

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 3581.

Registered Cable Address: Jarwitsem, Canada.

Vol. 21, No. 10

TORONTO, JULY 9, 1942

Whole Number 1051

Canadian West Answers Quebec

Subject of Addresses by Dr. Shields and Rev. H. G. Martin

in Jarvis St. Church, Thursday Next, July 16, 8 p.m.



Part of crowd at meeting in Jarvis St. Church, Sept. 16, 1941, protesting Pontifical Mass on Parliament Hill.

Condemns "Attempts at Fascism" in Canada

Rev. Dr. T. T. Shields Attacks Roman Catholic Hierarchy

PRAISES RUSSIANS

(Following is the report of a great meeting under auspices of the Canadian Protestant League in Edmonton, Alberta, taken from the *Edmonton Journal*, Thursday, July 2, 1942. A similar report, in the *Edmonton Bulletin* of the same date, follows.)

Condemning any move to establish a Fascist state in Canada, Rev. Dr. T. T. Shields, pastor of Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, and president of the Canadian Protestant League, lashed out at the Roman Catholic hierarchy when he addressed a crowded meeting in the Masonic Temple, Tuesday night.

Approximately 700 people attended the meeting, packing the auditorium, balcony and aisles. Hundreds were turned away.

Rev. H. G. Martin, Toronto, superintendent of the Yonge Street mission, who is accompanying Dr. Shields on his tour of western Canada, opened the meeting.

Appealing for support for the League in the form of increased memberships, Dr. Shields said it was required "to provide a body of public opinion that would impress itself on appeasing politicians and bring about the will of the majority instead of permitting continued dominance by the Roman Catholic Church in Canadian affairs as exemplified in Quebec."

Telling of thousands of people who had attended meetings in eastern Canada and in British Columbia, the speaker said people were "surfeited with the domination of Quebec" in Canadian affairs.

Dr. Shields praised Russia's achievements in this war and referred to that country as "the saviour of the world." He said that he was not saying that everything done in Russia was right. "My judgment, however, is that since Russia has been at war, we have seen that no nation has been so grossly misrepresented and libelled as Russia," he said.

Dr. Shields blamed the destruction of the Russian monarchy on the Greek or Eastern church, which was the dominating church in Russia. This church, like the Roman Catholic church, was "pagan", and the revolt in Russia was the natural reaction from oppression by the church.

The purges which had been carried out in Russia by Stalin were to rid the country of Red generals who were dangerous fifth columnists willing to sell out their country to Germany.

Russia "Saviour"

"Russia has proved under God the saviour of the world," said Dr. Shields. "Why did Hitler not attack

Britain with his legions, after the fall of France? It was because he heard the growl and knew he had first to destroy the Russian bear.

"We should have been overwhelmed before this if it had not been for the intervention of Russia," he said.

Referring to the Sirois Report on dominion-provincial economic relations, Dr. Shields asserted it was a "di-

abolical scheme to mortgage the whole dominion in the interests of the Roman Catholic church."

Referring to the federal action against the Ontario Conservative leader, Dr. Shields said: "I think the man who should be interned is the minister of justice. I charge him with making subversive statements." The minister was reported to have stated that it was no part of a per-

son's duty to fight for his country anywhere but at home, he said.

The League was the outgrowth of protests against the great Catholic pontifical mass that was held on Parliament Hill, Ottawa, he said.

Raps Vichy Relations

He criticized the maintenance of diplomatic relations between Vichy and Canada.

"When Prime Minister King says the British government wants a Vichy representative in Canada, I must say that I don't believe him," said the speaker.

He denounced any move that would mean a Fascist state here.

"Who rules Canada?" the speaker asked. "King George VI or Cardinal Villeneuve of Quebec?" He said the answer was that the Roman Catholic hierarchy rules the country by the use of its influence over politicians, the press and businessmen.

"I do not condemn the individual Roman Catholics," said Dr. Shields, "doubtless many of them are serving in the armed forces of this country. But Roman Catholicism at bottom is a system of government. It does not ask or permit anyone to think."

Hitting out at Prime Minister King, Dr. Shields said "the politics of the prime minister have made him the most contemptible figure in the public life of the empire."

Dr. Shields charged that Quebec had put the brakes on Canada's war effort. Premier King, while he obeyed

JARVIS ST. AUDITORIUM

Thursday, July 16, 8 p.m.

Canada's Fifth Column and the Fourth Axis Power Exposed

The answer of the West to Quebec's sabotage of National Unity in Canada

will be the subject of addresses by

DR. T. T. SHIELDS & REV. H. G. MARTIN

on their return from a tour of the West

the Quebec minority in regard to conscription, "pulled the wool over the eyes" of the rest of Canada by saying conscription was not necessary.

"The Liberal party in Canada now is the Roman Catholic party," he said. "The Conservatives applaud that. Yes, the Liberals are the Roman Catholic party and the Conservatives want to be."

"I voted for the prime minister in the last election," he said. "It was the least of two evils. The leader of the Conservatives was a Roman Catholic. The premier's chief lieutenant was a Roman Catholic. It was a case of 'heads I win, tails you lose,'" he said.

"Eyes on Quebec"

Both parties had their eyes on Quebec's 65 seats in the house of commons, he declared.

The speaker said Quebec was "a natural breeding ground for the Roman Catholic church." The aim was to win an "empire" in the west and French-Canadian children swarmed west like locusts to establish "Little Quebecs" in Manitoba and Alberta. The migration and rate of population increase threatened in 30 years to reduce Protestants to a minority.

He dealt with maintenance of the French tongue which was "encouraged as a separatist device", while these schools "catered to the Roman Catholic church."

Dr. Shields said "there are thousands of people who call themselves Roman Catholics who would be horrified if they knew what their church really stood for." He said French Canadians, if left to themselves, would be just as loyal as English Canadians.

Dr. Shields described Catholicism as the fourth Axis power, as as great an enemy of Britain as Germany, Italy and Japan.

He linked the Roman Catholic church with Fascists and Naziism and said a purge of the liberal elements of the Roman Catholic church was carried out in Germany to pave the way for the rise of Hitler.

Dr. Shields, in blaming the destruction of the Russian monarchy on the Greek church, said this church, "like the Roman Catholic church, was pagan." He described it as not a religion of reason and with nothing in common with the religion of Christ. In his opinion, the Roman Catholic church is "paganism in the darkest and densest and most virulent form." . . .

Dr. Shields, attacking the Roman Catholic church, charged that the Spanish Civil War was instigated and financed by the Vatican and that more than 1,000,000 lives were sacrificed for the rule of Rome in Spain.

Axis Leaders

"There is not one Axis leader in Europe who was not baptized a Roman Catholic and is not a Roman Catholic still," he declared.

In all the enemy occupied countries, including Czecho-Slovakia and Belgium, the hand of the Pope was to be seen, he said.

Speaking of Laval as the "reptile in human form" in France the speaker said the Pope had expressed his approval of Marshal Petain.

Nearly all the isolationists and non-interventionists in

the United States, such as Father Coughlin, were Roman Catholics, said Dr. Shields.

All along, the Roman Catholic church had been against Britain, the speaker asserted. This had been demonstrated in the south of Ireland in the last war. He expressed gratification that there was a loyal north of Ireland, or otherwise the whole of Ireland would be neutral in this war.

Through the loyalty of the north of Ireland, British and American troops were stationed there and prepared to play their part in the war with the Axis powers.

"There is no more loyal spot in the British Empire than in the north of Ireland," he said.

Says Japan Blessed

Japanese paganism had been blessed by the Pope and Vichy had received the Pope's blessings, he said.

"I wonder why I have not received the Pope's blessings! However, I am far happier under the Pope's maledictions than under his benedictions," said Dr. Shields.

Dr. Shields also declared that England never had been more prosperous than in the period when the Pope cursed the country.

"I am here to plead the rights of the majority in this country. It is about time those rights were recognized," said Dr. Shields.



Roman Catholic Altar in Main Entrance to House of Commons, Ottawa, Sept. 14th, 1941.

R.C. Church Is Attacked By Dr. T. Shields

Appeal was made Tuesday night to a capacity audience at the Masonic Temple by Dr. T. T. Shields, Pastor, Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, for increased membership in the Canadian Protestant League to "provide a body of public opinion that would impress itself on appeasing politicians and bring about the will of the majority instead of permitting continued dominance by the Roman Catholic church in Canadian affairs as exemplified in Quebec."

Dr. Shields said the Canadian Protestant League was formed in protest against the great Roman Catholic pontifical mass that was held on Parliament Hill, Ottawa, a celebration held to announce to the world that Canada was a Roman Catholic country.

"The people of Canada are surfeited with the domination of Quebec," stated Dr. Shields as he told his audience of the thousands of people who attended his meetings in Eastern Canada and in British Columbia.

"DIABOLIC" SCHEME

He asserted that the Rowell-Sirois report on dominion-provincial relations was a diabolic scheme to mortgage the whole of Canada in the interests of the Roman Catholic church and the province of Quebec.

Referring to the charges against Lt.-Col. George Drew under the Defense of Canada Regulations, Dr. Shields said,

"The man who should be interned is the Minister of Justice. I charge him with making subversive statements." The minister was reported to have stated that "it was no part of a person's duty to fight for his country anywhere but at home," he said.

He was critical of the maintenance of diplomatic relations between Vichy and Canada, and added that "when Prime Minister King says the British government wants a Vichy representative in Canada, I must say that I don't believe him."

Dr. Shields condemned any move to establish a Fascist state in Canada.

CAPACITY AUDIENCE

An audience of 700, that filled every seat on the main floor and balcony and overflowed on to the auditorium stage and crowded the aisles of the hall, heard the anti-Catholic speaker repeat charges he has made in his tour across Canada—that the Roman Catholic hierarchy constitutes the fourth Axis power, and that it is attempting to rule the world temporarily as well as spiritually. Chairman of the meeting was Rev. H. G. Martin, Toronto, superintendent of the Yonge Street Mission, Toronto. Hundreds failed to gain admission to the hall.

Dr. Shields charged that people in Quebec were dominated by the Roman Catholic Church, and through that domination it was the settled policy of the church's hierarchy to take possession of the whole Dominion for the church. Gradually that was being done, he asserted.

"Who rules Canada," asked Dr. Shields, "King George VI or Cardinal Villeneuve of Quebec?" He answered the question by saying that the Roman Catholic hierarchy rules the country by use of its influence over politicians, the press and businessmen.

VOTED FOR KING

"I voted for Prime Minister Mackenzie King in the last election," continued Dr. Shields. "It was the lesser of two evils. The leader of the Conservatives was a Roman Catholic. It was a case of 'heads I win, tails you lose'. It makes little difference. The Liberal Party of Canada is the Roman Catholic party, the Conservative party wants to be," Dr. Shields stated.

Both parties, he added, have their eye on Quebec's 65 seats in the House of Commons.

He charged Quebec with having put the brakes on Canada's war effort and said Prime Minister King, while he obeyed the Quebec minority in the matter of conscription, pulled the wool over the eyes of the rest of Canada by saying conscription was not necessary.

"The direction of Canada's affairs in recent years," stated Dr. Shields, "stamps Mr. King as the most contemptible statesmen in the British Empire."

Denying any personal quarrel with 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."

He said the French Canadians, if left to themselves, would be just as loyal as English Canadians.

DEADLY 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. Dr. Shields charged.

"We are fighting Germany, Italy, and Japan," Dr. Shields stated, "but we ought to be fighting the fourth Axis power, the Roman Catholic Church."

Quebec, said Dr. Shields, was a natural breeding ground for the Roman Catholic church, whose French-Canadian children swarmed westward like locusts to establish "Little Quebecs" in Manitoba and Alberta. This migration, and the present rate of population increase, threatened, in 30 years, to reduce Protestants to the minority.

He said the maintenance of the French tongue was encouraged as a separatist device, while their schools catered to the Roman Catholic Church. So great was this catering by the schools that Premier Godbout of Quebec had stated that the Que-

bec educational system must be broadened to provide education other than for the priesthood, Dr. Shields stated.

Linking the Roman Catholic Church directly with the Nazis and Fascism, Dr. Shields said that through the agency of Franz Von Papen, German ambassador, a purge of the Liberal elements of the Roman Catholic church in Germany had been made to pave the way for the ascendancy of Hitler to power.

He said the whole advance of Fascism "is simply Jesuitism on the march. It is Roman Catholic action."

LAUDS RUSSIANS

Dr. Shields paid tribute to the marvelous achievements of the Russians in the present conflict, and added that, while he did not agree with Stalin, he "thanked God daily for the successes achieved by His armies."

"It was well for the British Empire and democracy that Hitler knew he had to destroy the Russian Bear before attacking Britain after the fall of France," he said.

He said that no nation had been more grossly mis-represented than Russia. He blamed the destruction of the Russian monarchy on the corruptness of the Greek Church, the dominating church in Russia.

This church, he said, like the Roman Catholic Church, was Pagan. It was not a religion of reason, and still less had it anything in common with the religion of God in Christ. The Roman Catholic Church, he said, was paganism in the darkest and densest and most virulent form, and primarily political.

He said the revolt in Russia had been the natural reaction from oppression by the church, and that purges staged by Stalin were to rid Russia of formidable fifth columnists in the pay of Germany.

The five year plans started by Stalin were to prepare the people for the conflict with Germany, which the Russian leader knew was unavoidable. The hardships endured by the Russian people during the five year plans hardened them and made them fit to vanquish the German hordes, Dr. Shields stated.

SAVIOUR OF WORLD

"Russia has proved the saviour of the civilized world," stated Dr. Shields, "and after this war Russia will be the most fruitful missionary ground in the world." —Edmonton Bulletin, July 2, 1942.

PROTESTANT TRUTH SOCIETY

There is increasing unrest concerning the pro-Roman faction now installed at the B.B.C. Is it not shameful that the former Director of Programmes, Sir Cecil Graves, is now raised to the highest seat in the organization, and naturally nothing gets through reflecting on Romanism as a national danger? . . . With distortions of history and controversial matters introduced in the *Listener* and at general religious broadcasts and services, there is undoubtedly an anti-Protestant atmosphere.—*The Churchman's Magazine*, June.

ROMMEL'S THRUST IS HALTED

Dr. Shields Refused Right To Use City Hall

RUSSIANS COUNTER-ATTACK, THROW NAZIS BACK

WOULD CREATE HATRED, SAYS MAYOR ROSS

Permission to hold a meeting in the Fort William civic auditorium on Monday evening at which Dr. T. T. Shields of Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, was to speak, was refused by Mayor C. M. Ross today.

WHO RULES CANADA...

"Does King George VI or Pope Pius Rule Canada?" was the advertised topic of Dr. Shields' address scheduled for the auditorium. It has been announced now that Dr. Shields will speak on the same subject under the auspices of the Protestant League at the Prince of Wales Rink Monday at 8 p.m.

"There is no catering on my part in any shape or form," declared the Mayor in an interview today with Rev. W. C. Tompkins, Fundamental Baptist Church, Fort William, who about two weeks ago paid for the rental of the civic auditorium at the city clerk's office on behalf of the Protestant League.

Mayor Ross said he was a Protestant and he maintained that a man was justified to worship his God in any way he saw fit without persecution. He pointed out that the civic auditorium was maintained by both Catholics and Protestants.

WHAT'S TO BE GAINED?

"What is to be gained to hear another man's religion torn to pieces?" asked the Mayor.

"Dr. Shields does not go after the fellow, but the system because it interferes with politics," replied Rev. Mr. Tompkins.

Mayor Ross reaffirmed his stand that it was not a personal matter with him. He said he felt sure that Dr. Shields' address would create racial hatreds, and the civic auditorium, supported by all, was not the place for such an address. Mayor Ross suggested a private hall or the church pulpit for the address.

The Rev. Mr. Tompkins said in his opinion that the Mayor's refusal to permit the address in the auditorium would

create more dissension and trouble than if it had been allowed. He said the meeting had been advertised and the Catholics could stay away.

Mayor Ross said he would have no objections to Dr. Shields speaking in the auditorium provided he did not stir up racial differences. The Mayor gave Rev. Mr. Tompkins a written statement of his refusal to allow the meeting to be held.

(Reprinted from the *Daily Times-Journal*, Fort William, Ontario, Saturday, July 4, 1942).

Dr. Shields Denied Use Of Auditorium

Declaring that he had no assurance that the address would not cause "religious embitterment" at a time when all citizens should "strive toward unity," Mayor C. M. Ross today announced he had denied use of the city auditorium to Dr. T. T. Shields, head of the Canadian Protestant League, for an address Monday night.

Rev. W. C. Tompkins, of the Fundamental Baptist Church, said that owing to the cancellation of the auditorium, Dr. Shields will speak at the scheduled time at the Prince of Wales rink.

Outlines Reasons

Outlining reasons for his action, Mayor Ross sent the following letter to Mr. Tompkins:

"I regret to inform you that the permission you received to hold a public meeting in the auditorium of the City Hall on Monday evening, July 6th, 1942, to be addressed by Dr. Shields of Toronto, Ont., must be cancelled, due to the fact that you were unable to assure me when I interviewed you today, Friday, on my return from Toronto, that the address to be given would not be such as would create religious embitterment, in our city.

"In cancelling the permission which you received, I am using my prerogative as mayor of the city of Fort William, feeling that, in so doing, I will be carrying out the wishes of all fair-minded citizens who believe as I do, that our religious belief is something sacred to each and every individual, and as our civic auditorium is the property of all taxpayers regardless of their creed, I feel that an address such as was advertised to be delivered by Dr. Shields, would be ill-becoming to a civic auditorium.

"Our first duty I feel, as good citizens, is to strive toward unity, wherein lies our strength at the present time, and anything that would tend to create disunity, or inharmony should surely be frowned upon as unpatriotic."

Tompkins' Statement

Mr. Tompkins issued the following statement:

"Mayor Ross of Fort William, stating that he would use his prerogative as mayor, cancelled a contract made by the Canadian Protestant League for the use of the Fort William City Auditorium on the night of July 6th.

"Asked for his reasons the mayor issued a statement charging Dr. T. T. Shields with causing religious dissension, and saying he wished to avoid bloodshed at the meeting."

Mr. Tompkins, speaking for the League, stated he had hired the Prince of Wales rink in Fort William, where the meeting will be held at the advertised time. Mr. Tompkins said he had made the contract in good faith, and spent a large amount on advertising, hence, it was hardly fair, to say the least, to expect new arrangements at this late hour.

Join the Canadian Protestant League

French Quebec Enlists about 1 in 100, Other Provinces 4 or 5 in 100

In the endless debate of our Parliament at Ottawa on the removal of the restrictive clause in respect to compulsory military service in the Mobilization Act, French-Canadians have said again and again that their beloved province is doing its share. Those who know, simply do not believe that. We propose again to prove conclusively that it is not true.

In *Hansard* of June 24th, the enlistments in the province of Quebec since the war began were said to total 74,415, of which 36,235 were judged, by their names and language spoken, to be French-Canadians. (On July 1st the Minister of National Defense made a slight correction in the figures:

"The figures of enlistments in the Province of Quebec given do not include enlistments in the four counties of Gatineau, Hull, Pontiac and Temiscamingue, which are in Military District No. 3."

This, however, does not invalidate the point of the following argument.) French-Canadian enlistments approximate half of those in the Province of Quebec. One has only to recall, however, the fact that that province is far from being only half French, to realize how poor is this French showing. The 1941 census, as published, does give the population of Quebec, but it has not been given out in terms of national origin; so that for our proportionate figures we must go back to the 1931 census, which for present purposes is near enough, we suppose. According to that tabulation, out of a total of 2,874,255, only 432,726 were of British origin. Those of British origin formed about 15 per cent. of the Province; those of other than British or French, 6 per cent.; which left the French proportion at 79 per cent. of the Province. From indications, we believe that it is quite probable that the French proportion is now considerably larger. But even if it were the same as in 1931, out of a total of 74,415 men enlisted in the Province of Quebec since the war began, the French share would be 57,787, whereas it actually is only 36,235, or less than 49 per cent.

We must remember, in accounting for the preponderance of enlistments of other than French-Canadians in the Province of Quebec, that some Quebec regiments came to the city of Toronto to complete their quotas. These things must be regarded in estimating Quebec's part in the war, even when we have figures for enlistments per thou-

sand population. For Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, the enlistments per thousand is 49.5; for Ontario, 42.6; for Quebec, only 20.4, or less than half those for Ontario. The average for the other provinces than Quebec is 44.7. From Quebec's 20.4, to find the French proportion, one must make such deductions as would bring it to less than 10 per thousand of the French population of Quebec. (If Ontario's population were not 8.7 per cent French, its proportion would doubtless be higher).

The whole situation reminds us of the new man at the lumber camp. After some time, the old sawyer said to his new mates: "Young fellow, I don't mind giving you a ride, but don't drag your feet!"

It is time there was great plain speaking in this matter; and among the plainest speaking done in the House was a speech on June 24th by Hon. George S. White, member for Hastings-Peterborough, who said:

"No longer are the eight other provinces of Canada going to be dominated by the Province of Quebec. If this matter is to come to a showdown, the sooner the better. Does any member believe that when the war is over, and the boys overseas return, they are going to be dominated by a province which refused during the war to make an equal contribution to the common cause?"

Mr. White said further that if Quebec members persist in their course there will be left in the Dominion of Canada "such a legacy of hate, distrust and suspicion that no sitting member in this House will ever again during his lifetime see even a semblance of unity in this country."

"We have heard much about national unity, but apparently the view of national unity held by Hon. members from Quebec is that the other eight provinces must bow to their will. For years the province of Quebec has held the balance of power in this Dominion, and they have used that position for their own benefit. I for one say that the end has come."—B.

Is This British Justice?

The Minister of Justice selected by Prime Minister

King for this country is a lawyer who has long practised in a province ruled largely by canon law rather than by British justice. He is a French-Canadian who defends the insularity of French Canada in refusing to lend full support to the Canadian war effort. He is a Roman Catholic who calls heartfelt and hand-expressed loyalty to Great Britain colonialism. His name is Honourable Louis St. Laurent.

The Leader of



The Height of Something or Other

—Courtesy of *Saturday Night*.

the Opposition in the Provincial Legislature is a man who was a colonel in the last war, who directed gun fire from the front line until he was seriously wounded. Back in his native land he has practised law under the British system. This old soldier has been "all-out" in his advocacy of the most effective prosecution of the war of which Canada is capable. In such interests he ventured publicly to criticise army administration both before and after the issuance of the Crown investigation of a matter. And now the French-Canadian Roman Catholic Minister of Justice, who is half-hearted in his support of Canada's war effort, is prosecuting an old soldier who is nobly doing his best to help Canada to help win this war.—B.

Would Conscript Quebec Residents

Doctor Shields Says Ottawa Policies Are Dominated By Eastern Province

(From the *Star-Phoenix* of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, of Thursday, July 2, 1942, we reprint this report.)

"If I were Prime Minister of Canada, I would enact conscription and apply it to Quebec," the Rev. T. T. Shields of Toronto told a capacity audience in the Regent Theatre, Wednesday night. "I am proud of being a Canadian, but I am ashamed of our Government for its conscription policy," he continued.

Dr. Shields declared that if anyone should be prosecuted under the Defence of Canada regulations, it was the minister of justice, who had told the French-Canadians that they need not defend Canada beyond the shores of this country.

The speaker declared that the Canadian Government policies were dominated by Quebec. "The Liberal party is the Roman Catholic party of Canada," he asserted and added, "and the Conservative party wants to be. There is not much to choose between them."

He said the politicians "want to sell us out to Rome" and asserted there was a need for a Protestant League, independent of all the parties.

The Rev. H. G. Martin, advance agent of Dr. Shields, opened the meeting with hymns and prayer. He charged that the *Star-Phoenix* had refused to print an advertisement of the meeting in the form it was submitted. On June 15, he said, he had submitted to the *Star-Phoenix* an advertisement on the subject, "Who Rules Canada: Pope Pius XII or King George VI?" In Calgary on Monday he had received word from the newspaper that the advertisement could not be carried in that form.

"Is the *Star-Phoenix* under the thumb of the Roman Catholic Church and frightened of Rome?" asked Mr. Martin.

There were cries from the audience of, "Yes!" and "Sure it is!"

The speaker declared that the press was frightened of the Roman Catholic Church.

For extra copies of this and other numbers of *The Gospel Witness* and Protestant League literature, write:

THE GOSPEL WITNESS,
130 Gerrard St. E., Toronto Canada.

Dr. T. T. Shields in Vancouver Great and Enthusiastic Gathering

By Rev. W. M. Robertson

Over two thousand people crowded into St. Giles United Church on the night of June 23rd, and hundreds could not be accommodated, when Dr. T. T. Shields gave a masterly address on the deadly danger confronting Canada from the subtle schemes of the Romish Hierarchy to control our national life. From the frequent bursts of applause it was evident that the speaker was interpreting the feelings of the people, and that a great undercurrent of resentment against the encroachments of Rome was finding expression. His masterly exposure of the Sirois Report, with its barefaced attempt to fleece the other Provinces in the interest of Papal-controlled Quebec, was an eye-opener to many. There was a great response to his appeal for members for the Canadian Protestant League, and we are determined that the enthusiasm generated by the meeting will not be allowed to evaporate, but will be consolidated in a permanent way by the formation at an early date of a branch of the League in British Columbia. As was to be expected, Dr. Shields did not forget to give a positive gospel emphasis to his message. He made it plain that the only answer on the religious side to the errors of Rome was a presentation of the glorious gospel of the grace of God. It was a memorable occasion.

Jarvis Street Church

Jarvis Street Church is eagerly anticipating the return of its Pastor next Lord's Day. Let us all pray that it may be a great day in Zion. All start best who begin with the Bible School at 9.45. This scribe will preach at 11 a.m., and Dr. Shields will preach in the evening after a five-week tour of the West in the interests of the Canadian Protestant League. Rev. H. G. Martin who was co-speaker with Dr. Shields on this trip, will also speak, Sunday evening. Dr. Shields said in his telegram of last Sunday that he felt there is a tremendously strong rising tide of Protestantism in the country; those attending next Sunday will feel some of its lift.

Last Lord's Day was a good one, especially for a July Sunday when many are away. There was response to the invitation in the morning, and new members were received in the evening. Baptism will be administered next Sunday morning. We have had many visitors of late, from Fort William, North Bay, Kapuskasing, St. Catharines, Sudbury, Quebec City, Richmond, Va., Ellwood City, Penna., etc. —B.

The Editor's Regina Address

The great audience at Regina were promised that Dr. Shields' address in the City Hall, July 2nd, would appear in this week's issue of *THE GOSPEL WITNESS*. It has been found impossible, however, to get the text ready for inclusion in this issue, but it will appear without fail (D.V.) in the issue of next week.

Dr. Shields' Sunday Evening Subject: RESPONSE OF THE WEST TO THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

OUR FLAG—AND OUR GOD

A sermon by Rev. W. Gordon Brown, M.A., preached in Jarvis St. Baptist Church, Sunday evening, June 28, 1942

"Jehovah-nissi (The Lord is my banner)"—Exodus 17:15.

"In the name of our God we will set up our banners"—Psalm 20:5b.

Loyal hearts of brave men kindle at the sight of the flag. No braver hearts are anywhere than those which serve under the Union Jack. It is the symbol of the combined England, Scotland and Ireland who have led the world in religion, in freedom, in culture. Here is the banner of an empire on which the sun never sets, the British Commonwealth of Nations. Here are unity and brotherhood, sacrifice and service, purpose and determination. Ours is a glorious history. We love peace, but once roused we fulfill the poetic figure of the Song, "terrible as an army with banners".

Over the B.B.C. a tale of real heroism was told the other night. A certain Polish legion fought at Warsaw, but when the city fell, escaped through southern Europe, and got to France to meet the Huns again. At the time of the French collapse they were fighting as rearguard in protection of certain French troops. Their own colonel saw the case was hopeless and ordered a corporal and a half dozen men to bury the battle standard. They did, but the corporal and all but one man were killed. He was taken prisoner. He thought all was over. He was utterly down-hearted, till he heard of continued resistance in England: Poles were fighting with the British. This Pole was being taken from France to another prison camp in Germany, and from the train managed to escape. He made his way to where his battle standard was buried, and by night dug it up. French peasants hid him. Next day he spent trying to clean the symbol of his lost legion. It has a cloth banner a yard square, mounted on a standard of five feet length, and the whole surmounted by a large Polish eagle. This man determined to take the emblem to England. Once just outside of a French restaurant he accidentally stuck the pole into a German. He saluted smartly and apologized, and his fear that 'his number was up' was relieved when he was let go. Somehow he crossed the channel. The old standard now rests in a baronial hall in Scotland, together with many other old and honoured emblems of victories past and future. Just below the eagle of Poland on this battle standard is a small box sealed, containing the battle honours of its legion. When the war is over, that is to be opened and the story of this Pole's bravery for his flag to be added to the contents.

Please God, the flag of Poland will fly again over a free land. Please God, the Union Jack also shall fly in all the seas and on all the continents when the swastika is obliterated.

I said, "Please God", for I would speak to you of another flag, more ancient, more mighty, flying over a wider kingdom and assured of more glorious future. This flag is invisible, yet every Christian has seen it. With this standard goes all authority. To this banner gather the redeemed of all ages against its enemies—for it has many and strong ones. It has led mighty hosts in triumph. It has been set up as a trophy upon the very

fortifications of its enemies again and again. It has never been hoisted in reverse to signal distress. It has never been struck in surrender nor had another above it indicate conquest. It is the signal of best direction. It is the sign of ultimate victory. It is most conspicuous for those who have the eye to see it. In Hebrew it is called Jehovah-nissi, which in English is, "The Lord is my banner". Under it the faithful join with David: "In the name of our God we will set up our banners."

I.

Consider these two texts. The former teaches us that **THE LORD IS A GOD OF WAR.**

"The Lord is my banner." This was a name Moses gave to an altar he built in the wilderness when God, in answer to his prayer, gave Israel the victory over the fierce Bedouins who fell upon them. God was the author of many victories for His ancient people. They called Him "the Lord of hosts", for He was Captain of their host, and His were the hosts of heaven. They said of Him, "The Lord is a man of war". When in the travels in the wilderness the ark of God was taken up, Moses said:

"Rise up, Lord, and let thine enemies be scattered;
And let them that hate thee flee before thee."

God fought for Israel and with Israel. But you must not confine God's authorship of wars to Israel and the land of Palestine. In Isaiah heathen Cyrus, the great Persian conqueror who united Persia and Media, then swept across Asia Minor from east to west, then turned back to take Babylon, is called by God "My shepherd". Jeremiah refers to the same thing, and tells how God summoned the nations against Babylon, "the kingdoms of Ararat, Minni, and Ashchenaz", lands that knew Him not. God sent an angel with a flaming sword to guard the gate of Eden, and many times since have His angels carried swords and led hosts and made war.

The story of the fight with Amalek, together with much else in the Word of God, shows us that **THERE MAY BE RIGHTEOUS WAR.** Moses, who knew God's will, sent Joshua with chosen men to fight with these Amalekites. A victory was gained while Moses prayed, but the war then begun was continued off and on for centuries and that at the command of God.

This was an *unprovoked attack*. "Then came Amalek, and fought with Israel in Rephidim." Israel did not start it. Amalek did. As Moses later reminded his people, they smote the hindermost, they cut off all the feeble, they came when the nation was faint. Israel may have seemed to them to be occupying the only fertile stretch in that part, which they specially claimed as their own, now called Wady Ferein; but Israel would not stay, for they were on their way to the promised land. Amalek started the war, but Israel, under God, finished it.

The analogy with the world war of to-day is obvious. Berlin radio says constantly: "Britain started this war,

but Germany will finish it once for all." What a lie! We did not want war. We were unarmed. America did not want war, but let us fight on for months, and came in only when attacked herself at Pearl Harbour. What shall we say of the smaller nations? Did Poland want war? I remember hearing a pacifist professor years ago speaking of the text in Zechariah, "The Lord shall be a wall of fire round about Jerusalem", say, in effect, that the peaceful intentions of Holland and Denmark made them secure. Did they? None of these people wanted war. Even Russia did not start in. Every man of truth knows who started this terrible war. It is a war of defence.

But carry on the story of Amalek and see that here there was *divine vengeance pronounced*. Moses called his altar, "The Lord is my banner", for he said:

"Because a hand has been raised against the throne of the Lord,

The Lord has war with Amalek from generation to generation."

When Amalek touched Israel, he touched God, he lifted his hand against the throne of the Lord. To dare God is to be fought. The destruction may not be at once, it may take generations, but divine vengeance is pronounced. Years later Moses reviewed the matter and charged Israel not to forget. Centuries later Saul was sent to execute the fierce wrath of God upon the sinners the Amalekites. David fought with the remnants of the people. In the days of Hezekiah a small number had got to Mount Seir, and there a band of men of Israel went and ousted them.

We have again been treated in the press by supposed intellectuals to the pacifist nonsense that says the way to draw up a peace is to forget the offences of the enemy and demand no price. That is not the divine way. Mr. Churchill is right when he speaks of the sword of justice in our hands. You have heard, perhaps, of the Dutch officer who was being tortured to elicit military information of value to our enemies, but who would not tell. "Then we shall bring in your daughter and dislocate her arms," said the inquisitors. And they did. I shall not name the crimes of Nazidom, they are beyond naming, they are more than we can count and they multiply every day. Shall they go unpunished among the nations? Shall this nation which less than a generation ago cast the world into the pit of destruction, do it again a few years from now? I remember the words of the psalmist, "In the name of the Lord I will destroy them." Yes, there has been, there is to-day, a righteous war.

But see how it must be managed. According to the example of the story before us, **THE SPIRITUAL LEADERS MUST PRAY FOR VICTORY**. Moses sent Joshua and picked men to fight, but he had even more important work to do than wielding the sword in a just cause.

He went up to the top of the hill, whence, I suppose, he could see all. How we need our hill-tops in this war! To rise above the bad news, to see things in perspective, get nearer God. In prayer, private and social, get up on the hill.

Moses took the rod of God in his hand. That was the rod on which a miracle had been performed at Moses' call, when it became a serpent and then a rod again. That was the rod he held when he called for plagues on Egypt, that was the rod with which he would presently bring water from the rock in the wilderness. **It was the sign**

of his commission. Christ was the Sent One of the Father. He pleads before the throne for us. He pleads the blood He shed in fulfilment of His commission to be the Saviour of men.

Moses held up his hand, which means, I suppose, he prayed, for prayer is "lifting up holy hands without wrath and doubting". We need guns, planes, tanks, ships, ammunition, manyfold more than we have; but supremely we must pray. If divine vengeance is to be done, God's remembrancers must take no rest and give Him no rest till He accomplish His purpose in the earth.

And Moses had helpers. Aaron his brother and one named Hur, an associate of Aaron, went along, and when Moses grew weary, they held up his hands until sundown. Our Saviour pleads before the throne. He has given His churches pastor and teachers to lead in spiritual exercises. But they need helpers, ones to hold up their hands, and specially in the matter of prayer for victory. Do not sin against the Lord in ceasing, either at home or when we gather together, to pray for victory for our arms.

When Moses hands were up, Israel prevailed. It was a righteous war. The spiritual leaders prayed for victory. Then the tide turned. So must we now believe that **GOD WILL ANSWER**. The war with Amalek was a mere skirmish beside the battles of to-day, I know, but what are earth's mightiest battles to an Almighty God? You mature men who are Christians pray to the God to Whom you prayed at your mother's knee, but your conception of Him is much larger. God is infinite. He is beyond our human minds. If we reckon the vastness of the scene to-day, let us know that our God is over all and beyond all. God answered Israel's representatives. He is still a God of war. Nor has He lessened His interest in this world of ours one whit. Effectual, fervent prayer still avails much. God can still answer.

When He does, **THE VICTORY MUST BE REMEMBERED AS FROM HIM**. The one in our story was.

God had answered. The altar was built in remembrance and called "The Lord my banner". I believe that already in this war God has answered the prayer of His people. Dunkirk is an instance. The entrance of Russia into the war on our side is an answer to prayer with help which we hardly dared expect just over a year ago now.

And the *God* Who did answer, *would answer* Israel. There had been a skirmish, but God promised, "I will utterly blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven." There would be other battles, till at last Amalek was finally out. God has helped us in this war. When the news is bad, do not think He has left us now. He will answer our prayers, He will deliver this world He made from the scourge of the evil that threatens it. When He does, may it be in such a way that all will see His hand, and men will unite in a great hymn of praise:

"Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us,
But unto Thy name give glory,
For thy mercy, and for thy truth's sake."

II.

"The Lord is my banner", and therefore, "In the name of our God we will set up our banners." If our former text taught that the Lord is a God of war, this other teaches us that **FAITH IN GOD FINDS ASSURANCE OF VICTORY**. The story back of the former is a national

escape, but here in the twentieth psalm is a national anthem, and as such it was read to-night. Our line from the poem sums up the thought of the lyric. Look at the psalm itself and see.

The eye of faith looks about and sees HUMAN PERPLEXITY. It was a "day of trouble". The nation seemed cast down. They needed help, support in the plan to win victory. The nation was seen in its king. The second person singular of the first five or six verses is the Lord's anointed, presumably David. Strong enemies are against him. They have an initial advantage, they seem to have won the day. They have equipment that seems superior to that of the army of this king. In it they trust. Israel had only infantry in David's day, though Solomon broke the divine command against it and multiplied horses till he had chariot cities for his fourteen hundred chariots. The Syrians whom David had to meet were well equipped with chariots, for on one occasion David took a thousand chariots and on another slew seven thousand men that fought in chariots. They were the tanks of ancient warfare, and, to soldiers accustomed to fight on foot only, utterly terrifying, especially when armed with scythes attached to the axles. "Some are strong by chariots and some by horses", said our singer.

Well, to-day the Russians still use horses when the terrain will not hold tanks, and with real success; but we have used modern science to devise engines of war far more terrible. I do not suppose we can imagine the hell that dive bombers, tanks, flame throwers and all the rest can and do create. Our enemies are well armed. They have been arming for a long time. After Dunkirk we had next to nothing in land equipment, and an air force relatively small. Truly, it was and is a "day of trouble", a time when we need help.

But where does faith look for help? Faith looks about and finds helplessness and perplexity, but then faith looks up to see DIVINE POWERS. Against horses and chariots, the vision of faith sets the name of the Lord our God. What is His name? Not so many letters nor syllables. The name of God is something you can neither spell nor pronounce. He has many names, but what is the name? It is the divine character, all the attributes of power, wisdom, love; holiness, righteousness, mercy; of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit: it is this character as revealed to man. It is not just the power of God nor the wisdom of God nor the kindness of God; but it is all those and all the rest combined in His revelation of Himself on our behalf. Against such a name what use are chariots, what strength have horses? They had no effect when Pharaoh's army followed Israel into the Red Sea, and the sea, at divine behest, closed over them. Against such a name, what resistance is there in armour? Goliath had the best of his day, but David said: "I come to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom thou hast defied"; and down went the giant at the hands of a mere boy with a sling and a smooth pebble.

Here is the true ground of confidence. I thank God for the help of Russia. Humanly speaking, where should we have been to-day without that mighty nation? I thank God for the United States of America. Speaking from our limited knowledge, whence should we have derived the tools of war without this arsenal of the United Nations? I thank God for all the United Nations, large

or small, but in the last analysis we cannot trust any one of them or all of them together. Where did David get his help?

"The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble;
The name of the God of Jacob set thee up on high,
Send thy help from the sanctuary,
And support thee out of Zion".

Whence comes victory?

"He will answer him from his holy heaven
With the saving strength of his right hand."

The earthly sanctuary, central symbol of the divine presence, is gone; but the Lord still hears, the God of covenant grace still defends. Heaven is still holy, His right hand is still capable of mighty deeds of salvation. Spurgeon has a witty commend on the phrase "help from the sanctuary": "Men of the world seek help out of the armoury, or the treasury, or the buttery, but we turn to the sanctuary." We need armour, and treasure (the new budget brings that home to us!), yes, and butter, but our chief need is "help from the sanctuary"; we must have divine powers to aid us.

Faith, I have said, sees human helplessness around and divine powers above ready for the emergency. Then is PRESENT CERTAINTY, and there cries the voice of faith, "Now I know". In our psalm, first the people pray for God's deliverance. Then one cries, "Now", in "the day of trouble"; "now", when prayer has been offered; "now", when sacrifice has been made upon the altar, "now", before the battle is joined; "now", before the victory is won; "now I know". It is the voice of assurance, it is present knowledge of what is yet to be. "Now I know that the Lord (literally) has saved his anointed". Faith speaks as if it were already done. The psalmist means the future, of course, he means, "will save", but to him it is an accomplished fact.

A close friend of my father's tells how "in Sault Ste. Marie a few years ago, a Salvation Army officer of (his) acquaintance became greatly burdened for his unsaved son away from home, whereabouts unknown. He gave himself to prayer on a certain day, until the Holy Spirit put a great assurance in his heart. Two days later he received a letter from his boy, to this effect: 'Yesterday I was on the train going from Toronto to Windsor, when it suddenly struck me that I was going to hell as fast as the train was taking me to Windsor. I could not shake it off, so I knelt down on my knees in the railway coach and asked God to save me.' Later enquiry, like that of the Capernaum nobleman, discovered that the boy's experience on the railway train was 'at the same hour, in which Jesus said unto him (the father), Thy son liveth.'"

God still gives the assurance of faith in individual cases. Why not also now, as in David's day, in the case of the nation and the Empire and the United Nations? Then the vision of trust in God enabled Israel to say of the enemy:

"They are bowed down and fallen;
But we are risen, and stand upright."

Still, even with the assurance, the people continued to pray:

"Save, Lord:
Let the King answer us when we call";

or as the old Greek version turns it:

"O Lord, save thy King,

And answer us in the day when we call upon thee." So may we gain the inward assurance of victory, and yet continue to sing our National Anthem,

"God save the King",
"God save us all".

Thus "in the name of our God we will set up our banners". Because of what God has revealed Himself to be, we may rest confident of victory by His help.

But let us make personal application of our texts.

I appeal to you who are Christians: Let the Lord be your banner. Really declare yourself. Some of you are believers in heart, but you have never come out openly for Christ. Do so to-night. Do so to-morrow at home, at work, in recreation, in all life. Declare yourself on the Lord's side, and against all that is against Him. It may be a hard battle, it probably will be. But remember "the Lord my banner", and persevere for Him. Take a position of complete allegiance to Jesus Christ and stand by it. Let nothing, let no one oust you from it. Then you can set up your banner, claim the victory, in the name of the Lord. Then you will stand with others of like precious faith. Of the Messiah Isaiah says, He "shall stand for an ensign to the people". Christ is the rallying point. He is in this church. We preach no other. We stand by one another because we stand with Him. Come and stand with us.

To you who are not Christians I also appeal: Make the Lord your banner. There is no other Lord like Jesus. He alone is worthy. All must bow to Him. Accept Him now. His name is the only way to real life here and hereafter. It is the greatest honour a mortal can have

to bear His name. 'Yes,' you say, 'I know it is an honour to follow Christ, to serve under His banner; but I have not the strength.' But He gives the strength. It is in the name of the Lord that you can set up a banner on the very fortifications of the enemy, whatever your personal enemy is.

"Jesu's tremendous name
Puts all our foes to flight;
Jesus, the meek, the angry Lamb
A Lion is in fight."

Do you feel the Spirit of God calling you into the army of the Lord to-night? Do not resist.

"Whoso has felt the Spirit of the Highest
Cannot confound nor doubt Him nor deny:
Yet with one voice, O world, though thou deniest,
Stand thou on that side, for on this am I."

Sunday Telegrams From Dr. Shields

Winnipeg, Man.,
July 4, 1942.

Since my telegram that appears in the current issue of THE GOSPEL WITNESS we have spoken in Regina to a packed City Hall Auditorium, and on Friday in the Walker Theatre, Winnipeg, to 1,500 people. Notwithstanding the limited capacity of the buildings in which the meetings were held—three of which were not half large enough for the crowds that gathered—we have addressed during the week, from Monday to Friday, at least 5,000 people. Over 500 signed memberships, with many hundreds to be sent direct to Toronto. Week's receipts approximate \$1,000.00 for all meetings. Great spiritual power. Every place visited like inlets about the seacoast, showing the steady rising of the tide. As the whole creation groans, waiting to be delivered, and as many other countries in time past have longed for deliverance from the yoke of Rome, so we believe all Canada is groaning in prayer for deliverance from the rule of the Hierarchy of the Italian Church.

We are anticipating a good service with Mr. Cunningham, Sunday morning, and another great crowd in the theatre in the afternoon. We leave Sunday evening for the Fort William meeting on Monday, where Romanists, by their opposition, have greatly assisted in advertising. I am eagerly anticipating being in Jarvis Street both services next Sunday, and in Massey Hall at 3.00 in the afternoon. Mr. Martin and I solicit the prayerful and practical cooperation of the whole church family in the Massey Hall meeting. We are both extremely tired, but extremely happy, too. With oceans of love to you all, and soliciting your continued prayers.

T. T. SHIELDS.

July 5.

Glorious meeting this afternoon, with largest Winnipeg crowd yet. It was a great triumph. Love to all.

T. T. SHIELDS.

Wire From Rev. Harold G. Martin

Winnipeg, Man.,
July 4, 1942.

Miss V. Stoakley,
Jarvis Street Baptist Church,
Toronto.

This is a personal wire sent without Dr. Shields' knowledge, to pay my personal tribute to the greatest man I have ever known. His thoughtfulness of others during this long trip, together with scores of personal interviews with pastors and those in trouble, strengthening and encouraging them, over and above the many great services, have made his visit to the West a benediction to thousands. Like Paul, "in labours more abundant, in journeyings often, in weariness and watchings," he never thinks of his personal comfort, but is spent and being spent for others. He has been kind and thoughtful to me, giving me credit to which I am not entitled. First Thessalonians 2:4 can truthfully be said of Dr. Shields:

"But as we were allowed of God to be put in trust with the gospel, even so we speak; not as pleasing men, but God, which trieth our hearts."

Earnestly pray that God will spare him for many more years of active service—no man more necessary to Canada.

HAROLD G. MARTIN.

Quebec's Illiteracy

It must be admitted that Quebec is Canada's most illiterate province. That point is not open to argument: it is simply a fact. This fact was brought home in a press despatch of July 4th from Montreal, which spoke of an unprecedented rush of boys and girls in their 'teens, seeking employment in factories and stores in that city:

Those between 14 and 16 must be able to 'read and write fluently', according to the Industrial and Commercial Establishments Act. So to qualify for the permit, the boy in this age group must produce proof of age and pass a superficial literacy test set by the inspectors.

"A surprising number of those applying to-day can scarcely do more than sign their own names, even after attending school for several years," commented Mr. Bernier. "They do not seem able to learn, and one becomes afraid that they will never be qualified for anything but pick and shovel work."

Boys and girls fourteen to sixteen who cannot read and write fluently! In 1942!! In Canada!!!

Let it not be forgotten that education in the Province of Quebec is in the hands of the Roman Catholic Church. The result is that thousands of boys and girls in the metropolitan centre—what we should say of rural centres, we hardly know—cannot "read and write fluently" at the age of fourteen or even sixteen. Apparently the priests, monks, nuns, and other ecclesiastical emissaries, spend their time teaching the catechism, loyalty to the Pope, fear of the priest, desire for French dominance of the Dominion, misrepresentations of Canadian history, and in some quarters at least hatred of the English.

It is time the Dominion Government stepped in, had the British North America Act rewritten on this point, and began the control of education over the whole Dominion. The present war is casting a lurid light on conditions in backward Quebec.—W.G.B.

"A Toronto Priest"

The report which appeared in the press of June 20th, that the German prisoner, Lieut. Hans Krug, who escaped from the prison camp at Bowmanville, and was finally apprehended in San Antonio, was assisted in the purchase of a railway ticket from Toronto to Detroit, by a Toronto priest—this report, we say, circulated in Toronto in rumour before it came out in the paper. Of course, Krug fooled the military police, who directed him to the priest. The priest got him a ticket, and thus helped him to escape from Canada. In Detroit he was again helped, this time by Max Stephan, who has since been the first man to be condemned for treason under United States law.

What we have not learned, but should very much like to have cleared up, is whether the priest's part in this escape was duly investigated by the police, and if so, what they found. This is a very serious matter; for this twenty-one-year old member of the Nazi air force was trying to get back to Germany, not only to fight again in the diabolical fashion in which only Nazi airmen can fight, but to make no end of misery for our own prisoners by attempting, as he put it, to

"inform the German government about the bad condition in Canadian prison camps, about the shooting and murder of an officer comrade, and about the treatment of officers in England."—B.

"Chiefly Anti-Catholic Bias"

The Social Forum, published monthly in Toronto, with the approval of the ecclesiastical authorities, has an article in the June edition on "French Canadians and National Unity", by C. J. Eustace, Assistant Educational Manager of J. M. Dent and Sons' Canadian Branch, and according to our information a convert to Roman Catholicism about the time of his marriage. We quote this real titbit:

"What, then, is the basis of the violent criticism that is directed against the French Canadian? It is, I think, chiefly anti-Catholic bias. Their critics are most often found to be, if not Irishmen who are temperamentally and prejudicially incompatible to the French, critics of the Catholic Church."

Anyone who criticizes French Canada must criticize the Catholic Church because the Catholic Church rules French Canada. Therefore criticism of French Canada is anti-Catholic bias! Simple, isn't it?

We are not against the French Canadians, but for them. At Kamloops, for instance, the press reports an address at a Protestant League meeting by the Editor of this paper as follows:

"Of the French-Canadians as a people, Dr. Shields said he had no prejudiced feelings. They are as good as anybody, and he admired and respected them."

To recognize the trouble in Quebec is scarcely to be "biased".

The French-Canadians are ever telling about how long they have been in this country. This writer belongs to families on both sides of the house who have been in North America so long that when the census man brings his foolish question as to whether his ancestors were English, Irish, or something else, he does not know the answer: he is just a Canadian. We Canadians feel that it is high time that we got out from under minority rule, especially when that minority is isolationist in respect to the war.—B.

Massey Hall Meeting Cancelled

When Dr. Shields engaged Massey Hall for a great Protestant rally, Sunday afternoon, July 12th, he did so by telegram from Winnipeg, and was unaware of the Mass Orange service scheduled for the same hour, and other interests which make it inadvisable to hold the service at that time, officers of Massey Hall therefore very courteously released Dr. Shields from the engagement.

Thursday, July 16

The meeting, as announced elsewhere in this issue, will be held in Jarvis St. Church, Thursday, July 16th, at 8 o'clock.

The Sault Ste. Marie Meeting

As we look the forms of this paper at midnight (Wednesday) a telephone call by the Editor from Sault Ste. Marie tells of the Protestant League Meeting there. The contract for the use of the Technical School auditorium was cancelled by the Board under the leadership of a Roman Catholic Attorney who was a member of the Board. A splendid meeting was held in the rink with an attendance of 800 people—Revs. W. N. Charlton and H. G. Martin were counting the offering and memberships as we spoke with Dr. Shields.

"An Agency For Evil"

Rev. D. A. Casey, Litt.D., pays special attention to Dr. Shields and the Canadian Protestant League in an editorial in *The Canadian Register*, official organ of the Catholic Church Extension Society of Canada, published at Kingston, Saturday, June 27th. Though it is quite nasty, we give it in full:

An Agency for Evil

We feel like apologizing to our readers for making any reference to the fanatical minister of the Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto.

We have for long known that Dr. Shields has no great love for the Catholic Church. But, all unwittingly, he may be rendering it good service. For Canadians are an intelligent people and so the extreme extravagance of the Baptist preacher's language is very likely to defeat its purpose. For instance, only the entirely ignorant and the all but insanely bigoted will believe what this gentleman is reported (*Toronto Telegram*, June 16, 1942) as having said at a meeting of the "Protestant League" in Vancouver, namely, "Not a married man or woman here is really married in the eyes of the Catholic Church." If Dr. Shields so delivered himself he is in ordinary English a liar, or in sore need of treatment by an alienist.

Dr. Shields is quite at liberty to believe—if he does so believe—that the Catholic faith is "the most potent agency for evil in all the wide, wide world." But it is quite another matter to charge that the Catholic Church holds that members of the Protestant faith who have entered into wedlock are living in adultery. Calumny and slander are rather potent agencies for evil. And calumny and slander, discharged from the Baptist preacher's popgun, are more apt to recoil on the marksman's head than to dent the Rock of Peter. And, we might add, calumniating and slandering the faith of more than 40 per cent. of the Canadian people seems a queer way of promoting that national unity which is so requisite in the present crisis. Doesn't Ottawa read *The Telegram*?

—D. A. C.

That an editor of a Catholic paper should have to apologize for referring to the minister of Jarvis Street Baptist Church, in a day when the machinations of Rome are being widely discussed in this country and thousands of Protestants are being awakened to the dangers of this ancient heresy by its pastor, is really quite remarkable!

Dr. Shields has again and again declared his love for Catholics, although he abhors the system that holds them in bondage.

Dr. Casey says of Dr. Shields that his "language is very strong." This we would not deny, but really what can be said of such a sentence as this?

"If Dr. Shields so delivered himself he is in ordinary English a liar, or in sore need of treatment by an alienist."

Had we been writing that sentence, and intended to say the same thing, we should probably have reverted to the better squinting "terminological inexactitude"! We consider it quite indecent to call a fellow citizen a liar.

As to the validity of marriages performed by others than Roman priests, we ask: If marriages whose ceremony is performed outside the Roman Church are quite valid, why does the Roman Church deny the validity of the marriage of Romanists performed by Protestants?

The editorial writer refers to forty per cent. of Canada being Romanist. Of course, he is including in that figure the thirty per cent. which the French-Canadian element now numbers.

The editorial ends with the question, "Does not Ottawa

read *The Telegram*?" Just what that is supposed to convey is not hard to guess. Rome does not want to argue, because she would be out-argued. So she cries, "Liar"; "Slanderer"; "Have the law on him; and if there is no law to have on him, intern him, anyway." Such an attitude can be that only of "an agency for evil"!—W.G.B.

'Galloping Madly in All Directions'!

Our French-Canadian Roman Catholic Minister of Justice, Hon. L. St. Laurent, in his maiden speech in the House of Commons, referred to

"what the Shieldses, the Silcoxes and even *The Globe and Mail* have been pleased to call 'French Canada's stranglehold on this Dominion'."

Recently we saw how *The Globe and Mail* could not let its association with Dr. Shields, existent in the mind of the Minister of Justice, pass, even for the good of the cause of preventing the increase of this very real stranglehold. Of course, from an expert in moral theology we might have expected something more than that from a public organ like *The Globe and Mail* where, doubtless, Romanist pressure was exerted—for instance, from Dr. C. E. Silcox, prominent leader of the United Church of Canada. But we must have expected too much, for in *News* of June 27th, is the first instalment of an open letter from Dr. Silcox to Mr. St. Laurent in which he says:

Nor am I mainly concerned by your gratuitous linking of my name, in this address, with the name of Dr. T. T. Shields. When I read that reference, I was appalled by your lack of understanding of the real movements of thought in English-speaking, Protestant, Canada. Had you adequate information you would have known that the only thing that Dr. Shields and I have in common is the first letter in our surnames, unless one includes the doctorates in divinity.

Presently the learned doctor refers to the humourist "Stephen Leacock's equestrian who leapt on his horse and galloped madly off in all directions." Dr. Silcox is against "French Canada's stranglehold on this Dominion"—one direction; he is, rather strenuously against Dr. Shields—the opposite direction!

If you are a nominal Protestant, and yet unwilling to help the resurgence of true Protestantism in Canada, at least do not hinder it, as Dr. Silcox confessing to doing in *News* of July 4th. (The emphasis is ours):

"In conclusion, I can only mention, in respect to your association of my name with that of Dr. Shields, that I have never had and am unlikely to have anything whatever to do with any anti-Catholic movement, and especially with any movement of any kind led by Dr. Shields. If you were better informed on the matter, you would know of many attempts on my part to nullify the work of the Protestant League. The real leaders of the Protestant Church in Canada could give you many instances of my activity on behalf of a greater rapprochement between Protestants and Catholics, without sacrifice of principle, not only in Canada but also in the United States and Mexico throughout the ecumenical movement."—B.

PRINTING BIBLES

The American Bible Society has taken on, in addition to supplying Bibles to the American forces and war prisoners in many lands, a large part of the British, Scottish, Netherlands and French Bible Societies in fields from which they were cut off.

Convention of the Regular Baptist Churches of British Columbia

By REV. W. J. THOMSON

The Regular Baptist Churches of British Columbia assembled in their fifteenth annual convention from June 15th to 18th, 1942, in Ruth Morton Memorial Baptist Church, Vancouver. This convention had been anticipated with earnest and prayerful expectation, in view of the announced coming of the Rev. T. T. Shields, D.D., of Toronto, as the guest speaker. Owing to limitations in the way of housing accommodation for the large audiences expected, arrangements were made to secure the Dunbar Theatre as well as St. Giles United Church, the latter place being occupied for most of the evening gatherings. Much had been done in advertising the convention, with the gratifying result that most of the meetings were crowded with eager, earnest people, who listened to such preaching as few of us have ever heard before. We were thrilled and delighted to see that Dr. Shields was feeling fit and eager as ever in preaching the great message of the Book. His ministry among us seemed to be aimed at encouraging us in our stand for the distinctive things that are fundamental to our very life and ministry as churches; and we were convinced of the solidifying result that must follow such a time of exposition as places truth before the spiritual intelligence rather than merely exciting emotion. It would be vain even to attempt giving a synopsis of the messages delivered by Dr. Shields at the various services, but wisdom and graciousness in a very marked degree characterized them all. What holy incentives must have been awakened in all our people, and especially in the young, that their powers might be fully dedicated to the Lord, to do and dare for His cause! We trust that in the good providence of God it may be possible to have many visits from this great spiritual leader, whose ministry is such a clear, loyal and fearless exaltation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The business sessions of our convention were expedited under the leadership of our president, the Rev. H. C. Phillips, so that little or no time was needlessly occupied with matters that would interfere with the main purpose of our gatherings. Mr. Phillips has been unanimously elected as president for the coming year. The council, office-bearers and various committees will function to sustain him in his leadership in the interests of our convention of churches.

Two resolutions expressive of our appreciation to Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, as well as to Dr. Shields himself, were passed unanimously. The text of these resolutions is as follows:

Thanks to Jarvis Street Church, Toronto

Resolved that we the delegates and members of the Convention of Regular Baptists of British Columbia, assembled in Ruth Morton Memorial Regular Baptist Church, Vancouver, B.C., June 15th-18th, 1942, do hereby tender to the members and officers of Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, our sincere thanks and heartfelt appreciation of their action in temporarily releasing their pastor, Dr. T. T. Shields, from his pastoral responsibilities, that he might come to British Columbia and minister to us during the period of our convention; assuring them that they, through their pastor, have contributed in a large measure to the success of our convention gatherings, to the moral and spiritual welfare of the many who attended the meetings, and, we trust, to the future progress of our work in British Columbia, also to the fresh

determination he has inspired within us to "contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints."

Moved by Mr. A. L. Foster.

Seconded by Mr. D. Georgeson.

Thanks to Dr. T. T. Shields

Whereas we the representatives and delegates of the Convention of Regular Baptists of British Columbia, assembled in convention in Ruth Morton Memorial Regular Baptist Church, Vancouver, B.C., June 15th-18th, 1942, have affirmed our stand for the principles and practices of Regular Baptist Churches in British Columbia, as set forth in the Scriptures, which stand has always been a firm resolve to maintain and uphold these principles: and

Whereas we have been encouraged and inspired by Regular Baptists in this stand and affirmation, and especially by the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec, both by their visiting representatives, and their financial support of our work; and

Whereas Dr. T. T. Shields, of Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, President of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec, has given us much inspiration by his own steadfastness of character and loyalty to the Word of God, as well as his ministry to us through the pages of THE GOSPEL WITNESS; and

Whereas at this time and in this convention we have been favoured by God in sending His servant, Dr. T. T. Shields, to minister to us from the Word of God, to the edification and confirmation of our faith in the unchangeable verities of the "things most surely believed among us"; and

Whereas we recognize that this service has been rendered to us at great personal sacrifice to himself, as well as that of his great church, whose ministry he has maintained for over thirty-two years, with the signal blessing of the Holy Spirit,

Therefore be it resolved that this convention go on record in expressing our most cordial, hearty, and grateful thanks to Dr. Shields for rendering to us at this time of his most valuable ministry, and in expressing our sincere desire in prayer that God may spare him for many years to be the standard-bearer of the faith of Christ in Canada.

Moved by Rev. W. J. Thomson.

Seconded by Mr. O. S. Moore.

Protestant League Meeting in Kamloops, B.C.

We have already reported briefly the Protestant League meeting held in Kamloops. Since our last issue, however, we have received a letter from Rev. F. J. Carter, Pastor of First Baptist Church in that place, who also sent along a copy of *The Kamloops Sentinel*, which has the largest circulation of any newspaper between New Westminster and Calgary. It contained a front-page report of considerable length of the meeting of which Mr. Carter writes:

"It was in every respect a very good meeting, in fact, the biggest that Kamloops has had for a long time. People came from as far as fifty miles away to hear Dr. Shields.

"We had five hundred and fifty people in the hall, but I have been speaking to some people since, and they have all told me that there were more than a thousand people there. He hit hard and heavy, and of course the enemy did not like it."

Col. Munro's Booklet

We can supply copies of the testimony of Lt.-Col. D. C. D. Munro, many thousands of which we have already circulated, particularly among men of the forces, at a cost of about 1c each. (Please add postage). This booklet of about fifteen pages tells the experience of a self-righteous man seeking salvation and finding it all of grace. It is so printed as to go in a Number 8 envelope.

The Seminary and Missions

The success of our Union Missionary programme and the value of the work of Toronto Baptist Seminary has been brought home to me in a new way during the last seven weeks. The progress in the work of the Lord which I have witnessed with my own eyes in the course of a tour of our churches from Toronto to Winnipeg made such a deep impression on me that I feel constrained to share it with our readers that they may rejoice with us. To anyone who earnestly longs for the salvation of souls and the establishment of Gospel lighthouses in dark places, it is a thrilling sight to see New Testament churches holding forth the Word of Life in places where a few years ago no testimony of the Gospel could be found.

In the Spring of 1936 one of the students at Toronto Baptist Seminary went to the great mining town of Sudbury. His sole capital was the ancient car that took him there, a ten dollar bill, and his Bible. The first two items have long since disappeared but the Bible remains and the young man shows no signs of being preached out. On my Sunday with the Berean Baptist Church, Sudbury, I preached to an evening congregation of two hundred people and the morning Sunday school registered about two hundred and twenty-five, most of whom stayed for the morning service. The membership of Brother Boyd's church is largely composed of men and women who were outside of Christ when he arrived in Sudbury alone and without friends or funds. For some years our missionary money has aided this growing cause, which already bids fair to become one of the largest contributors to our missionary funds. So rapid is its growth that in a few years the Sudbury church will be, in point of number, one of the strongest causes in our Union fellowship, as it already is in point of spiritual power.

Five years ago two Christian men in another new mining town wrote to the President of Toronto Baptist Seminary, asking for a man. They promised to give liberally to his support but further help was again needed from our missionary treasury. Under the leadership of Mr. George Hicks it was not long till the cause was strong enough to support itself. There is no man among us who lives more sacrificially than Brother Hicks, and his heroic and untiring efforts have resulted in the gathering together of a strong nucleus in Geraldton. Although the comparative smallness of the town limits the opportunity, it is evident that the Geraldton church is flourishing. What a privilege to have fellowship with this church and to meet men and women and boys and girls who have heard of the unsearchable riches of Christ, because our Union had the missionary vision five years ago and because a young man trained in Toronto Baptist Seminary had the courage to face a hard task!

On my previous visit to Fort William I found a small group of discouraged believers about ready to close the church doors. They asked for two things: a good man and money to support him. I made arrangements for several of our pastors to visit the church and of their own free choice the friends there called Rev. Walter Tompkins to be their leader. On my recent visit I scarcely recognized it for the same church. Many new members were there to greet me, some fifteen of whom

were converted and baptized within the last year. The Sunday school has doubled in attendance, the debt had disappeared, our grant is no longer required and the building fund has been so liberally subscribed that the extensive reconstruction work on the building has been undertaken. Seldom has it been my privilege to see a church so transformed in such a short period. Once again the right man was the key to the situation and it was the Union's privilege to make it possible for the right man to go to the right place.

Some time ago I was able to complete arrangements with the Bethany Regular Baptist Church, Winnipeg, for Rev. John Cunningham to accept the call to become its pastor. In the course of my week's visit with Mr. Cunningham and the Bethany friends it became increasingly evident to me that in the last two years Mr. Cunningham had made his presence felt in the metropolis of the Canadian West. He is greatly beloved and respected in evangelical circles and his congregations have increased considerably. Some distance out in the country Brother Cunningham carries on a mission work among the Ukranian settlers. In addition to this he finds time to teach in the Winnipeg Bible Institute. While in Winnipeg I also had the joy of ministering to the Central Baptist Church and of fellowship with this fine group of believers. Winnipeg is a great city of a quarter of a million persons and presents one of the most challenging situations for an evangelical testimony in Canada. It is my conviction, based on what I have seen, that Mr. Cunningham, under the hand of God, is the man to enter into the door which has been opened before him in this great centre.

For the time being the Seminary has been forced to suspend operations, but it still lives in the life and ministry of its students. The missionary programme of the Union of Regular Baptist Churches has demonstrated again and again that a young man on fire for the Lord, trained in the knowledge of the Book, with some financial support to back him, can, by the Spirit's power, enter into these opened doors around about us in Ontario and Quebec and establish a sane and strong testimony for the Gospel of Grace. Our greatest need is men. We await with anxiety the day when we shall be able to open our doors again to train young men for the ministry of the Gospel. This is the key to our French-Canadian work. What our former students have already demonstrated can be done in English-speaking places, may be repeated in French-speaking Quebec, if we only have men consecrated, trained in the Word of God and possessing a knowledge of the French language. We look to our churches not only for financial contributions but for the more precious contributions of consecrated men and women ready to enter the service of God and the Gospel.—W.S.W.

A folder (four pages) with a brief gospel message we can furnish at 35c per hundred, issued by one of the young men of Jarvis Street Church, entitled, *Stop, Look and Live*.

A friend has furnished us with a supply of a printing of "High Flight", the splendid poem by a young American pilot since killed, which has been quoted more than once in this paper. This attractive page measures above five by ten inches and is suitable for framing. As far as they go, we shall be glad to furnish copies, but please enclose for cost of handling.—B.

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 6 Third Quarter Lesson 29 July 19, 1942

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

THE BAPTISM OF CHRIST

Lesson Text: Luke 3.

Golden Text: "Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased"—Luke 3:22.

I. The Preaching of Repentance—verses 1 to 20.

Read also Matt. 3:1-12; Mark 1:1-8; John 1:6-8, 19-28.

Luke the historian is careful to describe accurately the circumstances attending the manifestation of Christ on the earth, connecting this pivotal fact with the civil and religious history of the land. The Roman Emperor is named, also the subordinate rulers over districts in Palestine, and the high priests. That Christ lived among men, that He died, rose again and ascended into heaven cannot be denied, for the evidence is beyond contradiction.

The word of the Lord came to John in the wilderness (Lk. 1:80). He was not the first prophet, or the last one, who learned to know God in the secret place (Exod. 3:1-10; Psa. 78:70, 71; Gal. 1:15-17). We must commune with God in the sanctuary, if we would serve Him in the world; we shall be tested in private before testifying in public.

John was chosen to be the messenger of the Lord, the voice of Jehovah speaking to His people (Isa. 40:3-5; Mal. 3:1). Born in miraculous guise, he was filled with the Holy Spirit, and he went about in the spirit and power of Elijah (Lk. 1:5-25, 57-80). His message might be summed up in two words: "Repent; believe." He urged men to turn from their sins (Matt. 3:2) and to believe on Christ (John 3:36).

John was the King's forerunner and the King's herald. In Roman times when the Emperor travelled, road engineers were sent in advance to clear the way. They would cut through the mountains and fill in the valleys, to make the road as level as possible. They would straighten the curves and remove all obstacles to the king's progress. John was commissioned to prepare the way of the Lord, furthering His triumphant march, that His glory and salvation might be revealed to all men (Isa. 40:4, 5; 49:6; 52:10; Lk. 2:30, 31).

It was the duty of the king's herald to go before the king, blowing his trumpet to announce the king's approach. So did John the Baptist proclaim the presence of the King of glory. The Lord would have all His children prepare the way for Him and testify to His presence with them.

For a time John the Baptist was considered a popular preacher, and multitudes came to be baptized of him. Many, however, were insincere. It is still true that the multitude throng Christ, but few really touch Him by faith (Matt. 7:13, 14; Lk. 8:45).

The scathing language used by John against the self-righteous Pharisees shows how God regards those who would attempt to cover up their sins with a cloak of religion (Lk. 11:39-44). These men came seeking baptism, a symbol of death to the old life and resurrection to the new life, without exhibiting any desire to turn from their sin. They would depend for their safety upon this outward rite, as they depended also upon their birth as children of Abraham. These Pharisees were not producing fruits worthy of repentance, since they had not the root of repentance in their hearts.

To the people desiring to know what works they should do to show their repentance, he counselled deeds of love and unselfishness; to the publicans—honesty; to the soldiers—mercy, justice and contentment.

As the people were "in expectation" or "in suspense" as to whether John was the Messiah, they sent Levites and priests from Jerusalem to question him (John 1:19, 20). John called attention, not to himself, but to Christ, and urged even his own disciples to turn from him and to follow Christ (John 1:35-37; 3:30). The prophecy of the baptism of the House.

Holy Spirit and fire was literally fulfilled on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2:3, 4, 17). Since that day every believer is baptized by the Holy Spirit into Christ, and into the body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:12, 13; Gal. 3:26-28). The water baptism of John unto repentance was introductory to the Spirit baptism unto sanctification.

Fire speaks of judgment as well as purity (verse 17); the same element burns the dross and purifies the gold.

II. The Practice of Righteousness—verses 21 to 38.

Read also Matt. 3:13-17; Mk. 1:9-11; John 1:32-34.

What grace is expressed in those words "Jesus also"! He had no sin of His own to confess, but He bore the sin of others (John 1:29; Heb. 7:26, 27), and He stood in the Jordan River representing us (Isa. 53:12).

Christ became sin for us, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him (2 Cor. 5:21). He undertook to "fulfil all righteousness", to work out completely the law of God, which we were powerless to obey (Matt. 3:15; Rom. 8:3, 4). He fulfilled all righteousness for us, not merely throughout His earthly life, but especially in His death. Baptism pictures His death, burial and resurrection, by which salvation became possible for us.

Christ in His own Person instituted the ordinance of Christian baptism. John's baptism, intended for those who repented, was preparatory to Christian baptism, designed for all who believe (Acts 16:30-34; 18:8; 19:4, 5). As our Lord commanded all believers to be baptized (Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:15, 16; Acts 10:48), He first gave us the example, showing His grace in giving no command which He was not willing Himself to obey.

The three Persons of the Trinity—Father, Son and Holy Spirit—were manifested at the baptism of Christ. The Holy Spirit resting in the form of a dove upon the Lord was a sign to John that He was truly the Messiah (John 1:33, 34), a fact to which God gave further testimony in the words of approval: "Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased" (Matt. 17:5). The blessing of God and the benediction of the Holy Spirit will rest upon the believer who follows the Lord in baptism (Acts 2:38, 39). He has the answer of a good conscience, and the way is open for communion and service (1 Pet. 3:21).

Christ was about thirty years of age when His public ministry began. This was the age at which the priests of Israel commenced their duties (Num. 4:3).

The Gospel of Matthew gives the genealogy of Joseph, son of Jacob, of the royal line of David. In Luke, where Joseph is spoken of as "the son of Heli", we are probably to understand this as "son-in-law of Heli". That would mean that this genealogy gives the line of descent of Mary, who also belonged to the house of David (Lk. 2:4, 5). The Holy Spirit, speaking through the Old Testament prophets, had said that the Messiah should be of the line of David (2 Sam. 7:12, 13; Psa. 132:11; Isa. 9:6, 7; Jer. 23:5, 6), and the purpose of these two lists is to show the fulfilment of God's word (Matt. 1:1). On His mother's side Christ was a descendant of David according to the flesh, and also on Joseph's side according to Jewish law and custom, which regard the one who protects and trains a child as the father, irrespective of natural parentage.

Protests Rev. Dr. T. T. Shields

(We have reported a number of references to Dr. Shields made by French-Canadian members of Parliament, but we missed this one. It appeared, however, in *The Vancouver Sun* on June 18th last.—B.)

J. Lasseville Roy (Lib. Gaspé) declared that there was "no difference between the Conscription Act of 1942 brought in two weeks after the plebiscite and conscription as introduced by Sir Robert Borden in 1917."

He scored Rev. T. T. Shields, Baptist pastor of Toronto, as a man "who seeks to exploit prejudice and fanaticism", and lauded the "Canadian ideals" of Henri Bourassa, veteran Quebec Nationalist leader.

Liguori Lacombe, who left the Liberal party this year to form his own "Canadian" party, invited Quebec anti-conscriptionists to join his "ranks" in a fight against the government's policy. He is the sole member of his party in the

The Religious Aspects of the Sirois Report

Shall the Dominion Be Mortgaged for the Church of Rome?

Reprint of an address by Dr. T. T. Shields, delivered in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Thursday evening, January 16, 1941

(During his Western tour June 8th to July 10th, Dr. Shields has frequently referred to this report, with the result there have been many requests for copies of his analysis of that Report. The issue of *The Witness* containing that Report was long ago completely exhausted. The demand for this, as showing of Rome's attitude, justifies its reprinting herewith.)

Religion is concerned with, and is inseparable from, the fundamentals of human life. It is a voice which speaks of origins and destinies; and insists that the extent to which obligations growing out of the first are fulfilled, must determine the place of the last. There is nothing relating to the life of the individual, to the life of the primary social unit, the family, nor to society at large in its national, international, and world relations, that does not, philosophically, rest upon a religious basis. There can be no true concept of morality in any sphere of life from which a recognition of God is excluded; and without a sense of such moral responsibilities as such recognition involves there can be no right human relations anywhere.

This philosophy of human origins and destinies, and their intermediate obligations and responsibilities, is especially true of the Christian religion. Biblical Christianity relates a man in truth and righteousness to God above him, and to all his neighbours about him, in every sphere and relationship of life. The duty to render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, grows out of our obligation to render unto God the things that are God's.

Christianity was described in New Testament times as a way of life. When Saul of Tarsus was on his way to Damascus, he went armed with authority to "bring them bound unto Jerusalem . . . if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women." No Christian therefore can afford to be indifferent to the constitution of the state under which he lives; and he must ever be on the watch lest the original formulation or later modification of its written principles of life should be of such a character as to render the requirements of Caesar incompatible with his duty to God.

I insist therefore that any theory of statehood which would ignore, or compromise, or impede, or imperil, the full and free and unfettered discharge of one's conscientious religious duty by subordination of religions to economic considerations, must be opposed. We of the British Commonwealth of Nations are now engaged in a gigantic struggle for the preservation of the liberty—liberty in the broadest sense—of the individual, such liberty as Canadians now proudly and gratefully enjoy. While the state is a divine institution, and its ideal fundamental laws are clearly revealed, any democratic state—which means a state humanly constituted and maintained—like all other human things, will have its imperfections, and will face always the necessity of devising constitutional improvements for its way of life.

The British North America Act was framed to regulate the lives of groups of people widely separated, and spread over a vast and largely unsettled continent. It was framed when means of communication and trans-

portation were in a very primitive state and when the manner of life of the various groups was largely determined by geographical and circumstantial considerations. Hence the instrument which set up a number of provinces, and provided for the erection of others, which now have grown to the number of nine.

The Dominion, now consisting of nine provinces and a central government, is a federal and not a unitary state. Everyone will recognize that in many respects conditions of life obtaining seventy-five years ago when this federal state was contemplated, obtain no longer. We can sit in our own homes and hear men breathe on the shores of the Atlantic and the Pacific. One can now fly from Halifax to Vancouver in less time than a man could drive to see his neighbour in hard weather, forty or fifty miles away, when Confederation was effected.

Localisms and provincialisms, whether of speech or habit of life, or means and methods of maintenance, which seventy-five years ago were deemed indispensable to the individual's freedom, do not, or need not, now obtain. The improved methods of communication, transportation, and distribution, which science has put in our hands, have broken down many of the walls of partition upon which provincial distinctions at the time of Confederation, were founded. It does not seem reasonable that a population scarcely exceeding the population of Greater London should now require nine Legislatures, with a total of five hundred and eleven members; nine Lieutenant-Governors; and a Federal Parliament with a total membership of two hundred and forty-eight (besides ninety-six senators), to enable us to behave ourselves as to get along happily together.

I fear I did not study the terms of reference by which the SIROIS or as it was originally called, the ROWELL COMMISSION, was set up—I am not sure whether they were published or not. But I read of it; and it was my earnest hope that a Commission of honest men of good will would be able to devise such economies in our governmental system as would lift some burdens from Canadian shoulders without in any way jeopardizing such principles of jurisprudence as are indispensable to the unfettered expression of individual life.

But I anticipate the later development of my subject by at once removing one matter from the field of discussion. Nothing in the SIROIS REPORT suggests the possibility or advisability of changing the Dominion from a federal to a unitary state. On the contrary, it sets itself unflinchingly against any such change. I need not burden you with quotations, but if the report were adopted, it would leave us with the nine provincial governments and the government at Ottawa. The report does not ask the member of any Legislature to vote for or consent to his being put out of his position.

One might have supposed that a corporation having nine separate factories, varying in some of their products but fundamentally all doing the same thing, if they were seriously to seek a reduction of the overhead costs, would

consider the possibility of closing up some of their factories and amalgamating others, so as to have fewer separate units to heat and light and manage. No commercial or industrial concern, in an endeavour to reduce costs, would think of relieving some of its agencies of a good share of their work, and without reducing salaries or wages, increase its central staff to care for the additional work.

Nine separate Legislatures in the Dominion of Canada constitute a screaming advertisement either of our sectional selfishness or of our crass political stupidity. The nine legislative factories will continue, however, with the blessing of this report—albeit, stripped of some of their functions.

The changes proposed are chiefly economic, and have to do with the rearrangement of sources of revenue, and a re-distribution of the controlling authorities.

And here it may be well to glance for a moment at the personnel of the Commission. No such Commission can possibly become wholly impersonal, or an enlarged business machine. The Commission was made up of four men. In the beginning, the Hon. N. W. Rowell, Chief Justice of Ontario, was selected by the Government as Chairman. Something was done by the Commission under Mr. Rowell's Chairmanship, but his health soon became so unsatisfactory—or at least uncertain—as to compel him to resign. The Commission that did the work and prepared the report consisted of three Professors and one newspaperman. The Chairman was "Joseph Sirois, Esq., LL.D., of the City of Quebec, Notary Public, Professor of Constitutional and Administrative Law at Laval University." The other members were "John W. Dafoe, Esq., LL.D., of the City of Winnipeg, Man.; Professor Alexander MacKay, Esq., Ph.D., Professor of Government, Dalhousie University, Halifax, N.S.; and Henry Forbes Angus, Esq., M.A., B.C.L., Professor of Economics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver."

I hope I shall not be judged unfair if I call your attention to the fact that the Chairman of the Commission was a Professor in the Roman Catholic Laval University. In the preparation of a report like this, hundreds of experts have been employed; and it cannot be regarded as the work of any one man. The mass of statistical information brought together must have been assembled by an army of experts.

The Commission was more than a fact-finding Commission. The final instructional paragraph of the Terms of Reference reads:

"That the Commissioners be instructed to consider and report upon the facts disclosed by their investigations; and to express what in their opinion, subject to the retention of the distribution of legislative powers essential to a proper carrying out of the federal system in harmony with national needs and the promotion of national unity, will best effect a balanced relationship between the financial powers and the obligations and functions of each governing body, and conduce to a more efficient, independent, and economical discharge of governmental responsibilities in Canada."

It will be seen therefore that the Commission was to do more than gather evidence: it was instructed to express their opinion in respect to the facts assembled, and really to make recommendations which would involve the reconstruction of the constitutional economic structure of the Dominion.

That was its tremendous task—and that of course, would be involved in the adoption of the Commission's report. It would amount to re-writing a very large part of the British North America Act.

In my judgment, the Ottawa Government, by its very action in calling for a consideration of the report at this time, has made a most painful though unwitting disclosure of its whole attitude toward the war. If one could put upon the discussion of this Report the most charitable and conciliatory construction possible; if it could be assumed that its main factors might, by discussion, be soon resolved into a pattern agreeable to all the Provinces, there would still inevitably be left a residue of contentious matter which, though assuming the existence of the best of intentions, would be bound to provoke such discussions as would separate rather than unite, temporarily at least, some of the political components of the Dominion.

Can it be assumed that the Government consistent with a full-time, "all-out", war effort was yet possessed of a surplus, unoccupied, idle, legislative and executive capacity which would enable it to do two big things at once? Must we not rather conclude that by the very fact that while civilization in general, and the British expression of it in particular, is battling to keep its head above water on the seas, and to cope with billows of flame and man-made earthquakes on land, and protect itself from fire and brimstone dispensed by the prince of the power of the air, the Government of Canada can actually contemplate the leisurely re-writing of the Constitution of the Dominion? Does not that fact itself, I say, proclaim the further fact that the Government of Canada is not yet half awake to the perils of the hour? And because its mind and its hands are but half engaged in the war, it has the disposition and the unoccupied leisure to toy with professorial, academic, doctrinaire theories of governmental science.

When Nehemiah was so occupied with rebuilding Jerusalem, which had been laid waste by the Babylonian conqueror, that he gave the order, "Let every one with his servant lodge within Jerusalem, that in the night they may be a guard to us, and labour on the day. So neither I, nor my brethren, nor my servants, nor the men of the guard which followed me, none of us put off our clothes, saving that every one put them off for washing", when he was engaged thus in this "all-out" programme to overcome the destructive work of the tyrant, there were those that proposed they should cease from their labour, and meet in conference; to whom Nehemiah sent messengers, saying: "I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down; why should the work cease, whilst I leave it, and come down to you?"

We may now know how busily occupied the Government at Ottawa is with the war, by its turning aside from its prosecution for the present conference. Had the Prime Minister been properly seized with the horrors that threaten the world, had he ever felt a proper sense of his responsibility for the leadership of the nation in this time of crisis, he would have answered the Sannibals and Tobiahs and Geshems of Quebec by saying, "I am fighting a great fight so that I cannot come down. Why should Canada's war effort cease while I leave it and come down to you?"

But whether we like it or not, the Report is being discussed—and this, notwithstanding that no Premier nor Legislature of any Province in Canada has received a

mandate from the people of the Province to re-write the provincial constitutional provisions of the Dominion Constitution. Neither has the Government at Ottawa, large as is its majority, received any mandate from the people of Canada to re-write the Constitution of this Dominion. And such a matter should be contemplated and considered only when the minds of the people as a whole are in such a free and unoccupied condition as to make it possible for them really to understand the far-reaching effects and implications of the changes proposed.

It is of the very essence of true democracy that its Government should be an expression of the intelligent, considered, judgment of all the people.

I return then to a consideration of the personnel of the Commission. Its Chairman is a Roman Catholic professor of Constitutional Law at Laval University. What the religious affiliations of the other members of the Commission may be, I do not know; but the smoking ruins of the devastated neutral countries of Europe proclaim the principle that aggression will always force the hand of inactive neutrality. If anyone suggests that I am unduly suspicious, I remind them of the saying of Premier Godbout that "a little handful of French-Canadians led by M. Ernest Lapointe imposed its will on the country." I must not be blamed when I note that the Committee which appointed Professor Sirois as Chairman of the Commission was composed of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Justice—M. Ernest Lapointe.

I must confess that I read the Report before troubling to see who the Chairman really was, and whence he came; and quite apart from the influence of his name, I discerned at once that the argument of the report is one of the finest examples of adroit special pleading I have ever read. Before facts are assembled, or economic necessities are considered, the argument is designed to prejudice the mind in a particular direction.

Perhaps it was necessary to remind us that the greatest difficulty in the way of union in eighteen hundred and sixty-seven was found in Quebec.

In this connection it is noted that "Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, with their acceptance of the English common law, were in agreement on precisely those matters in which each differed so completely from Quebec." (Book 1, p. 34). From this forward it is argued that successive legislative acts "were long understood to be the essential laws for safeguarding the fundamental institutions and ways of life in Quebec."

The real point, of course, in all this argument is that what is called "the way of life" of French Canada was essentially different from that of other parts of the country comprising the new Dominion; and it seems to be assumed that every law was passed with a view to "safeguarding", and therefore by implication, perpetuating, that distinctive difference.

The fourth chapter declares that "the discussion of conscription and other issues which were so disturbing to national unity over twenty years ago is a delicate matter even at this late date." (Book 1, p. 94). It is also significantly remarked: "At the risk of being misunderstood we have, therefore, felt it imperative that these issues should be recalled, and set out here as objectively and fairly as possible."

It seems to us that if the Commission had especially

set out to perpetuate those influences that "were so disturbing to national unity over twenty years ago", it could scarcely have done better.

We make a few further quotations:

"Before conscription became a burning political question, there had been marked differences in the ratio of enlistments among the different elements of the population. Naturally enough, the response of the British-born had far exceeded that of the native-born."

The words, "naturally enough", indicate the point of view of the writer of this chapter. There is a basic assumption that French Canada was essentially different and separate from the rest of the country—that, indeed, there was no real unity at all. No credit is given for the ready response of the British-born: no criticism is passed respecting the reluctance of French-speaking Canada to do its full share. The difference between the two is simply explained by the words, "naturally enough".

Once more:

"There was a difference between English-speaking Canada as a whole and French-speaking Canada in the response to voluntary recruiting."

The responsibility for the difference does not lie with the French-Canadians. From the point of view of the Commissioner, the French-Canadians are impeccable. So, to give them a clean bill for their unresponsiveness, the Government is blamed:

"There were serious and exasperating mistakes in the management of recruiting in the Province, mainly through lack of sympathetic appreciation of how a sensitive people cherished their distinctiveness."

This quotation also contains an illuminating phrase: "how a sensitive people cherished their distinctiveness." We have observed a thousand times that people who shirk responsibilities, and justify themselves for evading burdens legitimately their own, invariably assume that they are a "sensitive people", and therefore are entitled to "cherish their distinctiveness." Of course other people may be "sensitive" and "distinctive" too, but the right of others to indulge their sensitiveness, and at the expense of everybody else to cherish their distinctiveness, is never recognized.

In apology for this difference, we are told:

"There were basic factors which lay much deeper. The French-speaking Canadians had been established in Canada for centuries."

And yet tens of thousands of them, in all probability, scarcely know the names of their grandfathers; nor whether they were born in Canada or in Europe! But the writer has a cause to plead, and therefore he proceeds:

"Their political connection with France had been severed 150 years before and they had never formed a close sentimental attachment for republican France with its anti-clerical associations."

Now the whole story is out! French Canada had no heart in the last war, because they had no "attachment for republican France with its anti-clerical associations." Which is to say that the basic reason for the detachment was not that they were French, for France was in the war; but that they were primarily clericalists, or otherwise, Roman Catholics.

And as though to add fuel to the flame, the writer raises the bilingual bogey respecting Ontario schools:

"In that year Ontario enacted further legislation in support of its separate school policy and the Federal Government declined to disallow it. The dispute over the bilingual school question, as it was called, went on with increasing bitterness, revealing the gaps which divided French-speaking citizens, in feelings and interests, from English-speaking Canada and emphasizing again the difficulty of tolerable accommodation between the two races. On the instance of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, a resolution was introduced in Parliament deploring the action of the Ontario Legislature."

We are then informed in a footnote respecting this matter:

"The resolution was actually introduced by Mr. Lapointe and is commonly known as the 'Lapointe resolution'."

Now a few further quotations:

"The split over the bilingual question foreshadowed the much more serious division on the issue of conscription. The principle of the political cooperation of the two races in the two federal parties had already begun to break down in 1916, because one of the races was being rapidly consolidated behind one of the political parties.

"The dispute over the separate school policy of Ontario embittered the debate on conscription . . . The issue led many into bitter opposition of Canada's participation in the War."

And so, because they were denied an official recognition of the French language in the English-speaking Province of Ontario, many of the French-Canadians opposed Canada's participation in the war! These disputes, it is said,

"inevitably diminished the support with Quebec gave to the supreme objective of the Federal Government."

Again:

"In Quebec, the proposal of conscription met with general opposition."

Again:

"Within the walls of Parliament, the Liberal Party was becoming identified with the Province of Quebec and Parliament itself was dividing on racial lines."

Again:

"Despite passionate opposition the policy of conscription commanded the support of a majority of the people of Canada."

Again:

"The Union Government swept English-speaking Canada while Quebec gave solid support to Sir Wilfrid Laurier's opposition to conscription."

And still the compiler of this Report pursues his argument. Everybody is to blame but the French-Canadians:

"Resentment at the manner in which the Military Service Act was applied in the following year gave an impetus to political action by farmers' organizations and immediately after the close of the War they took advantage of the confusion and weakness in the Liberal Party to enter the political field."

Again it is said:

"Canadians are reluctant to recall the events which reopened old antagonisms and renewed distrust and bitterness between the two races. It is imperative that the distrust and bitterness should be forgotten but it has been necessary to recall the events which provoked them because they have had a deep influence on the subsequent history of Canadian federalism and because they point to certain general lessons about the operation of the federal system in Canada."

The "lesson" presumably is that there must be no conscription in Quebec for the support of extra-Can-

dian interests. That perhaps is the reason why, as Premier Godbout says, "a little handful of French-Canadians led by M. Ernest Lapointe, dictated its will to the country." And here is more of it:

"The instinctive diversity of Canadian life did not long remain constant to a single conception of ends and means."

Again:

"Canada lacks that homogeneity and this, in turn, limits the extent of collective endeavour which can be effectively organized under Dominion control."

Surely this is an announcement that there is little use of trying to bring Quebec into line, for it is added:

"This is why Canada is a federal state and must remain so. Deep underlying differences cannot be permanently overcome by coercion."

And so throughout it is always Quebec, Quebec!

"The War period strengthened tendencies and opinions already evident in Quebec."

Again:

"Quebec became still further disposed to question any increase in federal power."

Again:

"Quebec became, more than before, a watchful guardian of provincial rights."

This is enough to illustrate the trend of the argument. The deep-rooted, ineradicable, devotion to clerical, that is, Roman Catholic interests, separates Quebec from the rest of the Dominion, and is assumed to justify her in shirking her full responsibilities as a member of the Federation. And let it be borne in mind that this Report is put forward by the present Government at Ottawa as a basis of national unity!

Noting the drift of population from metropolitan to urban centres both in Ontario and Quebec, it is said that in Quebec this tendency was more pronounced "despite the encouragement to colonize given by the Provincial Government and the Church." Thenceforward we find the Government and the Church generally linked together. Please to observe, "the Church" — not the churches. Not the United Church, nor the Anglican Church, nor the Presbyterian Church nor the Baptist churches, but "the Church"—spelled with a capital. This Report, put out by a Government Commission, utterly ignores other religious bodies than "the Church", the Roman Catholic Church, which is so closely associated with the Government.

It is noted later that the British North America Act secured the Province in control of education:

"The possibility of relieving the consequent growing burden on the provinces and municipalities through substantial federal aid to education was limited if not entirely excluded by latent racial and religious issues."

Please keep that in mind. — Someone is contemplating "substantial federal aid to education", but regrets that it was "limited if not entirely excluded by latent racial and religious issues." Anyone of discernment who follows that report through its discussions of economic questions, may easily recognize that the writer never loses sight of his goal.

We shall see presently that at least one of the principal objects of the recommendations of this Report is to secure more money for Quebec. Ontario supplies

approximately fifty per cent. of the Dominion revenue, and a sharp contrast is drawn between Ontario and Quebec. Ontario is as rich as Croesus! Geographically, and in every other way, it is a paradise! Really, one scarcely can read the Report without forming a neutral picture of some men surveying a bank from a distance, with their caps pulled down over their eyes, and telling each other that if only they could get in, they might hope for a rich haul. We do not wish to be offensive, but the attitude of the Report toward Ontario is not unlike that of Hitler toward the Russian Ukraine, the gold stored in the banks at Prague, the food supply of the Low Countries, the wealth of France and of the British Empire. Bluecher is reported to have said of Paris, "What a city to sack!" Ontario? What a province to sack!

What of Quebec? Poor Quebec! She is like Pharaoh's ill-favoured kine. "Naturally enough," she will eat up the kine of Ontario, so fat and well-favoured. Ontario is rich, Quebec is poor; therefore we must find some way for transferring some of the wealth of Ontario to Quebec.

That, in itself, would not be an evil thing if the wealth of the one and the poverty of the other merely happened. The fact is, the wealth of a country does not consist exclusively in its lakes and rivers, forests and fields and mines: the chief asset of any country is its people; and while the Report makes mention of the "cultural interests" of French Canada, and assumes that the people themselves are different and distinct from all others, it might be supposed that Ontario is inhabited by a mongrel population.

What strange presence is there in Quebec which makes it so different from Ontario? It is more than race or language. What withering blight rests upon Quebec? It is not unique. Wherever the same influences are at work the same contrast appears. Let Lord Macaulay explain, thus:

"During the last three centuries, to stunt the growth of the human mind has been her chief object. Throughout Christendom, whatever advance has been made in knowledge, in freedom, in wealth, and in the arts of life, has been made in spite of her, and has everywhere been in inverse proportion to her power. The loveliest and most fertile provinces of Europe have, under her rule, been sunk in poverty, in political servitude, and in intellectual torpor, while Protestant countries, once proverbial for sterility and barbarism, have been turned by skill and industry into gardens, that can boast of a long list of heroes and statesmen, philosophers and poets. Whoever, knowing what Italy and Scotland naturally are, and what, four hundred years ago, they actually were, shall now compare the country round Rome with the country round Edinburgh, will be able to form some judgment as to the tendency of Papal domination. The descent of Spain, once the first among monarchies, to the lowest depths of degradation, the elevation of Holland, in spite of many natural disadvantages, to a position such as no commonwealth so small has ever reached, teach the same lesson. Whoever passes in Germany from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant principality, in Switzerland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant canton, in Ireland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant country, finds that he has passed from a lower to a higher grade of civilization. On the other side of the Atlantic the same law prevails. The Protestants of the United States have left far behind them the Roman Catholics of Mexico, Peru and Brazil. The Roman Catholics of Lower Canada remain inert, while the whole continent round them is in a ferment with Protestant activity and enterprise. The French have doubtless shown an energy and an intelligence which, even when misdirected, have justly entitled them to be called a great people. But this apparent exception, when examined, will be found to con-

firm the rule; for in no country that is called Roman Catholic has the Roman Catholic Church, during several generations, possessed so little authority as in France."

The question is, Is there any essential difference between the hackneyed "cultural" life of Quebec and Ontario? Is there any reason for Ontario's being richer, or Quebec poorer? We begin to see a little more light from such a statement as this:

"The municipal and real property tax situation was particularly complicated by the unique rôle which the Church plays in Quebec. Many functions, particularly in the field of public welfare and education, which are carried out by the local or provincial governments in other provinces are supported by the Church in Quebec. Although the personnel engaged on these services serve for mere nominal pay, there are substantial and unavoidable overhead costs which in the last analysis must be borne by the same incomes that support provincial and municipal taxation. As a result the Quebec taxpayer contributes more for services which in other provinces are largely supplied by the state than is evident from public finance statistics. These costs affect real estate in particular, both directly and through the exemption from taxation of the major portion of religious property."

What are the sources of revenue? Here is the answer:

"The outstanding feature of the Ontario revenue system is the high yield, both proportionately and absolutely, of real property taxation. This particular source has long been the backbone of Ontario public finance as might be expected from the highly urbanized character of the economy. It is chiefly through real property taxation that Ontario governments have taken advantage of the wealth and income which natural advantages and national policies concentrate in Ontario. In addition, Ontario has been in a particularly favoured position to develop income taxes and succession duties to tap the same taxable surpluses. In the decade ending 1937 Ontario collected \$100 million of total succession duty collections of \$180 million in Canada. In 1937 succession duties and income taxes amounted to \$7 per capita, or nearly one-half the total revenue of the provincial government in Quebec, for example."

Here then are two sources of income for Ontario: tax from real property, and the revenue from Succession Duties.

Let us now make a comparison of the income from real property taxation in Quebec and Ontario. I will not trouble to be exact with the hundreds of thousands—who cares for such small matters anyhow? But here it is: 60½ million dollars revenue in Quebec: 107¾ millions in Ontario. We shall try to explain the difference a little later. Then when we come to Succession Duties, there is also great disparity between Ontario and Quebec. I give you the high and low records in Ontario; the high is 20 million a year, the low, 12 million. In Quebec the high is 11 million, the low, 3 million. The yield from personal income taxes for provincial purposes is also much higher in Ontario than in Quebec, and the same is true of corporation income tax.

What is the reason for the difference in the yield from real estate? We will not bother with hundreds of thousands, but keep to millions. In Ontario exempted property was valued at \$380,000.00; in Quebec, the valuation of exempted property was \$734,000.00. But the \$734,000.00 in Quebec, according to Jean-Charles Harvey, editor of *Le Jour* and former official statistician, does not include property owned by religious orders. In all probability the value of property owned by religious orders, would be as much more, but it is not possible

to quote exact figures for the reason that the Quebec law has no authority to obtain any estimation of the value of these properties. They are, indeed, beyond the jurisdiction of the law. It is probably therefore not an exaggeration to say that the exempted religious property of one sort and another in the Province of Quebec has a value of not less than a billion and a half dollars.

No wonder Quebec's income from real estate taxes is so much less than that of Ontario!

Once again, the difference between 17 and 20 million, high, and 3 and 8 million, low, for the two provinces is in Ontario's favour. Why the discrepancy? The population of Quebec is somewhat less than that of Ontario, and for argument's sake it might be admitted—though I doubt it—there are fewer great fortunes in Quebec. Unless I am mistaken, there are some very, very big ones roundabout St. James Street!

Again I have no figures, though I should think it would be possible to obtain them by an examination of the court records of wills probated in the Province, but I venture the suggestion that perhaps nowhere in the world does any church profit by bequests left in the wills of the people as in Quebec. It would be interesting to discover just how much money is thus bequeathed to the Church—and of course upon all such bequests no Succession Duties are paid. The Church, not the Government, profits as these estates are left for the saying of prayers for souls in purgatory.

Nor is that all. The Quebec Government has a Department of Colonization. I give this report from the November 26th issue, 1940, of *Le Devoir*:

"Quebec, Nov. 26: Since the beginning of the summer season 1,700 families of colonists have been established in various districts in the Province.

"This is what we learned yesterday at the Provincial Service for the Establishment of Colonists.

"About 1,000 families, which include 5,500 persons, have been sent to the colonization districts under the terms of the Federal Provincial Plan. 700 other families, making a total of 3,800 persons, have been established according to the Provincial Plan . . .

"The number of houses reconstructed has reached 600. In addition, 700 new houses have been constructed. The Government offers a premium of \$250.00 for the construction of each house. In addition, it furnishes, free of charge, plans and blueprints.

"The Department of Colonization has also brought about the construction of 380 barns for the colonists, by means of a premium of \$75.00 per barn in addition to the plans and blueprints furnished without charge.

"In the spiritual realm the colonists have not been forgotten. The Rev. Father Bergeron, missionary colonizer, informed us that the Department constructed 10 churches and 8 presbyteries (priests' houses). The government gives \$3,200 per church, and \$800.00 for each presbytery. It adds \$200.00 when the colony installs a water system in the presbytery."

It is to be observed, therefore, that the Quebec Government is so rich that in one year the Colonization Department had constructed ten churches and eight presbyteries or priests' houses. To each church they had given \$3,200.00, and for the building of each presbytery or priest's house, \$800.00. That is, the Government had given \$32,000.00 for the erection of churches, and \$6,400.00 for the building of priests' houses—and it adds \$200.00 when the colony installs a water system in the presbytery. My surmise is that all eight presbyteries had water systems installed! Which means that during this last year the Quebec Government expended the tidy

sum of \$40,000.00 of public money for building these Roman Catholic churches and priests' houses.

I have not heard of the Quebec Government ever making a contribution for the building of a Protestant church, or a Protestant minister's house of any sort.

If you look at the income tax returns, you find a disparity there, and discover that in the very large incomes the tax in Quebec for Provincial purposes is only one-third what it is in Ontario. It would seem that it is because so large a proportion of the Provincial income goes into the coffers of the Roman Catholic Church.

There is another matter to which I direct your attention. This report recommends that the Dominion

"assume the larger of either the net debt service of the Provincial Government (that is, of Quebec) or 40 per cent. of the total net debt service of Provincial and municipal governments."

What would that debt involve? The enormous debt, of course, of the City of Montreal, resulting so largely from its horribly corrupt administration:

"All provincial debts (including both direct obligations and those guaranteed by provinces) plus the debt of certain Quebec hospitals and other charitable and educational institutions for which interest and amortization is provided by subsidies from the provincial government."

But that is not all. I set out a paragraph from the Report:

"The rôle of religious institutions in Quebec requires special mention for financial reasons, because these bodies have habitually provided educational and welfare services which in other provinces have been for the most part the responsibility of the state. This fact makes comparisons with other provinces particularly difficult, and from some of the submissions made before the Commission it would appear that there are frequent misapprehensions as to the efforts being directed towards educational and welfare services in Quebec. Unfortunately, accurate statistics of the monetary equivalent of the contribution of the Church are not available; for example, most of the personnel are paid only nominal salaries. To allow for this factor the Commission has assumed that the contributions of religious institutions and the fees paid by pupils and other beneficiaries have brought education and welfare expenditures in Quebec to the national average. In view of other direct estimates of this contribution the assumption does not appear unreasonable, although the amount involved is very large. In the absence of any precise statistics this is the only procedure open, since it would be absurd to suggest that the educational and welfare services in Quebec are inferior to those in other provinces to the extent to which the expenditure of public funds in Quebec falls below the per capita expenditure in other provinces."

I have quoted the Report as speaking of hospitals, and orphanages, and other welfare agencies, which are owned by the Church, against which bonds are held by certain trustees, and guaranteed by the province. The paragraph I have quoted includes these institutions as part of the Provincial welfare equipment. Therefore the debts resting upon these Roman Catholic institutions would be included in the total transferred to the Dominion. The same would apply to the educational institutions; and the debt thus transferred to the Dominion would have to be paid by all the rest of Canada. And fifty per cent. of it would come from the tax-payers of Ontario!

Some may object that hospitals and other institutions owned by the Roman Catholic Church are really welfare institutions, and that the legal ownership signifies

by the Roman Catholic Church anywhere, whether it be a hospital, a monastery, a nunnery, an orphanage, a newspaper, a publishing house, a school, or a church, that is not an agency for the propagation of Roman Catholicism; and the people of this and other provinces would thus be required to help to pay the debt resting upon institutions owned by the Roman Catholic Church.

The Report further recommends a system of National Adjustment Grants. They are, in principle, what we Baptists might call, in respect to our weaker churches, Home Mission grants; what, I believe, the Presbyterians call grants from their Augmentation Fund. But call it what you will, they are designed to make up the deficit of the annual revenue of the local institution, and thus assist in its maintenance.

We are informed that

In the outline of "Plan I, no conditions are attached to the National Adjustment Grants. They are given when a province cannot supply average standards of certain specified services without greater than average taxation, but the province is free to determine on what services the grants will be spent, or whether they will be used not to improve services but to reduce provincial (and municipal) taxation."

"We do not think it would be wise or appropriate for the Dominion to make grants ear-marked for the support of general education."

These grants are not earmarked for any particular purpose: they are handed over to the Province, and the Province is left "free to determine" what use will be made of them. That is to say, it can apply the grants to the welfare service; it can apply them to education; or, if it likes, it need not apply them to either, but on the strength of this income, may reduce the taxation of the province—because someone else is paying their taxes for them! That surely is a most extraordinary provision.

But again we find this:

"No province would receive a payment to enable it to improve inferior services if it had chosen to have inferior services in order to tax its residents less severely than the average. The only exception to this general method was in the case of Quebec where the notable work of the Church in the fields of education and public welfare could neither be ignored nor measured in monetary terms. Consequently, in the case of Quebec it was necessary to make the arbitrary assumption that the contribution of the Church brought education and welfare service standards up to the national average."

And so, on the basis of an "arbitrary assumption" without any statistical provincial proof of its accuracy, this "only exception to the general method was in the case of Quebec." It will be observed that an exception is made in the case of Quebec everywhere, and always, in Quebec's favour at the expense of all the other Provinces of the Dominion.

But what shall be said of this arbitrary assumption, and of the standard of Quebec services? Poor Ontario comes in for it again, for we are told:

"The per capita expenditures on education and social welfare in that Province (Ontario) are about 10 per cent. above the Canadian statistical average. Even after allowance has been made for the higher costs in Ontario than in some of the other provinces there seems no doubt that the quality of services is well above that of those provided by most other provinces. This high standard can be maintained under Plan I, as it is now, by taxation which is less burdensome than that which is imposed by other provinces. There is no suggestion that Ontario

should not continue to provide these services but there is also clearly no claim for national assistance to maintain these standards."

Thus extravagant Ontario has perhaps two bath-rooms where Quebec has only one, and therefore Ontario is not to get so much as a dollar toward paying the plumber's bill; whereas in Quebec the Government—poor Quebec!—provides \$200.00 to put a water system in the priest's house! It will thus be seen that, in order that Quebec should be eligible for the National Adjustment Grants, the fulfilment of the national standard of welfare services is established on the basis albeit of an "arbitrary assumption"; for it is said:

"It would be absurd to suggest that the educational and welfare services in Quebec are inferior to those in other provinces to the extent to which the expenditure of public funds in Quebec falls below the per capita expenditure in other provinces."

But what are the facts? Mr. Jean-Charles Harvey, in *Le Jour*, describes his own Province as "the most ignorant Province in the Dominion". The Prime Minister of the Province, Mr. Godbout, levels rather a wholesale criticism against the French Roman Catholic schools of Quebec. He said:

"Our young people ought not be trained until they are twenty years of age by an education that prepares them for nothing unless they wish to become priests."

The notorious Duplessis at once leaped to the defense of the priests, and insisted that no public man had a right to insult them.

But what are fruits of a school system completely dominated by the Church? We quote from an official Dominion Government publication, "Illiteracy and School Attendance, Census monograph No. 5", based on the 1931 census, as follows: The percentage of illiterate male population ten years of age and over in the two provinces is as follows:

Ontario	2.71
Quebec	6.21

Startling as the figures are, they do not tell the whole story, as there are many French-Canadians in Ontario, and many English-Canadians in Quebec. Hence the following statistics for the whole of Canada give a truer picture of the fruits of a Roman Catholic school system. The percentage of illiterates in Canada (ten years of age and over):

British races	0.88
French	6.18

This means that French Roman Catholicism produces approximately seven times as many illiterates as are found among those of British extraction, the majority of whom are Protestants.

I quote again from a Quebec report dealing with the rural schools in Quebec, which shows that

"1. More than 80,000 children from 7 to 13 years of age have not attended rural schools at all during the year 1938-39.

"2. Of 282,865 who are enrolled, 16% have been absent, on an average, each day. That is to say, the majority of the pupils have missed about one day per week.

"3. Of a total of 25,133 pupils who did not return to school, 8,453 are enrolled in another institution. There remains, then, 16,680 children who have finally left school some after the fourth year, the others after the 5th, 6th or 7th."

Notwithstanding the Sirois Report, prepared under the Chairmanship of the Roman Catholic professor of Laval University, insists that it would be "absurd" to assume that the educational system of Quebec is inferior to that of other Provinces.

And mark, the accrued deficit for all these institutions might, under this Report, be charged to the Dominion, and thus to you and to me. And we should be forced, as tax-payers of Ontario, to pay our share of the National Adjustment Grants to Quebec for an educational system that at best, according to the Premier of Quebec, prepares young people for nothing but to be priests; and at worst, allows them by the thousands finally to leave school at the end of periods from four to seven years. And for the maintenance of this splendid condition, a minimum allowance of \$8,000,000.00 a year is to be made to Quebec, plus the National Adjustment Grants that may be made according to the exigencies of the time when they are made, I believe, for five-year periods.

The Premiers of all the Provinces, with their staffs, have been brought together at Ottawa to consider this Report. Premier Aberhart did not use too strong a term when yesterday he said that to presume to base national unity upon the adoption of this Report would be nothing less than "diabolical". Can any reasonable man, with this Report before him, doubt that one of the main purposes of the argument of the Commission was that 'a handful of French-Canadians, led by M. Ernest Lapointe, should dictate its will to the country.'

Those who see in this Report the action of certain corporations to enhance the value of bonds held against the various provinces, at most, can be only partly right. In our view, that is the least objectionable feature of the Report.

If any Province should be in default on its bonds, either in respect to interest or principal, it would be bound to impair in some measure the credit of the whole Dominion. Provinces like Alberta and Saskatchewan particularly, which have suffered so terribly from causes beyond their control, deserve help and ought to have help. The same is true of the Maritimes, insofar as their particular situation, if they are in difficulties, is not of their own creation. Quebec also should be helped if its present condition is due to conditions which Quebec itself could not control. But the indisputable fact is that *the Roman Catholic Church, like a malignant parasite, has fastened itself upon the body of Quebec, and is draining it of the last drop of its blood, reducing it to something little better than an emaciated political skeleton, if the Report is to be believed.*

And then this same malignant parasite stretches out its tentacles, and through a "handful of French-Canadians led by M. Ernest Lapointe," seeks to wrap itself about the vitals of the whole Dominion—including this Province.

And on what ground does Quebec demand these exceptional favours? Her superior loyalty? Her unusual service in peace or in war? The Report tells us she was against us in the last war, and implies she is against us in this. The Report tells us she was against us in the last war on religious grounds: on the same

grounds she is against us in this. In the last war she was against republican France because of its "anti-clericalism". In this war, she is against Britain, and for the men of Vichy, and the France to which all privileges of the Church—including the Jesuit Order—have been restored. She was behind in enlistment in the last war: she is behind in this. I can assume only that French-Canadians, left to themselves, would be as loyal as other Canadians of other racial origin; but nothing is clearer to me than that *behind this Report is the cunning of the Roman Hierarchy of Quebec*; and in the insistence of Premier King's chief, Mr. Lapointe, that this Report should be considered now, *there is an attempt, under a specious plea for national unity, to fasten a blanket mortgage on the whole Dominion in the interests of the Church of Rome; thus to compel non-Romanist tax-payers, whether they like it or not, indirectly to contribute to the propagation of Romanism.*

Were I included in the délegation of Premiers, I would move without delay that the Conference close, that the Premiers and their delegates return to their homes; that Premier King and his colleagues be earnestly requested at once to get back to their jobs, and get on with the war. And I would add a pledge for myself, that so far as I could influence others, I would endeavour to inaugurate a movement which would meet such a report as this at any time it may be presented, now or in the future, with the indomitable resolution, "It shall not pass".

Great Victory at Ft. William

Fort William,
July 7th, 1942.

We heard in Winnipeg on Friday that the Mayor of Fort William had cancelled the contract for use of the City Hall Auditorium for our meeting, notwithstanding the rent had been paid and receipt obtained. The Mayor told Mr. Tompkins that he had cancelled the contract on representations of Father McGuire, priest of the Italian Church, and on the insistence of the wife of Italian Alderman, and other Catholics. Arrangement was then made for the use of a large rink, the rent paid, and receipt obtained. Monday about noon we were advised the rink contract had been cancelled within eight hours of the hour of meeting. The Orange Hall; with a capacity of 250, was then engaged; and on arrival we found the place jammed, with enough outside to fill the hall nearly ten times over. At length we announced to the crowd that we would go to a nearby park, and great cheers went up. Hundreds of cars lined the streets in all directions. It was thrilling to see the procession of hundreds on street and sidewalks, hurrying to the park. We estimated conservatively over 2,000—general estimate 5,000—stood attentively until ten o'clock (still as light as at six). The results were equal to almost any place, and under similar circumstances as other meetings held, would easily have been our greatest meeting. The changes necessitated three sets of advertising in the Fort William and Port Arthur papers. They gave us generous write-ups, and treated us handsomely. While prohibited from taking an offering in the park, people voluntarily brought up in envelopes about \$200.00. The Romanists did not put us down, and our record of successive victories remains unbroken. There is no building here that would have been large enough to accommodate the crowd that gathered in the park. Leave in thirty minutes by ship for Sault Ste. Marie.

T. T. SHIELDS.