

# 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. 11

TORONTO, JULY 16, 1942

Whole Number 1052

## This and Last Week's Issues of The Gospel Witness

From the inception of *The Canadian Protestant League*, *The Gospel Witness* has given large space to pleading its cause, for the reason the cause of *The League* is our cause. In so pleading we expound the principles of the Protestant Reformation—which is but another word for the gospel of the grace of God.

But *The Gospel Witness* has not profited from the funds of *The League* by so much as one dollar. We have spent some thousands of dollars, altogether, in extra issues to make the work of *The League* known, sending the paper, not only to our own subscribers, but to tens of thousands of others. This has cost a great deal of money. This issue of the paper, and that of last week, have been most expensive. We receive no more, of course, from our subscribers, but the paper costs much more to print, and much more to mail to our regular subscription list. In addition, such issues are sent by thousands beyond our *Gospel Witness* family.

We have never stopped to consider expense when a job needed to be done, and through all these twenty years we have found that we had only to inform our readers of our need to find that need supplied. We write now to ask those who approve of our campaign to awaken Protestants in this country to the present peril, to come to our help. Ever since it saw the light of day, *The Gospel Witness* has been the hewer of wood and drawer of water for every good cause. It has been instrumental in getting thousands of dollars for missions, considerable sums for church buildings, and other needy causes; and in this ministry it has ever had the greatest delight.

But while doing all this, it has often had to make its way on pretty short commons; and although it has played freight-engine to many a heavy load, it has never received for itself much more than a redcap's tip. There must be among our readers many people who could, if they would, lend us substantial aid. There are those who give hundreds — and thousands even — to missions; and some give considerable sums to other benevolent objects. We would not suggest their giving a dollar less, but we know of no more important missionary agency in Canada to-day than *The Gospel Witness*. Our whole national structure is at stake; and unless people can be awakened to the seriousness of the present situation, there are very dark days ahead for Protestantism in Canada.

We need thousands of dollars for our *Gospel Witness Fund*, to enable us to do with these issues what ought to be done. We believe the distribution of the Analysis of the Sirois Report, as well as the matter contained in this issue, would be of great value could we send out tens of thousands of extra copies to people all over the land.

So far *The Gospel Witness* has had to depend on many small gifts—it may have to do so still. And we want all our readers to know that a contribution of \$1.00, or \$5.00, or any amount, will be greatly appreciated. We have written as we have in the hope that these words may catch the eye of some of the Lord's stewards of large substance who, with a really generous gift to *The Gospel Witness Fund*, will come up to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty. Let us hear from you immediately. Address the Editor, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto.

## A Happy, Successful, But Strenuous Tour

The Editor and Rev. H. G. Martin, Superintendent of Yonge St. Mission, Toronto, left Toronto by Canadian Pacific Railway for the Pacific Coast, Monday night, June 8th and returned to Toronto, Saturday morning, July 11th, having thus been *en route* to the Pacific and return for thirty-two days. In that time Mr. Martin travelled 6,206 miles via Winnipeg, Regina, Saskatoon, Edmonton, Calgary to Victoria, and return. Dr. Shields travelled 6,035 miles going straight via Calgary to the coast, and returning via Calgary, Edmonton, etc., a total mileage for the two of 12,241.

In the thirty-two days addresses were delivered at forty-six meetings to an aggregate by a very conservative reckoning—by actual counting where possible, of 31,739. At these meetings a total of 2,874 persons signed applications for membership in THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE. Of this number 1,982 paid their one dollar annual membership fee, the remaining 892 marked their application form as promising the fee. All have been written to, and of this number many have already sent in their fee, and others are being received by every mail.

Beside these, thousands of copies of the Constitution and Application envelopes, were carried away by persons attending the meetings, and we believe many of these also will yet be heard from. Hundreds of thousands more read about THE LEAGUE in the press reports of the meetings and in THE LEAGUE advertisements.

The total offerings at all LEAGUE meetings amounted to \$2,112.43. This, with the paid up memberships of \$1,982.00, makes a grand total of receipts for the thirty-two days of absence—actually thirty days from the first meeting to the last, of \$4,094.43.

A few friends have spoken of this tour as a "vacation"! True; it is the only vacation this scribe expects, or desires. But many will read this note in Britain and elsewhere who are not accustomed to Canada's magnificent distances. Our round-trip schedule was arranged for us by the Canadian Pacific Railway before we left Toronto, and all reservations booked in advance. The round trip of over six thousand miles was completed without one change, and every reservation was used as arranged. In view of all the meetings *en route* we think this is rather remarkable.

Just that our friends may not think the Editor and Mr. Martin were on a joy ride we publish herewith the schedule as arranged by the C.P.R. and as carried out to the letter. (The only exception was that transportation by road from Kamloops to Kelowna and return was, of course, arranged by ourselves, and not by the C.P.R. It should be noted further that the schedule herewith did not provide for Mr. Martin's detour going west via Regina, Saskatoon, and Edmonton to arrange the meetings in those cities.)

The Canadian-Pacific Railway is one of the greatest, if not the greatest transportation systems in the world. On this rapid tour we found it completely efficient. It will interest our readers to note what time was allowed in each place. We seemed to be running from trains to meetings, and from meetings to trains almost all the time.

Here follows our railway schedule:

## CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY

Toronto, June, 5th, 1942

ITINERARY FOR: Rev. Dr. T. T. Shields  
Mr. H. G. Martin

Station	Hour	Date
Lv. Toronto	10:55 p.m.	Mon., June 8th
Ar. Winnipeg	9:00 a.m.	Wed., June 10th
—Royal Alexandra Hotel—		
Lv. Winnipeg	10:20 a.m.	Thurs., June 11th
Ar. Calgary	8:45 a.m.	Fri., June 12th
—Hotel Palliser—		
Lv. Calgary	9:15 a.m.	Sat., June 13th
Ar. Vancouver	8:40 a.m.	Sun., June 14th
(Speaking at Regular Baptist Convention daily 14th to 19th)		
Lv. Vancouver	10:30 a.m.	Sat., June 20th
Ar. Victoria	3:45 p.m.	Sat., June 20th
Lv. Victoria	1:20 p.m.	Tues., June 23rd
Ar. Vancouver	6:40 p.m.	Tues., June 23rd
Lv. Vancouver	10:30 a.m.	Wed., June 24th
Ar. Kamloops	7:30 p.m.	Wed., June 24th
*Lv. Kamloops	9:30 a.m.	Thurs., June 25th
Ar. Kelowna	1:30 p.m.	Thurs., June 25th
*Lv. Kelowna	12:00 midnight	Thurs., June 25th
*†Ar. Kamloops	4:00 a.m.	Fri., June 26th
Lv. Kamloops	4:30 a.m.	Fri., June 26th
Ar. Banff	6:05 p.m.	Fri., June 26th
Lv. Banff	10:10 a.m.	Sun., June 28th
Ar. Calgary	12:50 p.m.	Sun., June 28th
Lv. Calgary	11:45 p.m.	Mon., June 29th
Ar. Edmonton	6:25 a.m.	Tues., June 30th
Lv. Edmonton	10:30 p.m.	Tues., June 30th
Ar. Saskatoon	11:15 a.m.	Wed., July 1st
Lv. Saskatoon	11:40 p.m.	Wed., July 1st
Ar. Regina	5:35 a.m.	Thurs., July 2nd
Lv. Regina	8:40 a.m.	Fri., July 3rd
Ar. Winnipeg	6:05 p.m.	Fri., July 3rd
Lv. Winnipeg	6:50 p.m.	Sun., July 5th
Ar. Ft. William	5:30 a.m.	Mon., July 6th
†Lv. Fort William	12:00 noon	Tues., July 7th
Ar. S. S. Marie	9:30 a.m.	Wed., July 8th
Lv. S. S. Marie	3:55 p.m.	Thurs., July 9th
Ar. Sudbury	9:30 p.m.	Thurs., July 9th
Lv. Sudbury	11:05 p.m.	Fri., July 10th
Ar. Toronto	6:30 a.m.	Sat., July 11th

\* By motor.

† (260 miles by mountain roads return).

‡ By C.P. Steamship.

### BOOKS BY DR. T. T. SHIELDS

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

### SERMONS ON THE WAR

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

# The Jarvis Street Pulpit

## MODERNISM ROME'S FIFTH-COLUMN AND ALLY

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, July 12th, 1942

(Stenographically Reported)

"There be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."—Galatians 1:7, 8.

To the Apostle Paul, the revelation of God in Christ was the divine ultimatum; it was God's last word to the world: "Last of all he sent unto them his son." To him, and to all the other apostles, the gospel of grace was absolutely final. He was sure there could be no other gospel, no really good news other than that which he had already preached; and so sure of it was he that he intimated to the Galatian Christians that even if he himself should come with another gospel—if he, like some modern preachers, should change his mind and preach something else,—he forewarned them that they were to regard such a change as a change from truth to error. If he should preach anything else, he assumed that he would be rather out of his mind, and they were to pay no attention even to him. Indeed, though one should come claiming to be an angel from heaven, and should preach any other gospel, they were not only to disregard it, but he pronounced a curse upon anyone who should endeavour in any way to amend the word of God. It was for ever final, God's last word.

Why did he say that? Because there were some who sought to pervert the gospel of Christ. There have never been wanting men who exercised themselves in that evil attempt. There have always been people seeking to pervert the gospel of Christ; and Paul exercised himself in defense of the gospel which he himself had proclaimed. "There it is", said he, "there can be no other." This whole epistle is written as an apology, as a defense against those who would pervert the gospel of Christ.

There are those who object to religious controversy. The fact is, we cannot live without controversy. Your physician will tell you that life is a constant battle against the things that would impair your physical health; and if you do not engage in controversy, in battle against these things, you may not live very long. The whole science of hygiene is based upon the assumption that we live by controversy, by battling against those things that are injurious to the human system.

There can be no intellectual progress without controversy. We must busy ourselves in correcting our mistakes of yesterday. The teacher has a controversy with his or her pupils. The pupil wants to spell a word his way, and the teacher insists it be spelled another. So it is in every department of life. The signposts at the crossroads are there to prevent our taking a wrong turn, and to make sure we take the right one. The gardener in his garden is holding a controversy with the enemies of his plants every day. Yesterday he thought he had everything under control, but today some new pest must be attacked. There is a worm for every root, a blight for every bloom. Life consists in controversies about something; whether life as considered

physically or in respect to some great principles of thought, as well as in all matters relating to the moral and religious realms. We must be on the alert always against those influences which would pervert the truth.

Many have endeavoured to pervert the gospel. For many a day I have warned my hearers and readers against these perversions. We have not pleased everyone by our contention "for the faith ONCE FOR ALL"—remember—"delivered unto the saints". For, as Paul says here, "If I yet pleased men I should not be the servant of Christ." But if we have offended any it has been because we put loyalty to the gospel before our personal friendships. The gospel I have preached in this place for more than thirty-two years is nothing new; there is nothing novel about it; it is the same old gospel, the principles of which were written into the Trust Deed of this building—and we still preach it, and still stand, and shall continue to stand for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints.

### What Is the Gospel?

What is the gospel? That is a large subject, but I can I think summarize it: "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." He came as the only Begotten of the Father, "full of grace and truth." The gospel is, that Jesus Christ, while being perfect man, was also perfect God. He united in His person Deity and humanity. He was not only the Son of God, but God the Son. Having a human mother, He had no human father: He was begotten of the Holy Ghost. That simple statement involves the principle of supernaturalism. The miraculous birth of our Lord Jesus is in itself an everlasting contradiction and disproof of the evolutionary hypothesis which denies that God can and does break in upon the stream of human life. He did break in. It admits the principle of divine interposition. It proclaims the sovereignty of God over His laws, His right—and His ability—to interpose. It proclaims the reality of the supernatural, of something that is above nature.

Therein lies the basis of the gospel, that the supreme, ultimate revelation of truth is in the person of Christ; and that, having come, He in His own person, in the infinity of His dual nature, received into His capacious soul the sorrows of the world; and, dying in our room and stead, God in Christ reconciled the world unto Himself. His death had infinite value, and compensated for the sins of us all.

His resurrection is a further disproof of that mechanistic evolutionary idea of the universe. He Who died, rose again, and ascended into heaven. Then He sent His Holy Spirit; and those who received Him were so inspired that they wrote His word for the perpetuation

of His teaching; and Paul here certifies that the gospel which he received, which was preached to many, was not after man, for he neither received it of man, neither was he taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. Paul insisted he had received the gospel firsthand, direct from Christ Himself; and having received that word from Christ, he said there is no one authorized to countermand that which God has decreed. Men may not take from it, nor add to it: it is God's final word.

#### **Perversions of the Gospel Outside of Rome**

We have not to go to the Roman Catholic Church to find people who pervert the gospel of Christ. Our battle for many years in this place has been against what is generally called Modernism. I venture to affirm that that philosophy of things is the natural child of the evolutionary hypothesis. There are varying degrees of it. Some are more anti-supernatural than others, but in principle the germ is the same.

It denies the unique divine quality of the Bible, and hence sets it aside as an authority. It denies, as a rule—though it asks questions about it first, and usually ends with a denial—the virgin birth of Christ—the cardinal, supernatural event. Following upon that is a more or less complete denial of the miraculous events of His life; and naturally and inevitably of the substitutionary adequacy of His death—for His death could have been of no value had He not been God as well as man. If He had been man only—a perfect man only—He might have atoned for the sins of one man, but He needed to be God to atone for the sins of all men. This He was: this He did.

The gospel is a revelation of the grace of God, the infinite stoop of Deity to a bankrupt humanity that, like the prodigal, had spent all, and had absolutely nothing left. Because we had spent all, God stooped to the depth of our need, and by His own resources of mercy, and righteousness, and truth, and faithfulness, and justice, and love, and eternity, effected our salvation by all the qualities of His being in combination, which are represented in that one immeasurable word that is as deep as hell, as high as heaven, as broad as the east is from the west—that one immeasurable word, the biggest word in any and all languages, which will require all eternity to define, which can be defined only by an eternal experience of salvation, the one word, GRACE.

#### **The One Great Heresy**

The heresy of all heresies is to believe that a man can do what only God can accomplish. If it were possible for man, by his own effort, to re-make, to re-create in the very essence of it, his own nature, and then to reform and refashion it into the image of God, if a man could do that, inevitably he would challenge the divine supremacy and enter into competition with God Himself. But He will have no rival, no competitor. He will not disgrace the throne of His glory; He will have pity on His own great name. When there was no eye to pity, and no arm to save, His own eye pitied, and His own arm brought salvation.

#### **Romanism the Heresy of Salvation by Works**

Any departure from that principle is heresy—and Romanism is just that. Romanism is the substitution of the flesh for the spirit, the carnal for the spiritual,

human works for divine grace, the image of a man for the image of God.

#### **In All Pulpits**

But we need not go to Rome to find it. You will find it in the United Church pulpits, in Baptist pulpits galore, in Presbyterian pulpits, and in Anglican pulpits; as, of course, in Unitarian pulpits. You will find that teaching everywhere, that a man can re-orient his life, re-make his own character, pay his own bills, build, like the Babel builders, a city and a tower whose top shall reach to heaven—and get home to God largely by his own efforts. It might be expected that these principles, under whatsoever name they are taught, would flock together.

I wonder if I can state a matter to you.

(Here, Rev. H. G. Martin of Yonge Street Mission, came to the platform, and was greeted with enthusiastic applause by the audience.)

I am glad you did that; if you knew him as I have known him in the last month, you would give him another cheer. (Still louder applause.)

#### **Phariseeism and Sadduceeism**

In the days of our Lord's flesh there were certain people who professed to believe the very things which He taught. The Pharisees were the orthodox people. They professed to believe the Scriptures. The Sadducees were the naturalists of their day, who denied the supernatural. They said there was no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit. The Sadducees and Pharisees had no love for each other. According to their profession, they believed the opposite.

You remember how the learned doctor of the law, Saul of Tarsus, after he became a Christian, on one occasion observing his audience was made up of both Pharisees and Sadducees, said, "Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee: of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question." By so saying he divided his audience in two, and "And when he had so said, there arose a dissension between the Pharisees and the Sadducees: and the multitude was divided. For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit: but the Pharisees confess both. And there arose a great cry: and the scribes that were of the Pharisees' part arose, and strove, saying, We find no evil in this man: but if a spirit or an angel hath spoken to him, let us not fight against God. And when there arose a great dissension, the chief captain, fearing lest Paul should have been pulled in pieces of them, commanded the soldiers to go down, and to take him by force from among them, and to bring him into the castle."

Paul was fully aware of this irreconcilable difference of view. But have you observed how, where our Lord was concerned and where the gospel was at issue, they buried their differences and joined hands against Him, and against the gospel? Why? Phariseeism had lost its spiritual vitality. It had become merely a theoretical, a doctrinaire, system, a thing of the head and not of the heart. Our Lord came expounding the spiritual content of the revelation they professed to believe—and they would have none of it. As between a spiritual religion, and a mere lifeless orthodoxy, and the naturalism of the Sadducees, they rejected the spiritual message of our Lord, and joined hands with their bitterest foes against the Truth.

### "Birds of a Feather"

Why do I say that? Because many years ago I ventured to say that Modernism was the handmaiden of Romanism. I will put it another way now, but the same in principle: Modernism is Romanism's Fifth Column. It is the thing that prepares the way, because, philosophically, Modernism and Romanism are the same. The Modernist does not wear the priest's robes, he does not burn his candles, nor offer his Mass. Theoretically, the modern Sadducee denies what the Mass professes to be. Modernism would say, "I do not believe it is possible to convert a piece of bread, a wafer, into the actual body, soul, and divinity, of Christ. That is against everything I believe." But when you bring the Modernist face to face with the spiritual implications of the gospel, he will accept Romanism in preference to the gospel.

There are those who, while denying the supernatural, are ready to accept the grossest superstition in its place. Many of the enemies of the principles of the Reformation are to be found without the pale of the Roman Catholic Church. The bitterest foes will often be found among such so-called Protestants.

Mr. Martin will say something about our experiences in the West, but I anticipate his message thus far as an illustration of my principle. In a certain city of the West we had engaged the City Hall for our meeting. The rental fee had been paid, and a receipt obtained. The meeting was announced. Then one day two men went to the City Hall to interview the officials of the city, in an endeavour to get them to forbid the use of the City Hall for a Protestant meeting. They went together. Who were they? The Pastor of the First United Church and a Roman Catholic priest ("Disgrace!") All who agree with that remark, say, Amen (A great chorus of, "Amen!") They did not succeed in that instance—we held our meeting. But *together* they tried to prevent it. Thus Pharisee and Sadducee joined hands.

I call your attention to the principle that quite irrespective of the names they bear, "birds of a feather (morally and religiously) flock together." They present an equal opposition to the truth as it is in Christ. There are some people who would feel that it is not particularly complimentary for a minister who used to have a fair reputation, to be denied the use of any auditorium. I am not at all disconcerted or humiliated by that experience. I remember that when the Lord Jesus came to this world, He found the representatives of a religion that owed its origin to a divine revelation, to have been so corrupted that when "he came unto his own, his own received him not." He began His public ministry in a synagogue; but after the sermon, while some wondered at "the gracious words that proceeded out of his mouth", others conducted Him to a cliff, and would have thrown Him headlong over, "but he passing through the midst of them went his way." And thereafter, where did the world's greatest Preacher preach? Where did the world's greatest Teacher teach? By the seaside, in the desert, on the mountainside—not in the synagogue or the temple. He went into the temple once with a whip and drove out the money-changers—a symbolic act—and said, "My house shall be called the house of prayer; but ye have made it a den of thieves."

### The Minister of Justice and Dr. Silcox

How very largely religion in our day has become com-

mercialized, and the church made a house of merchandise! The other day, in his maiden speech, the newly-appointed Minister of Justice did me the doubtful honour of dragging my name into his remarks. He mentioned my name in connection with a gentleman named Silcox, Dr. Silcox. I have heard of him, but know nothing about him. I have never met the gentleman, never seen him, never heard him. I have nothing in the world against him. I supposed he was a good man, I understand he is an official of the United Church. But he must needs write a long letter to explain that the only agreement between himself and Dr. Shields is that our names begin with the same letter! Well, my name begins and ends with "S": Dr. Silcox' name begins with "S"—and ends with "X", an unknown quantity. (Laughter).

I do not object to being named with him, and had I been in his place would not have bothered about it. I do not think anyone would mistake Dr. Silcox and myself, but this is what he says:

"I am 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. . . .

"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."

I did not know anything about it! I think the Protestant League was blissfully unaware of Dr. Silcox' "many attempts" to nullify the work of the Protestant League. I was driving along a mountain road the other day in British Columbia, and saw a poor little jackrabbit in the middle of the road, a rabbit that had made an "attempt" to stop a car! I am reasonably certain that those who were riding in the car did not even feel a bump. Poor little jackrabbit! I tender my condolences to Dr. Silcox on the complete failure of his "many attempts" to nullify the work of the Protestant League. I hope his nurse, or whoever looks after his safety will admonish him to look up and down the street before crossing lest the swiftly-moving Protestant League car should unintentionally, without even "attempting" it, bowl him over. Poor Dr. Silcox who laments that the Minister of Justice knows so little about him, supplies an illustration of my principle. It was so in the Master's day. He went on with His work without the religious leaders of His day: He did His work in spite of them. No, Nicodemus was one, but he was converted. Joseph of Arimathea was another, and he was converted. Let us hope that Dr. Silcox may yet be converted; for any man who would make that statement is either wrong in his head or wrong in his heart. There can be no agreement between Christ and Belial, between the temple of God and idols, between

light and darkness. There can be no agreement between Christ and Antichrist—and Rome is Antichrist.

### Diplomacy and War

Before Italy came into the war, Mr. Churchill spoke very politely to the Italians. He used the language of diplomacy. But after Italy entered the war, he talked about "that jackal Mussolini"! Why? That was the language of war. In what respect do I differ from Dr. Silcox? Or Dr. Silcox from me? Dr. Silcox still thinks it possible to hold diplomatic relations with Rome, with the Papacy. I refuse to accept the mark of the beast; hence I have resigned from the diplomatic corps, and joined the army—now I can call the Roman Catholic Church by its proper name, "the beast" of Revelation, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS, AND OF ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. (Loud applause). If Dr. Silcox wants to continue his "activity on behalf of a greater rapprochement" between the church he represents and that evil, he is welcome to it; and I find it a high compliment that we are so far apart. If I'm troubled about it at all, I should simply say, "There is one other common point of agreement between us, Dr. Silcox, and that is the mutuality of our repugnance to being linked with the other!"

The main story of our Western tour will be told Thursday evening, and we have a great story to tell. We have addressed tens of thousands of people, and I have seen a further illustration of what a friend of mine said some years ago: "Considering the long and varied experience he has had, the devil is a bit of a fool after all." We had the help of Roman Catholic Bishops and the Knights of Columbus all the way. I invited the Bishop of Victoria and the head of the Knights of Columbus of that city to join our party, to make it a quartette instead of a two-man affair, that they come along with us as our advertising agents—to do all the kicking they liked, and we would speak to the multitudes they gathered for our hearing!

I content myself with saying this, and then Mr. Martin will speak. On Thursday evening we will give you a full report of the most strenuous month I have ever lived—and I have lived rather strenuously. As for this man Martin: do not travel with him unless you want to work. Do you know what he said to me one day? Looking at his watch he said, "You have just time to go and get a haircut, or buy a violin-case"! I went to the barber! It was cheaper! He is a right royal and loyal, and very observant companion.

### Those Who Are Blind and Have Forgotten.

But I want to state this principle, and I have done. There is a passage in Peter's second epistle to this effect: "Add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity. For if these things be in you and abound"—if you maintain your spiritual life, nourish it by prayer and by feeding on the heavenly manna, and by a proper exercise in the application of spiritual principle to your daily living, thus growing up into Christ in all things, you will be a developing Christian, and will be "neither barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind,

and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins."

I believe there are multitudes of people in our day who are in that latter deplorable condition. The root of the matter, let us charitably hope, is in them. Let us dare to believe that they were, at some time, born again and purged from their old sins, and that in that day they saw the King in His beauty, and beheld the land that is very far off. That gave them inspiration, perspective, dynamic. But their experience faded away until now they are blind; they cannot see spiritual issues. When you talk with them about the things of God, they look at you in blank amazement, as though you were speaking a foreign language. Talk to them about being saved, and they ask you what you mean. They see no distinction between right and wrong, between truth and error, between righteousness and unrighteousness. Why? They are blind. Talk to such about the future, whether of our own country, the generation now rising or the generations yet to come who may be shackled or enslaved by this curse of Romanism, and they say, "I am not interested in the generations to come. I am interested in here and now." "Peace in our time" religiously! They "cannot see afar off." They are for sale. You can buy any man of that stamp for honours or preferments. "And hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sin." But if he be a Christian, if the root of the matter be in him, if ever God did give to him eternal life, though it be hidden it is there, and it may revive: "For this shall every one that is godly cry with thee in a time when thou mayest be found."

### Fellowship With Ministers of All Denominations

One of the great encouragements of our trip has been the fellowship we have had with ministers of all denominations. We held our meeting in a United Church in Victoria, the biggest building in town, with the minister's help and blessing. He is to pass through Toronto soon, and he is going to preach for us. I do not know what sort of preacher he is, but I know what sort of man he is! There are a great many of the other sort, the modern Pharisees and Sadducees willing to sell out the truth for which our fathers died, but not all.

### What About the People?

And what about the people? I said that our Lord went outside of organized religion to do His work. So did the apostles. They had to begin all over again. So have we. Someone said to me, "You will get no help officially from any of the denominations." "Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him?" I do not care whether they have or not, except for their sake. But we discovered that there are thousands and thousands of people who are head and shoulders above their ministers, and that all through that Western land there is a mighty tide of real Protestantism flowing. It needs only an opportunity to express itself.

We stand by the old gospel. We will have nothing to do with anything else; and that is why we are for THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE. After the Sudbury meeting we met two ladies who had been at the church, one I knew, and the other was a stranger, a French-Canadian. As we talked, she said, "I am so happy. I was a Roman Catholic, and have been free for a month now. I have my Bible, my French New Testament, and

my English New Testament. Oh, I am so happy. I cannot tell you how happy I am because Christ is my Saviour, and I am free. My husband has not altogether come out, but he comes with me to the services. He has given up his drink, I can see a change in him, he is interested; and I am praying, and am sure that soon he will be just as free and happy as I." That lady was saved under the ministry of Brother John Boyd in Sudbury.

We do not believe in a negative Protestantism that merely denies the pretensions of Rome. We set over against it, the positive message of the glorious gospel of the happy God. We would like to preach it to everyone, to make every Roman Catholic as free and happy as that French-Canadian woman. Come Thursday night, and we will tell you something that will make you happy. We have many things to tell you that will make you laugh. If you do not believe in laughing in church, do not come Thursday night. If you do, come.

I have tried to tell you that the many who have forgotten their initial experience of grace—because they have been fed by their ministers on doubts and questions instead of on the positive affirmations of the Word of God—when they heard the positive message again, smacked their lips, metaphorically, and said, "That is the food we used to eat. That is what this old heart wants. That is what my hungry soul requires. We are with you. We are for you. We will stand together for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints."

May I take my friend, Mr. Martin, at a disadvantage, and say this—not as a compliment; but every day of our travelling together, I have thanked God for him. The Lord has marvellously used him, and we could not have succeeded without his extraordinary sagacity—and all that is indicated in that chin of his,—that means when someone says, No, he says, Yes. And that he will be sure to say it last!

Hence we found places to speak. From Winnipeg to Vancouver and back again, to the praise of the glory of God's grace I say it, our trip was an uninterrupted triumphant procession all the way.

Mr. Martin will tell us about Regina, Saskatoon, and Edmonton. We wrote to these places, and the ministers replied, "Sorry; I will be on my holiday. In any case, I do not approve of such meetings." Mr. Martin dropped off at Regina, Saskatoon and Edmonton, and then joined me later in Vancouver, and we have been together since. Where the ministers said they did not want us to come, Mr. Martin arranged for meetings, saying, "That is the very place we are going." Tell us about it, Mr. Martin.

REV. H. G. MARTIN

We have had a glorious time, and all that Dr. Shields has said was true except his remarks about myself. They were somewhat exaggerated, for I did not do very much. I was glad to carry his bag, and felt it an honour to be with him (Dr. Shields: "He did not carry my bag.") When at Fort William—but you will hear Thursday night about that experience. Let me say, however, that I look upon it as a great honour to have walked down the street in that city, after having been refused two auditoriums, and crowded out of the small Orange Hall that we finally secured, to a park where we had a great meeting with hundreds and hundreds of people gathered. I never felt more like John the Baptist in

my life. Dr. Shields stood on a park bench, and preached to that great multitude; and afterward—as at every service—the people came to him with their problems.

At the hotel, I told the management to put all the telephone calls on my line, but he would come in to see if someone wanted to speak with him. I am glad that God has brought him back in such good health at the end of the trip, for he was really a sick man part of the time. One night he was so ill that as I lay in the upper berth praying for him, he looked up and said, "Brother Martin, one of these mornings I will wake up in glory." But I say advisedly, there is no man in the Dominion of Canada who is more necessary to the successful issue of the war than Dr. T. T. Shields (Applause). I am convinced of this too, that there is a growing disgust at the aggregation of politicians that we have in Ottawa. And I know this, that even though there are some of these fellows that Dr. Shields calls midgets in the West, there is a tremendous wave of loyalty behind Dr. Shields. People thank God for his messages there.

About those three cities I visited on the trip out, to arrange for meetings. I dropped off at Regina, and found in that city as in Saskatoon and Edmonton, the few who were not afraid. A man had written the League office and said he would bring the matter before his minister, who would in turn bring it before the Ministerial Association. The Chairman of that organization was a Baptist—and had no use for Dr. Shields. He took it upon himself to cancel the bringing of the matter before the Association. He said nothing to them. When we heard about that, we did not hesitate to give his name to the people at the meeting, and there were great cries of, "Shame." The people were indignant at the attitude of these Protestant ministers, and their indifferent attitude toward these things.

We made up our mind that God was in the work, and we were bound to succeed. A man came to the hotel to see me in Regina. We asked him if he would come on the platform—he was perhaps the most prominent business man in town. He replied, "I will pay the rent of the hall, and do anything else I can do; but do not let on to anyone who is doing it. I am supposed to run in politics."

A minister in that city came to see me at the hotel, a man who had had a church near Montreal; we had a great time together. He said, "We have one United Church man who has courage." When we got back and met a member of the committee and asked who was to be chairman of the meeting, he said, "We tried every minister in town, and could get no one to go on the platform." "How about Mr. Wright?"—for that was his name; and we are going to name these men. The committee member replied, "He will not even say prayers. He is frightened." When opposition began to show itself, he was afraid—and did not even come to the meeting. And that was a good meeting! We had good meetings all the way.

Then on to Saskatoon. What a stronghold of Satan! I stayed at the Bessborough, and had not been there long when the telephone rang. "Is that Mr. Martin?" "Yes." "Mr. Martin of the Protestant League?" "Yes; and who are you?" "I am not giving my name, but I want to warn you that you are being followed, and your life is in danger. I am calling as a friend: be careful

what you say over the telephone because your line is tapped." The information was perhaps of some use, for we did our important telephoning from a pay 'phone. On Sunday afternoon—I had spoken in the morning, and told something of our plans—a call came through, telling me if I did not get out of town they would cut me up into little pieces and throw me in the river, which ran conveniently behind the hotel. The man uttered more abuse of that sort, and then challenged me to meet him in the shrubbery at half past one in the morning. I said, "All right; I will take you on, and ten others like you." He said I would be afraid to go around by the river bank, but if I were not I would meet my friends there! I kept my appointment! Indeed, I was ahead of time: I was there at one-fifteen. But they did not turn up! I saw only a few folk who were in love, sitting on the park benches! And they did not want to see me!

Dr. Shields has said time and again that the Roman Catholic Church is an aggregation of bluffers. And it is. Join the army, and help us fight the Fourth Axis power. It is frightened of anyone who dares to stand up and say, "I have your number."

The minister of the Third Avenue United Church in Saskatoon—the biggest church in town—was a Mr. Päckham; and the church is rented for any kind of stage show, political meeting, or what-have-you, at fifty dollars a night. I did not tell him immediately the organization I represented, but afterward did. I said, "I am travelling with Dr. Shields, and we want to rent your building. I will pay you right now. You know something of what we are doing on our trip?" Somewhat discourteously, he kept writing at his desk, filling out a certificate, as I talked. Then he said, "I know of Dr. Shields. He is a sincere man, I believe, but greatly misinformed." I told him we were not asking his co-operation, but that we wanted only to rent the building at their usual fee; that they would not be required to subscribe to what was said at the meeting. He picked up *The Winnipeg Free Press* and said: "There he is; I know what it is all about."

We have learned, like Paul, to rejoice in good reports and evil. This man said, "I have not the final word; I will bring it before my session." I told him we would have a meeting if we had to stand in a public park, or rent the ball-room of the hotel. We held the meeting in the theatre, which was about one-tenth the size of the building we needed. At twenty minutes to eight, the ushers were at the door saying, "We are sorry, but you cannot get in; the place is jammed everywhere." We told the people about the minister of the Third Avenue United Church, and one of the members of the Session sent a note up to the platform asking if it could be possible that it was Mr. Packham. People are getting sick and tired of this complacency respecting the evil we face from Rome.

Then on to Edmonton, where we rented the Masonic Hall auditorium. There was opposition. Our feeling always was on going to a city, "What shall we have here?" And sometimes Dr. Shields would say, "We have not had enough opposition to make a good meeting"! We felt the more opposition the enemy gave us, the more assurance of real success.

You have heard it asked, "For what does Dr. Shields count?" Let me tell you. We were late getting out of Vancouver on the return trip. We had only fifteen

minutes to get from the hotel to the station, and care for the baggage. No, our bags were still in our rooms at fifteen minutes to train time. Dr. Shields said, "Call the station-master and ask him to hold the train." When we got to the station, I could not find a redcap—you never can when you are in a hurry—and there were ten pieces of baggage. As I ran downstairs, through the open gate to the train, they were calling, "All aboard." I said to the official, "Hold the train for Dr. Shields," and he replied, "We will hold the train as long as you want for him." I went back upstairs and said, "Take your time, boys." We got on the train, with people poking their heads out to see the man for whom the train was held—a man who has the courage of his convictions.

In Vancouver I went to the bank to pay some accounts, and the bank manager came along. He knew about the meeting, and said, "Where did all that money come from?" Both the bank manager and the accountant felt keenly about the matter—the gall of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Victoria daring to suppose he could stop a meeting. In the hotels and banks people were thanking God, everyone, for Dr. Shields and the meetings. It has meant something. I do not believe any series of meetings have meant more for the good of Canada in war time—or any other time.

As Dr. Shields has said, the meetings have not consisted solely—nor primarily—in a denunciation of the presumptuous claims of the Papacy, but in a positive message. And people have been impressed. The simple plan of salvation was presented, and it has done the country good. I am positive there has been fruit for eternity. We have had the privilege of witnessing for Christ on the train, in the hotels and banks; and we look forward to telling you on Thursday night of big things. We in Jarvis Street—I am a member of this church now—have the best Pastor on the Continent. I tried to take good care of him, but he is such a patient! He does not do as he is told. Every meeting at which he has spoken has been a miracle of grace. The people did not recognize he was weary and worn, for when he was speaking God's strength was manifestly in him.

### Another French Canadian Gem

From time to time this paper has quoted from *Hansard*, which gives in full the House of Commons debates, samples of speeches by French Canadian members showing the peculiar slant with which they look at the nation's affairs. On July 6th Mr. J. A. Bonnier (Saint-Henri) was guilty of this gem:

The advocates of conscription claim in every one of their speeches that they wish to maintain harmony and unity in this country. Now is it fair to expect the province of Quebec to knuckle down every time there is a sacrifice to be made? Let our friends from the other provinces who never stop talking about Canadian unity lead the way to a better understanding and cease all this chatter about conscription. That would be the best evidence of the fact they are willing to make some sacrifices for the sake of national unity."

SEND FOR EXTRA NUMBERS  
OF THIS ISSUE



# Shall King George VI., or Pope Pius XII. Rule Canada?

An Address by DR. T. T. SHIELDS

Delivered in the City Hall, Regina, Sask., July 2nd, 1942, Under the Auspices of the Canadian Protestant League

(Stenographically Reported)

(The address printed herewith was delivered in the City Hall, Regina, as stated above. It is published as being representative in general of the addresses given during the Western tour on which the Editor was accompanied by Rev. H. G. Martin. Naturally, not all addresses were alike. They were coloured by local circumstances. That is to say, the bearing of the principles discussed upon the local situation was particularly noted.

While the words varied in each address, the argument was substantially the same. There were, of course, other aspects of the Romanist controversy discussed, and this was especially so in places where opportunity was given for more than one address. Addresses were given from June 10th to July 10th in: Winnipeg, Calgary, Vancouver, Victoria, Vancouver (return visit), Kamloops, B.C., Kelowna, B.C., (Afternoon and evening meetings), Calgary, (return visit), Edmonton, Saskatoon, Regina, Winnipeg (return visit, Friday, July 3rd and Sunday afternoon, July 5th), Fort William, Sault Ste. Marie, and Sudbury.)

Ladies and Gentlemen: I am very happy to see that so many of you have managed to get here in spite of the efforts that were made to prevent our having a place of meeting.

I join with my friend, Mr. Martin, in agreeing that the supremely important consideration for every one of us is his personal relation to God. For myself, I am not interested in a Protestantism that consists in hating one's opponents—or in hating anyone. I have no sympathy whatever with a Protestantism that contents itself with crying down the Pope—although, mind you, I think he ought to be cried down. We are here this evening because we believe the religion of the Roman Catholic Church is directly opposed to the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Perhaps I may as well state the case at the outset because I shall have some fairly strong things to say before I finish my address this evening; and there may be some of you who will be inclined to think that what I say is too strong. Before Italy came into the war Mr. Churchill was accustomed to speak of Italy and the leaders of Italy somewhat restrainedly; he used the language of diplomacy. But when Italy came into the war and stabbed France in the back—and we perforce declared war on Italy—Mr. Churchill dropped his diplomatic speech, and adopted the language and attitude of one at war. Then he did not forbear to call Mussolini a jackal.

I differ from many of my Protestant friends in this, that they seem to think it is possible to maintain diplomatic relations with the Roman Catholic Church, and treat it as though it really were a Christian church, as though Roman Catholicism were only another form of Christianity. In my view, the Roman Catholic Church is not entitled to be called Christian. Roman Catholicism is not Christianity, it is not a form of Christianity: it is stark, unadulterated, ruthless, paganism—and nothing better. Roman Catholicism is paganism under a Christian name. Romanism, essentially, is the very opposite of Christianity; and I at least refuse to recognize it as having any place in the Christian family. I think I shall succeed in establishing my point before I conclude.

I speak strongly, but truly, when I say that the Roman Catholic Church is the devil's supreme masterpiece, and the greatest agency for evil in all the wide, wide world—and that I shall endeavour to prove.

## Italian Church Speaks With Two Voices

The Church of Rome invariably speaks with two voices. One voice is designed deceptively to woo those who do not understand its ulterior aims; and in an entirely

different voice, through the confessional and the priest, it commands the services of those who do its will.

## Pontifical Mass on Parliament Hill

THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE came into being last autumn, and it was formed for this reason: The Roman Hierarchy made arrangements for the celebration of a Pontifical Mass on Parliament Hill. The Roman Catholic altar was erected in the main entrance of the Canadian House of Parliament, under the Peace Tower. Thousands of people assembled, and moving and still pictures were taken of the proceedings; and the moving pictures have been shown all over the Continent. Within forty-eight hours of its celebration, one of the New York papers presented a full-page picture of the Mass on Parliament Hill, which of course gave the impression that Canada is now predominantly a Roman Catholic country. And I have little doubt that those films have already been exhibited before His Holiness the Pope.

## Canada Not Yet Roman Catholic Country

But Canada is not yet a Roman Catholic country—and some of us are resolved by God's help that it shall never become so! (Applause).

You have a right to expect, and to demand, that any public man shall be in a position to substantiate whatever statement he may make. Why was objection taken to the celebration of Mass on Parliament Hill? Have not the Roman Catholics a right to celebrate Mass? Certainly. Personally, I believe it to be a piece of idolatry. Notwithstanding, every man should be free to worship God in the way he believes to be right. He may be religiously wrong, but he has a religious right to be wrong if he wants to be! I would as readily fight for full freedom of Roman Catholics in general, as I would fight for my own religious liberty; for I believe in absolute freedom of conscience for every man, for liberty to worship God as his conscience may direct.

The state has no right to encroach upon the realm of conscience unless and until such action as a man's conscience may be alleged to dictate proves contrary to the general peace. We must be free. Therefore it was not to the Mass *per se* that we objected, but to the deliberate design to wave the papal flag on Parliament Hill, and thus to celebrate that which is distinctive of Catholicism and which is central to its whole system, at the seat of government.

In the main entrance to the popular Legislative Chamber of this Dominion they erected the Roman Catholic altar. Our protest meeting in Toronto was held on

September sixteenth last year. Two thousand people or thereabout found entrance, and probably an equal number were outside. Of that meeting, THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE was born. It was decided that the time had come for those who could not in conscience longer submit to Rome's encroachment upon our British rights and liberties; and could no longer be silent in face of her brazen assumption of so many of the functions of Government, to take some action. It was because we felt that the time had come when acquiescence in Rome's dictatorial rule in this country had ceased to be a virtue, and that something should be done to mobilize Canadian Protestant sentiment, and make it articulate, that the CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE was formed October sixteenth, nineteen-forty-one. Since that time we have had many meetings; and every meeting, wherever it has been held, has served to prove the necessity for such an organization as THE PROTESTANT LEAGUE.

#### The Ottawa Meeting

We contemplated going to Ottawa, but all the larger churches in Ottawa feared to open their buildings to a Protestant meeting. In some cases they were sympathetic. Their ministers and officers for the most part expressed regret that in their view it would not be politic for them to hold such a meeting under their roof. Substantially the same reason was given everywhere: each church said it had such a large number of civil servants belonging to its church and congregation, that if a Protestant meeting were held in the building, and these civil servants were to acquiesce, they would be in danger of being penalized on Parliament Hill. We found that there was not one of the larger churches in Ottawa that had not been brought under the fear of the Roman Catholic Church. One brave minister did consent to offer prayer at the meeting if and when it should be held, but later he called us by long distance to Toronto, to be asked to be excused even from that.

You may say that it was not complimentary to the leaders of THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE for such objection to be taken, but in reality it was not to the LEAGUE's leaders, but to the assertion of its principles objection was made.

I would remind you that the Lord Himself in the days of His flesh found a religious system that was so corrupt, so destitute of divine quality, that He had to go entirely outside the pale of organized religion to deliver His message to the world. The same was true of the apostolic church. It was founded in an upper room, by the wayside, in the valley, on the mountain—wherever people could be brought together to hear the word of God. They were permitted occasionally, it is true, to speak in the synagogues; but in general, the apostolic preachers had to deliver their message without the sanction of the religious authorities of their day—and generally in opposition to them.

And we have come upon a day when, in some quarters, many religious officials seem to be afraid of the Church of Rome. They are either afraid, or they are themselves apostate like Rome—and that, of course, would be still worse.

We felt, therefore, that we must go to Ottawa. We had a meeting in the Chateau Laurier. The corridors were crowded, and the attendants said that by their estimate there were at least two thousand people who could not get in. Thus we had to go over the heads of re-

ligious officialdom, to the common people, as did our Lord; and we found that the great masses of the people are tired of being held under the thrall and threatenings of Rome (Applause).

#### Meeting at Winnipeg

I spoke in Winnipeg on the way out to the Coast, on just one night; but between four and five hundred people set their signatures to our application forms for membership in THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE, and paid their dollar fee to help in the expense of the printing of literature. No one in the League receives a salary, not even an honorarium. The only remuneration paid is for office help.

Ever since the outbreak of war, the Roman Catholic press, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, has been demanding that I be interned, or brought before the courts. I owe a debt of gratitude to *The Winnipeg Free Press*, both for what it has said itself, and for the text it has provided the Editor of *The Leader-Post*, of Regina. *The Leader-Post*, I suppose, indicates a union of two papers. But the name itself is suggestive. What can one expect of a "leader" tied to a "post"? I suppose the "post" is another name for the Liberal party (Applause). And the Liberal party in Canada is the Roman Catholic party (Applause). And the Conservative party wants to be (Applause).

#### At Calgary

We held a meeting at Calgary on our way out to the Coast, which greatly overcrowded the building, as this building is overcrowded to-night—and the results were as gratifying as the meeting in Winnipeg. I was engaged to speak in Vancouver under other auspices than THE LEAGUE, but even in these meetings some hundreds joined THE LEAGUE.

#### League Meeting in Victoria

Our first LEAGUE meeting on the Coast was to be in Victoria, and following its announcement I was advised of a Canadian Press despatch to the effect that the Roman Catholic Bishop of Victoria, a Dr. Cody, had sent a telegram to the Minister of Justice at Ottawa, requesting him to exercise his authority to prevent our appearance in Victoria. It was also said that the head of the Knights of Columbus had made similar representation to the Victoria police. Asked by the representatives of the Press whether, in view of this protest, I would go, I replied in Luther's words when he said he would go to The Diet if there were as many devils at Worms as there were tiles upon the housetop—but I told them to make it "shingles" for Victoria.

I am speaking thus because of the rather nasty editorial in *The Leader-Post*, to let you know what effect opposition has had upon our meetings. The press later reported in Victoria that the Bishop had received no reply from Ottawa.

#### No Building Large Enough

In Victoria there was no building large enough to hold the crowds. The meeting was held in the largest church building, the Centennial United Church, the Pastor of which, Rev. John Turner, is a real man who could not be frightened by a Bishop's threats. We had four meetings in Central Baptist Church, of which Dr. J. B. Rowell is the minister, every one of which was crowded; and THE LEAGUE meetings were held in the church I

have named Sunday afternoon and Monday evening. At these meetings the church auditorium, the Sunday School Hall, and the Gymnasium—each of which was served by a public address system—were all packed to capacity, while many hundreds listened from loud speakers outside. In the two days we had in Victoria it was conservatively estimated that we reached between five and six thousand people. That was due, of course, to the generous assistance of the Roman Catholic Bishop, and the head of the Knights of Columbus.

#### The Vancouver Meeting

Returning to Vancouver for the Thursday, we found similar conditions—a great building said to accommodate seventeen hundred, with about five hundred beyond its capacity packed into it. There is danger of attaching too much importance to mere numbers, but on a subject of this sort it was interesting and encouraging to observe that notwithstanding great indifference in some quarters, there is still a Protestant conscience in this country, and we have found a great tide of Protestant conviction flowing through the West.

#### Canadian Protestantism Still Lives

I have said all this in order to make it clear that Protestantism in Canada is not dead. All it requires is an opportunity to express itself. And THE PROTESTANT LEAGUE exists to afford that opportunity. We left behind us in Victoria and Vancouver fifteen hundred members of THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE. We hope to organize branches in these large centres, and from these centres to carry the Protestant message to, and organize auxiliaries in, every part of British Columbia.

Returning, we held another great meeting in Calgary, and in Edmonton. The scene was very much like that which you see this evening—the same milling crowds, and the same enthusiasms. There were very many who said, "We thank God for THE PROTESTANT LEAGUE. It has not been organized any too soon."

Last night in Saskatoon was no exception to the rule. There, too, we found a perfect flood of humanity—the building was not half large enough.

#### National Unity—What Price?

We have long been exhorted to do everything possible to promote national unity. To this I emphatically agree. I believe it was never more necessary that Canada should be united than now. Surely there can be no two opinions among us that Canada's great task just now is the prosecution of the war. I believe that every ounce of energy of every sort should be mobilized so as to strike such a blow at Hitler and Hitlerism as will prove fatal.

#### Quebec and Conscription

The Plebiscite did nothing to promote national unity, but served only to reveal the disunity which really exists. In the issue of *The Winnipeg Tribune* of the very same date as the issue of *The Winnipeg Free Press* from which *The Leader-Post* takes its text for its testy editorial, there is a translation of an excerpt from an article in *Le Devoir* under the caption, "Conscription the National Peril", containing these words:

"For us conscription would not bring that peace with our fellow-Canadians which alone could form a solid foundation for our common existence. It would mean civil war, ruin, a country stained with the blood of its own people, fratricidal strife."

That is the sort of thing they preach in Quebec. I did not say that, nor would I. But they are preaching bloody revolution unless they are allowed to have their own way. And yet they have the impudence to talk to us about "national unity"! But if "national unity" can be realized only by the majority's submitting to a minority under the rule of the Pope, then I will have none of it! I would a thousand times rather die than submit! (Applause).

I have great respect for the office of Prime Minister of this country. If I should seem to speak contemptuously of its present occupant, it is because he has behaved so contemptibly. The policies of the Premier of this great Dominion have made him, in my view, the most contemptible figure in the public life of the Empire. That you may not think I am a narrow partisan I may tell you that I voted for him in the last election! I made a speech in his favour. That speech was published, and it was used by the Liberal party quite extensively in the election. I voted for Mr. King as the lesser of two evils. I could not possibly vote for a party that had chosen a Roman Catholic as its leader. But unfortunately, what some of us thought was the lesser of two evils has proved an evil of great magnitude.

#### Why Quebec Opposes Conscription

But the question arises as to why Quebec is so opposed to conscription. In answering that question I may even shock you. During the last war I picked up in Westminster Cathedral, London, a little booklet by Cardinal Mercier, entitled, "The Duty of Catholics." I did not open the book, but was attracted to it by Mercier's name. Later I read it. The thesis of the booklet was that it is the duty of Roman Catholic parents to marry their children at maturity, and breed a population for the church. The booklet stated the case thus baldly and boldly. Could there be a greater contrast to the church of the New Testament? The true church of Christ is enlarged and multiplied by spiritual re-generation; the Roman Catholic Church multiplies itself by natural generation. And it is for ever true that that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. The Roman Catholic Church is essentially a thing of the flesh. It is carnal, temporal, of the earth, earthy. "But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless, what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free-woman. So then, brethren we are not the children of the bondwoman but of the free."

A French-Canadian gentleman came to see me recently from Montreal. He came to urge upon me the promotion of "national unity". He said he had talked personally with Cardinal Villeneuve, and with several of the Archbishops of Quebec. I asked him what he had done in the last war, remarking that he seemed to be of an age which would have allowed him to serve in the army. He admitted he had been of military age, but he said, "I stayed at home to do my duty, and build up the nation. I have twelve children, my cousin has eighteen; and I know of others who have twenty and twenty-five. Before long we shall have the majority in this country."

A noted Canadian statistician tells us that within thirty years the Roman Catholics will have a majority

in this country. In nineteen hundred and thirty-one they had about forty-one per cent. of the population. They have largely increased since then, and probably have a much larger percentage than they had ten years ago.

### The Minister of Justice Speaks

The Minister of Justice did me the honour of naming me in his maiden speech in the House of Commons. This is by no means new, for they have discussed me and my paper both in the House of Commons and in the Québec Legislature a number of times. Invariably they have but one cry, "Stop him." Even the Minister of Justice did not attempt to meet my argument: he merely denied the truth of my statement. He was discussing my contention that the Roman Catholic Church of Québec is against conscription because it desires to retain its men at home that they may breed their kind, and thus hasten the day when they will have a majority of the population. The Minister of Justice denies that Quebec is opposed to conscription because it is seeking what they call, "The revenge of the cradle." But a voice from Quebec confirms my contention. This is a translation from a French paper, printed in *The Winnipeg Tribune*, of the date to which I have already referred:

"Not much has been heard lately of "The revenge of the cradle", (*La revanche du berceau*), a tradition supposed to be harbored by the French-Canadians. However, that this means of obtaining greater political power is still entertained by certain people in Quebec is evidenced by the following extract from a paper recently read by Paul Sauriol to the Société d'Economic Politique, and given prominence on the editorial page of *Le Devoir*:

"If in the United States no racial group is in a position to dispute first place with the Anglo-Saxons, this is not the case in our own country, where the French-Canadians probably represent today more than 30 per cent of the total population.

"As our rate of natural increase is twice that of the Anglo-Saxon population, we shall probably in due course equal the latter and then exceed it. Some English-speaking Canadian publicists are already apprehensive as to what will be taking place towards 1961 or 1971, failing in the meantime a new wave of Anglo-Saxon immigration. If this prospect is realized it forms a strong reason, among others, for opposing annexation to the United States."

Here the case is stated plainly enough. What is wanted is a racial group in a position to dispute first place with the Anglo-Saxons—and such a racial group is found in the French-Canadians of Quebec. It is the constant boast of Quebec that the French of Quebec were conquered by the sword, and that they will have their revenge through the cradle.

### Canada's Problem—The Roman Catholic Church

And here let me state plainly once more that I have not one word to say against Quebec as a province; nor against French-Canadians as a race; nor against Roman Catholics as individuals. Quebec is one of the richest provinces of the Dominion, in natural resources. I believe there are no finer people in the world than the French-Canadians. And I think there is ground for believing that large numbers of Roman Catholic French-Canadians are serving in the armed services of the country, and that they are serving faithfully and bravely.

Perhaps no people in the world are less informed of the plans and schemes of their superiors than Roman Catholics. The Roman Catholic laity are told to leave all great matters to their spiritual superiors. They are taught that it is their duty to be obedient to the pre-

scribed rules of the church, and to depend upon the church's good offices for their eternal salvation. As for the rest, they must not think: their religious superiors will think and plan for them. Hence there are many Roman Catholics to whom the Roman Church is only a religious institution, an institution which they think ministers the sacraments, and through the sacraments the grace of salvation. But they know nothing of the real genius of the Papacy. They do not conceive of it as the greatest political conspirator in the world, endeavouring to effect the subjugation of all the world to the Roman Pontiff. They know no more of the machinations of the Papacy, than the German private soldier knows of the plans of Hitler.

I can well believe that there are Roman Catholics who in spite of all the superstitions of Rome have got through it all to Christ; and through faith in Him have been born again, and received the gift of eternal life. Therefore I beg of you, do not go away from this meeting and say that I have spoken against Roman Catholics as individuals. There is no Catholic I would not take by the hand and do everything possible to help him.

Furthermore, I have no sympathy with racial antipathies. I refuse to join with the politicians and editors in calling Canada's problem a French-Canadian problem. French-Canadians cannot be other than French-Canadians. They were so born. I believe he does a great disservice to this country who would set race against race, and insist that there exists a racial disunity which cannot be cured. Our difficulty is that neither the secular press nor men in Parliament are willing to recognize and acknowledge the real issue. They skate around our problem, and talk about "Quebec" and "French Canada". They are like a doctor who feels a patient's body, and whose experienced fingers tell him that beneath the surface there is a malignant, fatal, malady which will ultimately take the patient's life; but he is afraid to tell either the patient or the relatives of the real trouble. He says he will send a change of medicine; and the patient takes the sedative or the narcotic, and feels a little better. But all the time the doctor knows that the real trouble is cancer.

Now I say, the Canadian problem is not Quebec as a province; nor French-Canadians as individuals, or as a race; nor Roman Catholics considered as individuals: Canada's real problem is the Papacy, the Papal Hierarchy in Canada. The Hierarchy dictates the policy of the Quebec members of Parliament; and the Quebec members in Parliament dictate the policy of the Prime Minister of Canada. The real ruler of Canada is not the leader of the majority of its elected representatives: the real ruler is the "prince" of the church, Cardinal Villeneuve and the Hierarchs who serve under him (Applause.) It is they who dictate the whole course of government. And behind them all stands Pope Pius XII. And if you would know how far the tentacles of this cancer reach, read your *Leader-Post*. That will unwittingly reveal it. Or read *The Winnipeg Free Press*—or almost any other daily paper in Canada. I say "almost", for thank God, there are some daily papers which hold fast their independence.

The present Minister of Justice, Mr. St. Laurent, in his speech in Commons, said in effect that it was no part of a patriot's duty to defend his own country beyond his own shores. He also said that one hundred and seventy-five years of Canadian history had proved

that three million French-Canadians cannot be assimilated. What is involved in such a statement? Surely this, that the French-Canadians are a race apart, and that it is useless to expect them to merge with other Canadians, to build up a unified Dominion. They are separate, and are determined they will so remain—and this from the Minister of Justice in a British Dominion! If anyone is guilty of preaching disunity, and impairing Canada's war effort, it is the present Minister of Justice. His influence is just as sinister as that of his predecessor, and he is far less politic. It is he who ought to be interned!

### An Appeal to Join the League

I rest now for a moment from my argument that I may appeal to you every one to become a member of THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE. An envelope on which is printed an application form, has been placed on every seat, and the envelope contains a copy of the Constitution, the important parts of which are as follows:

#### II. OBJECT:

1. THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE shall have as its chief objects the preservation, maintenance, and assertion of the traditional, civil, and religious liberties of British subjects.

2. To this end THE LEAGUE acknowledges the Bible to be the divinely inspired record which God has given to us of His Son; Who is therein revealed as the one and only Sacrifice for sins, the one and only Saviour, the one and only Mediator between God and men, and the one and only Person to whom universal authority in heaven and on earth has been given; and THE LEAGUE therefore acknowledges the Bible as being the supreme authority in religion; and in agreement therewith THE LEAGUE will endeavour to practise, defend, maintain, and propagate the great doctrines and principles of the Protestant Reformation.

3. And all this in contradistinction to, and in defence against, the supreme authority falsely claimed by the Roman Catholic Church; and also against the Roman Church's political methods of propagating its tenets, and of extending and exercising this illegitimate authority

#### III. MEMBERSHIP:

1. Any person who by signing an application for membership shall declare that he or she is in agreement with Section II. of this Constitution, and shall thus undertake to endeavour to fulfil its provisions, and who shall pay the prescribed membership fee, shall thereby become a member, and shall receive a membership certificate hereinafter provided for.

2. The annual membership fee shall be One Dollar, payable when application for membership is signed.

To become a member of THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE you sign the application form, and enclose one dollar as your annual membership fee. Why the one dollar membership? For this reason: we are facing, and fighting the richest corporation on earth. The Roman Catholic Church has billions of dollars at its disposal. Our only sources of income are our membership fees, offerings taken at our meetings, and such donations as may be sent to us. The one dollar membership fee is intended, first of all as a guarantee of good faith. Membership in any organization which costs nothing at all would have little value. One dollar a year is little enough for a man to pay for his convictions of truth. He is not likely to put even a dollar in an envelope without giving it serious thought; hence the membership fee is designed to insure that those who join THE PROTESTANT LEAGUE are really in earnest about it.

Then, of course, as we have said, these membership

fees are a source of income. I have already said that no salaries are paid to any officer of THE LEAGUE, nor does any officer receive so much as an honorarium. But we have considerable expense in printing literature and mailing it, and keeping our office records. We are not against the employment of regular officials of THE LEAGUE at a salary. We have none such at present only because as yet we cannot afford it. We have office help to take care of the clerical work, and that, I think, everyone will recognize is absolutely indispensable. I am hoping the day will come when we have nine strong men, one in each Province; but we have no one as yet. I am supposed to be on my vacation, and so is Mr. Martin, and we plead the cause of THE PROTESTANT LEAGUE without remuneration of any sort.

### Four Papers

We have several papers which are sympathetic to our Protestant cause: the Orange *Sentinel* stands, of course, for all that the Orange Order stands for, and the Editor, Mr. W. J. Armstrong, is a member of our Executive Committee. *The Sentinel* is a weekly paper. *The Evangelical Christian*, published in Toronto, is a monthly magazine, and is definitely set for the defence and propagation of the principles of the Protestant Reformation. Its Editor-in-Chief, Dr. R. V. Bingham, and its Managing Editor, Mr. J. H. Hunter, are both members of the Executive Committee of THE PROTESTANT LEAGUE. In the next place we have *Protestant Action*, a paper edited by Mr. Leslie H. Saunders, who is Secretary-Treasurer of THE LEAGUE. This paper issues every month, and gives a great deal of information on the Roman Catholic question. Copies of *Protestant Action*, will be found on the seats. We have distributed them as far as the numbers would allow. The other paper is THE GOSPEL WITNESS, which has been published for more than twenty years. It is a paper that has been discussed in Parliament again and again. It is the paper which the Catholic press has demanded should be suppressed. THE GOSPEL WITNESS is a weekly paper. It carries a sermon from Jarvis Street pulpit, stenographically reported, and many articles from week to week dealing with the Roman Catholic controversy, and with religious subjects generally. In the course of this tour I have discussed the SIROIS REPORT, and there has been a great demand for copies of my analysis of it. We shall, therefore, reprint my analysis of the Sirois Report in next week's issue. The price of the subscription to THE GOSPEL WITNESS is two dollars per year. We carry no advertising, not because we are opposed to it, but because its necessary supervision might cost more than it would yield. It has edited the paper now for more than twenty years. It has gone to more than sixty different countries, and we have subscribers all over the world. I wish you would subscribe to all these papers, *Protestant Action*, issuing monthly, is only one dollar per year, *The Gospel Witness*, two dollars. But we are offering *The Witness* for nine months as from the first of July to the end of March, nineteen hundred and forty-three, for one dollar. You will learn very little of these matters from the daily press. In our own office we take the French-language papers, and make our own translations, and we publish many things which do not appear in the English papers at all; indeed, we have furnished not a few texts for editorials in the secular press. Now if you are with us and are ready to support us,

put your name and address on one of these envelopes. If you have a dollar with you, put it inside. If it is a bill, do not seal the envelope: if it is silver, please be sure to seal it. If you have not the one dollar with you, give us your name and address in any case, and put an "X" after the word "promise". All these applications will be forwarded to Toronto. Those who have paid their one dollar membership fee will receive an acknowledgment, together with a membership card in THE PROTESTANT LEAGUE; and those who have promised will receive a letter of acknowledgment with an addressed envelope for your convenience in sending your dollar fee to Toronto. These dollar fees go to the general fund of THE LEAGUE. We always ask our friends to help defray the local expenses of the meeting. We have to pay for the rent of this hall, and for the advertisements which have appeared advising you of this meeting.

(At this point the envelopes were collected, then the speaker continued):

We will now receive the collection for local expenses. Please make it as big as you can. Pile in the dollars instead of the five-cent pieces. But be sure you keep enough in your pocket to pay your carfare home.

(After the collection, Dr. Shields resumed the discussion of his subject as follows):

#### The Neglect of History

There is a story in the Bible of a new king, a new Pharaoh who reigned over Egypt, and who knew not Joseph. That is to say, he was ignorant of the history of his own people. I am afraid Mr. Henry Ford is not the only one who regards history as being "bunk". But it is impossible for one to have an intelligent understanding of his own time if he is ignorant of the history of his own country, and of his own people.

#### The Manitoba School Question

At the turn of the century in this Western land there was a great political issue in Manitoba, when that Province abolished Separate Schools. They did not abolish Separate Schools on religious grounds, but because the schools that were controlled by the Roman Catholic Church were not furnishing to citizens of Manitoba an adequate education; and because they did not want Manitoba to be as illiterate as Quebec. Separate Schools were abolished. A Roman Catholic minority appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada against the Manitoba legislation. The Supreme Court ruled to the effect that the authority which had granted Separate Schools was competent to withdraw the privilege. And inasmuch as the Manitoba legislature had granted the special privilege, the Supreme Court's judgment said the Provincial Government was competent to withdraw it. An appeal was then taken to the Privy Council of London, which interpreted The British North America Act to this effect, that where a minority believed itself to be suffering an injustice, it had the right to appeal to the Federal Authority for remedial action; and that the Federal authority *may*, not *must*, grant such relief.

Sir Charles Tupper had been brought back from England to assume the leadership of the Conservative Party, and he became Prime Minister in a dying Parliament. Thinking to gain the vote of the Quebec people, he brought in a Remedial Bill which provided for the setting up of a Separate School System in Manitoba against the veto of the Provincial legislature. As it was near

the end of Parliament they talked the Bill to death, and before they could come to a vote Parliament was prorogued. There was a general election, and Sir Charles Tupper appealed for the support of his Remedial Bill. The Honourable Wilfrid Laurier, then leader of the Opposition, had taken the position that as Manitoba had abolished Separate Schools, it was wholly the business of the Province, and that he would not interfere. He said he stood for Provincial rights, and the cry was, "Hands off Manitoba." He said if he were elected as Premier he would not super-impose Separate Schools upon the Province of Manitoba. Protestants all over the country hailed Laurier's pronouncement as an indication that there had arisen a Roman Catholic who was a Canadian first, and a Catholic afterward. There were a great many Baptists, I know, who regarded Laurier's pronouncement as a forerunner to the emancipation of Quebec. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, or Wilfrid Laurier as he then was, was returned by a great majority. I have little doubt that Orangemen of all sorts, as well as others who were not Orangemen, Baptists, Presbyterians, Anglicans, Protestants generally, took Laurier at his word, and believed there had arisen in Canada a great French-Canadian leader who would unite both races and lead the Dominion on to further greatness.

I recall meeting a certain eminent Baptist the morning following Laurier's second election. He was reading *The Toronto Globe*. I remarked that he seemed rather cheerful. To which he replied, "Who would not be?" He indicated that he was very happy over the results of the election, and asked if I were not. I took the paper from his hand, with his consent, and pointed to the list of members elected from Quebec, a solid Quebec, and I said to him, "Mark my words, the Roman Catholic Laurier will yet do more for the Roman Catholic Church from principle, than the Protestant Tupper proposed to do from policy." My friend dissented from my opinion, and insisted that this marked the liberation of Quebec.

#### Erection of Saskatchewan and Alberta Provinces

Another election came around, and Laurier was returned for the third time. Immediately following his election he "erected" as the word was, these Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, and the Autonomy Bills were discussed in the House of Commons. By the initial proposal contained in those bills, there was a provision for a duplicate system of education to be set up in both these Provinces from the primary class to the university. There was to be a system not only of primary, but of secondary schools, right up to the university. Of course, the proponents did not expect to get all they asked for, but with some modifications the bill was passed. I was minister in London, Ontario, at the time; and while the bills were still under discussion in the House, a by-election was ordered for London. It came about in this way:

The Minister of Public Works was a Mr. Sutherland, who was dying of cancer. Mr. Charles Hyman was the Acting-Minister of Public Works, and Member for London. Mr. Sutherland died at the time the Autonomy Bills were under discussion, and Mr. Hyman was promoted to the position of Minister of Public Works. That necessitated an election. I discussed the matter at the time, saying there were two G. T. P.'s—one was the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the other the Gigantic Trick of the Papacy.

As soon as the writ for the by-election was issued, Mr. Hyman returned to London and immediately sent for me. I discussed the matter with him for three hours. I reviewed the Manitoba School question, recalling how Laurier had stood for Provincial rights, and had insisted that he would be no party to the coercion of Manitoba. And yet when setting up the two new Provinces, he incorporated the Separate School principle in their Constitution—two Provinces big enough to be an empire in itself. I asked him how it had come about, and he replied that Sir Wilfred came into the Council and laid down the bills and said that those were his terms. When objection was raised he told them that they would have to accept it or he would resign. That, of course, would have meant another election, and rather than face that the Cabinet submitted. I asked Mr. Hyman why he thought Sir Wilfred had done that, and his reply was: "He is a Roman Catholic." When I asked him what he was, he said perhaps he was not as good a churchman as he ought to be. I said to him then, "And so you voted to hand over that vast territory to the dominion of a foreign prince, and had not the courage to stand against it!" Thus the Separate School principle was written into the Constitutions of Saskatchewan and Alberta.

#### The Roman Church and Immigration

About nineteen hundred and twenty-nine, when on my way to England, I met a man on shipboard who was an agent of the Canadian National Railways. He said his special job was to get business for the Canadian National Railways. At that time you will recall there was no general ban on immigration. This man said that although an agent of the Canadian National Railways he was an Englishman, and knew nothing at all of Canadian politics, and asked me if I could explain something which had greatly puzzled him. He said they had long queues of people besieging their offices, people from England, Scotland and Northern Ireland, anxious to come with their families to Canada. But he said, "Your Government builds a wall as high as heaven, and one cannot get past it. We have to turn them back by the hundreds." On the other hand, he said, they were encouraged to bring immigrants from Southern Europe by the shipload. He asked me to explain why the Canadian Government was so steadfastly set against receiving British immigrants, and so anxious to secure immigrants from Southern Europe. I related to him the history of the School Question in the West. I pointed out to him that it is the boast of the Roman Catholic Church that it thinks in terms of centuries; and that notwithstanding Sir Wilfred Laurier's declaration that he would not coerce Manitoba, and Sir Charles Tupper's promise to give the hierarchy what they asked—reestablishment of Separate Schools in Manitoba, a solid Quebec voted for Laurier. I pointed out to him that while it appeared to unsuspecting people that the people of Quebec had voted against their priests, the truth was that while the bishops spoke publicly for the deception of Protestants in general, the priests instructed their people to support Laurier. Why? Because the hierarchy knew that if they would consent to the surrender of what they called the "postage stamp Province" of Manitoba, at a later time Laurier would hand over to them the empire of Saskatchewan and Alberta. The plan was, of course, to establish Separate Schools on

those great Western plains, and then to flood this country with Roman Catholic immigrants, and gather these foreigners into little colonies who would be under the tutelage of the hierarchy through its Separate Schools. In this way they planned to build up a vast Catholic population in the West, so that Ontario and Manitoba would be between the two blades of the shears, Quebec on the East, and Saskatchewan and Alberta in the West.

I know something of the sufferings of the people of Saskatchewan through the dreadful years of the depression. I know that it was scarcely possible for farmers to live, or, for that matter, for anyone else. Notwithstanding, I have sometimes thanked God for the depression which stopped the tide of immigration to this Canadian West. But for that we should have had ten or twelve years in which this part of the Country would have been flooded with foreign immigrants who would never have become Canadians, but who would have been segregated and separated like the people of Quebec, and brought up in complete subjection to the Roman Catholic Church.

Conditions in Saskatchewan and Alberta are bad enough even now. What they would have been if the depression years had not interfered with the hierarchy's plan, it would be difficult for us to say. Even in this Province, not content with having their Separate Schools, you have Roman Catholic nuns teaching in your public schools even now.

#### What Sin Have We Committed?

There is at present in Quebec such a bitter anti-British-Canadian attitude and speech that they talk of Civil War. Cardinal Villeneuve has tacitly threatened us, under certain conditions, with secession. What sin has the rest of Canada committed against Quebec that she should treat us so? She insists that all she wants is her share! Two brothers, Charlie and Billy, sauntered through the dining room of their home, where their mother was sitting. On the table there was a fruit bowl containing a solitary apple. On seeing it, Charlie began to cry. When his mother inquired the cause of his tears, he said, "Because there is no apple for Billy." There will be no apple for anyone if Quebec has its way. It has most of the plums in every Department of our national life, but has a shamefully small number of men in the Armed Services.

I have no objection to the French language, or any other language, except when it is employed as a barrier to segregate the French-Canadian people from English-speaking Canadians. The Roman Catholic Church is the most divisive thing in the world. It divides everything that can be divided. It must have Separate Schools, separate labour organizations, no mixed marriages, separate chaplains—separate everything! It is an authoritarian, totalitarian system that is absolutely intolerant of everything but itself.

#### The Papacy and the Peace

The Papacy everywhere is laying its plans for an attempt to dominate the peace conference. The Papacy is a bird of prey that fattens on the weakness of others, a buzzard that gorges itself on rottenness and death. In England shortly before the outbreak of war the Archbishop of Canterbury, an Anglo-Catholic, seriously proposed that the Pope should be solicited to act as universal arbiter between the nations, as the only man in the

world competent to exercise such powers. He was seconded by Lord Halifax, also an ardent Anglo-Catholic, who tells us that we ought to repent in deep contrition for the Protestant Reformation.

#### Immigration After the War

There is no doubt whatever that the Canadian Hierarchy has already laid its plans for the control of immigration after the war. They are exercising themselves to the utmost to overtake the arrears of the depression years.

I have seen something of the influence of Roman Catholicism, and of its attempt to dominate affairs in this province, and in Alberta. Just outside of Edmonton Mr. Martin and I were shown a Jesuit College, and in the grounds some young soldiers, cadets of the school, were training. We were informed they have their own unit, and their own distinctive uniform. I believe no other religious body in Canada would be permitted to have its own uniform.

#### The Sirois Report

Let me now refer as briefly as I can to the Sirois Report, as illustrative of the attitude and purpose of the Roman Catholic Church in Canada. I am aware that the Report was not adopted, but it is symptomatic of the church's schemes for the appropriation of the resources of Canada. It is the practice of the Church of Rome, when it cannot get what it wants in one way, to get it in another. Though the Sirois Report was not adopted as a Report, there is little doubt that by hook or by crook, the Hierarchy will secure for itself all the advantages which this recommendation proposed.

The Sirois Commission was first of all known as the Rowell Commission. The late Honourable Newton Rowell was Chairman. He was somewhat advanced in years, and had to retire on account of ill health. The late Professor Sirois of the Roman Catholic University of Laval became the Chairman. I must confess that the Sirois Report is rather a difficult thing to digest, and I am not disposed to blame anyone for not understanding it. It is contained in three large volumes, with not a few supplementary volumes. I made it my business to know what was in the Report, and spent some weary days and nights digesting it. It was one of the toughest bits of reading I have ever done.

When in Victoria, I learned that Mr. Pattullo, the then Premier of British Columbia, voted against the Report because he did not know a thing that was in it. He had not had time to read it, and could not find anyone to read it for him. I had a brief conversation with Mr. Aberhart, in which I referred to the subject, and while Mr. Aberhart did not say so, I am morally certain that he did not know what the Report contained.

I carefully analyzed the Report in an address which was published January 16th, 1941, under the title, "The Religious Aspects of the Sirois Report." I cannot of course go into it in detail, but I have communicated with my office requesting that the full text of that address be reprinted in next week's issue of THE GOSPEL WITNESS.\* It is enough now, as a general statement, to say that the Sirois Report was a scheme to mortgage the entire Dominion of Canada in the interests of the Roman Catholic Church. I can give you but the briefest outline.

\*This analysis of the Sirois Report was reprinted in last week's issue, July 9.

It proposed a reconstruction of the economic structure of the Dominion. It was, in some respects, tantamount to the re-writing of the British North America Act. It proposed to take from the Provinces certain jurisdictions, and transfer them to the Dominion; and some from the Dominion to the Provinces.

The Report begins with a discussion of the difference between the French Canadians and the English-speaking Canadians. It goes back to the last war, and disinters the troubles of that period. It puts all the blame on the Government of the day, and on the rest of Canada—and the innocent victim of everyone else's conspiracies was poor Quebec! The rest of us had to take things as they came, but the tactlessness of the Government of the day was responsible for all the ills of Quebec. One cannot but wonder why the Commission wanted to bring up the question of conscription at all. If they had sought an instrument of disunity, they could not have done better than they did.

Now to the Report. It sets up a certain "arbitrary" standard by which to measure the social welfare services of the various Provinces. They confess it is arbitrary and say it must be so because it is impossible, under the circumstances, to set up a common standard by which the services of the various Provinces may be measured. Then it lays down the principle—rightly, of course—that every Province which would derive any benefits from the Dominion Treasury must maintain its social services at the level of this standard. No Province will be allowed to slacken in its duty, and then go to the Dominion and ask for help to make up its default.

#### Quebec is "Different"

When it comes to Québec, it insists that Québec is "different". Yes, no matter how it is approached, what subject is discussed, in relation to Québec, it is always "different". That appears on nearly every page of the Report. Québec must be judged by an entirely different standard than that which applies to all the other Provinces.

#### A Family of Nine Children

Here is a family of nine children, and included in the nine is one little imp who has a very delicate palate, and a very sensitive tummy. He cannot eat what the others eat. Father and mother haven't any too much money, so they must operate on a family budget. The children must be provided with good food, and plenty of it; but of necessity it will have to be plain, and without any special delicacies. But this one little imp in the family will not eat the ordinary fare put on the family breakfast-table. He insists that he cannot eat what the others eat. He is "different". He must be considered first. The general fare may not be particularly appetizing for the others, but they have to take it or leave it. Not so this one young gentleman who seems to think he owns the house. He must have strawberries in December, and asparagus in January. Of course the other children would like a few delicacies too, if they could have them. But that is impossible. Yet this little gentleman is "different". Father and mother, in order that the house may not be kept in a perpetual uproar, let the selfish little wretch have his own way. He is resolved he will have it or he will upset the whole household. Therefore he must be given his strawber-



ries to keep him quiet. This dandy little gentleman is so "different". He must be coddled and pampered at the expense of the other eight children of the family.

### Quebec, The Spoiled Child

That spoiled child is Quebec, and the Sirois Report is the conference of daddy and mother as to what to do with this little imp in order to keep him quiet. It tells us that Quebec is "different" because all the institutions of Quebec—schools, hospitals, care of widows and orphans—these and other services are rendered by agencies of the church. Then it is explained that the people who serve in these institutions receive no salary, only meagre honoraria. Therefore it is impossible to set a monetary value on the services they render.

But Quebec must maintain the average in order that it may be qualified to receive special concessions from the treasury of the Dominion. The Report says it would be "absurd" to suppose that the services rendered by these ecclesiastical institutions are inferior to the social services in other Provinces. "Absurd" indeed! And yet the Premier of Quebec, Mr. Godbout, is constantly inveighing against the inadequacy of the educational system of his own Province, and insists that they provide an educational system that will train young people for something other than the priesthood.

Once more. Many of these institutions are heavily in debt, but their bonds are guaranteed by the Province; and the Sirois Report generously recommends that these bonds should be transferred to the Dominion. That, of course, would give the rest of us the privilege of paying interest on the bonds of these Roman Catholic institutions.

Furthermore: since the personnel of these institutions receive no salary, but only meagre honoraria, it is difficult to see how it is possible for them, on any percentage basis, to pay a National Defence Tax. So far as I am able to ascertain, the priests stand in much the same position. They do not receive a stated salary, but rather a modest honorarium; and yet I was told by an ex-Roman Catholic priest that in some prosperous parishes, a priest may receive as high as \$25,000.00 a year. And he is under no obligation to report it, even to his Bishop. I should be glad to be corrected if it is not a fact, but I should like to know how many of the personnel of these Roman Catholic institutions in Quebec Province, and how many of the priests in Quebec Province, actually pay Defense and Income Tax.

Of course it must be borne in mind that these great institutions, having a value, in the aggregate of millions, perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars, are all exempt from taxation. The Report notes the difference in revenue between the Ontario and Quebec treasury from real estate taxes. The Quebec treasury receives comparatively little.

Again: in the Province of Quebec the government has a colonization department, which sets up new colonies or parishes, in new districts. Recently there was a report that the Quebec Government had, during the year, erected eight parishes, to each of which they had given \$3,200.00 for the erection of a Roman Catholic Church, and \$800.00 for the priest's house; and if a water system was installed in the presbytery—as the priest's house is called—he was given an additional grant of \$200.00 to cover that expense. So it comes to pass that

when a new part of Quebec is opened up where there is to be a new mine or a new mill, it is not unusual for a Roman Catholic Church to be the first building erected. Why not, when it is paid for out of the Quebec treasury? Other religious bodies who desire to open a mission in such a place must buy a lot and build a church—and build a parsonage if the minister is to have one—and maintain it all by voluntary contributions. But in the Province of Quebec the Roman Church puts its hand into the public treasury for the extension of its work. Then when the Province has thus been bled white, until it has been reduced to the verge of economic bankruptcy, the Sirois Report calls on the other eight Provinces to give a blood transfusion to save this poor anaemic member of the family, reduced to a state of economic impotence, from extinction. A more diabolical scheme was never hatched in the pit, a scheme to mortgage this whole Dominion for the relief and enrichment of the Roman Catholic Church.

### Quebec a Thing Apart

In Quebec Province our sailors, when walking on the street, are sometimes spit upon because of the uniforms they wear. It is folly to talk about national unity. Quebec Province is a thing apart, and it is a thing apart because the Roman Catholic Church is determined it shall be so. Its talk of rebellion and of civil war is wholly due to the influence of Roman Catholicism. The Roman Catholic Church is the enemy of democracy everywhere, and the enemy of all free institutions, and of all free men. It is, as I have said, an authoritarian system of government, and it is an authoritarian system which insists upon being totalitarian. That is to say, it will suffer no opposition to its fell designs.

### The Papacy and Europe's Troubles

The Roman Catholic Church, if it did not instigate the rape of Ethiopia, at least crowned it with the Pope's blessing. No one who has studied the history of the Spanish Civil War, so far as it is now available, can fail to see that it was a civil war that was instigated and financed by the Vatican, with the design of re-establishing the authority of the church in that country. Spanish Republicanism was an uprising of the common people in an attempt to overthrow the corrupt dominion of the Roman Church through the Alfonso régime. The Spanish Civil War was a bloody civil war fought to restore the Jesuits to power; and when the defeat of the Republican Government was assured, the Pope gave his blessing to the murderous Italians that had effected the massacre. Since that time, other religions have been banned from Spain. There is now, I believe, only one Protestant church that is still open. Since Franco came to power the Roman Catholic religion has been the only religion that is tolerated.

### What of France and Pétain?

What have we in France? The history of the fall of France has yet to be written, and all the factors which contributed to that great disaster cannot now be known. But it is at least significant that as soon as Pétain and Pierre Laval—the latter a reptile in human form (Applause)—came to power, the Vatican issued a statement to the effect that the Pope was sure Pétain and Laval between them would conduct the affairs of France

in harmony with the interests of the Roman Catholic Church.

#### Catholics in Germany

What now is to be said about Germany? We have heard much about the persecution of Roman Catholics in Germany—and there may have been some Catholic persecution. But let us review for a moment the history of the past. The present Pope talks much about peace. We are told again and again that the Holy See is always praying for peace. I can only say for myself, God give us someone else to pray for peace. All this is ill-disguised Roman Catholic propaganda. The Roman Catholic Church would like us to believe that she is suffering persecution at the hands of our enemy. That would, of course, allow her to work her will without her evil designs being suspected.

But the present Pope was Papal Nuncio in Berlin at the time Hitler came to power. The infamous Von Papen was the leader of the Centre or Catholic party, and was for a short time Chancellor; and it was at the instance of the present Pope that Von Papen and his party committed political suicide to make way for Hitler to come to power. Von Papen is the man who was expelled from the United States as a saboteur in the last war. Hitler is a Roman Catholic, and has never been excommunicated by the Pope of Rome. Otto Strasser, now a refugee in Quebec, is authority for the statement that Hitler did not write *Mein Kampf*, that the real author was a Jesuit priest, who wrote in collaboration with Hitler; and Jesuitism, like Hitlerism, makes a virtue of lying.

I know I shall be charged with bigotry, but no one of any historical knowledge can believe the word of the Roman Catholic Church. The whole institution is built upon falsehood; it is a falsification of history, a falsification of Scripture. It says the Pope is the successor of the first Pope of Rome—and there is no historical evidence that Peter was ever in Rome.

Its claim to scriptural authority for its absurd and blasphemous pretensions finds absolutely no support in the Bible itself. Roman Catholicism is a philosophy of falsehood. The Pope's blasphemous claim to being God's vicegerent and only legitimate authority on earth is as absurd as it is false.

The fact is, the alleged persecutions of the Catholics in Germany is but a part of the Jesuit purge of the liberal elements in the Catholic Church; and is parallel to Hitler's blood-purge of his party in nineteen-thirty-four.

Some will remember how Louis Barthou, when Foreign Minister in France six or seven years ago, sought to build up a Balkan block to dam back the tide of Nazism. King Alexander of Yugoslavia went to Marseilles to counsel with Barthou, and both were assassinated. Since then an Italian Duke has been made king of the newly-created Croat state; and the man who is now Premier of that unhappy country is the man who was responsible for the assassination of King Alexander and Barthou.

There is not one Axis leader in Europe to-day who is not a Roman Catholic. Nor has any public announcement been made of the excommunication of any one of them. The Roman Catholic bishops of Italy early in the war issued an appeal to Mussolini that he endeavour to crown his great career by handing over the Holy Land to the jurisdiction of the Holy See. Last summer

Matsuoko of Japan visited Moscow, Berlin, and Rome. He had an audience of sixty-five minutes with the Pope, and forty-five minutes with the Papal Secretary of State. Japan is a pagan country, but the Pope sent his apostolic benediction to Matsuoko's "dear people in that far-off land." And he went out of his way to describe Matsuoko as one of the greatest statesmen of the world.

After the outbreak of war, the representatives of every religion were expelled from Japan, or interned, except the Roman Catholic missionaries. The Roman Catholic press is my authority for saying that the "faithful" were assured that they need have no anxiety for their brethren in Japan, that Japan had guaranteed their safety, and had given them full permission to continue their work.

Surely there must be some significance in the perfect agreement of the Papacy with all the Axis powers. It is absurd to say that the Pope must be neutral. It is a crime to be neutral in respect to such iniquity as to-day abounds. But the Papacy is running true to form.

From the days of the Armada until now, the Papacy has been Britain's enemy. It is the boast of the Roman Church that she never changes. Hence the blood of millions of martyrs cries out against her. The Empire is bleeding unnecessarily at every pore because of the attitude of Eire, and the closing of the Irish ports to the British Navy. I know something of Ireland, and only a blind ignoramus would deny that Ireland's attitude toward Britain to-day, as for the last three hundred years, is dictated from Rome. The real difficulty in this country, the power that has strangled recruiting, and whose heavy hand is impairing our war effort everywhere, is the Roman Catholic Church, the Vatican, the Papacy, the Fourth Axis Power—which is just as truly at war with the United Nations as is Germany, or Italy, or Japan.

We appeal for your personal, practical, prayerful, support of THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE, that we may have one great organization in Canada through which Protestants may speak. Let us be Canadians! Let us be British-Canadians! Let us resolve that as we fight for world-freedom we will never allow the Papal pall of darkness and ignorance which is the curse of Quebec to mar the beauty and democratic Christian freedom of this glorious Dominion!

#### Last Sunday in Jarvis St.

Rev. W. G. Brown preached to a fine congregation in the morning. At the evening service the building was crowded in every part when the address printed on page three and forward was delivered.

**Subscribe for  
The Gospel Witness**

**\$2.00 per year**

## Press Reports of Last Three Meetings of Tour Fort William, Sault Ste. Marie, and Sudbury

We publish below facsimile reports of the meetings held by the Editor and Rev. H. G. Martin, in the cities named. The newspaper reports give a fair account of the meetings, except that of Sudbury, for we have received no press report from that place as we left the night of the meeting.

The Sudbury meeting was a good one, held in the Oddfellows' Hall. It followed a series of Baptist meetings, and was held in the Hall where Rev. J. R. Boyd holds the services of the Berean Baptist Church, Sudbury. The Sudbury meeting maintained the record of the other meetings in this, that its offerings paid all local expenses. Deep interest was manifest, and we are sure that great good was done. Rev. John Boyd, who is Pastor of the Berean Church, has done a magnificent work in Sudbury, building literally from the ground up.

The newspaper reports follow:

### CATHOLIC CHURCH HIT BY DR. T. T. SHIELDS

From *The Port Arthur News-Chronicle*, July 7, 1942.

Declaring the Roman Catholic Church was sabotaging the war effort, Dr. T. T. Shields, Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, urged an audience in Vickers Park last night to support the Canadian Protestant League for the purpose of defending Canadian liberties against the church in all fields of activity. About 1,000 were in attendance.

(Mr. Martin carefully counting a section estimated there were over 2,000, which we are sure was a fairly accurate estimate, although there were exaggerated estimates of 5,000. Had it been a meeting of a political favourite, the paper would have chosen the highest estimate.—Ed. G.W.)

#### MEETING PLACE CHANGED

Dr. Shields changed the meeting place at the last minute from the Orange Hall, Rankin Street, Fort William, to the park, due to the large crowd that could not be contained in the hall. Previously he had been denied the use of the Fort William City Hall auditorium and the Prince of Wales Rink when the subject of his address was announced as "Is King George VI or Pope Pius the Real Ruler of Canada?"

The Orange Hall was packed to overflowing long before the scheduled start and when Dr. Shields proposed the change of venue his audience trooped good-naturedly to the park, some distance away. City police were present in the park, but did not interfere.

Dr. Shields warmed to his subject immediately with an attack against the Catholic Church and he got a quiet hearing except when he referred to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as very largely an organization of propaganda for the church. One lone heckler, a husky, middle-aged man, called out the speaker was "crazy", but the doctor carried on without hesitating.

At the outset of his address, the speaker said he had nothing against the individual Catholics, many of whom were serving well in this war. They didn't know that Romanism was a system of government and that the Pope claimed to be the only legally authorized earthly representative of Christ, he said.

#### THE REAL HEAD

According to the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church, King George was not the legal ruler of his country. The Pope was the real head in that church's opinion, Dr. Shields said.

In Germany, Catholics were not being

persecuted if they were members of the Jesuit Order. He could prove that the leaders in power in occupied countries of Europe today were Catholics, he said. Hitlerism, in fact, was nothing but Roman Catholicism on the march.

Dr. Shields referred to the refusal by Mayor C. M. Ross to give him the use of the City Hall auditorium. This had come about by representations by Fort William Roman Catholics who, apparently, could go into the hall and tell the Mayor what to do. It seemed, then, that if the people of that city wanted to be under the thumbs of the Roman Catholic Church their job was to re-elect the mayor. Dr. Shields said he would likely take action for breach of contract on the part of the city and the rink.

It had been said that the 3,000,000 French Canadians of Quebec could never be assimilated because they were under the control of the Catholic hierarchy of that province, an organization that not only ruled the people but dictated the policies of the Government.

Dr. Shields paid tribute to the Lakehead daily newspapers for fearlessness in printing his story. In one Saskatchewan city, the local paper ignored him in the news columns and printed a scathing article on its editorial page demanding that he be brought to the courts.

#### AS TO POLITICS

As to politics, he contended that the Liberal Party was the Roman Catholic Party of Canada and the Conservatives would like to be. Those 65 Quebec votes in Parliament held the balance of power, with the result that Canada today was being ruled by a minority. The Protestant League wanted rights for the majority as well as for the minority.

Speaking of what he described as the religious aspects of the Sirois report on

Dominion-provincial relations, Dr. Shields said the report placed the burden of paying the huge bonded debt of Quebec social services on the shoulders of other provinces, thus making Quebec a special case in the Dominion.

The Quebec educational system, he held, was the worst in Canada, even the premier of that province having declared that Quebec needed a system that would train the people for something more than the priesthood.

Priests were not paid large allowances by the church, but one priest had told him that a rich parish would yield a priest \$25,000 annually and the money would not have to be reported to the Bishop. And he doubted, Dr. Shields said, whether the priest would pay income tax on it either.

Where Roman Catholicism had gained the ascendancy, he said, the people were reduced to poverty.

When the speech ended, Dr. Shields distributed application blanks for membership in the Canadian Protestant League and also copies of the constitution. The application form indicated that one dollar would entitle the donor to membership. Dr. Shields said none of the money would find its way to his pocket.

From *The Sault Daily Star*, July 9, 1942.

### Shields Denounces Dallying of King

#### Enactment of Immediate Conscription Demanded At Sault Meeting

Denouncing what he termed "one delay after another" which, he charged, was made to appease Quebec province, the Rev. Dr. T. T. Shields, Baptist Church pastor of Toronto, called upon the Ottawa government to implement immediate conscription for overseas service and an all-out war effort, in a speech delivered at the Arena Rink last night.

"I have the highest respect for the office of Prime Minister of this country, but if I speak with contempt of the man holding it now it is because I believe his actions contemptible," he said, as he castigated Prime Minister King for hesitating in carrying out the expressed wish of the majority of the people in the recent manpower plebiscite.

"Our Prime Minister told us that he had to have a plebiscite because he couldn't break his word and we are still waiting for him to carry out the verdict," he declared, as he criticized Mr. King's stand in announcing a further vote of confidence in Parliament before adopting full conscription. "We are told about the plea for national unity and minority rights."

"I believe," the visiting pastor said, "in national unity, but not at the price of subjection of the majority to a minority."

Sponsored by the Canadian Protestant League, the meeting drew an audience of about 800 to the Arena Rink after the use of the Technical School auditorium had been barred the night previously.

Declaring that "an eleventh hour notice had been received on the cancellation of the Technical School arrangements," Dr. Shields criticized the Sault Technical School Board which, he charged, was responsible. "I understand someone protested to the board and the members had no more backbone than to listen," the speaker said, censuring what he termed a "weak-kneed action."

"Even if we are wrong, we have a right to be heard," he said, declaring that

he was going to complete a speaking tour which took him from Victoria, B.C., to Montreal and then Ottawa.

Branding Quebec as the "spoiled child of Canadian politics," Dr. Shields drew laughter when he termed Prime Minister King as "the former Charlie McCarthy of Mr. Lapointe (the late minister of justice)." "Premier Godbout of Quebec has openly boasted about a little handful of men from Quebec guiding the government," he said, charging that the rights of eight other provinces were forgotten or disregarded.

"Quebec's policy has been to ask for special privileges and then call them rights," he said, declaring that he valued freedom at almost any price, but not above security of the country.

"We cannot have an all-out war effort unless Quebec pulls its full weight," he said, remarking: "None of us wants war. It is hell and we would avoid it at almost any price, but giving up our freedom is too much. Our French-Canadian friends have been enjoying the full privileges of our freedom and they should be willing to do their full share to defend it."

"Yet this is the province," the Rev. Dr. Shields declared, "that gives us a minister of justice who says that it is

no part of patriotism to fight for one's country beyond its shores.

"We are told that it has been shown 3,000,000 French Canadians can't be assimilated," he said, denouncing further statements he said were made by Quebec members. "They tell us they don't want anything to do with us and then talk about unity."

Dr. Shields declared that he did not entirely blame the French-Canadian people themselves but charged that it was largely the fault of the Roman Catholic Church.

"Adolph Hitler," he stated, "was baptized a Roman Catholic and has never been excommunicated. Mussolini was given the same blessings." He further charged the Roman Catholic Church gave its full approval to the Spanish war in which a million people died, so the church could maintain its power there, and he said the "rape" of Ethiopia also received its blessing.

Declaring that he had been warned by the censors, but that he was not afraid of the Defence of Canada regulations, Dr. Shields said: "I challenge the minister of justice to show where I ever said anything not in favor of an all-out effort to defeat Hitler."

## From the French Language Press

### "They Chose the Course of Ignorance"

Translated from *Le Jour*

The leaders of our education in wishing to keep our people in a closed vessel risk losing them forever.

During the Saint-Jean Baptiste procession children were distributing in the crowd a sordid, lying, slandering little leaflet, entitled "L'Union", which was destined, in reality, to sow tares of hatred among Canadians. On page five of this paper, from which oozed stupidity and malodorous prejudice, one could read, "Prayer for my race," by Mr. Léopold Richer, a journalist who belongs to a clique of public malefactors connected with the newspaper of the Fifth Column, *Le Devoir*.

In this prayer, Mr. Richer asks the Lord to keep the Race as it is, to see to it that the elect people learn nothing from its neighbours and live eternally at the very place where its forefathers left it. He wishes for our people something that is perfect, unalterable, stationary, arranged and labelled; that is to say, a beautiful quiet cemetery, with crosses and pretty inscriptions at each step. Because the things which do not change are dead things, and the living ones who will not adapt themselves to their environment are assuredly marked for the undertaker.

"In order to be faithful to you and to remain true to themselves," cries the journalist, "*the French of Canada* (detached from their former mother country) *have chosen the heroic course of ignorance. . .*" We do not know whether Baptiste will greatly enjoy this compliment. It is false to say that the French-Canadians have themselves wished to be ignorant. This people is intelligent, thirsty for knowledge, ready for every task. As soon as one of its members can get out of his narrow confine and cast a glance over the vast world, he, soon reveals surprising native qualities. The course of ignorance: it is not the people who have chosen it, it is their

leaders. These latter have thought they were saving them in preventing them from adapting themselves: they are actually losing them. . . .

"*The French of Canada have chosen the heroic course of ignorance.*" It is you who say it, Mr. Richer, and you seem to be very proud of it. You are glad that the statistics and the census show, among our people, the highest proportion of illiterate people; you exult over the discovery that our young men, failing to receive the desired education, cannot obtain, in the army, the ranks which they deserve; you thank the Lord for the fact that the only motto of our race is suffering and poverty. I pity you, and I pity your children . . . unless they themselves react against your dismal teachings.

### Text of a Resolution Condemning Dr. Shields

Translated from *L'Action Catholique*

The following is the text of a resolution adopted by the Special Plenary Congress, held at Quebec, the 21st, 22nd, 23rd and 24th of June, 1942, at the occasion of the centenary of the founding of the *Société St. Jean-Baptiste de Quebec*.

*In view of* the numerous injurious declarations of Rev. Pastor Shields of Toronto, against the Roman Catholic Church, the Holy See, His Excellence the Apostolic Delegate in Canada, His Eminence Cardinal Villeneuve, and all the Catholics of Canada, English-speaking as well as French:

*Whereas* the said declarations are equally injurious for all the Catholics of the twenty-seven united nations, which number several hundreds of millions if one considers the Catholics of all parts of the British countries, of the United States, of the Free French Movement, of Free Belgium, of Free Holland, and those of the countries of Central America and of South America, associated with us in our war effort, where the number of

Catholics exceed a hundred million:

Whereas the said declarations are not only injurious but unjust and of a nature:

- (a) To impair the "bonne entente" in the country;
- (b) To sow among the non-Catholic members of our armies of the air, of land, and of the sea distrust of the Catholics and of the Catholic chaplains both of English and French tongue;
- (c) To endanger our war effort in a way which is contrary to existing Canadian laws;

THEREFORE IT IS MOVED BY THE ST. DOMINIQUE COUNCIL, SECONDED BY THE COUNCIL OF ST. SAUVEUR,

THAT LA SOCIÉTÉ ST. JEAN-BAPTISTE DE QUEBEC, MET IN SPECIAL PLENARY CONGRESS ON THE OCCASION OF THE CELEBRATION OF THE CENTENARY OF ITS FOUNDING, ADOPTS THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

1. That as a protest, the respectful homages of the *Société Nationale* and feelings of profound admiration and of filial piety of all its members be respectfully extended to His Holiness Pope Pius XII, gloriously reigning, to His Excellence the Apostolic Delegate to Canada, to His Eminence Cardinal Villeneuve, to our lords the archbishops and bishops of the ecclesiastical provinces of Québec, of Montreal, of Ottawa, of Toronto, of Kingston, of Halifax, of Moncton, of Saint-Boniface, of Regina, of Edmonton, of Vancouver and of Winnipeg;
2. That an expression of our feelings of admiration and attachment be sent to all the Catholic military chaplains of both languages, of our armies of air, of land and of sea;
3. That a request be made to the Honourable Prime Minister of the Province of Ontario to repudiate and to denounce these unworthy and infamous words pronounced by a resident of his province;
4. That a request be made to the Minister of Justice of Canada to instruct the officers of his department to analyze every declaration of Rev. Pastor Shields since the declaration of war, in the light of Canadian laws in wartime, and to act with rigour against the said Rev. Pastor Shields if there is occasion;
5. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the *Société St. Jean-Baptiste de Canada*, and to the *Société St. Jean-Baptiste de Montréal*, with the request that they adopt it and have it adopted by all their councils in order to have copies sent to those interested;
6. That a copy of this resolution be addressed to every newspaper of the country.

ADOPTED.

### Proud, Peaceable and Constructive

Translated from *L'Action Catholique*

We ask our readers to read on this same page the text of two resolutions adopted by *Société St. Jean-Baptiste* of Quebec at its last congress. Without doubt, they will see in it, with pleasure, the expression of a proud, peaceable people desirous of living in peace with its companions of Canadian life.

### Normal Difficulties Aggravated

In a country with a mixed population the relationship between its citizens is naturally more difficult than among a homogenous people in origin, religion and traditions. The unhappy and too frequent intervention of certain spirits incapable of measuring the import of their words complicates still further this problem.

### Religious Peace Necessary

The prototype of the firebrands of discord in Canada is most certainly Rev. Pastor Shields of Toronto. Contrary to other Protestant pastors he finds his mission not in the evangelization of his hearers, but in war on the Catholic church. It will be admitted that, on their side, the Catholic clergy conduct themselves very decently towards Protestants.

We are often asked to protest against the diatribes of Pastor Shields. Sometimes we submit to this wish, but not always. In truth, cases like that of Dr. Shields worry all serious men. Should importance be given to such hopeless idiots, or would it be better to let them founder in the insignificance to which their lack of spirit will lead them sooner or later? This is a question that one is inclined to answer sometimes, in one sense, sometimes in another.

Once more, we believe we ought to deal with this pastor, in supporting with all our power the very worthy, very complete and exceedingly well inspired protest of *La Société St. Jean-Baptiste*. Obviously, our national society does not in the least aim at prolonging the agitation aroused by this fiery enemy of Catholics. It suggests very simply in order to put an end to this little religious war in concurrence with the great war against the Nazis, several means of which one seems to us particularly practical; as follows:

If the Prime Minister of Ontario who has often shown proof of a great breadth of views, would repudiate publicly the unworthy and infamous words of Pastor Shields, this fellow would soon lose the prestige which he may enjoy among those who do not know him. We believe Mr. Hepburn capable of performing this act kindly solicited by a very representative group who desire to safeguard the moral union of Canadians in this moment when universal collaboration is so necessary.

The spontaneous and personal intervention of Mr. Hepburn would seem to us more preferable than the ministerial action of the Minister of Justice, the former not having to fear, as the latter, that motives of vengeance or of fanaticism either religious or racial will be imputed to him:

(Editorial Note: This is a rare bit of unconscious humour. The idea of "the prestige" of this editor being affected for good or ill by any word of Premier Hepburn is really comical. It is a further evidence of the complete isolation of Quebec and of its utter inability to understand any but its own point of view. It is in harmony with the Catholic idea that "prestige" or authority of any sort depends upon some kind of official *imprimatur*. The Romanists are a people under authority, and therefore assume that non-Romanists will run like a flock of sheep at the bark of an official sheep-dog.

If Premier Hepburn were to "repudiate" us a thousand times, what difference would it make? Mr. Hepburn is a politician utterly devoid of any competence to form a worthy judgment on such matters. This silly editorial from *L'Action Catholique* referring to the stupid resolution adopted by *Société St. Jean-Baptiste* will surely touch the funny spot in most minds, and prove a tonic for blue Monday.—Ed. G.W.)

## The Resolution of The Société St. Jean Baptiste de Quebec

On these pages will be found the text of a resolution adopted by the Special Plenary Congress of the St. Jean-Baptiste Society held in Quebec in the latter part of June. We print the translation of this text in full, together with the editorial comment on it made by *L'Action Catholique*, daily French paper of that city. We print them as documents illustrative of Catholic thinking. Neither the resolution nor the article attempts to discuss Dr. Shields' strictures on Roman Catholicism. They simply howl that he should be silenced by some authority. Roman Catholicism never discusses; it asserts. Its only argument is the torture chamber and the stake.

The only innovation introduced in the above resolution is the suggestion that the Honourable Prime Minister of the Province of Ontario, that is, Mr. Hepburn, should repudiate Dr. Shields' declarations. No doubt Mr. Mitchell Hepburn would be only too delighted to do this as he owes his political power in Ontario to the combined forces of rum and Romanism. He gave the Roman Catholics some millions of dollars of public taxes in order to win their favour, but was forced to make them disgorge later on, largely on account of the campaign of enlightenment conducted by Dr. Shields at that time. Mr. Hepburn has recently discovered that he has been beaten at his own game of purchasing Catholic votes by giving public money to the Roman Church. The one who has beaten him at it is none other than his sworn enemy, Mr. Mackenzie King. Mr. Hepburn has therefore turned from his first love, the Roman Church, and is found on the side of those who are demanding an all-out war effort. It will be interesting to see his "reaction" to the appeal of the French Roman Catholic Society in Quebec. There is no doubt that if it would serve his political end he would take the greatest personal and political pleasure in ferociously condemning Dr. Shields whom he has every reason to fear. It will be interesting to see whether he believes that political expediency will allow him that pleasure.

It will be of special interest to our readers to note that the resolution passed by the St. Jean-Baptiste Society pays its respectful homage and profound admiration to "His Holiness Pope Pius XII 'gloriously reigning', to His Excellence the Apostolic Delegate to Canada, to His Eminence Cardinal Villeneuve, etc., etc.," but there is not a word of loyalty to His Majesty King George VI. We call the attention of our readers to this undesigned confirmation, by a Catholic Society, of the title of Dr. Shields' address, "Is King George VI. or Pius XII. the real ruler of this Dominion?"

The second clause of the resolution is an expression of admiration and attachment "to all Catholic military chaplains." In this connection we note that the present Liberal government, which owes its power to Quebec, has decreed that there should be one Protestant chaplain for every one thousand Protestant men but one Roman Catholic chaplain for every five hundred Roman Catholic enlistments.

As a further indication of the intellectual level of the St. Jean-Baptiste Society we call our reader's attention to the article which we translated from *Le Jour* in this issue, "They Chose the Course of Ignorance".

We might also add that the paper *L'Action Catholique*,

together with other Catholic Action papers directly controlled by the hierarchy, have led in the campaign to bring out a negative vote in the recent plebiscite. They are anti-British to the core, and if they do not belong to the Fifth Column in Canada then it is only because there is no Fifth Column here or anywhere else.

In view of the above facts it would be surprising if the St. Jean-Baptiste Society and Catholic Action did anything else than condemn Dr. Shields for his plain speech in the interest of an all-out war effort.—W.S.W.

See Resolution on page 20.

## No Liberalism in Our Schools

Translated from *Le Jour*

The contrast between the system of education in Quebec and that in the rest of North America: The former is essentially conservative and the second essentially liberal.

We have often emphasized in these pages that the intellectual and moral discipline of French-Canadian education differs entirely from the kind of discipline that prevails in most of the corresponding institutions of learning in Canada and United States. The former is founded on a dogmatism which does not suffer any discussion; the other is inspired by the right of each individual to follow his own line of thought, reason and personal sentiments. The one is essentially conservative; the other is liberal.

Those who direct our school system have never recognized the charter of human rights such as it was conceived and expressed by the thinkers of the Revolution, nor the principles of individual rights as they were formulated in the noble terms of the American Constitution. For example, the liberty to think which is considered as an abomination by our masters, is regarded among the Americans, the English and the French, as the first condition of the democratic way of life.

We people in Quebec are the fruit of several generations of men and women formed by a dogmatic and absolute school, while the English-speaking population enjoy the fruits of a century and a half of liberal teaching. The difference is very profound and explains one of the gravest difficulties which bars the way to Canadian unity and true democratic sentiment.

It is well known that in certain circles of the French-Canadian hierarchy, the word "liberal" has been accepted only with repugnance and if, in the course of the last fifty years, it has succeeded somewhat in penetrating these circles, it would be erroneous to believe that it has succeeded in winning a majority there.

In this connection it would be interesting to reproduce here an article which appeared on the 20th of April, 1871, in the *Journal* of Three Rivers, with the approbation of Monsignor Lafèche:

In principle we belong to the Conservative party; that is to say, to that party which has made itself the defender of social authority . . . In the present political situation of our country, as the Conservative party is the only one which offers serious guarantees to the religious interests, we regard it as our duty loyally to support its leaders.

But this loyal support must be subordinated to the religious interests, of which we must never lose sight. If then there exist in our laws certain gaps, ambitions or tendencies which put the interests of Catholics in peril, we ought to demand of our candidates a formal promise to bring about a disappearance of these faults in our legislation.

The religious press complains with reason that there are defects in our laws on marriage, on education, on the setting up of parishes and on registration of births, deaths and marriages, inasmuch as they injure the rights of the Church, limit its liberty and hinder its administration and lend themselves to hostile interpretation. The present state of affairs imposes on Catholic members of Parliament the duty of changing them. . . Let us conclude then by adopting the following general rules for certain given cases:

1. If there is an election between two Conservatives it goes without saying that we shall support the one who accepts the programme outlined above;

2. But if, on the contrary, there is an election between a Conservative and a follower of the Liberal school, our active sympathies go to the former:

3. If the only candidates which offer themselves in a county, are without exception Liberals or members of the opposition party we must choose the one which subscribes to our conditions;

4. Finally, in the case of an election between a Conservative who rejects our programme and an opposition candidate who accepts it, our position would be very delicate. To vote for the former would be in contradiction of the doctrine which we have just set forth. To vote for the latter would be to put in peril the Conservative party. In such a case we should advise Catholic electors to abstain from voting.

The attitude expressed here is not always put with such clarity, but it is generally recognized that all liberalism is held in suspicion in these circles and that our schools, almost without exception, have received a strong dose of conservatism not only in the political realm but above all, in the intellectual. Up to a certain point the Liberal party has received some favour when it has become clear that at bottom it is only a name which did not carry with it liberal doctrines. But there has been no reconciliation with the liberal teaching which prevails in the rest of North America.

We must admit, however, that there are a large number of French-Canadians who are liberals by nature . . . and I am not speaking here of any Liberal party but of liberalism in thought, reason and action. How much true liberalism is hidden among thousands of French-Canadians who are forced to fly false colours in order to make a living, or to satisfy their clientele! In time this group will become so numerous and so strong that it will dare to show itself in the light of day. Then and only then will there be an open fight between conservatism and liberalism. And from that moment we may expect to see profound reforms brought about in our school systems.

### The Secret of Mr. King's Political Power

What is Mr. King's recipe for political power? The following article translated from *Le Jour*, and specially the quotation it contains from a Catholic paper, will go far toward explaining the secret of Mr. King's recipe for the perpetual enjoyment of the fruits of office. While Mr. King has set himself up in English-speaking Canada, as the protagonist of Unity, he has, at the same time, been jealously cultivating a reputation in French-Canada as the guardian of Roman Catholic interests.

His watchword of unity has two faces—to English-speaking Protestants it is a threat of disturbance in the body politic if Quebec is not satisfied; to French-Canadian Roman Catholics it is a promise that their terms will be fully complied with.

Few Canadians who turn wearily from the dull, ponderous utterances of the Prime Minister realize that he

is a professional politician with a shrewd sense of the niceties of political expediency. Mr. King has been by turn a civil servant in the employ of the government, a minister of the crown, a defeated member in opposition, a high executive in party circles as well as Prime Minister of the Dominion. He knows politics from above and below, from the inside and from the outside. By long training and probably by nature also he is an adept in the theory of government, but the hard realities of defeat as well as those of high office have developed a willingness to compromise in practice the very theories that he preaches. Thus Mr. King boasts of his liberalism even while he lends himself to the anti-liberal forces which rule the Province of Quebec. He has discovered that so long as he fulfills the conditions laid down by the Roman Catholic hierarchy he can retain the support of Quebec's solid bloc. His peculiar genius has been exercised in preaching liberalism in English-speaking Canada while practising the opposite to win Quebec's favour. Examine Mr. King's present policies in the light of the general rules given in the accompanying article for the guidance of Catholic voters and the secret of his political power is patent.—W.S.W.

### The Gospel Witness Nine Months for \$1.00

During our tour of the West we have offered THE GOSPEL WITNESS for nine months—from July 1st, 1942, to March 31st, 1943, for \$1.00. Even \$2.00 a year does not by any means pay for printing and mailing, but we are making this offer in the confidence that it is good advertising, and that of those who subscribe for the nine month period, the majority thereafter will continue to subscribe at the regular rate.

We now appeal to every reader of THE GOSPEL WITNESS to cooperate with us in endeavouring to increase our subscription list; and we therefore make this special offer. To everyone who will send us ten new nine-month-for-a-dollar subscriptions, the Editor will send free of charge an autographed copy of: *The Plot That Failed*, or, *Other Little Ships*, or, *The Adventures of a Modern Young Man*. We believe it is not difficult to get people to subscribe for a periodical for a period when the price is only \$1.00. You will be helping the cause of Christ, and specifically the cause of Protestantism in Canada, if you will call up your friends—or call on them—and endeavour to secure ten paid-up subscriptions of \$1.00 each for the period July 1st to March 31st. We name this period so that all dollar subscriptions will expire at the same time; and inasmuch as the issues for July thus far have been of special value, we will send to each such new subscriber the back numbers for this month, thus covering the nine-month period.

If any of our readers desire sample copies of THE WITNESS to help them in their efforts to secure new subscribers, a note to THE GOSPEL WITNESS Office will bring them as many sample copies as they require. Let us hear from you.

## Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 6 Third Quarter Lesson 30 July 26, 1942

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

### THE EARLY MINISTRY OF CHRIST

Lesson Text: Luke 4.

Golden Text: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve"—Luke 4:8.

#### I. Words of Rebuke in the Wilderness—verses 1 to 13.

Read also Matt. 4:1-11; Mk. 1:12, 13.

Christ was as surely led of the Holy Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted as He had been led into the waters of the Jordan to be baptized, for He was always filled with the Spirit of God (Eph. 5:18). It is not a sin to be tempted, but it is a sin to yield. The one who treads the path of obedience to the Lord will not always be guided in ways of pleasantness, but all his times are in the hands of God, Who can make all things work together for his good (Psa. 23:2-4; 31:15; Rom. 8:28; Jas. 1:2, 3; 1 Pet. 1:6, 7).

It was in the lonely wilderness that Satan tempted Christ (Psa. 102:6, 7). He lived a solitary life; no human soul could enter into the secret of His sorrow and suffering (Isa. 63:3; Lam. 1:12; Matt. 14:23).

The fact that Christ was tempted immediately after he had been baptized is not without significance (Mk. 1:12). At His baptism He was manifested as the Son of God, and approval was given to the ministry just commencing. Satan tried to lure the Saviour into misuse of His powers as the Son of God, and to turn Him aside from the Divine plan of redemption to which He had publicly committed Himself.

We gather that Satan tempted Christ throughout the forty days and at the end of that period attacked Him in the three ways mentioned. The figure "forty" in Scripture suggests testing (Deut. 8:2; Jonah 3:4).

We do well to notice Satan's methods of attack; they are still the same. He came to Christ when the Saviour was physically exhausted after forty days of fasting and testing. He came to Eve when she was alone, her natural protector being absent. Then, he prefaced his words with an "if". Such subtle insinuations and questionings are more dangerous and damaging to faith than direct denials of the truth (Gen. 3:1). Again, his exaggerated claims (verse 6) were based upon the truth, and half-truths are always more difficult to meet than open lies. Satan is "the god of this world" and "the prince of the power of the air" (2 Cor. 4:4; Eph. 2:2; John 14:30; 16:11), but his kingdom is limited to his minions and those who accept his sway by rejecting the rule of Christ (Col. 1:13). God rules over all, and Satan dare not go beyond the limit assigned to him.

The first insinuation was that, if Christ were the Son of God, He need not be hungry. In other words, he bad the Saviour use His Divine power for His own ends, rather than for the salvation of men; selfishness versus self-sacrifice. Avoid the way of the cross. Our Lord answered by Scripture that satisfaction is found only in obedience to the will of God (Deut. 8:3; John 4:34).

The second temptation centred around the suggestion that if Christ were the Son of God, He need not wait for His kingdom (1 Cor. 15:25; Rev. 11:15). Satan promised Him the kingdoms of this world, the power and the glory, by a short route. Let Him take the glory without treading the path of suffering (Lk. 24:26; Compare Matt. 16:21-23). The Scriptures again proved a defence (Deut. 6:13; 10:20).

The third temptation was to the effect that if Christ were the Son of God, He could prove it to the believing people and establish His Kingdom without danger to Himself. Satan's suggestion, "If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down, from hence: for it is written, He shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee", is strikingly parallel to the challenge of the people and the leaders of the Jews: "If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross—If he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him. He trusted in God; let him deliver him now" (Matt. 27:40, 42). God's promises are for those who

walk in His ways. If a man deliberately goes into forbidden territory, he cannot expect God's battalions to shield him from danger.

In His answer, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God" (Deut. 6:16; 1 Cor. 10:9), Christ rebuked the attempt to force God to vindicate His word and His Son's claims. At all times, God is to be trusted, not tested.

Our Saviour met all these temptations and conquered them in the power of the Spirit, using the weapon of Scripture which is available to all Christians (Eph. 6:11-17). His victory gave Him sympathy for us, and also made victory possible for us (Heb. 4:15).

The adversary departed from Christ "for a season", or, as the Greek words imply, "until a favourable opportunity". The truth is that Satan was in conflict with Christ time and again, endeavouring all the while to prevent the work of redemption on the cross, which spelled doom to him (Gen. 3:15; John 12:31). Although Satan still has power to accuse us, he has been vanquished, and will ultimately be destroyed (Rev. 12:10; 20:10).

After the temptation angels ministered unto the Lord (Mk. 1:13; Lk. 22:43).

#### II. Words of Grace in Nazareth—verses 14 to 30.

Christ went into the synagogue "as his custom was". We are not to forsake the public assembly of the saints "as the manner of some is" (Acts 16:13; Heb. 10:25).

Doubtless the synagogue in Nazareth was crowded on that day (v. 14), and it is not surprising that every eye should be fastened upon Him as He read the Scriptures concerning Himself (Lk. 24: 27, 32, 44, 45). What an opportunity the worshippers in Nazareth were offered that day! And yet, since the Word of God is living and powerful, and since the Holy Spirit, the Author of that Word, is ever ready to illuminate the sacred page and to inspire our hearts, we, also, may listen to the Gospel message as it comes to us directly from the Lord (Neh. 8:8; Acts 10:33; 1 Thess. 1:5; 2:13; 1 Pet. 1:25).

Christ was indeed proclaiming "the acceptable year of the Lord" (2 Cor. 6:2), and they wondered at "the words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth" (v. 22, Revised Version). But they looked upon Him with natural eyes, and saw no beauty in Him (Isa. 53:2; Matt. 13:55-58). Their minds and hearts were prejudiced. They were looking for the Messiah to come in glorious power and majesty, while He was reading of Himself as the lowly servant of Jehovah.

The objections of the people to the reading and its application were two-fold (v. 23). First, they implied that He Himself was in need, hence without qualifications for being a prophet. Secondly, they said that He offered no proof of His claims. Prophets are accepted only by the few who believe (John 1:11).

In anger because Christ numbered Himself among the prophets and His hearers among the prophet-rejectors, the audience rose up out of the synagogue and drove Him through the streets to the brow of the cliff to cast Him down. But His hour had not yet come.

#### III. Words of Power in Capernaum—verses 31 to 44.

Capernaum in Galilee now became our Lord's place of abode (Matt. 4:13), the scene of His preaching and healing (Matt. 11:23).

The curing of the man possessed by demons teaches us at least five things: (1) Spirits which are unclean and cruel sometimes make the human temple their abode, mastering the will and personality of the victim (Lk. 9:39; 11:24-26). Let us yield to the Spirit of God. (2) The unclean demons recognize Christ as the Holy One of God. (3) They know He will destroy them (Matt. 8:29). (4) They fear Him (Jas. 2:19). (5) Christ has power, not only over Satan himself, but also over the whole Satanic system with its emissaries and agents (Lk. 13: 12, 16).

Just as Christ brought health and healing to the demoniac, so can He speak the word of salvation and power to all who are in slavery to sin and Satan (Lk. 8:35; Rom. 6:14, 22). And just as He rebuked the fever of the sick woman, so can He drive away the fever of sin and fear from the human heart, bringing peace (Matt. 6:25; Lk. 10:41, 42; John 14:27; Phil. 4:6).

The citizens of Nazareth in their anger thrust Christ out of their city; the people of Capernaum in their selfishness attempted to keep Him within their city.