

Editorials: Relative Importance of Unity—Premier King's Hindsight—
Why Vichy Representative So Long Retained—Pages 13 to 15

The Gospel Witness and Protestant Advocate

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF EVANGELICAL PRINCIPLES
AND IN DEFENCE OF THE FAITH ONCE FOR ALL DELIVERED TO THE SAINTS.

\$2.00 Per Year, Postpaid, to any address. 5c Per Single Copy.

Editor: T. T. SHIELDS

"I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ."—Romans 1:16.

Address Correspondence: THE GOSPEL WITNESS, 130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2, Canada.

Telephone: ELgin 3531.

Registered Cable Address: Jarwitsem, Canada.

Vol. 21, No. 28

TORONTO, NOVEMBER 12, 1942

Whole Number 1069

NINE ARCHBISHOPS Including ONE CARDINAL Protest "Life" Magazine's Article on French Canada. Dr. Shields Replies Below:

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

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

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

(Stenographically Reported)

"Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience. Be not ye therefore partakers with them. For ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord: walk as children of light. (For the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness and righteousness and truth;) proving what is acceptable unto the Lord.

"And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.

"For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret.

"But all things that are reprov'd are made manifest by the light: for whatsoever doth make manifest is light.

"Wherefore he saith, Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead; and Christ shall give thee light."—Ephesians 5:6-14.

I have often felt a deep sympathy for those who have given their lives to the teaching profession, who are shut up to the task of teaching boys and girls, youths and maidens, young men and young women, the elements of knowledge in the sciences and arts. I heard of a professor in a religious college, a professor of Greek, who

always opened his classes with a form of prayer, who as he came into the class-room hat in hand somewhat hastily, would begin his prayer before he got to his desk; and then go on with his lecture. He had been teaching successive classes of students for thirty or forty years, and I suppose he could recite many of his lectures back-

ward or upsidedown. It was a very necessary task—line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little. It is a great vocation, but I fancy that sometimes it may become a little monotonous, to have to deal with the fundamental principles over and over again.

I read a sermon of Mr. Spurgeon's which began something like this: "My dear friends, here we are again to discuss the great doctrine of faith. How often we have studied it together. The other day I was in the country, and I heard a man singing a song as he dibbled beans. He had a stick with which he made a hole in the ground; he dropped three beans into each hole, and went on. As he did so, he sang a ditty to himself:

"One for the worm, and one for the crow,
And let us hope the other will grow."

I remember the great Dr. Conwell's telling a story of how a very brilliant lawyer had attended church, and had heard something which had profited him. The great lecturer paused and said, "Mark, my friends—Here was a man who actually learned something in church!" I grant you there is not much to learn in some churches.

But that should be the preacher's task, to get people to think, to develop their minds, and to exercise their minds with the great verities of the Word of God. It is, however, often a thankless task. That is what my text says. There are many people who sleep. You know very well that when the alarm goes off in the morning that boy or girl who has to get up to go to school, for the first two or three minutes is not in the happiest of moods. He is almost as ill-tempered as his father—and not much sweeter than his mother, under such circumstances. We none of us like to be awakened from a sound sleep—especially if while sleeping we have dreamed sweetly of impossible things which have no basis in reality. To be awakened from an idealistic dream to the stern realities of life is not pleasant.

And it is not a very pleasant task to have to awaken people. But I conceive it to be my duty to do that very thing. That is part of the task of the preacher, to get people to gird up the loins of their minds, to wake up mentally as well as spiritually, to see things in the light of God's truth. The thief usually breaks in at night, when people are asleep. That is the story of Europe, the story of England; it is the story of the United States, of the United Nations—fast asleep; and "while men slept, the enemy sowed tares".

It is the story of Canada. A very small proportion of the people of Canada are even now awake to the perils of the hour. They think of Europe, of Africa, of the Russian front, of Irak and Iran, of India and Burma, China, and the Islands of the Pacific as war theatres, but they do not think of Canada as being in danger—they rub their eyes at the sound of an alarm, and they turn over and go to sleep again. They do not want to be awakened. If you attempt it, you will be called by many names. I say, it is a thankless task, being a watchman; yet it is the duty of every gospel preacher to stand guard; of every true shepherd, to be keen of eye, quick of ear for the baying of the wolves, even in the distance. "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light."

I come back therefore to a subject which I have discussed in its various aspects again and again over an extended period. We were almost the only voice in Canada. Now people say, "It is no new thing: he has been at that for years." I have, for more than twenty

years. But the vast majority of people do not, will not, see the peril in which this country stands.

We had an unexpected visit this morning from a missionary from Central Europe, who escaped at the time of Dunkirk. He told me that he has been following our testimony on this matter very closely. He said that an informed and experienced European had remarked to him that there are two countries of which he stands in fear: one is the United States, and the other, Canada. Many of these people who have lived in Europe are able to understand as many here do not understand, that the United States and Canada are honey-combed with Romanist termites.

A few weeks ago, *Life* magazine printed an article, rather profusely illustrated, on French Canada. *Life* magazine occasionally says some things with which you and I do not agree. It may not always be accurate in everything. Both men and journals may occasionally err. Our Toronto papers are not altogether infallible. But they say good things occasionally—so I take them all. A certain Presbyterian minister told me some years ago that Dr. Alexander White of Free St. George's, Edinburgh, preached about one good sermon a month. The rest, he said, were about as thin as water; but as no one knew when the good sermon was coming, they kept going all the time, hoping each Sunday would be the day for high tide. That is why I take the Toronto papers, hoping some little bit of wisdom will occasionally be found in the editorial columns.

Many editors are wise only after the event. They are like some physicians: in the habit of diagnosing a disease by means of a *post mortem* examination. They can tell you what the man died of after he is dead. I want a physician who can tell me what is wrong when I send for him—I do not want to die just now; I have too much to do.

Such men can speak with authority, because they see the things in the germ; in advance of the event they warn people of coming danger.

We are just now rejoicing—albeit with trembling—at the good news that has reached us: Vichy France is now at war with the United States. The French Fleet is reported to have put to sea—what for we do not know; nor indeed whether it has put to sea or not. At this hour American troops are disembarking at various points on the coast of Algeria and Morocco, over a strip of coastline covering about six hundred miles. About seventy transports are standing off at one point, waiting to disembark their living freight. Vichy reports that the American army now being landed in Algeria and Morocco numbers something like one hundred and forty thousand men; and at the same time, we are told that about ninety thousand Italians have already surrendered to General Montgomery's army, or are wandering in the desert without food or drink. The Germans left them in the lurch, to take what the gangsters call "the rap", while they made good their escape as fast as they could. Rommel's forces are now reduced it is presumed—only a guess—to approximately twenty thousand men. The British armies are in hot pursuit. To the west; the Americans are landing; and four or five British divisions are said also to be in the offing, waiting their turn to join the Americans. It may be that at long last General Rommel is going to have to take a little of his own medicine.

Adolph Hitler thundered away to-day in a German beer-parlour. He spoke for eighty minutes. He threaten-

ed; he boasted that it had been his habit from the time he was a boy to have the last word! I thought that was the monopoly of the ladies! However, it is said to be somewhat characteristic of a gentleman who lives in a tight little island called Britain, a gentleman called John for short! He loses a great many battles, but has formed the habit of winning the last one. I think he is going to maintain his record (Loud applause). To-day we are told that in New Guinea the Americans have outdone Adolf Hitler, and have surpassed the accomplishment of the Germans at Crete. They have landed great forces by air—and that is giving the "little Jap" more than a little anxiety!

I remember the last war. Terrible days they were, in March, nineteen-eighteen, and the months that followed. Then came August, and from then forward there was an ever-accelerating collapse of the enemy until we almost wearied of reading of successive victories—as we had sorrowed wearily up to that time of reading pages of casualties. We are not yet out of the woods; we shall have many reverses, serious losses at sea I doubt not; but I am inclined to believe that when seen in the perspective of history, it will appear that these are pregnant hours through which we are passing, hours for which we shall give God thanks in the days that are to come.

But the thing that gives me concern, in Canada and elsewhere, is the peace. The peace! And that because of the sinister influences which are seeking now to establish themselves. You remember how Dr. Murphy told us about the French Cardinal Talleyrand in the days of the French Revolution, who, looking down from a balcony upon a milling crowd of rioters, said, "Our side is winning." When asked, "Which side is that?" he replied, "I do not know yet"! They are always on the winning side. That is why, as we shall see, Rome speaks with a voice for both sides. It is the source of the most lying propaganda that the world has ever known. And Canada is not free from its machinations.

I have here *The Canadian Register*. — the Roman Catholic organ—in which appears an editorial on "Will the Pope be Barred?" Last week this same paper said that this war was due to the fact that the Pope was not given a place at the Peace Conference following the last war; that if the Allied Powers had listened to the "greatest moral force in the world", we should have avoided the present disaster! Here they quote the Secret Treaty of London, drawn up in the Fall of nineteen-seventeen, barring the Pope from exercising any influence on the peace-making which would follow the conclusion of the First World War. Here is the wording:

"France, Great Britain and Russia undertake to support Italy in so far as she does not permit the representatives of the Holy See to take diplomatic action with regard to the conclusion of peace and the regulations of questions connected with the war."

Britain, France, and Russia, entered into a compact with Italy, that they would fight together on condition Italy would agree with them to deny the Pope a place at the Peace Conference. Since that time Mussolini has made his peace with the Vatican, and now the temporal power of the Pope has been recognized by Italy. If you are at all familiar with the trend of things in the Roman Catholic press—I study it carefully—you will know that all over the world the Papacy is preparing the way for taking a large place in the making of peace; and we all know in whose interests the conditions of peace would be

dictated. The future is all the more ominous and dangerous because of that new relationship. It may be that with the collapse of the Axis in Africa, and the opening of a second front in Sardinia and Sicily and Italy, that the Italian people will surrender—and perhaps they will hang Mussolini to the nearest sour apple tree! Or if they have no apple-trees in Italy, any kind of tree will do! I would, help if I were there, and count it an honour to have the chief place. Mussolini is a murderer, not fit to live.

Historically, Italy and Britain have been friends, and I hope we shall be friends again. The Italian people are not like the German people. They have been imposed upon; and our experience with them in Ethiopia, and in General Wavell's first success, indicates that their heart is not in this conflict. It may appear that we shall have more help in that direction that we have hoped for. Perhaps they will fight more valiantly with us than they have ever fought against us.

But in Canada, the Roman Hierarchy is definitely preparing for conditions which will obtain after the war. A certain gentleman, a responsible person, supplied me with a statement from a responsible man in Quebec Province, which, were it read throughout Canada, ought to produce a political earthquake. The Dean of a certain Montreal college, who was chairman of a Refugee Committee at the time women and children from Europe were seeking asylum in Canada, reported as follows:

"He (the Dean) informed me that on a certain occasion Cardinal Villeneuve of Quebec paid him a visit and told him not to admit any Jews or English as in the course of the next eighteen years he would control Canada. The Dean did not like it, and journeyed to Ottawa to interview the Honourable Ernest Lapointe, then Minister of Justice, by whom he was informed that he could not fight God. This is the story as it was given by the Dean himself."

A member of a committee in Toronto informed me that the same pressure was used here in large measure. He said one man was admitted only on condition that he promised to become a Roman Catholic—and that man is now attending a Roman Catholic church in Toronto, in fulfilment of his pledge.

The reason the Hierarchy is so disturbed about this article in *Life* magazine is that *Life* in this instance tells the truth—and the truth is what they do not want known to the readers of a paper with a circulation of more than four millions. The Roman Church is the mother of darkness. It is not a city set on a hill which cannot be hid. It favours education for the Hierarchy, but has always been the enemy of enlightenment for the masses. It has trained its officials to be clever enough to take advantage of a multitude of poor ignorant people. You have only to go to South America, to Southern Ireland, to Quebec; and you will find a greater percentage of illiteracy where the Roman Catholic Church is in the ascendancy than elsewhere in the world. Thousands of people in Quebec can neither read nor write. It is the one spot in Canada where there is no compulsory education, where education is under the control of the church, and where the mass of the people are taught little more than enough to learn the catechism and obey the priest. They work as serfs for the church, in order to profit it.

When *Life*, an influential magazine, accurately tells the story, they do not like it. I am sure if this were untrue to fact, we should not have had a statement from nine Roman Catholic Archbishops, including "the prince"

of the church. It is only a short article, but it certainly stirred things up. I congratulate the writer of the article on the effect it has produced!

Premier Godbout of Quebec also issued a statement, because he was mentioned in the article. He merely denies that it is true! Nine Archbishops deny that it is true. But they do not meet one solitary point made by the article. They never do. When Dr. Murphy was here he said, "I know what they will do. They will try to make out, either that I was never a priest, or that I was kicked out of the church." They do not want people to suppose that a priest would ever voluntarily resign. There was a short editorial note in *The Canadian Register* which admitted that Dr. Murphy was a priest. They said it was not true that he had been attached to the Washington Embassy. But he was! Dr. Murphy, in a letter to me said they are in rather a trying position. They were better informed than usual, for when he left China, the present Papal Delegate in Canada, Archbishop Antoniutti, went to the station at Peking to see him off because he knows him well. Archbishop Antoniutti is now living in Ottawa. He knows that Dr. Murphy had been a priest. They do not attempt to meet any position that is ever taken, whether it be by a priest or a Baptist preacher. They have never argued the case with me: they have merely denounced me.

The Globe and Mail has done the same. They "detest" my campaign. But at long last they find they have had to take the same position. They pointed out that Premier Godbout has put himself in "the same class as Dr. Shields!" I am getting much company. Now I have *The Globe and Mail*, *The Evening Telegram*, *The Toronto Star*, and *Life*, all on my side. Little by little people are waking up to see that what we have been saying is true.

Life magazine published an article on French Canada, which so far as I am able to discern, is quite true. That magazine has a circulation of over four millions, and the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in Canada are evidently quite alarmed. Nine Archbishops, including one Cardinal, Villeneuve, who is the Archbishop of Quebec, "the prince" of the Church and the head of the Hierarchy in Canada, thought it necessary to issue a joint statement in respect to this article in *Life*.

I have read of it in many papers, but I have here a cutting from *The Canadian Register*, the official Roman Catholic organ. I take their version of it as being duly authorized and official, and therefore reliable.

This evening I shall refer to certain things, in order to disprove what the Hierarchy says, and to prove the truth of what *Life* has published. I will prove up to the hilt that these nine Archbishops are a company of unmitigated prevaricators. I do not mean people who resort to "terminological inexactitudes", but plain, unmitigated falsifiers of fact.

First of all I shall read you the article from *Life*, and examine its salient points quite independently of the Cardinal and his eight archiepiscopal colleagues. I shall not in this address burden you with extended quotations, but in its printed form, I will put the quotations in, completely documented, so that the whole matter can be critically examined. The emphases in the quotations from the *Life* article are mine. Here is the first paragraph from *Life*.*

* From this forward matters of record which, in the oral address, were referred to only in brief statements, are set out in detail.

The War Makes Trouble For Catholic Quebec

In the heart of North America, Protestant and English-speaking, flourishes a single province with 3,000,000 Catholic Frenchmen. That is Quebec. *It is more foreign to Americans than is France, for it is essentially foreign also to the 20th Century.* Philosophically and religiously it stems from the Catholicism of the 16th Century. It despises the France of the French Revolution and of the Third Republic. Now its youth admires the France of Pétain.

No American—nor Canadian either—who has travelled through Quebec, will be disposed to question *Life's* statement, that it is "more foreign to Americans than is France", and that "it is essentially foreign also to the 20th Century". Nor can we find any ground for objection to the statement that the Catholicism of Quebec "stems from the Catholicism of the 16th century." The fact is the Catholicism of Quebec "stems" from a more remote date than the sixteenth century.

Sir Alexander T. Galt, one of the Fathers of Confederation, only nine years after Confederation, in 1876, published a pamphlet entitled, "Church and State". In that pamphlet he quotes as follows from the fifth Provincial Council of the Hierarchy held at Quebec in 1873:

"We assert that the Church is a perfect Society, independent of the Civil power and superior to it. Between the religious authority of this Society (the fulness of which authority resides in the Roman Pontiff) and the political power of the Christian ruler, there exists, from the very nature of things, such a relation, that the latter is to the former not only negatively but also positively subordinate, although indirectly so. The Civil power can do nothing which tends to the injury of the Church, and ought to abstain from such acts as would clash with the laws of the Church, and, indeed, should also, at the request of the Church, cooperate toward its benefit and the attainment of its supernatural end. This is the true doctrine of Boniface the Eighth, in the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, in which he teaches that the material sword should be subordinate to the spiritual sword, and should be used for the Church, but not against the Church. The opinion of the Fathers is the same who write that the Civil power has been instituted by God for the protection and care of the Church."

—p. 21 *Church and State*.

Galt quotes one of the Bishops, Bourget, as saying:

"Each one of you can and ought to say in the interior of his soul, "I hear my Curé; my Curé hears the Bishop; the Bishop hears the Pope, and the Pope hears our Lord Jesus Christ, who aids with his Holy Spirit to render them infallible on the teaching and government of His Church."

—p. 23 *Church and State*.

It will be recalled that Boniface VIII., whom Galt quotes, "reigned" from 1294 to 1303.

The history of Quebec during the last war, and its anti-British and anti-conscription attitude, as well as of Quebec's record in this war, absolutely proves *Life's* contention that Quebec "despises the France of the French Revolution and of the Third Republic." As a matter of fact, the Vichy representative in Ottawa, in an address in Montreal shortly after the collapse of France, declared that the collapse of France was the judgment of God upon his own country for its disobedience to the Church. That sentiment met with no protest from those to whom it was addressed.

Further this paragraph says that "now its youth admires the France of Pétain." I know of nothing that would more certainly confirm the truth of that statement than a report of a meeting in Montreal held in connection with Stanislas College. I would call attention to the list of names of representative men who were "pres-

ent on the platform and in the hall". At all events, it was thoroughly representative of the Province of Quebec. Here is the report as contained in *The Montreal Gazette* of September 17th, 1940:

Says Vichy Happy to Continue Payments to Stanislas College

Rene Ristelhueber, French Minister to Canada, Makes Pledge at School Ceremony—Many Prominent Local Figures Attend

"We have built on solid soil, on venerable Canadian soil, on the soil on which Maisonneuve erected the cross 300 years ago and on which Ville Marie was to spring up and prosper," Rene Ristelhueber, French Minister to Canada, declared this morning during the blessing and inauguration of the new Stanislas College building, 780 Dollard street, by His Excellency, Mgr. Joseph Charbonneau, Archbishop of Montreal, the French-language newspaper *La Presse* reported Monday under a double column heading, bringing to its readers the account of what transpired at this ceremony.

Present on the platform and in the hall were Senator Donat Raymond, who introduced the speakers, Premier Adelard Godbout, Hon. T. D. Bouchard, Minister of Roads and Public Works, Hon. Henri Groulx, Minister of Health, Mayor Adhemar Raynault, Mayor Joseph Beaubien, of Outremont, Senators Leon Mercier-Gouin and C. P. Beaubien, Mgr. Olivier Maurault, rector of the University of Montreal, Rev. Gaudrault, Dominican provincial; Thomas Vien, M.P. for Outremont, deGaspe Beaubien, Jean Bruchesi, Under-Secretary of the province, Ernest Tetrault, president of l'Alliance Francaise; J. O. Asselin, chairman of the Executive Committee; Jean-Marie Gauvreau, director of l'Ecole du Meuble, Rev. Amable Lemoine, rector of Stanislas, Emery Beaulieu, Charles Bourassa, J. J. Perrault, Dr. Armand Fortier and Judge Arthur Trahan.

Invited to speak, Hon. Adelard Godbout, Quebec's premier, declared that the Stanislas College of Montreal "is the symbol of the desire, of our firm determination to remain French." "We have a mission to fulfil in America," he continued, "and we will accomplish it if we remain faithful to our traditions and to the French culture."

Terminating his brief address he said "I can bring you the guarantee of the Government's support in this essential work."

Archbishop Charbonneau

Addressing himself to the same elite audience, His Excellency, Mgr. Charbonneau had stated earlier that, despite the trials France is experiencing at this moment, "Marshal Pétain, the Good Samaritan of his wounded country, deigned to think of our Stanislas College, as if he had said, here as over there, 'I Will Carry On.'" (Je Maintiendrai)

His Excellency lauded the good influence and rivalry which Stanislas cannot but help spread among the other institutions of secondary high school education, to accentuate their progress, even now so apparent.

Mayor Joseph Beaubien, of Outremont, recalled in moving terms the memory of the two men who launched the idea for the foundation of Stanislas College, the late Archbishop Georges Gauthier and the late Senator Raoul Dandurand.

Hon. T. D. Bouchard, Minister of Roads and Public Works, also said a few words.

M. Ristelhueber Speaks

He made it a point to emphasize that "France, despite its distress, has nevertheless assumed half the cost of this construction and I wish to publicly express here, he continued, all my ardent appreciation for the generous alacrity with which the Canadian authorities were ready to share this amount with us."

Assistance to France

He added: "France is happy today to continue to contribute to the college budget; she asks you to furnish your share by improving its resources through increase in the number of its students."

This beyond controversy proves the truth of *Life's*

statement that Quebec's "youth admires the France of Pétain". But for full measure, and as a sidelight on this matter, I quote an editorial from *The Canadian Register*, of September 12th, the official Roman Catholic organ:

Pétain Breaks the Shackles

It is seldom that the press has a good word for Marshal Pétain's Government. As a general rule the scribes elect to forget that the heroic old soldier has been locked into a very tight corner and is surrounded by all but insuperable difficulties. And so it may not be amiss for a Catholic paper to draw attention to certain facts which indicate the emergence of a truly Christian France when the sorrow, ruin and desolation of the present are but ugly memories.

As early as September, 1940, the Pétain regime began the restoration of the freedom of the Church by abrogating the law of July 7, 1904, which forbade religious orders to engage in educational work. Then in February, 1941, all property which had been confiscated from the diocese of France was restored to them. Next came a law which sanctioned the return of the Carthusian Monks and restored to them the property of the Grande Chartreuse, mother house of the Order, from which the monks were expelled during the French Revolution and to which they returned in 1816, only to be expelled again 85 years later. Finally came the law of April, 1942, which removed the disabilities placed on religious orders by the Law of Associations of July 1, 1901.

The shackles with which aggressive and militant anticlericalism crippled the activity of the Church are thus being broken, and a new Concordat with the Holy See seems a certainty once the invaders are hurled from French soil.

We come now to *Life's* second paragraph:

Quebec is a testament to the tolerance of Imperial Britain, which reformed after deporting the French Acadians of Nova Scotia in 1755 and watched 65,000 conquered Frenchmen in Quebec expand between 1763 and 1942 to a total of about 6,000,000, in all Canada and the Northern U.S. *To-day the British Crown is a very small part of the life of the Province of Quebec.* The test of British policy has come to-day in Quebec's contribution to a world war for all free men everywhere. In last April's plebiscite *Quebec voted over 70% against conscription for overseas service.*

Surely Quebec is a testament to the tolerance of Imperial Britain! Again, the best proof of the truth of this second paragraph will be found in the statements of Quebec's own representatives. Let us see whether "to-day the British Crown is a very small part of the life of the Province of Quebec." In *THE GOSPEL WITNESS* of August 6th, Rev. W. S. Whitcombe wrote:

It may be rather surprising to the majority of our readers to learn that the Union Jack is considered by the Saint John Baptist Society to be a foreign flag. It may be surprising to read that the National holiday of Canada is the Saint John Baptist Society day—June 24th. Dominion Day, July 1st, in Quebec is just another day. "The National Holiday"—St. John the Baptist Day—in Quebec is of course a Roman Catholic religious feast.

And in that connection he drew special attention to a paragraph translated from a daily paper published in Quebec City, as follows:

"It is requested that the Union Jack should not be employed nor the Stars and Stripes nor any other flag which is foreign to us."

But again, let us have good measure, pressed down and running over. I quote from Rev. W. S. Whitcombe's translations as follows:

"The Union of the Religious and Civil Authority"

"In Toronto, in the English language, the Cardinal (Villeneuve) said:

"Never did I wish that Quebec should become either a clerical or a Fascist state."

"Here is what he said in Quebec City, in French:

"Cet anneau marque l'union—Dieu en soit loué—de l'autorité religieuse et de l'autorité civile."

"That, of course, you say, means the same thing as his English speech in Toronto. Do you think so? I shall translate for you a newspaper account of the event that took place in Quebec City when the Cardinal made his French speech. The newspaper report is headed 'A Document to Conserve'.

"It was in these terms on the 26th of June, 1937, at the opening session of the National Eucharistic Conference, in the course of an unforgettable scene which took place in the Manège of Quebec, His Eminence Cardinal Villeneuve interpreted the gesture of the Duplessis government, which had just offered him through its Prime Minister a remembrance ring."

"The following are the last two paragraphs of Mr. Duplessis' speech:

"In the name of this province and as a symbol of our indefectible attachment to the Fisherman's ring, who was a preacher of charity, I am happy to present you this ring bearing the escutcheon of the Congress and your Coat of Arms.

"And I think that I shall make your bishop's heart rejoice even more as I say to you in closing: In the name of the Government and of the people of the province of Quebec I proclaim our faith, and I do so with my whole heart, my whole soul; Credo! I believe! I believe in God and in the Catholic religion!"

"In reply, the Cardinal said in part:

"This is a precious and very beautiful gift. It comes from the Government of the French province of Quebec. This ring marks the union, praise God, of the religious authority and of the civil authority.' (Emphasis ours.)

"If that is not a clerical state then what under heaven is it?

Fascism

"Again, the Cardinal declared in Toronto that he did not wish Quebec to become a Fascist state. If that is so, then why did he not put the curb on a priest who recently spoke in Quebec City before a meeting of la Société St-Jean Baptiste—not a Baptist society, I beg you to remember! Said this priest:

"We desire a French province of Quebec, a French state well organized, governed by ourselves, centralizing our economic life, our political life and that for the purpose of being masters in our own homes (Chez-nous). That is what Father Simon Arsenault p.s.v. declared in a lecture that he recently gave at Quebec under the auspices of la Société St-Jean Baptiste.

"Nationalists use all methods to diffuse the national mystic: schools, national sessions, la Société St-Jean Baptiste, congresses, national excursions, festival of the dead (Dollard, La Vergne), festival of the living (those who honour us), historical lectures, salute to the flag.

"Nationalists do not believe in numbers which engender discussion, indecision, perpetual recommencements. Nor do they believe in the popular sovereignty which is an illusion, or an anarchy, or an immorality. They do not believe in the mirage of individual competition which is supposed to give everyone a chance by a process of selection. (Emphasis ours).

"The dogma of nationalists is order. That is their first principle, an order which takes account of the

human person but also of the collective body, as of the evil of men, for the advancement of the nation. . . ."

"The speaker concluded by citing Marshal Pétain as a perfect model of efficacious authority. What he has done in France since he came to power is admirable. In him everything is in perfect equilibrium, he has the qualities of a chief, of a leader, his authority radiates from the top of the pyramid to the base. Let us make him our pattern.

"Long live nationalism. Down with individualism!"

The third paragraph of *Life's* article is as follows:

The French Canadians are among the nicest people in the world, sweet-tempered and amiable, virtuous, frugal, industrious and honest, very sociable and hospitable. The church and the farm dominate most of their lives. Sitting at the gateway to Canada, it is the most unprogressive of the settled provinces. Its infant mortality has been consistently high and one town (Trois Rivières) has a rate higher than Bombay. Quebec City's diphtheria death rate has been the highest in the world.

In this paragraph *Life* says what we ourselves have repeatedly said of the French Canadians: that no finer people are to be found, if left to themselves. That they are dominated by the church, and that Quebec is the most unprogressive of the settled provinces, surely there can be no question.

Let Archbishops Disprove by Official Statistics

In respect to the two items: we have not at hand the statistics as to the infant mortality of Trois Rivières, or the diphtheria death rate of Quebec City. But all the nine archbishops needed to do was simply to quote the official statistical record in these matters. We can only assume that the fact that they failed to do so, proves that they could not thus disprove *Life's* statement. When a man charged with a misdemeanour does not go into the witness-box in his own defense, it is generally assumed that he could not safely submit to cross-examination.

Following is the fourth paragraph of *Life's* article:

Actually rural Quebec is run by the Catholic Church, which exacts a 4% tithe on all grain harvests. Non-payment of tithes brings seizure of property. The Church controls education in Quebec. Permission to attend a non-Catholic school may be given youth (never children) by the bishop. Girls may marry at 14 but may not go to the movies until they are 16.

Does anyone doubt that rural Quebec is run by the Church? Not only rural Quebec, but Quebec as a province, including urban Quebec. Only a week or so ago I referred to the action of the Quebec City Council in passing a by-law prohibiting the erection of places of worship and certain other buildings in a particular part of the city—where the Roman Catholic Church already has all the churches it wants. You remember I quoted the *Quebec Chronicle-Telegraph* to the effect that the Mayor had submitted the whole controversy to Cardinal Villeneuve, and, coming from the Cardinal's palace he informed the press that he had been authorized to issue a statement to the effect that the Cardinal would settle the question!

And what about the four per cent. tax on all grain harvests? And seizure of property for non-payment? Is that not true? The Hierarchy makes no attempt to disprove that assertion. (Following the sermon last Sunday night a gentleman informed me of a case that had come under his observation but a few days before. An aged Roman Catholic woman had left Quebec, and had become a resident of Toronto. She was an old age

pensioner, and when the due date of the pension came, and the pension did not arrive, she made enquiry as to the reason; and received the information later that ten dollars of pension was overdue, and that the amount had been deducted from her pension.)

Once more, in the foregoing paragraph, *Life* says, "The Church controls education in Quebec." It is enough in confirmation of that to quote Cardinal Villeneuve in the *Semaine Religieuse de Quebec*. Following is the Cardinal's statement:

"It is my duty to recall that Catholic children are not allowed, according to the laws of the Church, to attend schools which are non-Catholic, neutral or mixed, that is to say, which are even open to non-Catholics. (c'est-à-dire ouvertes même aux non-catholiques).

"Indeed if we but remind ourselves for a moment that schools, even more than institutions of learning, are homes of education, that is to say, of moral formation, we shall understand why Catholics cannot find in non-Catholic schools the atmosphere which is suitable for the conservation of their piety and the practice of Christian virtues; and this is true even on the supposition that neutral or non-Catholic institutions do not carry on religious proselytism and give evidence of sympathy to the Church. It is no offense to make this observation.

"Catholic parents who reflect will be quickly convinced. Just as a plant does not thrive outside its own climate, so the religious sentiment of a child runs a strong risk of becoming weakened or even exhausted in a school neutral or foreign to its faith. An unhappy experience has long since proved it to be so. That is the reason why the church is so severe in this matter. Catholic parents, or those who take their place, if they knowingly educate or instruct their children in a non-Catholic religion thereby incur excommunication at the discretion of the Bishop, (Canon 2319, paragraph 1, 40), and will moreover fall under suspicion of heresy. (paragraph 2.) The Church also forbids Catholic children to attend non-Catholic, neutral or mixed schools because of the danger of perversion that they may run and it reserves to the Bishop the care of decreeing, in accordance with the instructions of the Holy See, in what circumstances and at the cost of what precaution the thing may be tolerated, always in such a way as to prevent the danger of perversion. (Canon 1374).

"In England, for example, and in the United States and in several provinces of the Dominion, Catholics must make the greatest sacrifices and even sustain the most ardent struggles in order to have their own schools where they may send their children without damage to their beliefs and to their religious practices. In our province, thanks be to God, Catholics have the immense advantage of organizing all their schools according to the dictates of their own conscience.

"In view of this, reasons of a natural order are not sufficient to excuse parents for exposing their children to the danger of weakening or losing their faith.

"If in very special cases, young people who have passed the age of childhood are under the necessity of attending non-Catholic institutions they must first obtain the permission of the Bishop. This permission in our diocese must be requested through the parish priest with strong reasons to support it: it will not be given except on condition that the parish priest or one of his workers may watch over the religious instruction and the moral conduct of these young people. This toleration will be given for not longer than one year at a time and it will be necessary to make a new request each year, if the reasons on which it is based should continue. (Diocesan Synod Decree 451, par. 1.)

"To parents, who, having been duly warned, continue to send their children to a non-Catholic school without the permission of the bishop, confessors must refuse absolution. (Diocesan Discipline, art. 454, b.) Quebec the 31st of August, 1942.

J. M. Rodrigue Villeneuve, O.M.I.
Archbishop of Quebec."

We call attention to the closing paragraph of the above letter, dated August 31st, 1942, less than seven weeks before the appearance of *Life's* article. It will be seen, not only that the Church prescribes what education the children shall receive, but that it steps in between the authority of the parents and the child—in fact, substitutes the authority of the Church for the authority of the parent. If the Church is not obeyed, "confessors must refuse absolution." And that, to the Roman Catholic mind, would of course mean consignment to perdition. Can anyone imagine a more intolerable authoritarianism than that?

We come now to paragraphs five to eight of *Life's* article. And let it not be forgotten that the emphases in these quotations are my own. Also remember this article in *Life* is profusely illustrated, and here and there are references to the photographs which of course we cannot reproduce. Here follow paragraphs five to eight:

Canon Law re Education

This gentle and pious world, bordering the U.S., is examined in the village of Saint-Fidèle on the St. Lawrence River, on the following pages, by *Life* Photographer John Phillips. All photographs of Saint-Fidèle were taken with the help of the village curé, L'Abbé Thomas Louis Imbeault.

Peasants of Quebec Live by the Church

God is always very close to the little people of Saint-Fidèle and the Church is even closer. As shown at left, devotion is a function woven deeply into everyday existence. It affects every part of the village life, in both a spiritual and a temporal sense, far more than it does life in Quebec's cities. It is exceedingly uncomfortable for anyone in Saint-Fidèle who would defy the village curé.

Under the last premier, a man's house could be padlocked on the mere notification to the attorney general that he was suspected of having "radical" thoughts. If he broke in to get out his belongings, he could be sentenced to several years in jail. This "Padlock Law" is still on the books but under Premier Godbout is no longer enforced.

The people of Saint-Fidèle are not "radical". The educated read Corneille and Racine. They feel that it is their sacred duty to combat "Communism or Bolshevism", which may include almost anything from State allowances for mothers to American atheism. This makes them more than a little troubled by a world war being fought by Russian, Bolsheviks, Chinese Buddhists and English-speaking Protestants against, among other places, Rome, the home of the Church.

Here we are told that while God is close to the people, "the church is even closer." This of course is true of Roman Catholicism in general. While the Scriptures teach "there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus", the Church arrogates to itself the position of mediator between men and the divinely-appointed Mediator. Hence Mary, and all the saints, and the "holy Mother Church" in general, stand between the soul and God.

Some time ago we published a letter from a Roman Catholic chaplain to the soldiers, urging devotion to the Church, and the blessed virgin, with not so much as an allusion to Christ. That, I repeat, is the very genius of Roman Catholicism: it makes itself a mediator, and takes toll of everyone who is blind enough to accept its blasphemous pretensions.

Nor can there be any doubt of the accuracy of *Life's* statement: "It is exceedingly uncomfortable for anyone in Saint-Fidèle who would defy the village curé." Here I repeat the saying of Bishop Bourget at the fifth provincial conference of the Hierarchy held in Quebec in eighteen-seventy-three as follows:

"Each one of you can and ought to say in the interior of his soul, 'I hear my Curé; my Curé hears the Bishop; the Bishop hears the Pope, and the Pope hears our Lord Jesus Christ, who aids with his Holy Spirit, to render them infallible on the teaching and government of His Church.'

Sir Alexander Galt—p. 23 Church and State."

In the next paragraph it is said the Padlock Law was designed for the restriction of persons "suspected of having 'radical' thoughts." I shall return to this implied principle, that the church, through a subservient state, aims to control the "thoughts" of the people, when I deal with Cardinal Villeneuve's specific statement. Many of you will remember reading of the enforcement of this infamous Padlock Law. We recall one such case in Montreal, if we are not mistaken, when a man who was a carpenter fell under suspicion. Returning to his own apartment, he found it padlocked, and he did what most of us would do: broke open the door. He was sentenced to a term in prison for thus forcibly entering his own house. It is true that that padlock law is not being enforced—but it remains on the statute books; and its enforcement is a mere matter of policy. It is there with all its un-British provisions, to be invoked at any time.

The people of the village under examination are apparently troubled by being required to participate in a war "being fought by Russian Bolsheviks, Chinese Buddhists and English-speaking Protestants against, among other places Rome, the home of the Church." We believe the position taken by *Life's* reporter cannot successfully be controverted: that "English-speaking Protestants" are classed with the other hated isms of the Roman Church is known to everyone.

After all, this last paragraph quoted goes to the heart of the whole matter. Not Ottawa, nor London, but Rome, is the capital city to which Romanists are taught they owe their first allegiance.

We continue our quotation from *Life* by setting out paragraphs nine, ten, and eleven:

Big Families Hope to Populate All Canada

The gigantic families of Quebec have given an estimated 150,000 of their men so far to this war for service at home and abroad. The village of *Saint-Fidèle* has probably given fewer than most. The non-Catholic Canadians are being realistic about Quebec, and last week a French Canadian, Major General LaFleche, was put in charge of getting soldiers for all Canada.

Nationalist Quebec's objections to "fighting Great Britain's wars" go back to the Boer War and the first World War. But whenever Britain was fighting the U.S., French Canada fought the U.S. too, often with great gallantry, usually in exchange for more concessions made to the Church in Quebec. Thus came the Quebec Act of 1774, in which the Church established its ascendancy and old French civil law in Quebec.

The French Canadians really expect some day to be the vast majority in Canada. Canada to-day is 45% Catholic, 37% French. The Church forbids birth control and out of Quebec's 3,500,000, it has an impressive total of 3,000,000 regular Church members. The flock is kept firmly French, Catholic, compact and productive.

Paragraph nine deals with what some have called, "The revenge of the cradle". By natural increase they expect soon to obtain the majority in Canada. This paragraph speaks of an estimated one hundred and fifty thousand men as given "so far to this war for service at home and abroad". But the great majority of them—if indeed there are one hundred and fifty thousand alto-

gether—are for service at home. It must always be borne in mind, however, that of the number credited to Quebec, a very large proportion come from the English-speaking Protestants of Quebec, and many of them have been recruited for French-Canadian regiments outside Quebec—who are neither French-Canadians nor Roman Catholics.

In *Life's* article there is a picture under which are these words: "An airman, Marcel Dassylva, comes home on furlough. Of *Saint-Fidèle's* 1,100 people, only two have enlisted, three have been conscripted for service inside Canada, or a total of 0.4%." It is not possible to obtain accurate statistics respecting the number of Roman Catholic enlistments in Quebec, and the rest of Canada. We have asked for information, only to be told that it is not in the public interest to supply it. But Quebec's contribution of men to the armed services, so far as we have statistics, is less than fifty per cent. of the contribution of Ontario. In its war effort, Quebec is far behind in its contributions of men and of money.

And what shall be said of the French-Canadian expectation that they will some day control Canada? That has been repeatedly said by French Canadians, and is a matter of general knowledge everywhere. But, in confirmation, I remind you of what a college dean in Montreal reported of Cardinal Villeneuve's saying he expected to control Canada in eighteen years.

It is not difficult, however, to obtain volumes of evidence to prove that the Roman Catholic Church expects to be in control of Canada before long.

Our next section of *Life's* article is paragraphs twelve to fourteen as follows:

The Premier Fights Hitler and the Past

What has held Catholic Quebec together is the Church's lasting fear of English-speaking Canadians, and rambunctious Americans. Other Frenchmen have been absorbed by Britain and the U.S., but not the Canadians. The ancestors of these Normans fought the English from 1066 to 1763, usually with success.

A voice of commonsense is raised by Premier Adélar Godbout, a man truly *Canadien* in his farm and church origins. He believes Canada has its own stake in World War II and urges full co-operation. He is for the reform of the Church's educational system. The strongest of his proposals is that more English be taught in Quebec schools. Chief point of his reforms is to help French Canadians to qualify for jobs in modern English-speaking civilization. But above all, he is remorselessly against Hitler, "Whose villainy is beyond the power of words to describe."

Liberal Godbout's frame of mind is probably close to the true sentiments of most French Canadians who in a Gallup Poll last August voted Canada's Liberal Prime Minister Mackenzie King the greatest living Canadian by vote of 50% against 4% for the Cardinal.

It may be presumed that the Honourable Louis St. Laurent, Minister of Justice, is a fairly representative Canadian. In his maiden speech in the Canadian House of Commons, he said that one hundred and seventy-five years of history had demonstrated the impossibility of assimilating three million French Canadians. (See Hansard for June-July, 1942). Here is official confirmation of *Life's* statement quoted above.

Premier Godbout has urged the necessity for educational reform in Quebec, insisting that its young men should be furnished with opportunity in higher education for training for something besides the priesthood.

The next paragraph from *Life's* article is particularly important. Here it is:

The Cardinal Opposes Hitler and Change

Probably the most powerful man in Quebec is the Cardinal, benign Archbishop J. M. Rodrigue Villeneuve, O.M.I. Whereas the low clergy of Quebec oppose the war, Cardinal Villeneuve undertakes to support the war, and thus placates the Ottawa Government. This naturally makes for confusion in Quebec. In his early days, he spoke of "the break-up of that great and ostentatious empire" (Britain), of "the covetousness of the neighboring Ogre" (the U.S.) and "the wild, lying, atheistic democracy which reigns to-day in almost all the countries of the world." But he has courageously faced the fact that Hitler is even worse and that the war must be fought by French Canadians far from Quebec. His moral position on individual freedom was expressed in 1938: "It is never permitted . . . to grant freedom of thought, writing or teaching, and the undifferentiated freedom of religions, as so many rights which Nature has given to Man".

That Cardinal Villeneuve is "the most powerful man in Quebec", we think will be generally admitted. Nor will anyone dispute the statement that "the low clergy of Quebec oppose the war". Their opposition is notorious. It was in the last war. But now as then, the so-called higher clergy pay lip-service to the nation's cause. The fact is, however, that the bishops speak for the deception of Protestants, and the priests for the direction of Romanists. Is anyone simple enough to suppose that "the low clergy" really oppose their superiors? Of course they do not! *Life* says, "Cardinal Villeneuve undertakes to support the war, and thus placates the Ottawa Government. This naturally makes for confusion in Quebec." *Life* is correct in what it says of the Cardinal, but there is no "confusion in Quebec" on that account. The parish priest understands what is expected of him, and the people do what the priest demands of them.

Someone may object, that to imply that a bishop or a Cardinal could be guilty of deliberate deception is to beg the question, and to impugn the sincerity of honourable men? Very well then, they shall speak for themselves:

"Let a French Roman Catholic review tell you:

"... throughout our history, it has been necessary for our high clergy to lavish their marks of loyalty in order to conciliate the civil authorities and to hinder them from giving ear to certain propagandas that nothing disarms. Without these declarations of which it has been necessary to make a shield, they tell us that the Catholic religion in Canada might have encountered hostility and evil days." (Emphasis ours).

"And lest anyone should attempt to pass off the statement I have just read you as the vapourings of some irresponsible person speaking without authority, I tell you that on the Board responsible for the publication of this French review are found the names of three priests, one the head of the great University of Montreal, which is supported by the province of Quebec, another priest is professor of history there; three other members are editors or writers in French Catholic newspapers, there is at least one M.P.P., and the head of the School of Higher Commercial Studies in the University of Montreal.

"If Dr. Shields or I had said what that important review said, the French Catholic press would have said, 'Sacrilege! They accuse the Cardinal of duplicity, of deliberate, official, public duplicity, on a nation-wide scale!' But there you have it in a French Catholic review."

(From a sermon by Rev. W. S. Whitcombe, M.A.,
April 20th, 1941.)

Life says further:

"In his (Villeneuve's) early days, he spoke of 'the break up of that great and ostentatious empire' (Britain), of 'the covetousness of the neighbouring Ogre (U.S.).'"

I cannot lay my hand on the publication containing either of these sayings. But the obviously correct answer to the charge that these things were said, is specifically to deny having said them, and challenge *Life* to name the place where the quotations can be found. Because the Hierarchy know well that these things were said, they dare not specifically deny them.

Cardinal Villeneuve did not actually himself frame the next sentence quoted, "The wild, lying, atheistic democracy which reigns to-day in almost all the countries of the world". But he did quote a certain Polish bishop with approval in the following terms:

"I do not admit the wild, lying, atheistic democracy which reigns in almost all the states of the world. The Masonic organizations, secret or avowed, the revolutionaries and the politicians in their pay, the scribblers, the communist orators who have explained and who still explain to the people that chance and a blind majority of votes shall decide the organization of power in the State, fill me with horror."

And that is consistent with the general teaching of the Roman Church. Individualism, the value and rights and freedom of the individual, is the very foundation of democracy. A democracy is an association of individuals, each of whom registers his will; and having done so, accepts as law the collective will of the majority. It is against that principle of evaluation and regulation of life, totalitarian authoritarianism is contending on all the battlefields of the world. And totalitarian authoritarianism is of the very essence of the Roman Catholic philosophy of government.

The present Papal delegate in Ottawa so declared in the plainest terms possible.

The Canadian Freeman, the Roman Catholic paper of Kingston (now absorbed in *The Canadian Register*), dated September 25th, 1941, which bore on its masthead these words, "Catholic Press is my voice—Pope Pius XI.", in a despatch from Quebec, reported a speech by "His Excellency Archbishop Antoniutti, Apostolic Delegate to Canada and Newfoundland", in the following terms:

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

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

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

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

At the end of the despatch are these words:

"This was the vibrant appeal given by His Excellency Archbishop Antoniutti, Apostolic Delegate to Canada and Newfoundland, to a large audience attending the *Semaine Sociale in Quebec*."

If that is not Fascism and subversive of all democracy, I do not know what could be.

But *Life* quotes the Cardinal himself as having said in 1938:

"It is never permitted . . . to grant freedom of thought, writing, or teaching, and the undifferentiated freedom of religions, as so many rights which nature has given to man."

Here is a denial of "freedom of thought"! A man may not form his own opinions. According to Antoniutti, if he is allowed to be "master of his 'credo'", it makes him master only "consequently of all his errors." Freedom of religion of conscience of worship is equally denied as a human right, by this would-be lord of even the thoughts of all Canadians!

This is the sinister thing which, in Canada, like the earth's shadow at an eclipse, is gradually and quietly stealing across the radiant orb of revealed truth; and would shut out from us the light of the Sun of Righteousness, and give us instead the noxious tapers which, with but enough light to make darkness visible, burn and sputter on the Canadian pagan altars of the Papacy.

If Cardinal Villeneuve never said or wrote what *Life* attributes to him, let him specifically deny it. I believe what *Life* says to be true to all the facts of the case, and that that magazine has rendered a real service to truth, and to British democracy, by showing what the Roman church has made of Quebec.

The last paragraph of *Life's* article is of great significance:

Quebec Catholic Church Organizes Its Youth

Not even the clergy of Quebec can entirely keep out the swelling forces of the modern world, as more and more Quebec youths go to the cities and hear radio broadcasts, see U.S. movies, join labor unions and lose touch with their village curés. One Church solution is the set of youth organizations shown on this page, the J.A.C., J.E.C., J.I.C. and J.O.C., covering farm, student, middle-class and labor youth. Justification for these are two Papal encyclicals, the *Rerum Novarum* in 1891 and the *Quadregesimo Anno* in 1931, sometimes read as sponsoring the corporative society. The youth organizations are built on the principle of "cells", four or five men in a cell, each of whom leads another cell. At top of this structure is the Council of Bishops of Quebec. Cell leaders meet once a week with the curé for "study class". They pass on instruction to their groups and so on. Members are aged from 16 to 25. They have stopped wearing uniforms since war began. Slogans are: "Proud, pure, cheerful, triumphant", "Family, work, leisure." Their aim is "bloodless revolution".

The Church cannot stop the revolution of the years, nor wholly imprison her youth in Medieval darkness. Hence, she is doing what she has always done: when unrest manifests itself within the Church, when it has expressed itself in various attempted reforms and the founding of various orders, if and when the Church found she could not suppress, she threw her mantle over it, and gradually absorbed it into her system. This she is now doing in her youth organizations. She will do anything and everything to segregate her people so that they may not be contaminated by the free thought and life of people without the pale of the Roman Church's freedom-destroying tyranny.

And now I shall deal briefly with the Archbishops' protest against *Life's* Quebec article. It is dated at Quebec, October 29th, and *The Register* says:

"The statement, released from the Archbishop's Palace, was signed by Cardinal Villeneuve, Archbishop of Quebec, and by Archbishops William Duke of Vancouver; James Charles McGuigan of Toronto; J. T. McNally of Halifax; Alexandre Vachon of Ottawa;

Joseph Charbonneau of Montreal; Norbert Robichaud of Moncton, and Georges Cabana, Archbishop Coadjutor of St. Boniface, Man.

Then follows the Archbishops' statement:

"The Archbishops of Canada, assembled in solemn session in the City of Quebec, vehemently protest against an article entitled, 'French Canada', appearing in *Life*, under date of October 19, 1942.

"This article attributes to the Catholic church in the Province of Quebec, ideas, views and attitudes which give an unfavourable and untrue picture of the Catholic church in French Canada, and leaves with the reader a totally incomplete and wrong impression of the church's action and influence in the religious and social life of the Catholic people of the Province of Quebec.

"We express in the strongest possible terms our complete disapproval of this article, which is not only false and prejudicial to the good name of the church, but which likewise flagrantly abuses the 'good neighbour' policy and the natural laws of justice and truth.

"We observe in particular that:

"1. The writer of this article ignores the fact that the laws of the Catholic church are the same the world over, and are not differently applied to the people of Quebec. The apparent diversity comes from the fact that in most Quebec districts all the people are Catholic and therefore spontaneously react accordingly in their private and public activities.

"2. The pastor, as in all our Catholic parishes, is the 'father' of his people, who naturally go to him in their problems and difficulties.

"3. The author of the article should have learned the leading part taken by our church wardens, elected by the people, and sanctioned by the civil laws of the province, in the administration of our church properties.

"He is moreover unaware that in the Province of Quebec as in the other provinces of our Dominion, the elementary schools are administered by trustees elected by the people, and that in this supposed 'priest-ridden Quebec', greater liberty is granted to the national and religious minorities than in the other provinces of Canada, nay, much greater than in the United States."

My readers will be able to judge for themselves whether *Life's* article gives an "untrue picture of the Roman Catholic Church in French Canada". That it gives an "unfavourable" picture there can be no doubt. They express their disapproval of this article on two counts: that it is "false and prejudicial to the good name of the Church"; and secondly, that it "flagrantly abuses the 'good neighbour' policy and the natural laws of justice and truth."

That the article is "prejudicial" to the good name of the Church, we think nearly everyone will agree; but no one who knows Quebec can agree that the article is in any respect "false". On the next count, it is surely no part of the duty of a "good neighbour" to withhold the truth; and certainly *Life's* article does not violate "the natural laws of justice and truth".

Now let us look at the numbered paragraphs in the Archbishops' reply. *Life's* article does not controvert the fact that the laws of the Roman Catholic Church are the same the world over: it speaks only of French Canada. Neither the writer in *Life*—nor anyone else, we presume—is disposed to question that the laws of the Roman Church are everywhere the same. But that does not make them any better! One has only to observe the appalling conditions obtaining in the Roman Catholic countries of Europe, and in the rest of the world, to decide that they are not "differently applied to the people of Quebec". Hence the unprogressiveness and

illiteracy of Quebec, and the particular conditions noted in respect to Three Rivers and Quebec City.

We are grateful to the Archbishops for referring to "the apparent diversities". That is the one thing we are labouring constantly to make clear to the people of Canada. The difference between Quebec and other places is that "in most Quebec districts all the people are Roman Catholics." That is to say, in Quebec one has an opportunity of seeing Roman Catholicism as it really is, when it is completely separated from the neutralizing effect of Protestant influences. That is why "in their private and public activities", the people in Quebec are completely subservient to the Church. Moreover, what the laws of the Church have made of the province of Quebec they will make of every country in which the Church obtains the ascendancy.

There is nothing in *Life's* article contrary to the contentment of the Archbishops in paragraph two. It may, however, be remarked that the parish priest, holding the secrets of all his people, and possessing, according to the teaching of the Church, the power to detain their souls in purgatory, or consign them to perdition, is a "father" with a very hard-hitting rod in his hand.

As to paragraph three, we cannot see that the point of view of the author of the *Life* article would have been changed by learning such things as this paragraph mentions—unless it would have been to make him a little more emphatic.

"The church wardens are elected by the church, and sanctioned by the civil laws of the province." What of it? The quotations we have made earlier, in the report of the giving of a ring to Cardinal Villeneuve, and the matter of the by-law in Quebec City, forbidding the erection of churches in a certain district having been submitted to the Cardinal for "settlement", will show that the civil laws of the Province are such as the Church consents to have enacted.

Furthermore, the Archbishops say that "the elementary schools are administered by trustees elected by the people." But the Archbishops do not explain how they are elected. But here I set out Sections Twenty and Twenty-one of the Education Act of Quebec, Chapter 133, R.S.Q., 1925:

"20—The Council of Education shall consist of Roman Catholic and Protestant members, who, in the performance of their duties, shall be subject to the orders and instructions of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

"The Council shall be divided into two committees, one consisting of Roman Catholic members, and the other of Protestant members. R.S. (1909), 2539.

"21—1. The Roman Catholic Committee shall consist of:

"The bishops, ordinaries or administrators of the Roman Catholic dioceses and apostolic vicariates, situated either wholly or partly in the Province, who shall be members *ex officio*;

"An equal number of Roman Catholic laymen appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council during pleasure.

"The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may add to the said committee four members of the teaching profession, two of whom, being priests, (emphasis ours), shall be principals of normal schools in this Province, and two of whom shall be laymen, officers of primary education; such appointment being made for a term of not more than three years.

"2. The Protestant Committee shall consist of:

"A number of Protestant members, equal to the number of Roman Catholic lay members, and appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council during pleasure.

"The Protestant Committee may associate with themselves six persons, and the Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers may, each year, at their annual meeting, elect one of their members to be an associate member of the Protestant Committee, for the following year.

"The persons so added shall not form part of the Council of Education, but shall have, in the Protestant Committee, the same powers as the members of such Committee. R.S. (1909), 2540."

Thus it will be seen that the Roman Catholic Committee of the Council of Education is, in the beginning, loaded with "the bishops, ordinaries or administrators of the Roman Catholic dioceses and apostolic vicariates, situated either wholly or partly in the Province, who shall be members *ex officio*." It will be observed that the Protestant Committee shall consist of "a number of Protestant members equal to the number of Roman Catholic lay members"; but there are no *ex officio* religious officials on the Protestant Committee. And though the Protestant Committee "may associate with themselves six persons, and the Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers may, each year, at their annual meeting, elect one of their members to be an associate member of the Protestant Committee, for the following year", they are no part of the Council of Education. Neither is there any provision for the addition of two Protestant clergymen to balance the two additional priests. An examination of the Education Act of Quebec shows that it is clearly prescribed by and in the interests of the Hierarchy.

But now, what is meant by an "elementary" school, to which the Archbishops refer? In Part One of the Education Act, called "declaratory and interpretative", Section Two, Subsection Twelve, we read:

"The words 'elementary school', and the words 'intermediate school' mean every school of one or the other of such grades whose course of studies is determined by the Protestant Committee of the Council of Education."

It is interesting to note the regulation respecting the manner of voting. Section 151-A is significant:

"The school commission may, by resolution, order that the voting at elections shall be effected by ballot in place of by word of mouth; it may also, in the same manner, re-establish the method of voting by word of mouth."

Where else in a democratic country does "the method of voting by word of mouth" obtain? I have quoted these sections from the Education Act to illustrate the deceptive methods of the Hierarchy. Elections under such conditions would be just about as free as elections under Hitler!

Last of all, these nine Archbishops have the audacity to declare that "in this supposed priest-ridden Quebec, greater liberty is granted to the national and religious minorities than in the other provinces of Canada, nay, much greater than in the United States." That, of course, is an unmitigated, unadulterated, absolute, false-

**READ SPECIAL OFFERS
ON BACK PAGE**

hood. I think I can safely leave my readers to reach their own verdict. There is nothing anywhere on earth which so completely illustrates the scriptural phrase, "A refuge of lies", as does the Roman Catholic Church. All its pretensions are based upon a falsification of Scripture, and a falsification of history; and the whole Papal system is a fabrication of falsehood. It can be said with absolute truthfulness of the incumbent of the Papacy, whoever he may be, as our Lord said of the devil himself, "When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar, and the father of it." For proof of this statement, and the most up-to-date exemplification of it, we commend our readers to the statement of the nine Canadian Roman Catholic Archbishops, including "His Eminence, Cardinal Villeneuve".

Let us repudiate all such paganism, and turn again to the pure Word of God, and make the great inspired saying of the Apostle Paul our motto, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth."

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 6 Fourth Quarter Lesson 47 November 22, 1942

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

THE INHERITANCE OF THE CHRISTIAN

Lesson Text: 1 Peter 1.

Golden Text: "Kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time"—1 Pet. 1:5.

I. The Character of the Inheritance—verses 1 to 12.

About the year 60 A.D. the Apostle Peter addressed this letter of comfort to the Christian Jews scattered throughout the Roman provinces of Asia Minor who were suffering intense persecution for the Lord. But its blessed truths are applicable to Christians of all ages. We have here the secret of victory in the time of trial.

Those who receive the inheritance are described as those who have been chosen of God, Who knows all things (Acts 2:23; Rom. 8:29; Eph. 1:4, 5). They have been set apart by the Holy Spirit (2 Thess. 2:13), and saved by the shed blood of the Lord Jesus Christ (Heb. 10:19-22; 12:22-24).

The word "grace" summarizes the whole of the Christian revelation. Because of the grace of God we may have peace with Him (2 Pet. 1:2). Had the Lord in His grace not planned, secured and offered peace to us, we would for ever have remained estranged from Him (Rom. 5:20, 21; Eph. 1:6, 7; 2:8-18; 1 Tim. 1:14).

Mercy is grace which is bestowed upon the unworthy and undeserving (Eph. 2:4-7). Our title to the inheritance is made valid and sure; we have been born into the family of God (John 3:3-8; Rom. 8:15-17).

The Christian has every right to be hopeful (Eph. 2:11-13). His is not a hope which ends at death, but it is a hope which lasts for eternity (Heb. 6:17-20). The ground of our hope of eternal life is the resurrection of Christ from the dead (Rom. 8:11; 1 Cor. 15:22; 2 Tim. 1:8-10).

By "inheritance" is meant the sum-total of the blessings which the Christian, as a child of God, will receive (Eph. 1:11-18; 5:5; Col. 3:24). It is an excellent inheritance, and unlike earthly inheritances, it is not liable to decay, it is free from blot or stain (Rev. 21:27), and it is unfading in its beauty (Heb. 9:15). The Lord Who keeps the inheritance safely for us (Matt. 6:19, 20; 2 Tim. 1:12) will also keep us for the inheritance (John 10:28, 29; Jude 24). We are guarded by the power of God, and no enemy can harm us (Psa. 34:7; 56:9; Rom. 8:28-34; 1 Pet. 3:13).

In the purpose of God our salvation is already complete (Eccl. 3:14). It waits God's time, and then it will be fully

and finally revealed (Eph. 1:3-10). When Christ comes, our redemption will be fully realized (Rom. 8:22-25; Col. 3:4).

Suffering is necessary to the completion of our salvation. Faith, like precious metals, must be tested (Job 23:10; Prov. 17:3; Mal. 3:1-3; Jas. 1:2, 3; Rev. 3:18). The dross must be consumed, and the gold refined (Deut. 8:2, 16; Isa. 43:2). Suffering is also the prelude to glory (Lk. 24:26; Rom. 8:17, 18; 1 Pet. 5:1, 10).

"No pain, no palm;
No gall, no glory;
No thorn, no throne;
No cross, no crown."

The Old Testament prophets found difficulty in understanding their own writings concerning the coming of the Messiah in humiliation and later in glory. For example, Isaiah could not comprehend the significance of his messages concerning the death and glory of Christ (Isa. 53; 60). The Spirit of God was speaking to Isaiah about things which had not yet happened (John 16:12, 13; 2 Pet. 1:21). We Christians in this day can understand those prophecies (Acts 3:18). Thus, Isaiah was ministering, not to the people of his own day only, but also to those of us to whom the Gospel has been preached.

The unfallen angels, who have never experienced sin and who cannot fully enter into the meaning of redemption, are eagerly interested in the salvation of men (Lk. 15:7; Heb. 1:6-14).

II. The Cost of the Inheritance—verses 13 to 25.

In view of the greatness of our salvation we are exhorted to live a life of sobriety (1 Pet. 4:7; 5:8), hopefulness (Col. 1:23, 27; Tit. 2:11-13), holiness (1 Thess. 4:7; Heb. 12:14) and godly fear (Heb. 12:28).

Our hope rests in the finished work of Christ. By His own precious blood He has redeemed us from iniquity (Tit. 2:14), delivering us from the penalty of sin (Col. 1:13) and rescuing us from its domination (Rom. 6:1-10). Christ is the spotless Lamb of God Who bears away the sin of the world (John 1:29; Heb. 7:26). In the plan of God, Christ was slain from the very beginning, but God's purpose was not revealed to men till after the crucifixion (1 Tim. 2:6; 2 Tim. 1:9, 10; Tit. 1:2).

The chapter closes with a description of the way in which we enter into our inheritance. The truth of the Gospel—the truth concerning the death of Christ on our behalf—must be believed and obeyed (Mk. 1:15; Rom. 1:5; 10:9, 10).

It is the Holy Spirit Who convicts of sin (John 16:8-11), reveals the Saviour (Matt. 11:27; John 16:14, 15; Eph. 2:18), and enables us to believe upon Him (Rom. 8:15, 16). By the Holy Spirit also we are born again (John 3:6, 8; Tit. 3:5), and our souls are cleansed from sin (Acts 15:8, 9; 1 John 1:7).

The eternal and living Word of God is the instrument used by the Holy Spirit to quicken us into new life (Heb. 4:12, 13; Jas. 1:18).

FOR JUNIOR CLASSES:

The lesson may be illustrated by telling the children a story concerning some poor child who has suddenly and unexpectedly become heir to a vast estate. The child formerly lived in the midst of poverty and distress, but now is enabled to enjoy many good things. He did not win the fortune by his own efforts, but it came to him by reason of his relationship to the rich person.

Show the scholars that to become children of God they must believe on Christ as their Saviour (John 1:12). When we belong to Christ we have the promise of living for ever with Him in joy and blessedness (1 Cor. 3:21-23). He will one day share with us His great riches.

Subscribe for
The Gospel Witness
\$2.00 per year

Editorial

The Relative Importance of Unity

We remember a time when unbelieving Modernists were bombing the citadel of Truth, and driving the inhabitants thereof out on to the highways leading to their occupations of sustenance, and thereafter grinding them beneath the treads of their tanks of persecution. Their leaders pleaded for "unity", and seemed suddenly to conceive a conviction of the divine inspiration of the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians! And while "breathing out threatenings and slaughter", they hissed their admonition to read the great chapter on charity, and emphasized their advice with clenched fists!

Burglars are always considerate of the repose of their sleeping victims; and those who have only tares to sow, are adepts in advertising opiates. The Lord Jesus Christ came into this world as the Exponent, Exemplar, and Protagonist of righteousness. As Captain of the Lord's hosts, He came to subdue and completely conquer the kingdom of darkness; and in that great battle, never for one moment did He expect Beelzebub to be divided against himself. He knew that the opponents of righteousness would present a supreme example of unity. He knew that where He and all that He represented were concerned, Pilate and Herod would bury their differences and become friends.

Our Lord did not urge unity upon any other ground than that of union with Himself. Apart from that, He declared that He had not come to send peace on the earth, but a sword. He had come to set a man "at variance" against all those with whom he might, on natural grounds, be expected to be at peace. Whenever and wherever He spoke, there was always a "division" among those who heard Him. He was, indeed, the supreme Example of holy intolerance of all the ages. He would brook no departure from divinely-revealed truth, even by a hair's breadth; and was incapable of even the slightest gesture of appeasement toward evil.

That spirit and attitude were equally characteristic of all the apostles, and is representative of the invariable intolerance of Truth.

During this war-time there has been much advocacy of "national unity", but almost without exception the advocates of unity have been among the chief promoters of disunity. The collapse of Europe has resulted from that deadly doctrine of appeasement; and while men thus disguisedly advocated union, a united enemy marched in and conquered. It is ever those who have something to lose by others' discovery of their duplicity, who are loudest in their denunciation of the advocates of truth.

In this present conflict, we need a united Empire, and we need a real unity—not mere external unity—in all the component parts of the Empire. Union may be effected by law, by some form of force: unity is always a quality of the spirit. Hence, where there is a passionate devotion to a common spiritual objective, there will always be unity among those who engage in the pursuit of it. But as there is danger where a form of godliness is substituted for the power of it, so there is grave peril when mere outward union is obtained at the cost of spiritual unity.

The whole freedom-loving world is inspired by the better news that has been reaching us from all theatres of the war; but the prospect of our armed services becoming increasingly victorious must not blind us to the

dangers of Quislingism. In religious controversies, we have repeatedly seen errorist minorities numerically overwhelmed, only to observe an organized subtily defeat a superior number of unaffiliated individualist advocates of righteousness.

All this is another way of saying, Beware of peace. In these columns we have repeatedly pointed to that religio-political thing called the Papacy as the chief of all visible enemies of mankind. As the tide of battle turns, and the doom of the Axis powers becomes visibly nearer, we may expect the Papacy, gradually and without announcement, to abandon its neutrality, and endeavour to ingratiate itself with the powers of freedom. We must not allow ourselves to feel the slightest elation when gangsters begin to cheer the police. As the tide gradually turns in our favour and against the Axis, we may expect to see the whole Roman Catholic Hierarchy in Canada emulate the example of Admiral Darlan: they will fight even openly just so long as they think there is any chance of winning; but as soon as they see the die is cast, they will make their exit from France, and turn up as a guest of the victorious armies. Therefore, while we are far from the end of the conflict, the Quislings who helped to precipitate it, will soon be attempting to reorient themselves in order to get as much out of the wreck they have made, as may be possible.

Let us therefore remember that He Whom we serve is "first King of righteousness, and after that, King of Salem, which is King of peace."

Premier King's Hindsight

We should say nothing about the dismissal of the Vichy Minister "at long last" were it not for the lesson to be derived from the whole farcical procedure for which Premier King has been responsible.

The Globe and Mail of this morning contained an excellent editorial. We agree with every word of it. The whole matter of M. Ristelhueber's retention has been a farce. But nothing that has occurred in the two years since the collapse of France has served more clearly to reveal the mentality of the Premier than his utterly silly behaviour in respect to this matter in the last two or three days. He talks so much and so aimlessly and vacuously that one grows utterly weary of his garrulousness.

Forcing ourselves to read his recent vaporings, we found ourselves repeating Mr. Churchill's question, What sort of people does he think we are? Does Mr. King give the Canadian people credit for knowing anything? Or does he really think we have the mentality of dumb cattle that can be driven here and there with whips? After every one of the United Nations had severed diplomatic relations with Vichy, Mr. King still held bravely on. He even trotted out the old excuse that the British Government desired the maintenance of relations with Vichy. We are positive that was not true, and never has been true. There is no more unreliable man in public life than the man who tried to persuade the country that he could not possibly enact conscription because he had promised he would not, unless and until he was relieved of his promise. But, relieved of his promise, he has ever since utterly disregarded the manifest implications of it.

That is why this man cannot speak with authority to people of any moral discernment.

Once again, he tried to persuade us that he was retaining M. Ristelhueber that he might get what information he could from him. Could anything possibly be more absurd, especially when he openly announced, by implication, that he was going to keep him that he might pump from him what he could of his knowledge of Vichy's intentions? And, having still further preyed upon the patience of the people by his tissue of puerile nonsense, within a few hours he completely reversed himself; and his journalistic batman in Toronto informed us that this shrewd master of diplomacy had now "terminated" relations with Vichy to prevent Pierre Laval from declaring war on Canada! If it were not so tragic, the whole performance would be as funny as a punch and judy show.

Does Mr. King think the rest of us do not understand the English language, when he tries to draw such a fine distinction between "severing" relations and "terminating" them? If only something could be done to remove this public nuisance from Ottawa, we should not care "tuppence" whether the Canadian people "severed" their relations with him, or "terminated" them.

Then he labours to justify his belated action by saying that he takes it because Vichy had ordered resistance to American troops in North Africa! Does he think we have forgotten that Vichy ordered resistance to British forces in Syria, and in Madagascar; and that before either of these, immediately after the fall of France, she did precisely the same at Oran? Nothing could be weaker, or more absurd, than these latest utterances of the Canadian Premier. Every true patriot, especially in time of war, desires to be proud of his country, proud of her armed services, and proud of her Government. But Mr. King has humiliated the Dominion of Canada before the whole world. We wonder, indeed, which has inflicted the greater nerve strain upon the people of Canada, Hitler or Mackenzie King. We can fight Hitler and get some relief; but we have to endure Premier King—and that is an endurance test of the first magnitude.

The True Inwardness of Canada's Prolonged Relations With Vichy

We would gladly forget the farcical conduct of the Canadian Government in the Vichy matter were it not that properly understood, it throws a flood of light on a condition of things in Canada which augurs ill for the future. Why was Vichy's representative so long retained and so reluctantly dismissed? The underlying reason for what *The Globe and Mail* rightly calls a "farce" is symptomatic of the presence of a deadly malady in the very blood-stream of the Dominion. But we shall not argue the case further, but content ourselves with setting out certain items of information which, from time to time, have appeared in the public press since the fall of France. It is important to understand the relations of Vichy in Europe, if we are to understand Canada's prolonged relations with Vichy. The following quota-

tions will throw light on these questions. Please observe the date line in each quotation:

"Vatican City, July 15, 1940—The Vatican has formally given its support to the new French totalitarian régime of Marshal Henri Philippe Pétain, it was stated in authoritative Vatican quarters to-night.

"The papal Nuncio to France, Monsignor Valeri, was said to have been instructed to support the Pétain Government in its work of French reconstruction.

"Pope Pius XII was said to be convinced that Marshal Pétain and Vice-Premier Pierre Laval will work for the reconstruction of French national life in line with policies which will meet with approval of the Church.

"At the same time authoritative Vatican quarters emphasized that the Holy See will give its support to the French Government in a fight against the spread of communism, atheism, materialism and against anti-religious and anti-clerical elements.

"It was said, however, that the Vatican will refrain from any direct interest in French political problems."

Isn't that lovely? But will anyone in his senses believe that last sentence?

And this from *The Daily Telegraph*, London, of Sept. 12th, 1940:

"Messages from Vichy reveal that France ended a 36-year rift between Church and State when the Vichy Government formally repealed a law of 1904, thus abrogating a series of discriminatory measures then designed to restrict the influence of the Catholic Church in the field of education.

"Passed at the height of a wave of anti-clericalism which swept France ten years before the last war, the measure specifically forbade the right of association of monastic orders in France, and nominally barred religious orders from conducting schools.

"A new decree issued restores the spirit of the concordat signed between Napoleon Bonaparte and Pope Pius VII., permitting Jesuits to teach in Catholic educational institutions and allowing convents to reopen officially."

Vichy Representative Remains at Ottawa

Ottawa, Aug. 6, 1940—(CP)—Canada has permitted the French minister, Rene Ristelhueber, to remain at his post in Ottawa and carry out his duties, Premier King told the House of Commons today. He said he believed this met with the approval of the British Government, although it has, to a certain extent, severed relations with France.

The prime minister said he was convinced the French minister would not send to his Government any information which might be injurious to Canada if it fell into the hands of the German authorities in France. If there was any possibility of that happening it would not be permitted by the Canadian Government.

"Mr. Ristelhueber is a very honourable man and has given us every reason to believe his sole desire is similar to our own," Mr. King stated. "He is doing everything he can to relieve the situation."

Manchester Guardian, May 24, 1940

"Among the higher ranks of the Catholic clergy a decisive majority desire to see the victory of the Reich or at least a peace that will leave Germany's political and military strength unimpaired. At the same time they still look to an eventual Catholic-Conservative restoration. The National Socialist State has, it seems, been able to reach an understanding with the Catholic leaders. Assurances have been given as to the status of the Church in the Bohemian-Moravian Protectorate and in

SEND FOR EXTRA NUMBERS
OF THIS ISSUE

Germany itself. The special position of the Catholic Church in Poland is also to receive due recognition. In spite of the persecution of laymen and priests by the Nazis, in spite of all the attacks upon the Christian religion, new hopes have been raised among the German Catholics as a result of these negotiations. . . ."

Ottawa Despatch, August 14th, 1940

"There is a complication that did not exist in the last war, and that is the withdrawal of France from the struggle. There is no close link between Quebec and France, but there is a natural sentiment toward the ancient Fatherland.

"Some of the moves the Pétain Government has made, hardly noticed in the rest of Canada, have been cleverly calculated to appeal to Quebec and Catholic countries.

"Back in 1903 the Combes Laws in France resulted in the confiscation of Church properties and the exiling of many religious orders. Many of the exiles came to Quebec, where they fanned the anti-French feeling the laws had caused. Ever since then, France has been depicted in Quebec as an irreligious country.

"The Pétain Government has invited the religious orders to return. Quebec leads this continent in large families; Pétain has urged France to get back to large families. He has attacked the Freemasons; Quebec considered them authors of the seizure of French church property.

"Consequently the Pétain Government assailed in the rest of Canada, has been receiving favourable comment in Quebec, and this comment has in turn been misunderstood in other parts of the Dominion." (Italics mine.)

These quotations give some idea why M. Rene Ristelhueber was retained so long at Ottawa—and very likely why he was at last allowed to go—the Roman Hierarchy probably kept him as long as it was safe, and then advised his departure to avoid the Dominion-wide protest which would have been inevitable.

A Specious Defense of the Liquor Business

We have received a re-print from the October, 1942, issue of "The Canadian Business, a Magazine for Executives". It is really a defense of Canada's liquor trade. It is a tirade against prohibition. We have seldom read anything more contrary to fact.

The writer must have been half drunk when he wrote the article. Here are a few gems:

"Shorter hours of sale would react to his (the bootlegger's) benefit, and the elimination of all advertising of beer, wine, and liquor would give the illicit product that much more advantage."

This editorial is taken from a magazine which is called "the magazine for executives". Can any executive worthy of the name be so utterly stupid as to believe such nonsense? For example:

"Yet we can honestly say that we sincerely believe that more has been done by the liquor people themselves to promote temperance than has been accomplished by the dries with all their distorted arguments."

When liquor runs in rivers, and drunkenness abounds, and habitual drunkards are being multiplied by the thousand, we are asked to believe that the liquor interests have done much to "promote temperance"!

The editorial says:

"Prohibition does not prohibit."

Of course it does not. Laws against murder, and

theft, and other offences, do not prohibit; but they do most certainly restrict.

Once more:

"Both in Canada and in the United States, records indicate that more drinking is done in dry areas than in those which are under sane control. Observation points to more drunkards per square mile as well."

Where on earth did the writer find warrant for such manifestly untrue statements?

Once again:

"Prohibition stimulates drinking, and under it the criterion for liquor degenerates to its power to stupefy. The dry pressure group, however, has been careful not to advocate prohibition."

With this last clause we agree. But Goebbels himself could not have kept pace with the lying propaganda of the liquor interests; and as there was no counter propaganda or defense against it, multitudes of people unthinkingly believed the liquor men's lying. One has only to take account of the enormous enlargement of all liquor-producing concerns since the ban was lifted, to see that the trade itself gives the lie to its own contention. If prohibition really increased the liquor business, we may be sure the brewers and distillers would immediately all become ardent prohibitionists. If the editorial under review had been inspired and paid for by the distillers and brewers of Canada, it could not have pleaded the interests of the liquor people more earnestly; nor could it have offered a greater affront to the moral sense of all sober people. The article is an insult to the intelligence of the "executive" for whose enlightenment the editorial was written.

BOOKS BY DR. T. T. SHIELDS

"The Adventures of a Modern Young Man" ..	\$1.00
"Other Little Ships"	1.00
"The Plot That Failed"	1.00
"The Oxford Group Movement Analyzed"05
25 copies	1.00

Russellism or Rutherfordism (103 pages)35
War Sermons from "A Sword Bathed in Heaven" to the Sermon in this issue— - postpaid, individual sermons, each05

There are also still available copies reporting the great Protest Meeting which inspired the organization of The Canadian Protestant League and of other issues dealing with the Roman Catholic controversy.

The Gospel Witness, published weekly, per annum	2.00
---	------

Address: THE GOSPEL WITNESS,
130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto, Canada.

BEHIND the DICTATORS

This is the title of a book by Dr. L. H. Lehmann, an ex-Roman Catholic priest, who is Editor of *The Converted Catholic*, New York City. Dr. Lehmann was born in Ireland, received his early education there, and his theological training in Rome, where he was ordained a priest. He was priest of one of the Roman Catholic churches in Rome, and later went to South Africa, returning again to Rome for a while, and then was transferred to the United States.

Dr. Lehmann knows Roman Catholicism from the inside, and is able to write on the subject with authority. In this book he shows what a large place the Roman Catholic Church has behind the dictators, in fomenting and carrying on the present war. No one who would be informed on the Roman Catholic question throughout the world, and especially as it relates to this conflict, can afford to be without this book. It is a book of sixty-six pages, and is packed full of information which it would be very difficult to obtain elsewhere.

We have published the book at the expense of THE GOSPEL WITNESS, and we offer it to our readers at the very low price of 50c, in order to help defray the cost of publication. Please fill in the order-form at the bottom of this page, and mail it to THE GOSPEL WITNESS, WITH 50c, AND THE BOOK WILL BE SENT YOU. The 2nd Edition of 5,000 copies ordered.

To all new subscribers of *The Witness* we offer *The Gospel Witness* for 52 weeks and a copy of "Behind the Dictators" as a premium for \$2.00.

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

1. Find enclosed \$2.00 for *The Gospel Witness* for one year including a free copy of "Behind the Dictators".
2. Find enclosed 50c for which please send to address below one copy of "Behind the Dictators".

(Cross out 1, or 2, whichever is not used)

Name _____

Address _____

(Block letters for name and address please)

BEHIND THE DICTATORS

By L. H.

LEHMANN



AGORA PUBLISHING CO., 229 West 48th St., New York, N.Y.

Printed for The Gospel Witness, 130 Gerrard St. East, Toronto, Canada

(Facsimile of book cover)