

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. 8

TORONTO, JUNE 25, 1942

Whole Number 1049

"Dr. Shields Declares Catholics On Axis Side" Challenges Pope to Debate

(From *Victoria Daily Times*, of Monday, June 22, 1942)

Rev. Dr. T. T. Shields, pastor of the Jarvis Street Baptist Church of Toronto, spoke to between 2,000 and 2,500 Victorians in a series of meetings Saturday night and Sunday.

He repeated charges he has made in his tour across Canada—charges that the Roman Catholic hierarchy constitutes the fourth Axis power, and that it is attempting to rule the world temporarily as well as spiritually.

Opening Address

Jubilant over the publicity given his appearance here by opposition to his coming from the Bishop of Victoria and Roman Catholic organizations, Dr. Shields lashed the Roman Catholic Church as "Satan's Masterpiece" in his opening meeting Saturday night in the Central Baptist Church.

That opposition had done him good, given him publicity from coast to coast, Dr. Shields said, adding:

"The unmitigated impudence of a man to propose a British subject couldn't go just wherever he pleases."

"I defy the Catholic hierarchy of this neighborhood. I don't care what they think and probably I'll criticize them more rigorously than I would have."

He invited the Bishop of Victoria and priests to his meeting, saying he wanted to bring the Roman Catholic Church "out into the open."

"There isn't one of them who would dare to come into the light," he charged.

The Roman Catholic religion was a religion of fear and force. It was not a religion of reason and still less had it anything in common with the religion of God in Christ, he said. It was not Christian. It was "paganism in the darkest and densest and most virulent form and primarily political," Dr. Shields said.

"I don't believe the Roman Catholic Church need be feared after the war," he added. It was the most gigantic bluffer in the world. Its forces would fight in ambush and darkness, "but when you turn the light on it, it runs," he said.

He denied any personal quarrel with individual Roman Catholics, but said sometimes "in exposing the ravages

of Rome some Roman Catholics may get a few splinters of shrapnel."

Hundreds of thousands of nominal Roman Catholics throughout Canada, he said, were in thought and spirit divorced from the Roman Catholic Church.

French Canadians would be just as loyal as English Canadians if they were left to themselves, he said.

Calls Vatican an Enemy

Roman Catholicism was the enemy of free institutions everywhere, he said. It was the fourth Axis power and just as much the implacable enemy of Britain as Germany, Italy and Japan, he added, remarking, "Though we win the war, the chief enemy will still be in the Vatican."

"The real ruler of Canada this moment is not Prime Minister Mackenzie King, but Cardinal Villeneuve of Quebec," he said. Not a thing could be done without approval from the Vatican, he added.

Dr. Shields told his hearers one of the reasons R. B. Bennett left Canada lay in his weariness of having the Roman Catholic Church continually pulling his coat-tails for special privileges.

Discussing efforts to bar him from Victoria, Dr. Shields quoted Scripture to the effect forces had arisen from the earliest times to oppose the progress of the gospel. That was ever the way of purveyors of evil, he said.

"We have a right to be wrong," he added, emphasizing his belief in the right of religious freedom and saying he would fight for freedom of conscience for the Roman Catholic.

He said he would have felt small had he been in the position of the Bishop of Victoria, who had made representations to the Minister of Justice to prevent his appearance here and had received no support.

He was used to threats, Dr. Shields said, referring to hints that had come to him from the censor and the late Minister of Justice Lapointe.

In Ottawa, he stated, he had been unable to secure

a Protestant church in which to champion the Canadian Protestant League, because members of the congregation, civil servants, were afraid to offend Roman Catholicism in high office there.

At Centennial

"We are fighting Germany, Italy and Japan," Dr. Shields told an audience at the Centennial United Church Sunday "but we ought to be fighting the fourth Axis power, the Roman Catholic Church."

The audience of 1,300 that filled every seat in the church and overflowed into the chapel and Sunday school rooms, heard the anti-Catholic speaker repeat his local references to the Bishop of Victoria and in addition hurl a challenge to debate with the Pope himself in a radio forum that could be heard round the world.

Saying he had no quarrel with individual Roman Catholics, Dr. Shields said there were thousands of people who call themselves Roman Catholics who would be horrified if they knew what their church really stood for.

Linking the Catholic Church directly with the Nazis and Fascism, Dr. Shields said that while perhaps some liberal-minded Catholics in Germany had been persecuted, no Jesuit in Germany ever had or ever will be banned.

"The whole advance of Fascism," he said, "is simply Jesuitism on the march; it's Catholic action."

Illustrating this theory he said the Vatican had tried to influence politics in Malta to gain control of that island and that Britain had been forced to suspend the constitution and revert it to the status of a Crown Colony.

"Considering the Catholic Church boasts of thinking in centuries can we not assume that the Catholics saw what was coming in this war and how vital Malta would be in the battles of Libya and the Mediterranean?"

Other instances of the link between Catholicism and Nazism he said, was the statement of refugee Otto Strosser, now in Quebec, that Hitler had written *Mein Kampf* in collaboration with a Jesuit priest, that the Croatian political leader, a Catholic, had engineered the plot to assassinate Louis Barthou, French foreign minister, and King Alexander of Yugoslavia who sought to create a Balkan bloc against Fascism, and the Catholic Church's close connection between Franco of Spain and the Petain-Laval régime at Vichy.

Calls It 5th Column

Picturing the Roman Catholic Church as "the world's greatest fifth column movement," Dr. Shields said all the Vatican's diplomatic and consular representatives throughout the world had been given Vatican citizenship, which made them all neutral, with the right of diplomatic immunity from prosecution and freedom of censorship in letters and dispatches to the Vatican.

One of its worst features, he said, was that the Catholic Church still claimed the right to force obedience to its laws.

"Even today, they demand the death penalty for heresy," he said. "They want us to be tolerant but I can't be tolerant of a man who wants to burn me at the stake. I don't want to be burned."

The first hour of the meeting was taken up with hymns and prayers led by Rev. J. C. Rowell of the Central Baptist Church and with an appeal for subscriptions to the Protestant League of Canada.

Great Protestant League Meetings

Telegraphic News from Dr. Shields and Mr. Martin
Vancouver, B.C.,
June 23rd, 1942.

Miss Violet Stoakley,
130 Gerrard St. E., Toronto, Can.

There is a tremendous response to Protestant testimony in the West. Total attendance at all services in Victoria on Sunday and Monday conservatively estimated at five thousand, two hundred and fifty. On Monday three buildings were packed at once, and people heard through loud speakers within and without. Nearly four hundred new members for the Protestant League at meetings, and about \$800.00 receipts. Roman Bishop's attempt to prevent the meetings was resented by the public, and greatly assisted in the success of the meetings. The Vancouver meeting of to-night (Tuesday) was the greatest of all. There was an attendance of more than two thousand in a building of seventeen hundred capacity, which constituted a veritable flood which overflowed everything. Practically six hundred new memberships, bringing the Vancouver grand total to more than a thousand; nearly fifteen hundred memberships registered in Vancouver and Victoria. Each city will organize a local branch as soon as membership lists are complete, and will plan to carry Protestant appeal from these centres to every part of British Columbia. Nearly \$1,800.00 receipts at coast, but best of all these meetings have stirred both cities, and made the Protestant conscience articulate. It is abundantly evident that notwithstanding much spiritual deadness, a mighty undercurrent of Protestantism still flows, which through the Protestant League will express itself. Were we free to give our time, believe we could by such meetings wake up Canada. We are convinced there is a rising tide of opposition to further Roman encroachments upon our British liberties, which is only waiting for leadership to express itself, and to determine that King George VI., and not Pope Pius XII shall rule Canada. Leave Vancouver Wednesday morning for Kamloops, service same evening. Then Kelowna Thursday, June 25th; Calgary, Sunday and Monday, June 28th and 29th; Edmonton, June 30th; Saskatoon, July 1st; Regina, July 2nd; Winnipeg, Friday, July 3rd, and Sunday afternoon, July 5th; Fort William, Monday, July 6th; Sault Ste. Marie, Wednesday, July 8th; Sudbury, Friday, July 10th; and back to Toronto for both services Sunday, July 12th. Wish we could take the angry Roman Catholic Bishop of Victoria and the head of the Knights of Columbus with us as advertising agents; it would save us a great deal of money. Request all GOSPEL WITNESS readers and Jarvis Street Church to continue instant in prayer for us. We were delighted to make the acquaintance of many valiant Protestant helpers in Victoria and Vancouver; and above all, God is with us and manifestly blessing our testimony.

T. T. SHIELDS
H. G. MARTIN

Prominent Romanists Publicize Protestant League

"Le Canada" Reports Dr. Shields

In last week's edition of THE GOSPEL WITNESS we reported that Dr. Gaspard Fauteux had called the attention of the Minister of Justice, Hon. Mr. St. Laurent, to statements made by Dr. Shields, as he said, against the province of Quebec, which appeared in *Le Canada* of Friday, June 12th. The reason why we did not give the report as it appeared in *Le Canada*, was that we could neither buy nor see one in Toronto. Since then, however, the paper has come to hand. On page three the middle of the first column is devoted to Dr. Shields. The heading is interesting.

"Pastor Shields Persists in Sabotaging National Unity.

"He attacks the Catholic Church which is described as 'fifth column.'"

Preceding the Canadian Press report from Winnipeg of the Protestant League meeting there is an apology for printing it:

"We publish the following news item for the information of our readers because other dailies will doubtless publish it. But we believe that it is not necessary to attach any importance to the suggestions of Mr. Shields, whom almost no one in Toronto takes seriously, and who there plays the roll which other extremists of a camp opposite to his play here. It is proper to observe also that Mr. Shields is in bad grace (*en rupture de ban*) with the hierarchy of the Methodist Church though he claims to belong to it."

Those who dislike what a man says usually try to belittle him. I know of no preacher in Toronto, and I have lived here almost all my life, whose utterances are so closely followed and so much discussed as those of Dr. Shields. He is one of those characters who makes strong enemies or strong friends. Because he sees farther than many and is able to draw out implications in advance of their full developments, those who do not like him think he is extreme. We must admit he speaks strongly, but this is no day for placid utterances.

The reference to Methodism is altogether funny. The editors of *Le Canada* are seventeen years behind times. The Methodist Church of Canada passed into the United Church of Canada about this time of year, 1925. Of course one cannot expect that such Papists as the editors of *Le Canada* will ever understand that most Protestant churches do not have hierarchies. At least Methodists never did. A hierarchy is a rule of priests, and we have never heard of a Methodist priest. So we remind *Le Canada* that far from belonging to any hierarchy Dr. T. T. Shields is a free man,—a Baptist and therefore an individualist, pastor of the first Baptist church of Toronto, located on Jarvis Street, and hence called by its name.

Hon. Mr. St. Laurent Denounces Dr. Shields

In a telegram from Dr. Shields to Jarvis Street Baptist Church, which was read at both services on Sunday, he remarked of the present progress of the Canadian Protestant League in the West and the meetings being held under its auspices there, that "the devil has once again been our best advertiser." Among other means used for such advertising is the official report of the proceedings of the House of Commons debate, commonly called *Hansard*. On Tuesday, June 16th, the Minister of Justice mentioned the editor of this paper when he referred to "an increase in what the Shieldses and the Silcoxes, and even the *Globe and Mail*, have been pleased to call 'French-Canada's stranglehold on this dominion.'"

We have discussed Mr. St. Laurent's attitude and utterances in the sermon printed in this edition. That the honourable gentleman should not be able to appreciate the fear which English-speaking Canadians, who are conversant with the trend of affairs in the Dominion, have of the increasing stranglehold upon the country by the French-Canadians, is easy to understand. He is a French-Canadian himself and a loyal Catholic, as was his predecessor in the Ministry of Justice. Incidentally, isn't it a remarkable thing that the people of this country should have a French-Canadian Minister of Justice? French-Canada constitutes some thirty per cent. of the country. The Province of Quebec is not so much under British law as under canon law, that is, the law of the Roman Catholic Church. Things are done under the legal system of Quebec which would never be permitted outside of that province, that is, where British law prevails. So we repeat our remark that it is passing strange that Canada should have a French-Canadian Minister of Justice.

'Mr. Shields an Extremist'—Mr. Rheume, M.P.

In the report of the debate on Thursday, June 18th, Dr. Shields came in for further mention. Mr. Martial Rheume (Saint-Jean-Iberville-Napierville) said among other things in his opposition to the bill to repeal the limitation in respect to service overseas:

"There are some extremists in Ontario also and among them are the chief of the Orange Lodge and the minister, Shields. These two men spoke of the province of Quebec in terms of greater violence towards the French-Canadians of Catholic faith than the French-Canadians themselves would use against the English-speaking people. In Quebec the religious issue has never been raised against anybody in Canada. . . ."

"With regard to pastor Shields, who says that the Roman Catholic Church is a racket, I must say to this gentleman that if he were devoting all his energy to stimulating recruiting and goodwill between the two races, he would promote national unity to a much higher degree than he has done these last years."

The honourable gentleman from Sherbrooke betrays the usual misunderstanding of our point of view. Dr. Shields does not speak against French-Canadians. They are a fine people. He speaks against their ecclesiastical overlords, who would use them for their own ends.

One would almost think from Mr. Rheume's speech that complete religious liberty obtained in Quebec. Those who have tried to do evangelistic work in that province, know how utterly untrue the statement is that "in Quebec the religious issue has never been raised against anybody in Canada."

Mr. Rheume suggests that Dr. Shields would do better "in devoting all his energy to stimulating recruiting". It is not permissible for anyone outside the army to hold recruiting meetings, but those who follow the pages of this paper know that Dr. Shields has done all in his power to stimulate recruiting. He would like to promote national unity, but the man who points out the existence of disunity does not thereby create it.

'Dr. Shields Unpatriotic'—Mr. A. Denis, M.P.

In *Hansard* of the same day another French-Canadian, Mr. Azellus-Denis (Saint Denis), again referred to Dr. Shields and the Canadian Protestant League and the Winnipeg meeting in these words:

"Somebody from Toronto, a man by the name of Shields, who is president of the Canadian Protestant League, said recently in Winnipeg that the Roman Catholic Church is the worst 'racket' in the world and the most dangerous fifth column that has threatened any country in this war. (*Canada*, June 12, 1942).

"And it is not the only statement of this nature he has made. Do you think those statements and publications are to be recommended as a means of promoting patriotism and a friendly understanding among our people and among our neighbours and allies, a considerable proportion of which profess the Roman Catholic faith? And I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that those statements are not from the province of Quebec; harm is done even though a penalty be imposed."

As to fifth columnism we cannot forget the recent riots against conscription in Montreal and the very light penalties given to some of those who took part in them. We cannot forget the seditious words of Mr. Chaloult. The current edition of *Saturday Night* had this limerick signed by one who calls himself "Poor Richard II."

"ECHO OF A DEBATE"

"There was a young man named Chaloult
Who said to his voters: 'It's trout,
If you're fighting for freedom
You send men where you need 'em,
But not if you live in P. Quoult."

Incidentally, we may mention that this quotation occurs on a page on the opposite side of which is a picture of a crucifix hung in a cow shed!

What Mr. Denis meant by "though a penalty be imposed", we must leave our readers to guess. Probably the wish is father to the thought.

Quebec Society Thinks Dr. Shields Seditious.

Though under priestly direction the Society of St. John the Baptist in the province of Quebec is the great lay society of Romanists. One will readily understand, then, their attitude towards Canada's war effort. The following item which appeared in the back page of *The Toronto Evening Telegram* on June 22nd is all the more humorous:

"Ask Attorney-General Con Pastor's Speeches"

"Quebec, June 22nd. The St. John Baptist Society of Quebec City, at a meeting marking its 100th anniversary, last night passed a resolution asking Premier Hepburn of Ontario to have the provincial attorney-general's department study speeches of 'Rev. Shields' to determine if they are seditious or harmful to national unity.

"The resolution did not identify Rev. Shields but speakers indicated they referred to Dr. T. T. Shields, pastor of Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto. Dr. Shields has made several anti-Roman Catholic speeches recently in Western Canada."

We sincerely hope that Attorney-General Conant is a constant and attentive reader of THE GOSPEL WITNESS. We are sure that the perusal of its pages would be a splendid tonic for all members of the Ontario Provincial Government. By his liquor policy we believe that Mr. Hepburn has done the province great harm, but his earnestness in desiring an all-out Canadian war effort we heartily recommend.

But that the speeches of "Rev. Shields", by any stretch of imagination, could be thought "seditious", is possible for only those who are quite unacquainted with his British loyalties and his determination to spare no effort in urging this country, in general, and its government, in particular, to speed up our war programme to carry through with the utmost determination our part against the powerful Axis.

R. C. Protests to Ottawa.

A fuller report of the protest against Dr. Shields' appearance in Victoria than that appearing in Toronto papers, we take from the *Victoria Daily Times* of Wednesday, June 17th.

VICTORIA CATHOLICS ASK BAN ON SHIELDS

Protests against the scheduled appearance here next Sunday and Monday of Rev. Dr. T. T. Shields, head of the Protestant League of Canada, and pastor of the Jarvis Street Baptist Church in Toronto, have been sent by Victoria Roman Catholics to the Minister of Justice, the City Police and to the Army Intelligence Office. The protest to the intelligence office has been made on the grounds that they contend his speeches elsewhere in Canada have been subversive.

Rt. Rev. J. C. Cody, Bishop of Victoria, led the protests with a night letter to the Minister of Justice at Ottawa, to which no reply had been received up to this afternoon. His lead was followed by the 4th Degree Knights of Columbus, who also, according to one of its members, Frank Doherty, protested to the city police.

Service Men Protest

Catholic chaplains in the three services here have received strong protests from Catholic men and officers, who say that Dr. Shields in addressing anti-Catholic gatherings throughout Canada has accused Catholics of fifth column tactics and a subversive attitude towards Canada's war effort.

A Catholic officer at the Gordon Head Officers' Training Camp, who would not be quoted, said there were 7,000 Catholic soldiers and sailors in this military area, and that they were unanimous in their resentment at the public appearance here of Dr. Shields.

Dislike Advertising

City police officials acknowledged receipt of the protests but declined to say what action would be taken.

Bishop Cody also protested to the B.C. Electric Railway Co. against advertising cards regarding Dr. Shields' appearance being carried in public street cars.

"This protest was made," he said, "on the ground that Catholics, forced to use public street cars by reason of gasoline and tire rationing making their own automobiles unavailable, should not have to read advertisements insulting their faith."

The protest against advertising cards in the street cars is really humorous, as all who are forced to look at such advertisements twice a day will well realize.

One may be sure that the above protests were unavailing. Neither Rev. Harold Martin nor Dr. Shields are easily frightened.

During the days spent in Vancouver fifteen great meetings were held before the real League meeting in that city, and up to Friday the total number of new members secured on the present tour by the Canadian Protestant League was eleven hundred, with thousands more people aroused. In fact, the tour has exceeded the utmost expectations, with great crowds and enthusiasm everywhere. The meetings of the Regular Baptist Convention of British Columbia were times of evident spiritual blessing.

Saturday evening, Mr. Martin and Dr. Shields arrived in Victoria and addressed an extra gathering in preparation for seven meetings on Sunday and Monday. At the League meeting Sunday afternoon so many were in attendance that two overflow meetings were held, the congregations of which were reached by loud speakers. The total attendance at that meeting was fourteen hundred. The meeting Monday night, also held in defiance of the Pope, and all his minions, was attended by two thousand persons.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

WILL OUR FRENCH-CANADIAN MINISTER OF JUSTICE INTERN DR. SHIELDS AT THE BEHEST OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH?

A Sermon by Rev. W. Gordon Brown, M.A.

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Sunday Evening, June 21, 1942

"And now, Lord, behold their threatenings: and grant unto thy servants, that with all boldness they may speak thy word,
 "By stretching forth thine hand to heal; and that signs and wonders may be done by the name of thy holy child Jesus."—Acts 4:29, 30.

The war rages on through its third year. Russians by the thousands are dying for us, not only defending their own country but holding Germany back from riches of resource which she requires to conquer the world. In Libya Tobruk fell yesterday, and Hitler's African Corps is pressing toward fertile Egypt and the vital Suez. Australia is threatened with invasion. China is fighting bravely and losing all the time. Gone to Japanese control are the Philippines and the Dutch East Indies; gone is Burma. The intrepid Japs have now occupied one of the best anchorages on the tip of North America, and a submarine has just shelled a point on our own Vancouver Island. The Empire and the United States are planning a western front in Europe, in which effort we shall lose thousands of Canadians. Prime Minister Churchill has flown the Atlantic for conferences of supreme importance with President Roosevelt. The disastrous world situation brings to mind the mighty lament of Jeremiah:

"I looked at the earth, and lo! it was chaos;
 At the heavens, and their light was gone.
 I looked at the mountains, and lo! they were quaking;
 And all the hills swayed to and fro."

Ottawa Fiddling

In the midst of such world shaking, what have we in Canada's capital? A quiet debate on a bill to remove a few words of restriction from the National Resources Mobilization Act, 1940; a bill which puts the power of conscription for service anywhere—and nothing else is really conscription—entirely in the hands of the King Government, which has never favoured conscription; a bill which, according to the Prime Minister himself, is "conscription if necessary, but not necessarily conscription", certainly no such conscription at present, not before next March, and perhaps—or should we say probably?—never. In this quiet discussion members of the Cabinet take part. Hon. Mr. St. Laurent, Mr. Howe and Mr. Thorson speak of Canada's war effort as if it were the most of which this country is capable. Canada has an army of 505,000, but see what we should have if we kept pace with other dominions of the Empire:

Dominion	Population	Per Cent. in Army	Army	Corresponding Canadian Army
Australia	7,000,000	8	572,000	913,000
South Africa	*2,000,000	11½	223,000	1,313,000
New Zealand	1,336,000	14½	238,500	1,656,000
Canada	11,420,000	4.4	505,000	

* White.

Yet the leaders of the King Government point to the advantages of the purely voluntary system. One would think they were speaking against the bill, against con-

scription, instead of for it. Some fifty members from Quebec, led by Mr. Cardin, threaten to vote against the bill, saying there must be no conscription—at least of French Canadians. The other Liberals, the Conservatives, and the C.C.F. are going to vote for the bill because they believe in conscription. Then what will happen? Mr. King will have the matter completely in the hands of the Cabinet, which may do nothing about it. Talk about fiddling while Rome burns. This is playing political poker while the world goes up in smoke.

Where are the men to cry against such dalliance? Who clearly points out the real trouble and the trouble-makers? Who uses language sufficiently strong to make people listen? Who speaks so convincingly as to make those who would block our war effort angry? Who like the pastor of this church, Dr. T. T. Shields, veteran of many campaigns, advocate and example of a free pulpit, defender of the faith, enemy of the liquor traffic, now president and moving spirit of the Canadian Protestant League?

What would his enemies do with such a man? What have the threats of priestcraft ever been against the boldness of testimony? What were they in the story of the Apostles Peter and John we read to-night? What answer did they give, and what answer shall we give? The apostles asked God to look at the threats of the priests and then paid no attention to them themselves. They prayed for holy boldness, ability to speak "the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth", and that with God's help.

I.

Consider, then, THE THREATS OF PRIESTCRAFT.

The Apostles Peter and John performed a miracle at the gate of the temple called Beautiful; and when the people were amazed, they used the miracle like a church bell to call them to listen to the message of the gospel of Jesus Christ and His power to save the soul. At the instigation of the priests, they were put in hold till the next day. That day before the rulers of the Jews, under the presidency of the high priest, they were asked for their authority. Their power was the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, than Whom, they said, there is no other Saviour. Their boldness convinced the rulers that they had been with Jesus. Doubtless they remembered how the Lord had denounced them in that very temple. The miracle could not be denied, for there was the healed man standing by. So they threatened the apostles, told them to be quiet henceforth. They would not promise to say no more; they had to speak what they had seen and heard with Jesus. So the priests added more threats and let them go. "And being let go, they went to their own company"—as people usually do, and the

company held a prayer meeting. They knew they were in the will of God, they remembered that Christ had been opposed as they were now opposed. So they prayed the Lord to "look upon their threats, and grant to thy bond-servants (slaves) with all boldness to speak thy word, while thou dost stretch out thy hand for healing, and signs and wonders come to pass through the name of thy holy servant Jesus. And when they had made request, the place was shaken in which they were gathered together, and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and they went on speaking the word of God with boldness (confidence)." So you see the threats of priestcraft did not stop them. They refused to be put to silence.

But WHY DID THE PRIESTS THREATEN THEM?

A few weeks before Christ had died, put to death by Romans at the instigation of the Jewish leaders. Priestcraft seemed supreme. He Who had said that true worship was spiritual, that rabbinical regulations were of no force, that the temple would be destroyed, that He was greater than the temple, that He was the Son of the God Whom they thought they worshipped there, He was tortured, then hanged, then buried. The priests had had their way. Their ignorance held sway. But Jesus Christ arose, and the verdict must be reversed. Fifty days later He sent the Holy Spirit, Who was the personal power of His followers, Who in them continued the work He had been doing, Who enabled them to show that, far from being dead, He was alive and at the right hand of Power. Priestcraft was challenged. Its tale of a dead Jesus was not true. Its pretence at worship was not in the Spirit. The priests by the apostles were being exposed as wrong.

They were wrong in their past estimate of Jesus. He was no ignorant fanatic, no pious demagogue. He was the Messiah, the Christ of God.

They were wrong in their treatment of Him. They had killed the Lord of life. They had murdered God's last Messenger, while they cried through the people, "His blood be on us and on our children."

They were wrong in their present estimate of Him. He was not dead but alive. He did not have power on earth alone, but also in heaven. He still healed the sick, and that as a guarantee that He could and would forgive sins.

The priests did not want their position and power challenged. They refused to admit they were wrong. They tried to prevent their exposure, and so they threatened those who preached the name and power of Jesus Christ.

Exposing Romanism

Fundamentally, the situation is the same to-day, right here in Canada. Why would Rome and her minions threaten the pastor of Jarvis Street Church? Because *Dr. Shields is exposing the priests*, showing where they are wrong in teaching, in method, in disloyalty to our war effort.

Dr. Shields has exposed their *teaching*. Every Protestant minister ought to do so constantly.

The pastor of this church has spoken against the doctrine of the mass, he has called it what the Book of Common Prayer calls it, idolatrous. That a priest can create the body and blood of the Son of God out of a wafer and wine, is not only absurd, it is blasphemous.

Dr. Shields has exposed their doctrine of purgatory as

a priest-devised racket for getting money out of people. There is no such place as purgatory. The Word of God nowhere describes any such place. It does say there is a paradise and a hell, but something of an impermanent hell through which you may pass to heaven, is never put forth in our only authority on the subject. Prayers for the dead do no good. Nowhere in this Bible do men offer prayers for the dead. Those who have died in the faith of Christ are with the Lord in perfect peace and joy and do not need our prayers. Those who have passed on without Christ are in a darkness separated from the world of light by a great chasm which none can cross; so prayers for them will do no good. Anyway, that priests should have to be paid to pray for the dead is itself absurd even if the Bible did authorize such prayers. It is like a mother asking loan of a neighbour's ladder to rescue her baby from an upstairs room of the burning home she has just returned to, and being asked to pay in advance for its use. Again and again the pastor has described the way the Church of Rome collects fortunes for prayers for the dead as a racket.

He has exposed their withholding of the Bible from the people. Rome says she encourages her people to read the Bible, but actually she does the opposite. She makes it almost impossible for her common people to get a Bible. In how many Romanist homes of this city is there even a Romanist version of the Bible? When I asked a French Roman Catholic recently whether he had a New Testament, he said, "What's that?" When Protestants try to distribute the Word of God even to those of the Church of Rome who ask for it, Cardinal Villeneuve issues a special *communiqué* demanding that such books be not accepted, and if they are on hand, be burned. They must not even be looked at. The priests tell their people that the Bible is a bad book. There is a Cardinal Dougherty, now of Philadelphia, who when he was bishop of the Philippines had thousands of Bibles burned at his Manila cathedral. The priests keep the Word of God from the people so they may not see how far Rome has departed from the faith of Christ.

Not only has Dr. Shields exposed the doctrines of Rome, but he has shown their *method*. Take, for instance, their use of public funds to support Separate Schools here in Ontario in order to teach their religion. They are always asking for more and more of taxes that ought to go only to public schools, and a man like Premier Hepburn says, 'Sure, I'll slip it to you under the table.' If the Romanists want Separate Schools, let them pay for them themselves with church contributions, not out of taxes to which the state has sole right.

Clerical Disloyalty

Of special point just now is the fact that Dr. Shields has exposed Romish *disloyalty* in this war.

Every Catholic owes first allegiance to the Pope. He is supposed to be bulwark of faith and the security of morals. Is this war in a moral cause? Is it just? Are we fighting for liberty and for life itself? Beyond a doubt we are: "We fight for world-freedom." We fight against oppression, tyranny, barbarism. Is the self-appointed guardian of the world's morals with us? He says he is neutral. I do not really believe it, there is too much evidence to the contrary; but for the sake of argument, assume that he is neutral. How can any man, any public man; any religious man, any head of a so-called Christian institution of world-wide extent, be a

good man and be neutral in such a war of justice as this? If the Romanist follows the supposed stand of his supreme pontiff, he cannot be loyal to the cause of freedom to-day.

That disloyalty appears most clearly in Canada in the one province which claims that it is the most devotedly Romanist section of the world. Quebec is behind in enlistment, behind, as far as I know, in everything except in Government contracts for war orders. We had a plebiscite last April, asking the people of this country whether they were willing to release the government from its foolish pledge never to have conscription for overseas service. Quebec said No. The other eight provinces said Yes. In the aggregate the country said Yes two to one. Has Quebec submitted? The Quebec Legislature demanded of the Dominion Government that it do not carry out a conscription policy. Quebec members in Ottawa are demanding that the vote of the country two to one for conscription be ignored and the minority obeyed. Quebec people still think this is a war of Britain and France. France has fallen, so they want Britain and the United States to defend them, while they stay at home and more and more dominate Canada. They desire to make Mr. Godbout's famous words prophecy as well as history: "A little handful of French Canadians . . . dictated its will to the country."

Most even of those who have denounced Quebec's attitude have failed to lay a finger on the cause of the trouble—the clergy of Quebec who completely rule the province. (Let no one say we are against the French Canadians. We are for them. But we are against the priests who rule their lives for their own ends). Dr. Shields has not been so timid. He has told this country that the trouble is Cardinal Villeneuve and his henchmen, the clergy of Quebec. This makes Quebec Romanists angry. Our new minister of justice made his first speech in the House of Commons last Tuesday, and on that point he got quite warm. This is what the Honourable Louis S. St. Laurent said:

"Another obstacle to national unity is the accusation levelled against French-Canadians that they and their leaders, and especially their clergy, are deliberately abstaining from greater participation in the armed forces in order to bring about an increase in their proportion of the Canadian population, an increase in what the Shields and the Silcoxes and even the *Globe and Mail* have been pleased to call 'French-Canada's stranglehold on this dominion.' . . . To impute such thoughts and motives to our clergy is an indignity against which I protest with all the earnestness I can command."

Oh, no, what he calls "my church" and "my religion" could not do a thing like that! Proof? Why, you read something, if not all, of the long pastoral letter sent out from Quebec City by Cardinal Villeneuve and fifty-eight other arch-bishops, bishops and ordinaries, of whom thirty-five were French. That letter, read in all Romish Churches of the country last Sunday or the Sunday before, praised our men of the forces and urged support of Canada's war effort. Cardinal Villeneuve and his clergy in Quebec led the way in a No vote on the plebiscite in Quebec. Quebec now demands that the less than thirty per cent. of the population of Canada which is of French descent have its way and that there be no conscription. For that blocking of an all-out war effort Cardinal Villeneuve is personally responsible. Then he sends out a long letter in part of which is urged support for the war effort. Now just what would be an appropriate name for

a man who acts that way? I leave you to supply it.

From long before the war Dr. Shields has discussed our just cause, has urged an all-out effort, and has therefore been forced to say that the great hindrance is Quebec and its clergy. Thus has he had to expose Romish disloyalty to our great cause to-day.

So you see the threats of priestcraft to-day are fundamentally the same as in the days of the Apostles Peter and John. They were threatened because they exposed the grievous ignorance and error of the priests: Roman priests to-day would threaten Dr. Shields because he is exposing their ignorance and errors in doctrine and method and especially in their lack of loyalty in this our nation's hour of dire peril.

In those early days of the Christian faith, **WHAT DID THE PRIESTS THREATEN?**

They demanded that the apostles speak no more in the name of Jesus, "or else—." The temple authorities had kept these two witnesses to the faith of Jesus in gaol over night. I suppose they threatened longer imprisonment or worse. I suppose they gave political grounds as their reason. They would say that these men were making a disturbance in Jerusalem, that they were undermining national unity in a day when it was greatly needed. To keep the movement from spreading, they demanded silence from the followers of the Nazarene.

What would Canadian Roman Catholic priests threaten to-day?

They demand that Dr. Shields stop exposing Romanism. The French Canadian daily of Montreal called *Le Canada* a week ago Friday called him "Shields the Possessed", "semi-fool", "a case of religious insanity", who ought to be ducked. You have noticed, of course, that if you throw a stone at dogs in a fight, the one that gets hit yelps. The alarming thing is that many who ought to agree with the pastor in his stand against Rome, join with Rome itself in saying, "Stop". Outstanding as a present example is Toronto's one morning daily, *The Globe and Mail*. On Thursday it took Mr. St. Laurent to task for being "illogical", and in doing so quoted part of his maiden speech in Parliament, in which the stand taken by Dr. Shields was coupled with editorial utterances of *The Globe and Mail*, as protesting the increase of "French-Canada's stranglehold upon the dominion." That editorial, however, said nothing further about Dr. Shields: One might have thought the paper, if it could not help his present western campaign for Protestantism, at least would not hinder it. But no, Saturday morning we were treated to an editorial on "Dr. Shields' Crusade", in which his zeal is described as "the bigotry of the Middle Ages". I should like to remind the editorial writer that that bigotry was Roman Catholic. The Knights of Columbus protested the holding of a Protestant League meeting in Victoria to the chief of police. That demand against free speech is just "the bigotry of the Middle Ages", when Rome tried to stifle all free speech. But the editorial ends up by saying the League is all wrong. The League should not attack Roman doctrine.

"It would be more profitably engaged in constructive work for what it believes to be better."

Constructive Destruction

Now there's a word—"constructive". Some weeks ago I wrote to the Canadian Breweries to ask about the use of sugar in the manufacture of beer. I knew nothing about brewing; and so asked where they know. Of

course, I was informed sugar is not used to make beer. That was precisely the point I wanted to know. But the man who replied went on to abuse me, the United Church and all "the dear old ladies" (with sons in the forces, of course) who were concerned about the consumption of liquor in this country. He ended up his angry letter by demanding, "Give us something constructive." Imagine that from a well-salaried employee of the interests that are taking \$232,000,000.00 per year from the 11,500,000 people of Canada for what is worse than waste.

And now *The Globe and Mail* asks the Protestant League to turn its attention "to constructive work". What does "constructive" mean, anyway? When I was small, my father gave me many spankings, but as I look back, I think they were "constructive"; my father was "constructing" character in his son. Is the farmer who puts up fences for the protection of his fields not "constructive"? Is the sounding of a siren to warn that enemy bombers are coming nothing "constructive"? Is the resistance of "French Canada's stranglehold upon the Dominion" not "constructive"? Is it "constructive" to allow our liberties to be lost? Is it "constructive" to sit back as English Canadians prepare to die by the thousands in the defence of this country, while French Canadians stay quietly at home and enjoy their protection without taking their own share of the suffering? *The Globe and Mail* knows better, of course. It is just trying to appease the fourteen per cent. of Toronto's population that is Romanist in such a way as at the same time not to offend the weaker brethren in the Protestant Churches who dislike Dr. Shields for his strong speech. But I come back to this: It is a most unfortunate thing that those who should support the man that speaks out often take the other side, and join with our modern priests in saying to him, "Stop".

Of course, Rome's demands would go much farther than a proposal that Dr. Shields stop. They know too well that he will not stop. So they demand that he be interned. They have done it again—and again. The Romanist press of this province demanded it. It is reported that the late Minister of Justice, Mr. Lapointe, said to Mr. "Tommy" Church that he was considering interning Dr. Shields, and that the latter replied, "Then you'll intern me, too." Now the Rt. Rev. J. C. Cody, Roman Catholic bishop of Victoria, has wired a protest to our French-Canadian Minister of Justice, Mr. St. Laurent, against Dr. Shields' holding Protestant League meetings in Victoria. According to what we heard on the air, he demanded that he be interned, not on religious, but on political grounds, as hindering recruiting by casting aspersion on a large per cent. of Canada's population. For some reason this internment demand did not come out in our papers. "Not on religious grounds"—does anybody outside the Church of Rome believe the bishop when he says that? Dr. Shields is to be interned for breach of the Defence of Canada Regulations. They demand that nothing shall be said to hinder recruiting or to cause disaffection among the forces. Does the man who demands a much more strenuous war effort hinder recruiting? Does the one who shows why so comparatively few enlist from French Quebec really cause disaffection among the forces? It is absurd to think so. There is no ground for interning Dr. Shields in any country where free men still dwell.

The demand that he be interned is characteristic of

the Roman Church. Study their history and you will see that their method of argument has usually been very simple: "Believe what the Pope says, do what the Church demands, or else—". The bloody Inquisition, the right to which Rome has never renounced, shows her way. Rome says she never changes. Nor does she. She here and now wants the man who speaks against her interned by the secular law.

II.

Consider, then, THE BOLDNESS OF TESTIMONY.

It is set forth in the prayer of our text: "Grant unto thy bond-servants, that with all boldness they may speak thy word, while thou dost stretch forth thy hand to heal, and signs and wonders are done in the name of thy holy Servant Jesus."

Here were men who were devoted to God and His Christ, who considered themselves the Lord's slaves. God's will was their command. Peter and John had said to the court: "Whether it is right before God to hear you rather than God, make up your minds; for we cannot keep from speaking the things which we have seen and heard." These men feared God so much they were afraid of none else. Away with men-pleasers from the ministry. God give us more men who, like Dr. Shields, are not afraid to speak in the name of the Lord.

Here were men who would speak fully. They prayed for grace to speak with all confidence, with all boldness. The word used means literally "saying all". They would tell the whole story. You cannot do that without speaking both negatively and positively. "Not . . . but . . ." is the method of Scripture: "Not many gods (or patron-saints), but one God; not many priests, but one High Priest; not many sacrifices (as in the mass) but His one sacrifice; not by works, but by grace alone." That was the way they preached. So we must speak against Rome's perversion of the gospel and for the truth as it is in Christ.

These men had divine aid. God's hand was stretched forth to work wonders. When they prayed; they were filled with the Holy Spirit, and so could speak with boldness. This is God's work we are in. After all, "the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through (or, to) God unto the pulling down of strongholds, casting down reasonings and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ, and having in readiness to avenge every disobedience when your obedience is fulfilled."

Dr. Shields' Stand

Consider Dr. Shields' stand against which Rome is so angry. We may describe it in three words.

First, *biblical*. He stands for the Bible, as originally written, as the infallible Word of God. The Christ therein depicted is very God. He offered once for all a full expiation for the sins of the world. That is the gospel. Salvation, then, is by grace without the works of the law.

Second, *Baptist*. The fundamental postulate of Baptists is individual responsibility to God: "So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." From that follows logically full liberty of conscience. That means freedom of speech. It also means the right of every man to worship God as he pleases. Individual responsibility is never complete without separation of church and state. In Quebec Rome is the state church. A crucifix hangs over the speaker's chair in the Provincial Parliament Building in Quebec City. But Canada,

thank God, has no state church. Yet Rome tries to give the impression to the world that this country is Roman Catholic. That was why they contrived to hold mass in the entrance to our Ottawa Parliament Buildings and sent pictures of the event around the world as if that were a state occasion of religion. It must never be if we would be free men. If Rome were the state church, we should be like Spain where one is not allowed to import a Bible.

Third, *British*. The pastor of this church believes that by the providence of God Great Britain has a great part to play in the destinies of a free world. She has been a bulwark of world freedoms. Hers is the mother of parliaments of free men. There "freedom slowly broadens down from precedent to precedent". Mr. St. Laurent had the temerity in Parliament to brand English-speaking Canadian loyalty to Britain as colonialism and a hindrance to Canadian unity. Canada is a full member of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Where would a nation of eleven and a half million be in a world struggle without protection of larger powers? Who have kept the Nazis from seizing Canada like a sugar-plum? Who but Great Britain? This is a poor time for a Minister of Justice, even though he be one of the petted and pampered French minority, to talk about "colonialism".

We in this church stand with our pastor for traditional British liberties and loyalties, for Baptist freedom of conscience and of speech, for biblical Christianity as alone sufficient.

The Meaning of "Christian"

But what is Christianity? I was asked that yesterday. Christianity is the faith and practice of those who trust themselves to Jesus Christ as the divine Saviour Who made full expiation for their sins, and as the Lord Whose presence directs them by His Word, while they await His return as the ultimate hope of the world. Are you a Christian in that sense?

Christianity is Christ. In the context of our story He is "the Holy and Just". He alone lived a perfect life. He who sees Him sees God. He is the "Prince of life". He rules heaven and earth. All authority is His. He gives life to those who come to Him. "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." For this to be so He became the Sufferer. All our sins were laid on Him. The penalty of the world's iniquity was met and paid at the cross. He is God's Child, His Servant, the only Mediator between God and men. There is no other way to God than by Him. "I am the way, the truth and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me", He said.

What, according to this same context, must you do to be saved, to become a Christian? You must repent, you must be converted, that is, turned right about face. Sin you must forsake, the Saviour you must accept. "But suppose I don't." Then there is no hope. Moses wrote of Christ as God's great Prophet: "Him shall you hear according to all things he will speak to you. And it shall be that every soul who does not hear that prophet shall be destroyed from the people." It is to hear Christ or to perish. It is Calvary or condemnation. It is Jesus or doom. No, there is no other way. "And neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." Friend, you must be saved. Here is the one way of salvation. It is the name of Christ, Jesus as the alone Saviour.

Is Protestantism Blasphemy?

We have before us a copy of what is called *Fellowship*, the Monthly Bulletin of the Canadian Conference of Christians and Jews, in which the director, Dr. C. E. Silcox, writes "Thoughts on Religious Liberty." In this regard he says:

"To-day we seldom invoke the laws regarding blasphemy, but they have been invoked in recent years in Quebec, and fairly recently the postmaster-general denied to a certain book-store in Toronto the use of the mails. This store had been importing and selling books which were alleged to attack rather vehemently one of the churches in Canada. In much the same way, Jehovah's Witnesses who are accustomed to attack all and sundry communions were, a few years ago, shut off the air."

It is unfortunate that the ban on the North Toronto Bible House, 2721 Yonge Street, of which Rev. Edwin J. Taylor is the proprietor, should be here classed with that on Jehovah's Witnesses. Jehovah's Witnesses are illegal in Canada, not because of their religious opinions, to which they are perfectly free, but because of their anti-British and seditious utterances.

Furthermore, why does not Dr. C. E. Silcox name the Roman Catholic Church instead of saying "one of the churches in Canada"? It would be a shame for his readers to think that anyone was selling books attacking the United Church of Canada, of which Dr. Silcox is such an important member!

The store to which he referred, and which we have named, was not denied the use of the mails "for importing and selling books" of a certain character. The book, note the singular, to which the postmaster took violent objection, the store had neither imported nor sold since it was banned in Canada. The store was accused of circulating a tract advertising the book—a circulation for which it was never responsible. Anyway the book itself was simply an exposure of Roman Catholic institutions, an exposure which, unfortunately, has to be made, but against which Rome has succeeded in using the office of the postmaster-general, who is a prominent Liberal. That the whole thing is most unfair has been shown before, and Mr. Taylor is, in a business way, a martyr to the cause of freedom in Canada. So that friends may buy Bibles, hymn books, religious books and gospel tracts from him, we repeat his address: 2721 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ont.—B.

Vandalism in Westboro Traced to Catholics

"The police informed me to-day of the names of the vandals who recently desecrated our church building by destructive and by unprintable ways. The report of the police and my own investigation establish the fact that the vandals were three Roman Catholic boys who attend the Roman Catholic Joan d'Arc School and Church in this community.

"To replace the things damaged or scratched would entail a cost of at least \$150.00. When I visited the homes of these boys, I soon discovered that one of the homes, at least, was too poor to pay for the damages. Our church furniture is not insured against such vandalism.

"This is a case for the Juvenile Court, but I am going to ask a few more questions before any further action will be taken. How these people in Roman Catholic darkness need the light!"

(Rev.) Robert E. J. Brackstone.

UNION WITH ROME

Pulpit and press these days seem filled with kindly sentimentality toward the Roman Catholic Church. Readers of THE GOSPEL WITNESS have been kept informed from time to time of these docile sentiments. According to these Protestants without a protest the great desideratum of our day is that all who profess and call themselves Christian should unite whole-heartedly, whether they be Modernists or Evangelicals, Established Church or Free Church, Greek or Roman, Protestant or Catholic. The outstanding achievements of church union toward which, we are told, Protestantism is rapidly coming is to be union with Rome.

It is remarkable that such innocent fulminations are all from one side. Rome shows no disposition to unite with Protestantism though she constantly invites those whom she thinks to have strayed from her fold to return. But to return to Rome is always to submit, that is, submit mind, heart and soul to the Pope. In spite of this unyielding fact the torrent of abuse continues against those Protestants who still believe in protesting, upon those who deny and denounce the blasphemous claims of the self-designated successor of Peter; while any movement that does in any way bring closer cooperation between Catholics and Protestants is hailed as an expression of the very heart of Christianity.

On Saturday, June 6th, 1942, "The Observer" in *The Toronto Daily Star*, whom we understand to be Rev. Dr. Salem Bland, published another characteristic article about

"an announcement made by the Rt. Rev. Geoffrey Fisher, bishop of London, that a joint committee of two societies, one representing at once the established Church of England and the Free Churches, and the other representing a recognized Roman Catholic organization, 'The Sword of the Spirit,' had agreed to seek 'the co-ordination of the work of the churches in the large area of common ground without raising the ultimate questions of church order and doctrines which divide us'."

"The Sword of the Spirit"

We rejoice that at last "The Sword of the Spirit Movement" has convinced even Dr. Bland that it is "a recognized Roman Catholic organization". That is an achievement. The movement began as an attempt to foster the spiritual aims of the war. Its opening meetings in England were under the patronage of the Free Churches and the Roman Catholic Church. Presently, however, voting membership in the movement was limited to Roman Catholics and the movement became a "recognized Roman Catholic organization".

When the opening meeting of the movement in Canada was held in St. Michael's Parish Hall, Toronto, last winter, this humble Baptist dared to attend, especially when the meeting was announced as an open forum where questions might be asked. We counted the assembly, and aside from the fine Glee Club of fifty young people, there were just about two hundred. Bishop Nelligan, chief Canadian Roman Catholic Padre, was the principal speaker. Outlining the methods of the movement, he stressed acts of penance, masses and other characteristic Roman Catholic devotions. When opportunity was given for questions a man in R.C.A.F. uniform arose and asked if he were welcome at such a meeting since he was a Jew. He was assured that he was. I arose

and asked whether membership in the movement was limited to Roman Catholics and was told that it was not. I then rose a second time and asked whether membership as extended to non-Romanists was in the Constitution. The Bishop then looked up the Constitution and said that Protestants were allowed only associate membership. He assured me, however, that this Constitution was only provisional. Following the meeting I sent him this letter:

November 3rd, 1941.

Bishop Nelligan,
Roman Catholic Chaplain,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir:

I am the young man who asked the question at the Sword of the Spirit Movement meeting last week relative to the restriction of the membership of the movement to Romanists. You assured me, on my second inquiry, that the rule which excluded all others was only provisional. Other information received was to the effect that the constitution to which you referred was the "revised" one, and so that others than Romanists were specifically excluded from full membership.

Further, a phone call to me the other day was to inquire whether it were true that in the forces there is one chaplain to every five hundred Roman Catholics with one to every thousand Protestants. When I replied that this was true, the man asked what reason the Romans gave for this. This I should like to know in order to pass on the information.

Believe me,

Very truly yours,

(Signed) W. Gordon Brown.

I received no reply, and so wrote again, but no reply came.

"Primitive and Vital Christianity"

But that, however, in which Dr. Bland rejoices is that Romanists and Protestants in the Old Country are to work together "without raising the ultimate question of church doctrines which divide us". The Observer feels that in such "brotherly work"

"they will find that the differences between them are, after all, not part of a primitive or vital Christianity and can still, if desired, be kept as gymnastic exercises to keep their controversial muscles supple".

And what is "primitive or vital Christianity"?

"We can all hold ourselves open to fresh light, but it seems to me incontrovertible that what our Saviour and Lord has set His heart upon is set forth in Matthew XX, 21-46—feeding the hungry, clothing the destitute, giving shelter to the homeless and friendship to the lonely.

"That, it is dead certain, was the main thing in primitive Christianity, and it will likely keep us busy for a quarter of a century at least. By that time we shall probably know more about what is really vital in Christianity. Till then a truce to controversy about church polity and doctrine."

So Christianity is simply social service: it is "feeding the hungry, clothing the destitute, giving shelter to the homeless and friendship to the lonely". Certainly in a world like ours, and particularly in time of war, such humanitarian efforts are necessary, and where needed and given, most welcome. The Law and the Gospel are both social in their results, but when did social service become the be-all and end-all of Christianity? Since when did the first commandment cease to be, "Thou

shalt love the Lord thy God", and become, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour"? We always thought that was the second commandment, and so consequent and contingent upon the first.

But since Dr. Bland thinks that the heart of Christianity is found in Matthew 25: 31-46 (which is certainly the reference intended), let us examine that passage. Far from teaching that the centre of Christianity is social service, it teaches rather that the centre of Christianity is the person of Christ. The picture turns around the Son of Man (verse 31). He is twice called the King (verses 34, 40). The destiny of a man is determined by his personal relationship to Him.

Arch-symbols!

This Son of Man is associated with angels (verse 31). Probably Dr. Bland will agree with Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick when in his *Modern Use of the Bible* he says on page 129:

"I believe in the nearness and friendship of the divine Spirit, but I do not think of that experience in the terms of individual angels."

Modernists do not believe in angels. They are supposed to be symbols, and so in the Church of England liturgy honest Modernists would have to say, "With symbols and arch-symbols we praise Thee!"

This passage in Matthew deals with the second coming. We should be greatly surprised to learn that Dr. Bland believes in it as a future historical fact, but there is little doubt that he agrees with the late Dr. W. Rauschenbusch who in his book on *Christianity and the Social Crisis* states on page 160, "We look to indefinite continuance of the present world." We still remember the series of pamphlets called *The Christian Hope* issued for the Department of Social Service and Evangelism of the former Methodist Church of Canada about 1924. In number seventy-five we were told regarding the second coming: "This is a spiritual coming, not a visible, audible return." Of course, Jesus really taught the second coming, literal, audible and visible. Matthew 25 makes that perfectly clear, but you cannot quote Matthew 25 as to the meaning of Christianity if you do not believe what it says.

This same chapter teaches a final judgment with Jesus as the Judge. Since when did Modernists revise their eschatology to get that in?

We have before remarked that the standard of judgment here is one's personal attitude towards Christ. Notice the number of times that the personal pronoun is used of Him. Of course, this attitude is expressed in one's attitude toward His brothers, that is toward those who have the same Father, toward believers. But however expressed, it is primarily one's personal relationship to Christ that determines one's destiny.

Furthermore verse 46 of this chapter deals with eternal punishment. Since when did Modernists abandon the larger hope for that strongly Scriptural doctrine?

Such doctrines as the second advent, final judgment, hell, according to Dr. Bland are only for "gymnastic exercises". According to the Scriptures they are the foundation of faith and morals.

How Far Apart?

But really, we are told Protestants and Catholics are not far apart:

"The fact is that the two great divisions of Christendom are not divided on the really great and essential

doctrines about God and the Trinity and our Divinely-human Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, nor as to what a true Christian is like."

Yes, Protestants agree with Catholics in the doctrine of the Trinity, but they revolt most heartily at making Mary a goddess, which to all practical purposes is just what Rome has done. They object most heartily to this and that hero of the Roman faith being little gods—patrons saints they are called, but in effect they take the place of the various heathen gods to be resorted to for this, that and the other thing.

True, Protestants and Roman Catholics do believe "in our Divinely-human Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ", if by Divinely-human we may mean God-man, as Modernists do not mean. But what about this God-man? Did He finish the work of salvation? Did He offer a satisfactory atonement for our sins, or must His sacrifice be repeated a myriad of times in the Mass? Can we get through to Him? Is He accessible, or must we go to Joseph, Mary, Michael and no end of saints?

Protestants and Catholics are supposed to agree "as to what a true Christian is like". On some of the fruits of holiness they may agree, but, fundamentally they are miles apart as to what constitutes a true Christian. The true Christian believes that God alone, by His grace, is his Saviour, and the Roman Catholic believes that salvation is attained by works.

Accordingly the differences between us on a "primitive and vital Christianity" are very great. They are as high as the heavens and as deep as hell.

We welcome cooperation with Rome as far as she will cooperate in efforts for social betterment of our country, but the idea that Romanists and Protestants may unite, can be carried out, according to Rome, only when Protestants submit to one who is blasphemously called "Holiness". — W. G. BROWN.

Jarvis Street Church

With Dr. Shields on his present western tour in the interests of the Canadian Protestant League, members and friends in Jarvis Street look forward eagerly to his Sunday morning telegrams of news of the great work in which he is engaged, together with personal greetings. There was a good congregation last Sunday morning and a very fine one in the evening. A man and wife were baptized in the evening. The sermon appearing elsewhere in this edition was delivered, and the people were enthusiastic in backing the pastor to the limit in his present stand. After the service we sent him a telegram to say so again.

Many visitors were present from out of town, from California, Illinois, Oklahoma, British Columbia, Nova Scotia, Quebec, etc.

Jarvis Street Church is greatly enjoying its new hymn books, which prove a treasure house of devotion in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs.

Next Lord's day is the first day of what is being celebrated in Canada as "Army Week." We believe that everything possible should be done to encourage our men in the army for the tremendous task before them. Jarvis Street Church is all-out for the war. Accordingly, we have thought it fitting to have a salute to the flag at both the morning and evening services. The subject for the evening service will be "The Flag—and God."

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 6 Third Quarter Lesson 27 July 5, 1942

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

THE BIRTH AND CHILDHOOD OF CHRIST

Lesson Text: Luke 2:1-40.

Golden Text: "For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord."—Luke 2:11.

Reading: Luke 1.

I. Christ and the King—verses 1 to 7.

Luke the beloved physician, speaking by inspiration of the Holy Spirit, describes for us two contrasted scenes; the audience chamber of a great Emperor and the humble resting-place of a little Child. The Emperor would soon lose his power, but the Child was destined to rule the world for ever.

Caesar Augustus sat on the throne in the royal palace in the Imperial City of Rome, and there he probably signed the decree that all the inhabitants of Palestine should be enrolled in their respective ancestral cities. The census would serve as a basis for future taxation. It is interesting to note that, humanly speaking, the place and manner of the Saviour's birth were determined by an official decree of the Roman Government, and likewise the place and manner of His death (Matt. 27:26; Heb. 13:12). And yet, the Roman nation was but an instrument under the direction of the determinate counsel of God (Acts 2:23; Gal. 4:4).

Christ was born a King (Matt. 2:2; John 18:37) of the house of David (Matt. 1:1). Mary His mother and Joseph his legal father both belonged to the line of David. All down through the ages the prophets had declared that the Messiah should belong to the royal tribe of Judah (Gen. 49:10; Num. 24:17; Isa. 11:1; Heb. 7:14), and to the house of David (2 Sam. 7:13-16; Isa. 9:6, 7; Matt. 22:42; Rev. 5:5). Although crowned with thorns in mockery by His foes (Matt. 27:27-30), the time would come when He would ascend the throne and reign in everlasting glory (Lk. 1:32, 33; Acts 2:25-31; 1 Cor. 15:24, 25; Rev. 11:15).

Christ was born of a virgin (Isa. 7:14; Matt. 1:18-25; Lk. 1:27, 34, 35), the seed of a woman (Gen. 3:15; Gal. 4:4). The Incarnation of the Son of God is a holy mystery and a holy miracle. He Who had existed from all eternity came into this world as a little child (John 1:1). He was Son of man as well as the Son of God. He took upon Himself the form of man, that He might also take upon Himself the sin of man (Phil. 2:5-9; Heb. 2:14).

The infant Saviour was laid in a manger, though not in a stable, as we understand that word. Many of the primitive houses of Bethlehem are built over caves which are level with the road, the room above being reached by a flight of steps. The caves are used as stables for the animals, the stone troughs or mangers being cut out of the rock. It is quite possible that the Nativity took place in one of these cave-rooms, and that the upper rooms, usually offered to travellers, were all occupied.

II. Christ and the Shepherds—verses 8 to 20.

God chose angels as His messengers to proclaim the joyful news of the Saviour's birth. The angels worship Him as Christ the Lord (Heb. 1:6). They were associated with Him throughout His earthly career; at the annunciation (Lk. 1:26), at His birth, after the temptation (Matt. 4:11), in the Garden (Lk. 22:43), at the resurrection (Lk. 24:4) and in His ascension (1 Tim. 3:16). They will accompany Him when He comes again in glory (Matt. 16:27; Mk. 8:38).

The revelation of the appearance of Christ in the flesh was made to faithful, reverent, watchful shepherds. Such read His power and glory as displayed in the heavens. In the solemn stillness of the night they meditate upon Divine things. The shepherds on the Judaeian hills hearkened to the wondrous proclamation from heaven because their ears were not deafened by the clamours of earth (Psa. 46:10).

The tasks of the shepherd illustrate various aspects of the work of Christ. The prophets declared that the Messiah

would be a Shepherd to His people, feeding, guiding, protecting, seeking and saving them (Psa. 23; Isa. 40:11; Jer. 31:10; Ezek. 34:23), and Christ confirmed their words (Matt. 9:36; 15:24; Lk. 19:10; John 10:11-18). He is described as the Good Shepherd (John 10:11), the Great Shepherd (Heb. 13:20) and the Chief Shepherd (1 Pet. 5:4).

The message of the Saviour's coming is the Gospel, the good news of great joy. Christ came as the Light and the Life of the world: the Light to banish darkness, sorrow and sin; the Life to triumph over death and the grave (John 8:12; 11:25, 26; 1 Cor. 15:54-57). He Who was called the Man of sorrows (Isa. 53:3) is also the Man of joy (Heb. 1:9; 12:2).

Inasmuch as the shepherds believed and hastened to obey the message delivered to them by the angels, they saw the Lord. What a blessing they would have missed if they had doubted the reality of the Divine revelation! The obedient heart shall know the truth (John 7:17). To the anointed eye the Babe of Bethlehem is Christ the Saviour, Jehovah God (Lk. 10:22, 23; 1 Cor. 12:3; 1 John 4:2).

When by faith we really see the Lord, thanksgiving and praise will rise spontaneously to our lips, and we shall hasten to testify of His grace to others (Mk. 5:18-20; John 4:39; Acts 1:8).

III. Christ and the Priests—verses 21 to 24.

The Lord Jesus Christ, consecrated as the eternal holy Priest, and made not after the law of a carnal commandment as the Levitical priests, but after the power of an indissoluble life, in His humility became subject to the ministrations of the earthly priests of the temple (Heb. 7, 8).

For our sakes the Saviour was circumcised (Gen. 17:9-14), throughout His earthly life obeying in every detail the law, which He came to fulfil (verse 39; Matt. 3:15; 5:17, 18) and from the bondage of which He redeemed us (Rom. 8:3, 4; 10:4; 1 Cor. 15:56, 57; Gal. 3:11-14; 4:4, 5). For our sakes He was given the name JESUS, the Deliverer, the Saviour (Isa. 7:14; Matt. 1:21; Lk. 1:31). For our sakes He was presented in the temple after forty days, and for our sakes the offering consisted of turtle-doves and pigeons, the sacrifice of the lowly (Lev. 12:8; 2 Cor. 8:9).

IV. Christ and the Prophets—verses 25 to 40.

Christ came to earth not merely as the King and Priest, anointed of God, but also as the Prophet of the Lord, the One Who should declare to men the Word and the will of the Father (Psa. 40:6-8; John 1:1, 18; 4:34; 6:38; 14:9, 10). He was the "Word of the Father, late in flesh appearing." And yet, He Himself was the subject of the prophecies of others; of Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Simeon, Anna and many others (Deut. 18:15; Isa. 9:6, 7; Jer. 23:5, 6).

Simeon's prophetic song of praise manifests wonderful faith. He saw God's salvation when he saw the Saviour. Christ came as a light to the Gentiles, who formerly were in the darkness of ignorance concerning God, and as a glory to Israel, who already possessed a measure of light.

Simeon's prophecy that Christ was appointed for the fall and rising again of many, and for a sign to be spoken against, indicates that Christ is the touch-stone of every life. The heart attitude to Him determines the destiny of each one. To some He is the Rock upon Whom they fall, broken, humble and penitent. Such will rise again, exalted (Lk. 14:11; 1 Pet. 5:6). To those who are disobedient and impenitent He becomes a Stone of stumbling and a Rock of offence, over Whom they stumble, and fall, the Rock falling upon them in judgment (Isa. 8:14, 15; Lk. 20:17, 18; 1 Pet. 2:7, 8). To such He is the sign spoken against. The decisions of men regarding Christ reflect their inmost thoughts.

Anna, the aged prophetess, also recognized Christ as the Messiah, the Redeemer for Whose coming the faithful remnant in the land had waited in eager expectation. May every heart be prepared to receive Him as Saviour and Lord!

Stop, Look and Live

Under this title one of the zealous young men of Jarvis Street Church has published a gospel leaflet of four pages, which we can supply at 35c a hundred. This tract has a good gospel appeal.