Those of us who were concerned about the future were looked upon as vociferous somnambulists, suffering from nightmare. Events have now demonstrated that the pacifists and appeasers were the real somnambulists. And when war was declared, and the battle was joined, the Prime Minister of this country, Mr. Mackenzie King, began to talk of the necessity of “national unity,” and flattered himself that by a compromising and halfhearted participation in the war, he was preserving Canadian unity.

Again and again, as loudly, and as widely as we could make our voice heard, we declared that national unity in Canada was a figment of the Premier’s imagination; that no such unity had any existence elsewhere than in the Premier’s mind. Again and again we declared this to be so, and warned that there was a fifth column ceaselessly at work in the Province of Quebec, and throughout the Dominion.

Cardinal Villeneuve was brought to Toronto, and was honoured by civil and religious and business leaders in this city as though he were in very truth a prince. Yet anyone of discernment, reading his speech, could see that in his view national unity was—and would be—conditioned upon the institution which he represented being allowed to have all its own way. He politely informed his hearers, in effect, that the minority would dictate the terms upon which national unity might be preserved.

Premier Godbout’s speech was no better. The Cardinal referred to me in his address as one who had spoken against his race—which of course was utterly untrue. I had spoken only against his religion. But even the Censor’s office paid attention to what I had said, and suggested that it was necessary to be careful to keep within the limits of the Defense of Canada Regulations. I answered him in a letter which occupied six pages of THE GOSPEL WITNESS, giving him copious quotations from the French-language press, and assuring him that the only menace to national unity was in Quebec, and not in Ontario.

Then at long last came the iniquitous Plebiscite. If Premier King had racked his brains to discover the best way of manifesting the reality of Canadian disunity, and of utterly destroying all possibility of unity on the min-

ority’s terms, he could not have devised a better instrument for the purpose than the Plebiscite. It was a wicked waste of a million and a half dollars, that was bound to shake still further the confidence of multitudes of people in any Government proposal.

The Plebiscite showed that the Province of Quebec has arrayed itself almost solidly against the other eight provinces in Canada. This has recently been declared from Quebec in trumpet tones. I refer to certain matters now for the information of some, and in order that I may include some quotations from French-Canadians in the record of this address.

In a despatch from Montreal, under date of May 20th we are treated to a fairly full report of the speech of a certain Rene Chaloult, M.P., of Lotbiniere, delivered at an anti-conscription rally in St. James Market Hall, which was held under the auspices of the League for the Defense of Canada. I quote from *The Globe and Mail’s* report of May 21st as follows:

There was no reason, Mr. Chaloult said, why Canada should “continue every twenty years, to be the policeman of Europe.”

“I speak of the after war,” said Mr. Chaloult, adding the hope that “Canada will sit in the Pan-American conferences at Lima and Rio de Janeiro,” and that there would be a rapprochement with Latin America “because our interests are only American.”

Envisaging the possibility that France might join the Axis and fight against Canada, Mr. Chaloult said: “For my part, I hold the most profound respect, the greatest admiration for that valiant old man who presides over the Government of France.” He warned that French-Canadians would never “consent to go under compulsion” to fight against France.

Chaloult spoke along with Maxime Raymond, M.P. for Beauharnois-Laprairie, and Jean Francois Pouliot, M.P. for Temiscouata, at a well attended but quiet and orderly meeting. Afterward police in breaking up a mild attempt at demonstration by one section of the crowd, arrested two young men, one for not having a registration card and the other for damaging city property.

Mr. Chaloult held it was necessary to combat conscription “by all legal and constitutional means.” If conscription were the only issue, however, he would not be on the platform there, he said. To him a national education campaign was also involved.

“We must hold meetings like this. If we can show the Federal Government that Quebec is solidly opposed to conscription, I think they would not dare to impose it. If they want to impose conscription on three and a half million people against their will, there is always an after war, and we shall know what we have to do. They don’t do such things without bringing actions and reactions, which are sometimes dangerous.

It was possible, Mr. Chaloult observed, that if conscription were imposed against Quebec’s will “they might provoke in spite of us the rupture of Confederation.”

The member for Lotbiniere congratulated the audience on its “No” vote in the plebiscite. For the first time in about 100 years, he said, French-Canadians had affirmed themselves with unanimity. It had been declared that the result was destructive of national unity, but “we have perhaps broken national unity, but we have re-established French-Canadian unity, which for us is worth infinitely more.”

It was to be noted, he continued, that French-Canadians all over Canada, wherever they were to be found, affirmed themselves with unanimity and without fear of saying “No.”

He did not think Americans were entitled to criticize Canada’s war effort, because in proportion to population the Dominion’s contribution was the greater.

"War Brings Strange Things"

"As for Russia, our excellent friends the Communists," he went on amid hoots and laughter. "Yes, our excellent friends the Communists with 180,000,000 population, have no army proportionate to ours." Clamor interrupted him. "Yes, war brings strange things. Maybe Fridolin was right when he said England might some day declare war on Great Britain.

"As for our cousins the Chinese, with a population of 500,000,000, they need millions and millions of soldiers to equal our effort.

"And our allies the English—where are their soldiers?" A voice called out, "In retreat," and a few boos were heard.

Mr. Chaloult resumed: "How many are to be found in Hong Kong? How many in China, in North Africa? How many English soldiers are there?"

"We are looking for them with a magnifying glass. They have an army of nearly three million men on English territory. I don't blame them. They feel the need of defending themselves. What I want is that Canada imitate England—isn't it the best compliment we can pay their policy? Canada is menaced by the Germans on the Atlantic coast and by the Japanese on the Pacific—then keep our soldiers here. It is elementary. And if Canada is not menaced then certainly keep our soldiers here."

Gift to Motherland

There was another reason against conscription, he said. News reports from London and Washington indicated the possibility that France might join the Axis, which meant she would be fighting Canada.

"It is not in our competence to discuss the policies of France. For my part, I hold the most profound respect, the greatest admiration for that valiant old man who presides over the Government of France."

A storm of applause interrupted him.

"As Bourassa said a year ago in Montreal, the Marshal Petain is greater now than the Petain of Verdun, because he has greater difficulties to face. Don't you think this situation is another argument against conscription? For French-Canadians will never consent to go by compulsion to fight against France."

Mr. Chaloult demanded that Hon. C. G. Power resign from the Cabinet, since he represented a French-Canadian riding. He also denounced Ernest Bertrand, M.P. for Laurier, and Colonel Thomas Vien, M.P. for Outremont, as having "renounced their compatriots."

"We should take all constitutional means to impress upon them that if they vote for conscription . . ."

A voice cried, "Death." Mr. Chaloult shrugged, didn't complete his sentence.

Canada Only Interest

Maxime Raymond, M.P. for Beauharnois-Laprairie, said defense of Canada was the sole interest of French-Canadians, "defense not only of our territory, but of all our rights, all our prerogatives, and in all domains. Canada is our fatherland, our sole fatherland."

Mr. Chaloult's speech provoked a storm of criticism throughout Canada, but speaking in the Quebec Legislative Assembly May twenty-second, he said he had nothing to withdraw from his Tuesday's Montreal speech.

The meeting at which Mr. Chaloult spoke, was addressed also by two French-Canadian members of the Dominion Parliament. Even *The Globe and Mail* editorially deals somewhat vigorously with Mr. Chaloult's speech, and says:

"The arrogant speech of the Lotbiniere member on this occasion, as an aftermath of the negative plebiscite vote in that Province, cannot be passed over without attention from the Canada that rejoices in the privilege

¹If Russia's armies were in the same proportion to population as Canada's she would have only about six and three quarter million men under arms. Had she had no larger army than that Germany would have beaten her, and even Quebec might by this time have been at the mercy of the Huns.—W.S.W.

of being British. We consider it a duty to let Ontario people know what vicious influences are operating to destroy this country as a British nation."

The Globe and Mail refers with approval to the dissent expressed by Mr. Francois Leduc in the Quebec Legislature, and says:

"It would be gratifying if this sort of talk were found to outweigh the self-centred, anti-British isolationism, but the man who admitted his sentiments might force him into private life and declared he could now look his children in the face because he had expressed his opinion frankly, got from the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Maurice Duplessis, the charge that it was 'shameful to hear a member of this House try to destroy the reputation of his fellow French-Canadians.' And he saw the Quebec House vote 61 to 7 for a motion calling on the Dominion Government to drop its plan to impose conscription for overseas service."

Brigadier-General Georges P. Vanier, Officer commanding Military District Number Five, called upon "all my French-speaking compatriots to speak up now before it is too late, in order to avert the disaster which will come, surely, if we allow a few anti-British French-Canadians to interpret our sentiments to the rest of Canada." He spoke also of the "irresponsible fanatics in this province, who speak with contempt of British achievements (as) rendering a dreadful disservice to their compatriots." And again of "the subversive speeches which have been made by a few, do not represent French-Canadian thought."

But, as *The Globe and Mail* points out, this is not the view of a "few fanatics". It is the voice of the Province of Quebec as expressed, first, by the overwhelming plebiscite vote against conscription; and secondly, in a vote of sixty-one to seven in the Quebec Legislature. If Quebec did not speak in the plebiscite, and through its representatives in the Quebec Legislature, how are we to know where Quebec stands? The fact is, the spectacle is presented of a practically solid Quebec against the rest of Canada.

The Real Quislings

My protest is against the assumption that this attitude and action are to be charged against French-Canadians as such. No politicians, no newspaper editors, are willing to name the real Quislings in Quebec. I again express my conviction that the French-Canadian people, if left to themselves, would be as loyal to the rest of Canada, to the Dominion as a whole, and to the Empire; as any other class of citizens. The real enemy of Britain, and the real opponent of an all-out Canadian war effort, is the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of Canada—and indeed, the Papacy as a whole. A *Globe and Mail* columnist quotes "a prominent Toronto business man" as saying:

"There is no doubt that you are right in saying that the hierarchy in the church favored a 'Yes' vote, while the parish priests advised their people to vote 'No'. Few parish priests have ever been very far away from home and they do not know the world. Their whole interest is their people, who still look upon the parish priest as their best friend. There are, however, forces at work that, I believe, will change the situation over a long period of time. The main forces are the automobile and the radio."

This "prominent Toronto business man" is a fine example of "innocence abroad." He believes that the Hierarchy and the Church favoured a "yes" vote, and that the priests went solidly against the wish of their super-

iors and advised their people to vote "no"! Such a remark shows the necessity of acquainting non-Romanists with the genius of the Roman Church, and with at least an outline of its history.

This quotation is a corroboration of all I have been saying from this pulpit, that the Roman Church always speaks with two voices; and those of the Hierarchy who ostensibly favoured a "yes" vote, spoke as they did to blind the minds of "a prominent Toronto business man", and thousands of others like him. The fact is, as all of us who know anything about Rome know all too well, that while the Hierarchy thus publicly favoured a "yes" vote, all the bishops instructed their priests to command the people to vote, "No."

The Alarming Part of the Situation

- But the alarming part of this situation, at least to me, is that notwithstanding our civil and religious liberties are being threatened by this movement, notwithstanding these anti-British Quebec speakers have dared to speak about civil war and the breaking up of the Constitution, not one of the official leaders of the various non-Romanist denominations has uttered a word of protest. Nor have they offered any leadership to their people. Why have we heard no word of protest from, or been given no indication of leadership by, the Primate of the Anglican Church? Why have we heard not a word from the Moderator of the United Church? Why has no protest been uttered by the Moderator of the Presbyterian Church? Why have we heard nothing, on a matter of such vital concern to the religious life of this country, from the Presidents of the various Baptist Conventions? I am the President of one Baptist Convention myself, and you may have observed that I at least am speaking on this subject.

What is the explanation of this official silence? *I have already pointed out to you that the so-called Protestants who have abandoned the gospel of grace, and have substituted for that great biblical principle various theories of the possibility of salvation by works, have really more in common with Rome than they have with biblical Christianity.*

European Analogies

I think we may find in the present religious situation in Canada something analogous to the situation obtaining among the occupied countries of Europe. Norway is supposed to be still Norway; and Denmark, Denmark; and Belgium, Belgium; and Holland, Holland; and France, France. But are they really so? The exiled Governments of Poland and Holland and Czechoslovakia and Norway and Belgium and Free France are in Britain. But let us look at France as affording the simplest illustration.

A large part of France—and perhaps the most important part—is occupied by Germany. Germany describes herself as "the occupying power". There is a supposedly French Government in Vichy; but that Government is pledged to collaborate with Germany, with the enemy of their country. It seems to me that most of the great denominations are very much like France. A large part of each of them is under the heel of an "occupying power", and is governed by a Vichy group who collaborate with the "occupying power", instead of serving the highest spiritual interests of their denominations. *The "occupying power" of these denominations is certainly not the Holy Ghost; and the affairs of these denomina-*

tions are certainly not being conducted in conformity with the principles of the Bible, or with the principles of the Reformation—which, of course, are essentially biblical.

It is perfectly evident that the United Nations will look in vain for any help from Vichy in fighting the "occupying power" of France. And it is equally manifest that biblical Evangelical Christianity, the Protestantism of the Reformation, will look in vain for any support in the war against Rome, from the Vichy officials of the various denominations. If Protestantism in Canada is to fight Rome, it will have to fight it independently of the official attitude of these great denominations. There will have to be *Free Anglicans, and Free United Churchmen, and Free Presbyterians*, even as there are Free French.

Look abroad! One can scarcely go a block without seeing a store, or a hall, or a church which church union had closed, occupied by one of the lesser religious bodies. They may be Pentecostals, or Nazarenes, or gospel churches, or mission halls of one sort or another. How and why have they come into being?—If you were to examine their membership you would find it is made up of people who have left the larger denominations. We may not agree with many of these bodies in all particulars—I certainly do not agree with them in some things—but I think we must recognize and gratefully acknowledge, that in respect to the essentials of saving faith, they preach the gospel of the grace of God. And these groups have come together by withdrawing from the various larger denominations as a protest against the spiritual deadness of these denominations. They have ceased to call themselves Anglican, or United Church, or Presbyterian, or Baptist, because they have been starved out of the churches to which they formerly belonged, and have come together in these new relations. They are, indeed, very much like the exiled Governments of Europe: they have left their own country with grief, and with the greatest reluctance, in order that they might be free to fight against the very things which have brought such spiritual barrenness to the institutions they loved.

And just as these various exiled European Governments, with what strength they can command, have joined hands with Britain and the United States and China and Russia, in fighting against the common foe, so I believe all lovers of the Lord, and of His word, and of His gospel, of every name should join hands in a united Protestant effort to stay the progress of Romanism in Canada. It does not necessarily mean that they cease to be what they are any more than Belgians and Norwegians and Free Frenchmen and Hollanders and Poles cease to be what they are because they fight with us against the Axis powers. So I make this appeal to all who love our Lord Jesus in sincerity and in truth, to "come up to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty."

And as for those who are still part of these actually non-Protestant and nominally non-Romanist organizations, I exhort them to heed the admonition concerning Babylon and all her works: "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities."

"Once to every man and nation
Comes the moment to decide,

In the strife of truth with falsehood,
For the good or evil side:
Some great cause, God's new Messiah,
Offering each the bloom or blight;
And the choice goes by for ever
"Twixt that darkness and that light.

"Then to side with truth is noble,
When we share her wretched crust
Ere her cause bring fame and profit,
And 'tis prosperous to be just;
Then it is the brave man chooses,
While the coward stands aside,
Till the multitude make virtue
Of the faith they had denied.

"By the light of burning Martyrs,
Christ, Thy bleeding feet we track,
Toiling up new Calvaries ever
With the Cross that turns not back.
New occasions teach new duties;
Time makes ancient good uncouth;
They must upward still and onward
Who would keep abreast of truth.

"Though the cause of evil prosper,
Yet 'tis Truth alone is strong;
Though her portion be the scaffold,
And upon the Throne be wrong,—
Yet that scaffold sways the future,
And, behind the dim unknown,
Standeth God within the shadow,
Keeping watch above His own."

THE LEOPARD'S SPOTS

Dr. T. T. Shields,
130 Gerrard St. E.,
Toronto.

Dear Dr. Shields:

I feel constrained to write you this letter following the news in this morning's paper since there could be no better vindication of yourself and the stand you have taken regarding the menace of Romanism in Canada, than the statements of responsible members of Parliament in the Province of Quebec. As the days go on this Province appears more and more in its true light as the enemy of Britain and the British connection. Surely few people in Canada have any illusions to-day on that score. While individual Roman Catholics may have deplored the stand of the Province and have joined the armed forces of the Empire in defence of the liberties we enjoy, ecclesiastical Quebec, like all Roman Catholic countries, is unalterably opposed to Britain, and always will be so long as Britain remains Protestant. The leopard will change his spots sooner than Rome would change her position in this regard. Leaders in the Québec House have come out into the open with statements that ought to land anyone promptly in an Internment Camp. I need not recall to the minds of your readers the threats that were made against yourself when many months ago, you pointed out the very dangers that are so glaringly apparent to-day, when you warned the Country where we were heading, and now a Quebec M.P.P. expresses the hope that "after this war we shall break the Imperial ties that bind us to England". It is rather ironical to find *The Globe and Mail* which, a few months ago, kept so religiously after your scalp when you sought to arouse people to the danger that menaces us, now finding it expedient in a long editorial, "to let Ontario people know what evil influences are operating to destroy this Country as a British Nation." That is a long step from the attitude of that paper some months ago, when it was

stated that there was no such thing as a French-Canadian problem and was busily engaged in castigating yourself for saying there was.

Unless Mr. King takes a firm stand, which he seems incapable of doing, a situation of the gravest kind in the history of the Dominion will have to be faced, since civil war and secession are being freely talked about in Quebec. Any more blathering about national unity in the face of this imminent menace, is the worst kind of folly. How long is it going to be before the Protestant people of this Dominion are thoroughly awakened and alive to the menace facing us. There is dire need for Protestants to realize that we are in the midst of a terrific crisis, a crisis in which pusillanimous Protestants would tell us to be neutral. To be neutral at a time like this is to lose all the hard-won liberties our Fathers bled and died for. We want to-day, a Protestantism, not of the lips, but of the heart. Not one that evaporates in empty plaudits, but the Scriptural Protestantism, broad based upon the Word of God which has all the fixity of an everlasting principle and the fervor of an undying passion. This alone to-day will save our country and our Empire from the power of a greater enemy even than Hitler. If we are to be told as Martin Luther was, "Luther, the whole world is against you," let our reply be, "Then England will be against the whole world." The time has come when Protestants must make their voice and influence felt at Ottawa.

Sincerely yours,

J. H. Hunter, Editor,

The Evangelical Christian.

Roman Catholic Holidays Observed in Government Offices

A Protestant League member, who was employed in a Dominion Government office for some years, writes to tell us that the following Roman Catholic holidays are observed, and that all Government offices are closed on these days: *January 6th*, The Day of Epiphany; *May 14th*, Ascension Day; *November 1st*, All Saints' Day; *December 8th*, Conception Day.

These holidays may have been dispensed with since the war or during the depression, but we doubt it. They were, however, always in effect whether under a Conservative or Liberal administration. Why should these religious holidays be observed by the Government of a country in which there is no established state church? We publish this merely as a matter of information.

We Are Sorry For This

The *Ottawa Evening Citizen* of May 22nd, 1942, contains a report of a Joan of Arc Institute "At Home", which was attended by Her Royal Highness, the Princess Alice. This, of course, is a Roman Catholic institution. The meeting was addressed by Hon. Louis St. Laurent, Minister of Justice, who commended the bilingual characteristics of the school, and its "broader view of justice".

The "at home" was held to celebrate the Feast of Joan of Arc, and the report says, "The statue of Joan of Arc was crowned by Anne Abel Smith." This young lady is the granddaughter of Princess Alice. The report says:

"Her Highness then spoke in French, congratulating the school upon its achievements and the religious atmosphere which it instilled into its pupils."

The "religious atmosphere", of course, would be a Roman Catholic atmosphere. It is thus Romanism insinuates itself, and makes its influence felt in high places.

Summer Evangelism

It is interesting to observe how wrong a multitude of people may be as a result of taking certain premises for granted, as though they were axiomatically true. One such assumption is that it is inevitable that the work of the churches should decline in the summertime. This assumption is so general that in many cases we have congregations unite in so-called union services. The result of such arrangements usually is that the "union" of several congregations manages to assemble only a handful of people.

We are convinced that in this country, with our climate, the summer season, together with the spring and early autumn, is the very best for getting the Lord's work done. It is much easier to get about in moderate weather, particularly in the country. There is no necessity for heating buildings; and very often services can most satisfactorily be held out-of-doors.

This writer gratefully records that some of the happiest and most fruitful periods of his ministry have been in the summer time; and even in Jarvis Street, in the heart of downtown Toronto, there is really no diminution of attendance in the summer. It is not at all unusual for hundreds of people to be unable to gain admission even when some other churches are closed in the evening, and where "union" congregations number a baker's dozen.

We believe this is due to the simple fact that we have formed the habit of just going on about our work, and forgetting that it is warm. It may be that sometimes a little extra effort is necessary, but we have observed that many games which involve the most strenuous exercise, are summer avocations with many people. We suggest to our readers that it would be well to dismiss from our minds the assumption that the Lord's work should be carried on at half-speed in the summer time. All that is in the world, and the devil who is the god of this world, are more active than ever during the summer season.

The farmer, the factory-worker, men who work at the blazing steel furnace, the train crew on their regular journeys, the sailor on the sea, the soldier amid blood and flame, the airman flying among the clouds—all these unremittingly fulfil their duties in the summer as well as in the winter. Why should we allow the work of the church to flag, and leave the field to the devil at the very best time of the year?

Last Sunday in Jarvis Street

Although it was a holiday week-end, there were large attendances, in the evening every seat full, and as many chairs crowded in upstairs and down as practicable. The address delivered appears in this issue. The new hymn-books, dedicated to our men in the armed services, were used for the first time. Aside from the

large number of books that will be purchased by the members of the church and congregation for their own personal use, the cost of providing books for the general use of the congregation will exceed \$1,500.00—indeed, it is likely to exceed it by a good deal. This announcement is also intended for Jarvis Street members. The cash contributions to this fund so far amount to about \$1,100.00. We need four or five hundred dollars more. Let us hear from you.

Jarvis Street Annual Meeting Adjourned

For the information of the members of Jarvis Street Church we write this note: Last Friday, between seven and eight o'clock, at the time when people would be on their way to the church for the Annual Meeting, it rained almost as it must have done in the days of Noah. This scribe drove through it. The rain came down in such sheets one could scarcely see to drive. Thirty seconds' exposure to that would have been sufficient to drench one to the skin.

The result was what might have been expected, an attendance which someone estimated at one hundred, but which we know was much less. We therefore suggested the adjournment of the meeting to Thursday evening, June 4th. By motion the meeting was so adjourned. Members of the church will please remember therefore the Annual Meeting on June 4th. It was felt it would not have been fair to the great number of people who would have been there but could not possibly come through such a rain, to proceed with the Annual Meeting in their absence.

A Word To Our Union Churches

We have not enquired of the treasury of the Union Office as to how funds are coming in—we hope they are flowing in copiously; but this is just a reminder to Pastors, and Treasurers of mission funds, if you have any mission money in your treasury, please send it on as soon as you can conveniently do so. And when your special offerings may be due, please make an effort to make them as generous as possible.

This note is written only as a reminder.

Colonel Munro's Testimony

One Pastor who is near a large Air Force camp writes to say he could use a thousand of the tracts giving Colonel Munro's testimony. But of course he cannot afford to pay for them. We are sending him the thousand copies.

The cost of printing this third edition of ten thousand is about one cent a copy, and the postage will be extra. Who will send us \$11.00 or so—make it \$25.00 if you like—to cover this expense? We have not waited for someone to send it. We repeat: the tracts are on their way.

We hope to print many more of this tract—perhaps our next edition will be twenty thousand—so that we can do with a great deal of money just to meet the expense. So far, on this account, we have received about \$250.00; but that has by no means paid for printing and postage. Let us hear from you at your convenience, that this message of salvation may be broadcast among the men of the armed services.

How Can An Emphatic "No" Mean "Yes"?

Because there is so little real Protestantism in Quebec, the non-Romanists of that Province, for political or business or social reasons, trot along behind the Roman Catholic chariot as a little alley dog trots along behind the wagon of the "rags, bottles, and bones" Jew. And they are trying to tell us that the overwhelming "no" vote of a million or thereabout in Quebec, and the vote of the Quebec Legislature do not represent Quebec. What unmitigated nonsense!

We believe *The Ottawa Citizen* of May 22nd exactly expresses the truth of the matter. We find ourselves in such perfect accord with it that we print herewith the whole editorial:

Premier Godbout Knows

In the Quebec legislative assembly last Wednesday, Premier Godbout led the vote against conscription in Canada for service overseas. In this free country, any provincial legislature has the right to put itself so on record by constitutional, orderly procedure. The Quebec prime minister should be given credit, too, for being honest. He is opposed to conscription. He is openly saying so. The people of Canada know where Premier Godbout stands. What the Canadian people need to know is where the prime minister of Canada stands. He is responsible.

In Premier Godbout's declaration on the policy to be applied in Canada, against the national selective draft, he said:

However, conscription will not be imposed in Ottawa if Prime Minister Mackenzie King's supporters keep him there. If ever there was a man who is against conscription it is Mackenzie King. No one ever interpreted French-Canadian sentiment better than King.

The Quebec premier has thus spoken for the prime minister of Canada. He knows Mr. King's mentality on conscription. He also knows that the continuation of party government in office at Ottawa is dependent upon the vote of Quebec members of the Liberal party. As Premier Godbout's statement would plainly indicate, the Quebec members are quite content to keep Mr. King in office at Ottawa so long as he does as the Quebec negative vote would require him to do.

Prime Minister King is being held to the position he took against conscription at the beginning of the war. The will of the Canadian people as expressed in the recent plebiscite has made no perceptible difference to the prime minister's negative policy.

Premier Godbout said in the legislature last Wednesday: In 1939 the promises made against conscription were made to Quebec and Quebec only can free the government from them.

There should be no hurling of blame at the Quebec premier for making this statement. It is, at least, an honest declaration of Quebec's position. The dishonesty is in the position of party government at Ottawa. The plebiscite served only as a temporary expedient to postpone the day when party government must give place to government without party limitation.

The honorable way to free the government of Canada of the limitations of Mr. King's promises to Quebec against conscription, the traditional way of statesmanship, is for the prime minister to resign. This recourse of statesmanship should have been taken in the first instance without putting Canada through the humbug of the plebiscite. Mr. King refused to consider Mr. Chamberlain's self-effacing example. He told the House in so many words that he regarded the office of prime minister as "my birthright."

The will of the Canadian people as expressed in every province of Canada but Quebec is for positive forward action. But Prime Minister King cannot separate himself from the negative vote in the recent plebiscite. He is irrevocably committed to reliance on negative party politics for office.

But the prime minister's limitation is more than simply being dependent upon the votes of Quebec members to keep the Liberal party in office. Mr. King cannot give war leadership in Canada. He is lingering on in office from the time of appeasement. He made an appeasing pilgrimage to Berlin in 1937 as an emissary of the old order when they were yielding on one front after another to Hitler. He kept Canada disarmed while Germany armed. He later made the Canadian declaration of war on Germany, but almost in the same breath committed Canada against effective preparations to fight.

Of course, Mr. King would like Canada to be on the side of victory. So would Mr. Godbout; but the position of both is as the Quebec premier said, they want it "through the voluntary, moderate means promised at the start of the war."

The plain answer is that the United Nations cannot win this war by "voluntary moderate means." Hitler would have been astride of Canada long ago, but for the rallying of other democracies to a far greater sacrificial effort.

It has to be more than merely an act of parliament to introduce the national selective draft for service overseas. The government of Canada has to reflect the affirmative spirit above the negative. The people of Canada have shown that they have this affirmative spirit. They are ready to go forward in line abreast of the other democracies. They are held back by the negation of statesmanship at the head of the government. Mr. King's admirer at the head of the Liberal party in Quebec, Premier Godbout, knows. He has stated the position at Ottawa under party government.

The responsibility is immediately upon the members of parliament whose constituencies voted "Yes" in the plebiscite. This responsibility is daily growing more grave. There is no other apparent way to meet it but by constitutional action in parliament—as in the British parliament in 1940—to inspire the prime minister to resign. It is within the power of the members to rise above party, as the Canadian people have done in the plebiscite, to form a war government entirely free from past commitments or party limitations.

The French Testament Campaign

"The Priest Will Never Get My Bible"

What effect has the Cardinal's Burn-the-Bible order had on French-Canadian Roman Catholics? That is a question that arises in the mind of every one who has read our translation of that official letter in these pages. After having spent the last week in extensive visiting among French-Canadians we are now in a position to give, in part at least, the answer to that question. We do so by recounting the following incidents which formed part of this difficult yet thrilling week.

Still Coming to Jesus By Night

A year ago a request for a French New Testament came to one of our pastors. He sent the Testament to the name and address as it appeared on the form provided for that purpose in our general tract distribution and not long afterward set out to find the person to whom he had sent the Word of God. Almost the entire day was taken up in fruitless searching up and down rough winding roads in a pioneer bush country. Few persons knew the name, and those who did had varying notions as to where he lived. Finally one man offered to take our pastor to the man on condition that he receive what he deemed a fitting compensation. But when at last the man whose name appeared on the request form was found he denied all knowledge of the New Testament. Under further questioning, however, he admitted that it was his sister who had sent for the Book. Our weary French Evangelists sought the sister, but she in turn denied any responsibility—it was her

brother that had sent for it, she said. But when brother and sister were convinced that they were not dealing with spies of the priest they plucked up courage and began to tell how night by night they gathered the whole family around the lamp, after a hard day's toil in the bush, and read the Word of God till the small hours of the morning.

"Two Are Better Than One"

We visited both brother and sister again last week. The girl is now married and has a home of her own, but she took her New Testament with her and she and her young husband study it together. It was a rare privilege to read the Word with them and then to kneel in prayer in their neat little pioneer home built by the young husband's hands. The older brother we met as he was making a fence on a piece of new land. He rejoiced in God's Word and its message. He told us how it had taught him to pray as the publican prayed, "God have mercy upon me!" And in the pocket of his overalls he carried a little booklet containing a selection of Scripture verses and he showed it to his friends and neighbours. We warned him that there were some who did not wish him to have God's Word for himself, and would seek to take it from him. "I know that," he said, but added with strong emphasis, "but they will never take it from me, for it is God's Word and it is good." Our hearts rejoiced to hear him say it, for we feared, at first, that the priest might have got in his deadly poison before the life-giving Word could sink into the man's heart and mind and set him free. May he go on to know still more of the glorious liberty of the children of God is our earnest prayer.

A Young Mother With Three Children

On a narrow, dead-end street in a Northern town where we visited lived a young mother with her three tiny children. We were both interested in and encouraged by the story which lay behind her request for a New Testament. When this young mother welcomed us into her home and assured us that she had received her copy and was reading it she told how, as a little girl, her grandmother had an Old Testament, or at least a book of Old Testament stories from which she read to her. The book had always fascinated her and left her with a longing to know more of it. Years she waited before she heard mention of this marvellous book again. This time it was when she and her baby, in a Toronto hospital, were undergoing operations and treatments. Christian workers visited her ward, played and sang the Gospel, and, as she said, "made short sermons" in which they talked about the "Book" which still held such great interest for her. But theirs were in English—she had scarcely spoken a word of English until her arrival in the Toronto hospital—the "Book" was still beyond her reach. We wish every reader might have witnessed her joy as she told us how happy she was one day the week or so previous to our call to find a tract in her mail-box with the offer of a free New Testament. Almost fearing it was too good to be true she mailed the enclosed slip at once, and, without delay, her French New Testament arrived. At last the coveted book was her own. Before leaving that home we bowed in prayer with her and her children to pray that the Lord of the Word, Who has had His hand thus mercifully upon her bringing His Word to her, may now reveal Himself to her hungry soul. Will you join us in intercession for her?

A Pathetic Story

A pathetic story was told us by a clear-eyed and capable "habitant" farmer as we found him at work harrowing a virgin field on his pioneer farm. Thirty-five years before he had obtained a copy of the Bible in French from an itinerant colporteur in a Northern Ontario town. He read it for a time with great interest and delight until a Jesuit priest, apparently conducting a retreat or mission, warned him that his Bible was a bad book, and that he must not read it. For ten years he did not look at it, in obedience to the priest's instructions. But when he moved to a new parish he asked his new curé concerning the Bible. The priest did not answer him: he did not say it was a good book or that it was a bad book. Our friend decided, together with his wife, to take up the Word once again. "Let the priest come here and try to take it from me again," he cried with flashing eyes. "He will never get it again. I know it is the Word of God. They took it away once, but they will never take it away from me again."

This man told us of the Cardinal's Burn-the-Bible order. He had not read our translation in THE GOSPEL WITNESS but the original in *La Presse* of Montreal. "What a difference," he said, "between the Cardinal's command to burn the Bible and your efforts to give it free to all who ask for it!" Yes, what a difference!

Many Still Under the Romanist Yoke

It would be out of all proportion and untrue to evident facts to infer, from what we have written above, that all French Roman Catholics have broken the yoke of priestcraft and are avidly searching the Scriptures daily. Thousands of our tracts with the free offer of a New Testament have brought no response. In some cases whole parishes or even quite large towns yield only a few names of those who dare even to ask for a New Testament. We have good reason to believe that there are few parishes in which an organized campaign has not been carried on against the reading of the New Testament. Indeed in some cases the priest's opposition has apparently served as very effective free advertising for our French Testament campaign. We face a powerful and unscrupulous foe who has no end of tricks whereby he seeks to hold down the Word of Truth. But even during the last week we have seen the power of the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, and with confidence we urgently request the aid of all who believe in it and who want to see French Roman Catholics brought to know its wonder-working power. Apart from actually seeing the transforming might of God's Word in the hearts of French-Canadians the most effective encouragement our workers on the field can receive is to read of the splendid way friends, known and unknown, are rallying to their aid with the sinews of war. If you wish to have a share in giving the Word to French-Canadian Roman Catholics send your contribution to the Union of Regular Baptist Churches, 337 Jarvis Street, Toronto, Canada. W.S.W.

Fergus, Ontario

From Pastor George Hunt of Fergus comes a most encouraging word regarding the services held in connection with the opening of his new building. This is a pioneer work that has been blessed with a splendid new church building which was erected with the materials from a deserted church in the country and is a credit to the energy of the pastor and the faithful work of his people. Rev. A. Dallimore of the Orangeville Church also had a hand in this work as it was he who drew the architect's plans for the building.

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 6 Second Quarter Lesson 23 June 7, 1942

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

DAVID'S SONG OF DELIVERANCE

Lesson Text: 2 Samuel 22.

Golden Text: "As for God, his way is perfect; the word of the Lord is tried: he is a buckler to all them that trust in him"—2 Samuel 22:31.

Reading: 2 Samuel 21.

I. The Greatness of Deliverance—verses 1 to 7. Compare Psa. 18:1-6.

Sweet are the uses of adversity, but sweet also are the songs of triumph (Exod. 15:2; Judg. 5:2, 3; Psa. 27:6). David's heart overflowed with joyful praise to God who had delivered him from all his enemies (Psalm 18, title). Our Lord has wrought for us a mighty deliverance (2 Cor. 1:10), redeeming us from the penalty of sin by His death (1 Cor. 15:3), from its power by His life (Rom. 5:10; 6:6, 7, 14) and from its presence at His coming again (Heb. 9:28). Praise to Him should be continually upon our lips (Heb. 13:15).

The Lord alone is our Protection from the foes which surround us. David uses various metaphors to emphasize the fact that God is our strong Defence. A rock suggests stability (Deut. 32:4; Psa. 27:5; 62:2, 6), a fortress strength (Psa. 31:3; 71:3; 91:2), a shield protection from enemy weapons (Gen. 15:1; Psa. 33:20; 119:114), a horn strength, dignity and honour (Psa. 132:17; Lk. 1:69), a tower watchfulness (Psa. 61:3; 144:2) and a refuge safety (Psa. 32:7; 46:7, 11; Isa. 32:2).

David suggests three enemies of the soul; death (Psa. 56:13), ungodly men (Judg. 5:13; Psa. 71:4) and hell (Psa. 86:13; 116:3-6). Christ by His Death conquered death on our behalf, and one day that last enemy shall be completely destroyed (Rom. 6:9; 1 Cor. 15:26, 54-58; Heb. 2:9, 14; Rev. 20:14). Ungodly men may persecute us, but no longer have they power to do us any real harm (Psa. 56:9; Matt. 10:28; Rom. 8:31; 2 Thess. 3:2; 1 Pet. 3:13). Christ has the keys of Hades (Rev. 1:18); the soul that trusts in Him need never fear the darkness of that awful grave that lies beneath the shadow of the cross, but on the other side (John 3:16; Rev. 20:6).

In times of distress let us call upon the One Whose ear is ever open to the cry of His children (Psa. 34:15-22; 61:1-3). To look within is to be miserable, to look around is to be distracted, but to look to the Lord is to be at peace (Psa. 34:5; Isa. 45:22).

II. The Manner of Deliverance—verses 8 to 20. Compare Psa. 18:7-19.

God rescues His people by a mighty deliverance (Psa. 66:3-8; 77:14; 78:12). He is sovereign in His working, and at times it is His pleasure to use the powers of nature as His instruments (Exod. 15:6-12; Judg. 5:4, 5). They are under His absolute control. It may be, however, that the language in this passage is figurative. The earthquake, thunder, disturbances on sea, on land and in the heavens speak of the Lord's great power (Psa. 77:16-18); the smoke is a token of His righteous wrath (Exod. 19:18; Rev. 15:8); lightning and fire of His holiness (Isa. 64:1, 2; Rev. 4:5); wind of His mysterious Deity and omnipresence (Psa. 104:1-3; John 3:8; Acts 2:2).

David's deliverance was complete; he had been safely redeemed from the power of his enemies and was now established in a large place, indicating fulness of life (Psa. 4:1; 31:8). The Lord can make us more than conquerors over the world, the flesh and Satan (Rom. 8:37; 2 Cor. 2:14; Eph. 6:13).

III. The Conditions of Deliverance—verses 21 to 32. Compare Psa. 18:20-31.

God by His Spirit will work on behalf of those who are

righteous, whose hands are clean and whose hearts are pure (Psa. 15:1, 2; 24:3, 4). Only those who are holy see the Lord (Matt. 5:8; Heb. 12:14). The blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son can cleanse us from all sin (1 John 1:7; Rev. 1:5). The unsaved must come to Christ by faith, and the saved must come trusting and confessing (Heb. 10:19-22; 1 John 1:9). Sin causes defeat, sorrow and distress.

God also demands that His children walk in obedience to His commands if they would experience victory (Psa. 119:97, 98). Disobedience and rebellion bring about a severance of communion with Him (Isa. 59:1-3; Matt. 15:8, 9).

The Lord desires that we be merciful (Matt. 5:7), humble (Psa. 138:6; Matt. 5:3) and also trustful (Psa. 17:7; Isa. 26:3, 4). Faith is the victory which overcomes the world (Exod. 14:13; Matt. 9:29; Mk. 11:22; Eph. 6:16; 1 John 5:4).

IV. The Results of Deliverance—verses 33 to 51. Compare Psa. 18:32-50.

The Lord will perfect that which concerns His children (Ruth 3:18; Psa. 57:2; 138:3); He will perform that which He has promised (Num. 23:19; Phil. 1:6). The Psalmist says that our feet shall be like hinds' feet; we shall leap for joy and gladness of heart (Psa. 16:11; Hab. 3:19; 1 Pet. 1:8).

The Christian is enabled to do exploits in the name of the Lord (1 Sam. 26:25; Phil. 4:13), for strength is given him to stand against his foes and then to conquer them. The gentleness of the Lord, His mercy and loving-kindness toward those who look to Him, make the believer great. We are given power to subdue our enemies completely, but this will be in God's good time (1 Cor. 15:27, 28; Heb. 2:8).

The victorious Christian has a testimony for the Lord. The one who has learned the secret of power with God shall have power also with men (Psa. 51:12, 13; 67:1, 2).

The Psalm closes with a great paean of thanksgiving and praise to God for His everlasting mercy and omnipotence. Praise ye the Lord!

NEWS OF UNION CHURCHES

Bethel Church, Orillia

Bethel Church, Orillia, recently gave a royal welcome to Rev. R. D. Guthrie, formerly of Briscoe Street, London. Pastor Guthrie remarks that he has never seen such a spirit of expectation and outstanding determination to support the pastor in the work of the Lord. Already one soul has accepted Christ in the pastor's home and another backslider has been restored. Mr. Guthrie has also accepted the call to the Mitchell Square Church just outside Orillia and is looking forward to a time of blessing on that field already.

Calvary, Ottawa

The financial report of the Calvary Church, Ottawa, has come to hand and we are happy to note that an increase in income, from all sources, of \$545.00 over last year is reported. The attendances at this church have increased and the spirit at the services has been encouraging.

BOOKS BY DR. T. T. SHIELDS

"The Adventures of a Modern Young Man"	\$1.00
"Other Little Ships"	1.00
"The Plot That Failed" (The story of Jarvis St. Church)	1.00
"The Oxford Group Movement Analyzed"05
25 copies	1.00
Russellism or Rutherfordism (103 pages)35

SERMONS ON THE WAR

Sermons on the War preached in Jarvis St. Five cents each single sermon or any 25 for \$1.00 post paid from THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard St. E., Toronto, 2, Canada.