

The Gospel Witness and Protestant Advocate

Authorized as Second Class Mail. Post Office Department, Ottawa

Vol. 26, No. 44

130 Gerrard Street East, TORONTO, FEBRUARY 26, 1948

Whole Number 1345

THE INDICTMENT OF QUEBEC

THERE can be no profit in blinding our eyes, or shutting our ears to the blazing, screaming fact that Quebec is a menace to the peace and prosperity of the Dominion of Canada. We have not said "unity" for the reason that Quebec makes unity impossible. Abraham Lincoln's famous dictum is just as pertinent to Canada today in respect to Quebec, as it was of the United States in respect to the South, that a nation cannot long survive half slave and half free. Jean Francois Pouliot is reported in the press of February 24th as having spoken the previous evening to the Liberal Club of the University of Toronto. Here is the report of this gentleman's speech:

In the opinion of Jean Francois Pouliot, talk of national unity in Canada is "the bunk". The fiery little Independent Liberal MP for Temiscouata, Que., predicted yesterday that there will never be national unity in this country "because Canadians are too tolerant to believe in it."

Speaking to the Liberal Club at the University of Toronto, Mr. Pouliot said: "Unity in Canada would mean giving up a language and a religion. But it is not necessary that people in Quebec forsake such fundamental components of their cherished heritage to get along with the rest of the Dominion. We all have common problems to face—taxation one of the greatest—and we must realize in our attempts to solve them, we will come together naturally."

Mr. Pouliot, who has represented his constituents for 23 consecutive years, believes that a Canadian flag—one bearing the Maple Leaf—would go a long way in promoting a spirit of nationalism. "But as long as we are bloated colonials, we will have no flag," he asserted. "We will be dependent on the United Kingdom as long as the King has power to annul what has been written into the statutes of Canada."

All Canada knows that this gentleman is rather a wild Parliamentarian, and that his speeches are usually most extravagant. He is a kind of political Bernard Shaw. Notwithstanding, he speaks for Quebec; indeed it serves the purposes of the Roman Catholic Church to have many "fiery" speakers like Pouliot, who, by many will be discounted for his extravagant speeches, and yet will be listened to and accepted by a great multitude. However, we quote it only to say that any talk of Canadian unity would certainly be nothing but "bunk".

It would be bad enough if Quebec were content to be just Quebec, and leave the rest of the Dominion alone; but the evil influence radiating from Quebec is not geo-

graphical, nor racial, but religious. It is the virus of Romanism which is poisoning the bloodstream of the entire Dominion, and the Roman Catholic Church is aiming at the complete domination of this country, whether we like it or not.

We have long been as a voice crying in the wilderness, but many others are joining us now. We shall quote several editorials, and other news items from the daily press, as indicative of the political trend in Quebec Province.

THE TORONTO STAR SHINES MORE BRIGHTLY

The Star has never been a friend of Jarvis Street Church, or its Pastor, nor particularly kindly disposed toward THE GOSPEL WITNESS. It is, however, an enterprising paper. It shows an uncanny awareness of any change of public temperature, or a change in the direction of the wind of public opinion. We do not like *The Star's* blind partisanship, but welcome some signs that *The Star* does not always regard infallibility as the monopoly of the Liberal Party. It does occasionally criticize actions of the Ottawa Government. It did express disapproval of the infamous espionage trials in which many innocent people suffered at the instigation of the Roman Hierarchy.

We publish herewith two recent editorials from *The Toronto Star*, the first entitled, "What Is Happening in Quebec?", published February 21st, and the second entitled, "If That's Sedition . . .", February 23rd. We set these out in order, and our comments will follow.

WHAT IS HAPPENING IN QUEBEC?

(From *The Toronto Daily Star*)

Things have been happening in Quebec of late which have made people in other parts of Canada wonder. The wonderment has been due to a series of restraints upon liberty in that province; the prosecution (or persecution) of Jehovah Witnesses; the application, after many years, of the old padlock law; the sentencing of two labour organizers. Back of it all is Premier Maurice Duplessis, and his claim that elements in Quebec which he does not like are "subversive", "seditious".

In Quebec Jehovah Witnesses have been imprisoned for "seditious libel" and "seditious conspiracy". Union organizers have been sentenced for "seditious conspiracy" and "conspiracy to intimidate". Sedition, as most people under-

stand it, is incitement to rebellion against the constituted authority in a state. But one Quebec crown prosecutor defined it (and he got a conviction) as "anything that would tend to arouse discord between the various classes of his majesty's subjects". If the criminal code of Canada lends itself to such an interpretation, it is time it was changed. Its own unhelpful definitions are as follows:

"Seditious words are words expressive of a seditious intention. A seditious libel is a libel expressive of a seditious intention. A seditious conspiracy is an agreement between two or more persons to carry into execution a seditious intention."

Further the code says: "Without limiting the generality of the meaning of the expression 'seditious intention', every-one shall be presumed to have a seditious intention who publishes or circulates any printing, writing or document in which is advocated, or who teaches or advocates, the use, without the authority of law, of force as a means of accomplishing any governmental change within Canada."

But in Quebec that is not the issue at all. It is not a case of advocating a change of government by force or otherwise. Mr. Duplessis himself made a speech a year ago which fairly well defines what attitude is behind what he considers his anti-sedition campaign. He was discussing a bill to permit municipalities to pass by-laws which prohibit the circulation of printed matter when it is "against public order and the respect of the race, religion or tradition of the Quebec people". And Mr. Duplessis said: "Those who wish to come to Quebec and respect our laws are welcome. But those who, whatever their opinion or faith, aim to attack our faith and traditions, will not be tolerated."

Thus Mr. Duplessis declared that even the attacking of Quebec traditions is to be considered illegal in that province. As for the Jehovah Witnesses, they said unkind things about churches. Their habit of doing so is in bad taste and their propaganda is irritating, but in other provinces it is not regarded as a crime. In Quebec they are sent to prison. To its credit, an English-speaking jury yesterday acquitted one of them.

Quebec also has a padlock law which Mr. Duplessis had the legislature pass in 1937, and he has lately invoked it to close the offices of the Labor Progressives' French-language newspaper, *Le Combat*. The provincial act was devised as a means of getting around the provision in the B.N.A. act that criminal law shall be within the jurisdiction of the Dominion. The province has jurisdiction over property, so Mr. Duplessis had a measure passed which enables the Quebec attorney-general (himself at present) to order the closing of any building where he thinks "communism or bolshevism" is being propagated "by any means whatsoever". The terms "communism" and "bolshevism" are not defined. Mr. Duplessis can let his inclinations be his guide. The law was dormant under Mr. Godbout's premiership, and until recently even Mr. Duplessis had not reinvoked it, but now he has padlocked *Le Combat* as he padlocked *La Clarte* in 1937.

It is only one in a series of recent developments in Quebec which, as we have said, make the people of other provinces wonder. They wonder whether the freedom of speech, of belief, of criticism, which is counted precious in the rest of Canada is to be permanently denied in Quebec.

OUR COMMENT ON "WHAT IS HAPPENING IN QUEBEC?"

The Toronto Daily Star refers to a speech by Premier Duplessis, made when he was discussing an appeal to permit municipalities to pass by-laws which prohibit the circulation of printed matter, when it is "against public order, and the respect of the race, religion, or tradition of the Quebec people". Mr. Duplessis said, "Those who wish to come to Quebec and respect our laws, are welcome. But those who, whatever their opinion, or faith, aim to attack our faith and traditions, will not be tolerated." Of course the preaching of the gospel in the opinion of a Roman Catholic is an "attack upon our faith and traditions". "And that," Mr. Duplessis says, "will not be tolerated." He has not yet arrived at the position where he could be bold enough to padlock all Protestant

The Gospel Witness

and

Protestant Advocate

Published every Thursday for the propagation of the Evangelical principles of the Protestant Reformation and in defence of the faith once delivered to the Saints.

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

Editor

T. T. SHIELDS

Associate Editors

W. S. WHITCOMBE, M.A. (Tor.)

W. GORDON BROWN, M.A. (Tor.)

Contributing Editor

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

S. S. Lesson and Exchanges

"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 RAndolph 7415

Registered Cable Address: Jarwitsem, Canada

churches, and all Protestant institutions; but that the Quebec Government, and the Hierarchy behind it, have the will to do it, there can be no doubt.

IF THAT'S SEDITION . . .

(From *The Toronto Daily Star*, February 23, 1948)

At Montreal on Friday a member of the Jehovah's Witnesses sect was acquitted of seditious libel by an English-speaking jury. A month previously a French-speaking jury had convicted another Witness on the same charge, and she was sentenced to three months in jail. The cases hinge on the contents of pamphlets which the Witnesses have distributed.

Last week's English-speaking jury was instructed by a French-speaking judge. And not instructed to acquit. He asked if the jurors didn't think this paragraph from a pamphlet seditious: "Quebec, Jehovah's Witnesses are telling all Canada of the shame you have brought on the nation by your evil deeds. In English, French and Ukrainian languages this leaflet is broadcasting your delinquency to the nation. You claim to serve God; you claim to be for freedom. Yet if freedom is exercised by those who disgrace you, you crush freedom by mob rule and gestapo tactics."

"Disgrace you" in this paragraph is evidently used in the sense of "expose your disgrace", and the reference is to criticisms of Quebec by the Witnesses which resulted in mob attacks upon them, and arrests. Noting that the pamphlet has been printed in English, French and Ukrainian, the judge asked the jury if in their consideration such tactics as the distribution of this pamphlet were not deliberately used to arouse ill-will and hatred among different classes of the people. And that, of course, is how Quebec authorities define sedition.

Reading the supposedly seditious paragraph, one cannot but wonder what would happen to Dr. T. T. Shields' GOSPEL WITNESS, and his Protestant League, and Ald. Leslie Saunders' *Protestant Action*, if the term "sedition" really covered what Quebec authorities seem to think it covers. For the paragraph is mild to some of the utterances which emanate from those Toronto sources. The freedom of discussion which permits such utterances may be approved (*The Star* does approve it) without approving the utterances themselves. *The Star* thinks they are often in bad taste—but not seditious. And it is doubtful whether either Dr. Shields or Ald. Saunders are shivering in their boots.

OUR COMMENTS ON THE EDITORIAL: "IF THAT'S SEDITION . . ."

Again *The Toronto Star* refers to the trial of certain members of the Jehovah's Witnesses Sect. In one case a woman was found guilty of "sedition", for having circulated the pamphlet, "Quebec's Burning Hate", and was sentenced to three months in jail, and this by a French-speaking jury.

On February 21st a man on precisely the same charge was acquitted by an English-speaking jury, after only thirty-five minutes' deliberation. We set out below the press reports on these matters.

The Star in its editorial, "If That's Sedition . . .", very properly wonders "what would happen to Dr. T. T. Shields' GOSPEL WITNESS, and his PROTESTANT LEAGUE, and Alderman Leslie Saunders' *Protestant Action*, if the term "sedition" really covered what Quebec authorities seem to think it covers".

The Star approves of freedom of discussion, but could not forbear a rap over the knuckles by saying, "*The Star* thinks they are often in bad taste—but not seditious". Of course, the question arises as to who is to be the judge of good or bad taste. We were once in a company where a physician diagnosed a case. His diagnosis was not couched in polite speech: it was, in fact, horrible. But he was an expert. He knew what he was talking about. He knew that the disease had death at the heart of it, and he had to speak plainly. The papers to which *The Star* refers, we make bold to say, are edited by experts, and who are, therefore, competent to make both the diagnosis and prognosis in respect to the malignant thing that has destroyed so many nations, known as Roman Catholicism. *The Star* remarks, "It is doubtful whether either Dr. Shields or Alderman Saunders are shivering in their boots."

Our friend Mr. Saunders is well able to speak for himself. But *The Star* is perfectly right in its assumption in respect to this Editor. As a matter of fact, when the pamphlet "Quebec's Burning Hate" was first issued, and challenged in Quebec, we published the whole pamphlet *in extenso* in THE GOSPEL WITNESS; and if occasion required, we would publish it again.

If the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of Quebec is to be reckoned as above the State, superior to it, and sovereign over it, then to criticize its priests, and to endeavour to dissuade people from obedience to them, might, with some show of reason, be called "seditious". But if there be any religious freedom left, then one must be free, not only to proclaim what he, himself, believes, but to expose what he believes to be fallacies in the beliefs of others. But Mr. Pouliot and Mr. Duplessis say virtually the same thing: in order to be comfortable in Quebec, one must speak the French language, and be a Roman Catholic.

TWO PRESS REPORTS

We set out two more press reports of Jehovah's Witnesses on trial, the first dated February 19th, and the second, dated February 21st, accounts of the trial of the same man on different dates. A defence witness endeavoured to quote a speech of Senator Bouchard mentioned in the pamphlet, in the Canadian Senate. But he was not allowed to proceed, notwithstanding the matter he quoted was printed in the pamphlet upon which the charge was based, because the witness admitted he was not in the Senate when the speech allegedly was made. We quote that as an example of the administra-

tion of justice in Quebec, especially to note that the speech referred to was actually quoted in the pamphlet that was the basis of the charge; yet when an attempt was made by the defence to have the witness file in the record a copy of the official Senate *Hansard* record, the judge upheld the Crown's objection! Justice under such conditions is an impossibility.

Here we set out the press report referred to:

WITNESS QUOTES SENATOR BOUCHARD AT SEDITION TRIAL

Montreal, Feb. 19 (CP).—Trial of Charles Elvey, 22, member of the Witnesses of Jehovah sect, was resumed today in a session studded with crown objections to defence questions.

Elvey was charged with having published seditious libel by distributing a pamphlet entitled "Quebec's Burning Hatred". After one day's sitting, the trial was postponed Feb. 10 until today because of illness of a juror.

The crown, which already has tested its case, adduced evidence to show that Elvey was arrested in suburban Lachine, November 26, 1946, following distribution of the pamphlet to a householder. Excerpts from the leaflet were read to the jury, the crown maintaining they constituted seditious libel by tending to cause disaffection and discord among different classes of the population.

A defence witness today, Charles Hedworth, also a member of the sect, was asked to indicate what parts of the pamphlet he knew personally to be true. Hedworth referred to a section stating that Quebec's law-making bodies framed laws to "get" those not favored by the ruling classes. He said he believed this to be true "on many occasions."

Hedworth also referred to a speech, mentioned in the pamphlet, of Senator T. D. Bouchard in the Canadian Senate. This portion spoke of Roman Catholic secret societies "backed by French-Canadian hierarchy". Hedworth was stopped when in answer to a crown question, he admitted he was not in the Senate when the speech allegedly was made.

An attempt by the defence to have the witness file in the record a copy of the official Senate *Hansard* record failed when Mr. Justice Wilfrid Lazure upheld a crown objection.

Another defence witness, Mrs. Rodolphe Weaner of Chateauguay, testified she had permitted the Witnesses of Jehovah to hold two meetings in the yard of her home in September, 1945. She said both meetings were broken up by the noise of sirens and horns of motor cars and by angry crowds throwing missiles.

Wilfrid Lavac, deputy clerk of the Recorder's Court, testified that up to November, 1946, there were about 600 to 700 cases pending in connection with violation of a by-law dealing with distribution of circulars without permission. He could not say how many of these cases concerned Witnesses of Jehovah.

His Lordship repeatedly asked both crown and defence counsel to restrict themselves to the pamphlet and its contents and not to wander afield.

In the particular case recorded above, the accused was acquitted, as we have said, by an English-speaking jury. But the Roman Catholic Judge had charged directly against the accused, and had justified the accusation of "sedition" against those who circulated the pamphlet. This particular Jehovah's Witness was acquitted because he was tried before an English-speaking jury.

But again we remind our readers that this young man of twenty-two, and Mrs. Rene Ouellette, were tried on exactly similar charges; the English-speaking jury freed the one; the French-speaking jury found the woman guilty of sedition, and she was sentenced to three months in jail. That is "What Is Happening in Quebec".

This Editor is almost glad the Union Jack has been

hauled down in Quebec, for *such travesties of justice would be a disgrace to the flag.*

Here follows the second press report:

QUEBEC JURORS FREE "WITNESS" ON LIBEL COUNT

English-Speaking Jury Deliberates 35 Minutes in Case of "Jehovah" Member Accused of "Sedition"

Montreal, Feb. 21—(CP)—Charles Elvey, 22, evangelical missionary of the Jehovah's Witnesses sect, yesterday was acquitted by an English-speaking jury of seditious libel charges brought by the Provincial Attorney-General. The jury deliberated 35 minutes.

Several weeks ago Mrs. Rene Ouellette, also a member of the sect, was convicted by a French-speaking jury on similar charges and was sentenced to three months in jail.

Mr. Elvey and Mrs. Ouellette were the first of 28 members of the sect to be charged with publishing and distributing seditious libel in the pamphlet, "Quebec's Burning Hate".

Before Elvey's case went to the jury Mr. Justice Lazure, of the Court of King's Bench, cited paragraphs from the pamphlets and asked the jurors if they did not consider them to contain seditious libel.

He reminded the jurymen they must give the accused the benefit of the doubt but he also said that "Catholics, Anglicans, Protestants and Jews have been living together in peace in this province for years without any such activities."

Crown Prosecutor Henri Loranger, K.C., told the jurors they should attach no bearing in their judgment to the fact that Jehovah's Witnesses had been attacked with tomatoes and other items in Lachine and Caughnawaga several months ago.

THE GLOBE AND MAIL JOINS THE CHOIR

In its issue of February 18th, it publishes an editorial entitled, "The Padlock Law Again". It has been applied for the closing of the offices of the French-language newspaper, *Le Combat*, and the adjoining offices of the French Section of the Labour-Progressive Party—new name of the Communist Party in Canada. The premises were raided under the Padlock Law, and are to remain locked for a year. This surely is a reversion to the Middle, or Dark Ages. This turns the clock of human progress back for three or four hundred years. Such an iniquity could not be perpetrated under any other authority on earth than the Roman Catholic Church.

The Globe and Mail remarks, "The lack of any definition of Communism in the Padlock Law meant that any house, or place of business could be closed on the whim and say so of a Minister". Does anyone suppose that the framers of that law forgot to define Communism? Of course they did not! That law is part of the Inquisition machinery of persecution, like the rack, and the thumbscrew, and all the rest of it. *The Globe and Mail* very properly denounced the law at the time of its passing, as it has often protested against any infringement upon human liberty. Its protest is all the more pertinent in view of the fact that it pleads for freedom of Communists, who are *The Globe and Mail's* pet aversion; but, of course, only so long as they keep within the law. *The Globe*, properly, as did this paper also, protested against the action of the Alberta authorities in dragging a publisher across Canada to stand trial on a libel charge. *The Globe and Mail* says, "What we need is a National Bill of Rights". But the Minister of Justice tells us that certain legal authorities have advised

the Government that Parliament has no power to pass such a bill; and as we are to be cut off from the right of appeal to the Privy Council, it would seem as though Canada is to be at the mercy of the Roman Catholic reactionaries.

Here follows the editorial from *The Globe and Mail*:

THE PADLOCK LAW AGAIN

(From *The Toronto Globe and Mail*, Feb. 18, 1948)

When in 1937 the Duplessis Government induced the Quebec Legislature to pass the "Padlock Law", as it became known, there was an outcry across the Dominion. Here, instead of the rule of law, was rule by an individual; for the measure gave the Attorney-General arbitrary authority to raid, close and padlock any premises where Communist propaganda was kept or circulated.

The lack of any definition of Communism in the Padlock Law meant that any house or place of business could be closed on the whim and say-so of a Minister. From 1937 onward, the law was denounced on many platforms in Canada, and by newspapers, including the *Globe and Mail*. Though strongly opposed to Communism, this newspaper objected to the use of totalitarian methods in suppressing it.

Demands for disallowance of the Padlock Law came to nothing and it was still on the Quebec statute books when the Duplessis Government was defeated in 1939. During the years of the Godbout regime, the offensive law remained in force. It fell into disuse but it was never repealed. It was ready to Mr. Duplessis' hand when he returned to power in 1944.

Until last Monday it was in abeyance but on that day, the Quebec Provincial Police, on instructions from Mr. Duplessis, closed the offices of the French-language newspaper, *Le Combat*, and the adjoining offices of the French section of the Labor-Progressive Party, new name of the Communist Party in Canada. Their premises were raided under the Padlock Law and are to remain locked for a year.

This action strikes a blow at press freedom and it therefore concerns every citizen. When the Alberta authorities found a legal loophole which permitted them to drag a publisher across Canada to stand trial on a libel charge, there was justified protest in the press of the Dominion. The closing of the Quebec newspaper and political offices is an even more serious infringement of the rights of free speech. Mr. Duplessis cannot be too strongly condemned, but it has been shown before that argument with him on such issues produces small results.

Today the Padlock Law is used against a paper which is unpopular and weak. Tomorrow it can be used against any political foe which the Union Nationale Government chooses to regard as offensive. This is a danger to which no free citizen need be exposed. What is needed is a national Bill of Rights under which those who suffer from such arbitrary action as that Government has taken may seek and obtain redress.

ANOTHER BLOW AT LIBERTY

But that does not finish the story of liberty's nearing total eclipse in Quebec. Here is another item: "The Church is Denied Charter by Quebec Legislature".

According to Quebec law a church must be incorporated in order to function, and when a charter is denied, it is tantamount to forbidding that church to prosecute its work there. Premier Duplessis said Quebec wants to keep its present character! Here is the news item.

CHURCH IS DENIED CHARTER BY QUEBEC LEGISLATURE

Quebec City, Feb. 10—(BUP)—Premier Maurice Duplessis said to-day that "Quebec is very generous, more so than any other province, but I don't believe, in fact I am sure that we have no right to create churches or meddle in religious affairs."

The premier made the statement to a committee of the legislature which unanimously refused to further hearing of a private bill to incorporate "L'Eglise Cana-

dienne de la Pentecôte" (known as the Apostolic Church of the Pentecost, under a federal charter) as an ecclesiastical corporation in the province.

The bill requested authority to "have the right to establish, conduct and operate a church to worship God, and for such purposes to develop the works and spread the teachings of the said church throughout the province of Quebec". It also requested the right to "conduct, operate and develop missions at home and abroad".

Duplessis said "the religious and school laws of the province of Quebec are very broad, very generous and those who cannot or do not want to obey them only have to establish themselves elsewhere". He added he was not in favour of those who "collected a few French-Canadian names and later want to give the impression that they belong to a French-Canadian church".

Duplessis said that "furthermore Quebec wants to keep its present character".

TRADES UNIONISTS SUFFER ALSO

There are many aspects of modern Trades Unionism with which we have no agreement. The closed shop, and subjection to highly paid agitators is something that will have to be dealt with. But the account of the jailing of a man and a woman for two years over a strike, as given below, needs a little elucidation. The Roman Catholic Hierarchy wants its own Trades Unions. It would capture the Trades Unionism movement entirely if it could, as it has almost completely done in Australia, and use it for its own purposes. These people who are sentenced to two years in prison, belong to a Union affiliated with the A.F.L. Therefore, they must go to jail. Here is the account of the Union persecutors:

WOMAN, MAN GET TWO YEARS OVER STRIKE

Organizers Sentenced by Quebec Judge After Conviction on Charges of Conspiracy

St. Jerome, Que., Feb. 10—(CP)—Madelaine Parent Bjornasen and Azelus Beaucage, organizers of the United Textile Workers of America (AFL), were sentenced to two years' imprisonment on charges of seditious conspiracy and conspiracy to interfere with the rights of workers. Sentence was pronounced today by Mr. Justice Philemon Cousineau.

The charges grew out of a strike last summer at the plant of the Ayers, Ltd., at Lachute, Que.

The union organizers were convicted by a jury Friday after only 40 minutes deliberation. Defense counsel previously indicated an appeal would be taken against the verdict.

Mrs. Bjornasen, more widely known under her maiden name Parent, was provincial organizer of the U.T.W.A. Beaucage's official title was business agent.

The two were arrested several times during the strike at the Ayers textile plant. R. Kent Rowley, national organizer for the union, was also arrested on similar charges. He was granted a separate trial because of his mixed parentage and his case will be heard before six French-speaking and six English-speaking jurymen.

BAPTIST PREACHERS INSIDE AND OUTSIDE OF JAIL

We have not finished yet. The Quebec Government refuses to allow Evangelicals of any name, in this case, a Baptist minister, to enter a jail to preach the gospel. Some time ago, in a legal battle for the custody of a child a Roman Catholic father insisted that the child should be brought up in his faith, and taken from its Protestant mother. The father, however, could not be

in Court because he was an inmate of Kingston Penitentiary.

The Roman Catholic Church should be the last to deny admission of gospel preachers to the penitentiary, because the penitentiaries are so full of Roman Catholics.

We were in the midst of arranging our statistics to deal with this aspect of the case when the February number of *Protestant Action* came to hand. Our friend, Mr. Leslie Saunders, we trust, will not object to our publishing these figures from his paper, as we trust such publication will only assist in increasing its circulation.

First we print the report of the ban on Evangelical preaching, and following that an extensive quotation from *Protestant Action*:

BAN EVANGELICAL SERVICES IN JAIL

Howard Society Official Protests Latest Move of Quebec Government

Montreal, Feb. 19—(CP)—Rev. R. Gordon Burgoyne, honorary president of the John Howard Society of Quebec, told a women's missionary group that the voluntary evangelical services which have been held in Montreal's Bordeaux Jail for 50 years have been stopped by order of the Provincial Attorney-General's Department.

He said the services were stopped without warning and that when a Baptist minister went to the jail recently to conduct a meeting, he was turned away by guards.

"Perhaps Quebec feels that the removal of the evangelical services on Saturday afternoons is a move in the direction of prison reform, although many Protestant prisoners and thousands of ex-prisoners will not agree," he said.

In Rouyn, Quebec, a Baptist preacher was put in jail for preaching on the street; in Quebec a Baptist preacher was forbidden to preach in jail! It may be that, like John Bunyan, we may have to preach on the street in order to get into jail! At all events, to be sure of a large Roman Catholic congregation, one must preach in jail.

WHERE CRIMINALS ABOUND

The following is reprinted from *Protestant Action*, Leslie H. Saunders, Editor, for February.

WHERE CRIMINALS ABOUND

Let us have a look at the picture in several countries where figures are available—

IN CANADA

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, speaking on the *Autonomy Bills* of 1905, attributed the prevalence of crime and divorce to the "godless" public schools. Is that so?

Carleton County jail, year ending Sept. 30, 1923 had—

Protestants	217
Roman Catholics	477
Population (including Ottawa) 1911	
Protestants	55,673
Roman Catholics	45,926

Roman Catholics, with 45% of the population had 70% of the jail inmates.

Toronto, Don Jail, 1934—Out of 6,789 prisoners, 1,744 were registered as Roman Catholic, or almost 26%. Toronto is 14% R.C.

The same year, the R.C. proportion of Ontario Reformatories was 40% and Ontario prisoners in penitentiaries 38.8%. Ontario was 21.7% R.C. in population.

Roman Catholics were 43.65% of the inmates of all Canadian penitentiaries, although their population was 41.3%.²

To bring the Canadian picture more up-to-date, we have the figures for 1941, as taken from *The Canada Year Book* of the following year. Roman Catholics made up 1,873 of a total of 3,688 penitentiary inmates or 50.78%. Canada's population (1941 census) was 44.4% R.C.

IN SCOTLAND

In the year 1928, 5,524 of the total of 14,737 convicted for offences were Roman Catholics—or 37.41%. Scotland's population is but 13.26% R.C.

In 1935, the figure was 37.09%; in 1936, 37.3% and in 1937, 38.09%. In the land of John Knox, Roman Catholics have nearly three times their due proportion of criminals and, it is acknowledged, that the majority of these are from De Valera's Eire.

IN ENGLAND

No comparative statement has been issued from England since 1906. Undoubtedly Romanist pressure saw to that as the figures were distressing, to say the least. This return, giving the number of prisoners in Great Britain on March 28, 1906 showed:

	Per 100,000 of denomination	
Salvation Army	11	2
Congregationalists	53	3
Baptists	132	9
Methodists	469	10
Presbyterians	1,803	46
Jews	262	116
Church of England	16,235	118
Roman Catholics	5,378	247

In one year 21,324 prisoners passed through Liverpool Gaol. Of these, 13,676 were Roman Catholics. Referring to this bad showing, *The Universe* (R.C.) under the heading "Catholic Morality in Liverpool" said:

"The vice and immorality existing among the Catholic body in Liverpool are fearful. The sooner we admit that fact the better, and deny it we cannot, in the face of statistics compiled by the Rev. Fr. Nugent (for over 20 years chaplain of Walton Gaol) . . . Their substance is this — that in Liverpool, the strongest phalanx in the devil's army is recruited from the ranks of Catholicism."

IN AUSTRALIA

The latest figures available from the Commonwealth are for 1937 and 1938. In 1937, of a total of 6,345 male prisoners, 2,130 were R.C. and 321 women of a total of 781. This gives 33% males and 41% females. In 1928, the figures were 2,474 males of a total of 6,898, and 328 women of a total of 930. This gives 36% and 35%, respectively. Australia's population is but 18 per cent Roman Catholic.

The situation in New Zealand is quite similar.

IN THE UNITED STATES

In the year 1925, in Sing Sing prison, there were 848 Roman Catholics as against 572 of all other faiths.

To the charge that crime is due to "lack of teaching of religion"—the Roman Catholic religion, of course—H. C. Kane, chief observer in the criminal courts for the Committee on the Control of Crime, is of the opinion

that *the teaching of religion in the public schools would seem to provide no deterrent to crime*, since Roman Catholics numerically top all crime lists and also exceed all others in teaching religion in schools.

Roman Catholics, according to their own estimate, form only 16% of the U.S. population, yet a book by Father Leo Kalmer³ shows that in a selection of 28 States, (with the average R.C. population being 17.24%) the average R.C. prison population was 33.62%. When a few typical States are selected, this is the picture:

New York:	26.73% of total population is Catholic. 56.46% of prison population is Catholic.
Wyoming:	7.13% of total population is Catholic. 32.18% of prison population is Catholic.
Arizona:	33.16% of total population is Catholic. 53.26% of prison population is Catholic.
California:	16.83% of total population is Catholic. 43.61% of prison population is Catholic.
Wisconsin:	23.79% of total population is Catholic. 43.52% of prison population is Catholic.

The argument is advanced by Roman Catholic prison chaplains that the majority of "Catholics" committed to prison are either of foreign birth or parentage, mostly Italian, Spanish, Polish, Austrian, and Irish. This, however, does not serve to exculpate the Roman Church, since these are Roman Catholic countries *par excellence*, where "Roman Catholic culture" is most effective. On the contrary, it only serves to show that the much-maligned traditional American secular education and non-Catholic culture cannot be blamed for the crime increase in that country.

It is an admitted fact that crime among Roman Catholics in the United States is about three times greater than in proportion to their population. An article in the *Daily Mirror* of New York,⁴ revealed that of the total population of 1,989 at Dannemora (Clinton) prison *twelve hundred were Roman Catholics*.

In the R.C. Magazine *Commonweal*⁵ the admission is made that "Catholics far outnumber Protestants in Connecticut jails, *possibly by four to one*." The author of the article tells of the wonderful co-operation received from Protestant ministers and Bible teachers in helping prisoners while confined to jail and after they are released, but complains of lack of similar co-operation from their own priests. A Protestant minister conducted a Bible class, but

"I have pleaded in vain for ten years for the help of a similar ministry."

The Los Angeles *Tidings* (R.C.) admitted, too, that *nearly one-third* of the prisoners of overcrowded California Institution for Women at Tehachapi were Roman Catholics.

A consistently abnormal 50 per cent or more of the criminals committed to prisons each year in the United States are Roman Catholics. In the two New York State prisons (Sing Sing and Clinton) the figures for three years were:

	Total	Roman Catholics	Per cent
1940	1727	877	51
1941	1626	805	50
1942	1462	707	49

HAVE YOU ANSWERED THE EDITOR'S ANNUAL LETTER YET?

in a State with a Roman Catholic population slightly more than 25 per cent.

Some Romanist apologists will argue that the figures quoted are for adults, many of whom migrated from countries where conditions were bad (although Roman Catholic) or had not the opportunities of modern education and standards of society:

FALSE PAPIST PROPAGANDA

In *Radio Replies*⁶ the following question and answer appears:

"496. Why are Catholics responsible for most of the crimes committed?

"Firstly, your implied assertion merits *no more than mere denial*. Secondly, close examination shows that such Catholics as happen to be criminals have, for the most part, never been in Catholic schools to receive a Catholic training, whilst many were once in a Catholic school only to be transferred to a state school later on, eventually dropping their religion, save in name only. Finally, granted that some Catholics are criminals, their conduct is in spite of, and not because of their religion, for they do just what their religion forbids. They are in no way an argument against the holiness of the Catholic Church. That Church is holy in her Founder, doctrines, worship. Above all is she holy in the numerous Saints of the ages who have been supremely faithful to her teachings. And no other Church can claim a holiness similar to that of the Catholic Church under these aspects."

First a falsehood, for the facts prove the priest's answer to be untrue.

Secondly, the blame is placed on the children being educated in other than Roman Catholic schools. Archbishop Mannix of Australia made the same statement some years ago:

"*about ten per cent* of Roman Catholic children were educated in other than Catholic schools . . . many of the children in reformatories might have been saved if they had been in touch with Catholic schools".

Supposing allowances were made for this "ten per cent"; would it alter the picture very greatly? We shall see as we proceed.

Further, the priest's reply speaks of the "holiness" of the Catholic Church and that

"no other church can claim a similar holiness."

(1) Msgr. McDonald.

(2) Quoted in "The Catholic Register" of May 6, 1937.

(3) Chaplain at Illinois State Penitentiary from 1917 to 1936, when the book was published.

(4) March 12, 1941.

(5) October 9, 1942.

(6) By Father Rumble.

BLACK-OUT IN QUEBEC

(From *The Toronto Daily Star*)

Last week, a court in Québec sentenced to two years in prison Madeleine Parent and Azellus Beaucage, organizers of the United Textile Workers' Union. They were charged with seditious conspiracy and the charge was laid by Premier Duplessis, who also is the attorney-general of the province.

The imprisonment of labour officials on such a charge is one of a number of examples of the increasing reaction in Québec. The province has violated the civil and religious freedom of citizens who belong to Jehovah's Witnesses. A few days ago, Premier Duplessis closed the offices of *Le Combat*, the French-language newspaper pub-

lished by the Québec branch of the Labor-Progressive party. He announced, as he did this, that he was reviving the Padlock Law which gives him power to raid and padlock any place where he believes there is "Communist propaganda".

Mr. Duplessis and his officers are the sole judges of what is Communist propaganda. The Labor-Progressive party is a legal party in Canada. It publishes and distributes in other parts of Canada an English-language newspaper. In Québec, however, the Duplessis government has overridden this basic constitutional freedom.

The conviction and imprisonment of Miss Parent and Beaucage serve as a warning to labour and liberal groups in Québec. In effect, the Padlock Law was applied to the two union officials. The crown based its charge against them on the statement, signed by Premier Duplessis, that they were "Communist sympathizers". The fact that the Premier signed the complaint carried the necessary weight in court. The labour organizers were convicted for "seditious conspiracy" on the crown's evidence that they were plotting to incite trouble among workers. Mr. Duplessis' statement formed part of the evidence.

The case establishes a precedent that may endanger the civil liberties of many citizens in Québec and perhaps in other parts of the Dominion.

Whomever Mr. Duplessis does not like, he has the power to order arrested on the loose charge of "Communist sympathizer" or "seditious conspiracy".

The officers of any organization of which Mr. Duplessis does not approve may be railroaded to prison, and its premises padlocked. An entire executive board of a trade union or social reform organization may be convicted of "plotting to incite trouble". Mr. Duplessis is the sole judge of what is or is not "trouble".

Whatever activity the attorney-general does not like, he has the power to suppress it.

The Textile Workers' Union has declared the intention of appealing the verdict and sentence against its officers. The test case will be important not alone to the labour movement in Canada, but for the protection of civil rights of all citizens.

"THE OTTAWA CITIZEN" ALSO PADLOCKING LIBERTY

(From *The Ottawa Citizen*)

Once again Premier Duplessis of Québec puts the padlock of prejudice on the edifice of liberty. He has ordered forcibly to be closed—just as Hitler and Mussolini might do—the offices of a small French-speaking weekly journal whose politics he dislikes. It may have been a Communist journal. Its editor says it is not; its politics are strictly labour. Nevertheless, it is now homeless and its staff is in the street without hope of redress. Even if the paper was Communist, communism is not outlawed in Canada. If the paper was alleged to be seditious in content, then the courts are open to decide the charge. The evil of the Padlock Law is that it is itself a denial of law. And it is useless as well. Obviously what will happen now is that the suppressed journal will be printed outside Québec where no Padlock Laws apply, and read clandestinely inside it. Premier Duplessis has also ordered to be seized two films, one of which showed the rebuilding of Warsaw. Apparently the police secretly attended a meeting of a Polish society in Montreal where these films were exhibited and a prosecution for failing to secure previous approval of the Québec censorship board will follow.

We are told that the teaching of God's ministers must be conformed to the spirit of the age. We shall have nothing to do with such treason to truth.

—C. H. Spurgeon.

**HAVE YOU ANSWERED THE EDITOR'S
ANNUAL LETTER YET?**

A GOOD JOKE WITH A SERIOUS MORAL

ANYONE who can tell us a good clean joke we regard as a true benefactor in a world where genuine humour is an all too scarce commodity. And then, too, we are also aware that many a serious word is spoken in jest. We do not know which of those two principles was the ruling factor responsible for bringing the following story to our attention, but in any case, it was handed to us last week by one of the printers the moment we stepped over the threshold of the great establishment where this paper is turned off the presses week after week. We assumed that it was on account of his religious affiliation with the church of Cardinal McGuigan that the printer who gave us the story was carefully selected for the task by his fellow-workmen—a group of men, we may add, that in our opinion could not be surpassed anywhere either for their technical skill or their spirit of co-operation. We are glad to pass on the story to our readers, with the preliminary explanation that last week the local Roman Catholic Cardinal issued, with a blare of publicity, a pastoral letter in which he exhorted all “the faithful” to abstain during the course of Lent from partaking of strong drink, from serving it to others, and from frequenting places where it was served. The story, we believe, was taken from *The Toronto Evening Telegram*:

INDIAN LIST

Last Wednesday afternoon at an East Toronto beverage room the manager grimly walked among his customers, every once in a while pointing a stern finger at one of the imbibers:

“Pat, you’re cut off . . .”

The waiters, of course, followed instructions. Pat was refused any ale. All in all, eight or nine in the room were “given the finger” and told they were “barred.”

It was an excited delegation that marched up to the manager’s office and demanded an explanation. The manager said nothing. Instead he tacked a large sign on the wall.

It read: “From this day—Ash Wednesday—no dogan will be served on these premises. Signed—The Management, co-operating with local R.C. Headquarters.”

It is, perhaps, ludicrously funny to think of a bartender co-operating with the Roman Catholic authorities to put members of that church on the “Indian List” during the Lenten season, but why not, in all seriousness? That is precisely what the Mayor of Rouyn did when he forbade Rev. Murray Heron and his associates to preach on the street corner or to distribute Bibles from door to door. The Roman Church authorities have commanded their “faithful” to abstain from hearing and reading certain truths, so straightway the civil authorities execute their orders “in co-operation with the local R.C. Headquarters”. The Roman priests have been compelled to answer the intensive campaign launched by the so-called “Jehovah’s Witnesses” in Quebec Province. Hence the civil courts arrested hundreds of these hapless and misguided religionists and are now proceeding to condemn them to sentences in jail, “in co-operation with the local R.C. authorities”. That, in a word, is the principle

HAVE YOU ANSWERED THE EDITOR'S ANNUAL LETTER YET?

of the bloody Inquisition, which almost never put its victims to death: it merely handed them over to the secular arm for the destruction of the flesh, allowing the laymen to play the part of executioners just as the pagan Romans carried out the orders of the religious tribunal that decreed the judicial murder of the Son of God.

As we remarked before, the jest is a good one, but the principle that it illustrates is an exceedingly serious one.—W.S.W.

A GOOD RESPONSE

THE GOSPEL WITNESS,
Toronto, Ontario.

February 4th, 1948.

Dear Editor:

In response to your Annual Letter I am enclosing ten dollars, and trust that this might help.

Regarding THE GOSPEL WITNESS, I feel that I could not afford to be without it. If it is a day late in arriving, I have a feeling of disappointment. I have, in times past, subscribed to a number of Christian magazines and journals, but can say sincerely that I enjoy your paper most. I like it because it fearlessly champions major religious issues. It is unrivalled in originality. I find the weekly sermons to be very heart-interesting, informative, and spiritual.

Let me say also that the recent sermons on last things have been very interesting. It is amazing to learn the feebleness of the dispensationalist’s foundation for the secret rapture, and the meaning of Christ’s kingship.

Long may this well-named paper live!

An appreciative reader,

Signed

NIGHT AND DAY

When on my day of life the night is falling,
And in the winds, from darkness spaces blown,
I hear far voices out of darkness calling
My feet to paths unknown,

Thou, who hast made my home of life so pleasant,
Leave not its tenant when its walls decay;
O Love Divine, O Helper ever present,
Be Thou my strength and stay!

Be near me when all else is from me drifting,—
Earth, sky, home’s pictures, days of shade and shine,
And kindly faces to my own uplifting
The love which answers mine.

I have but Thee, my Father; let Thy Spirit
Be with me then to comfort and uphold;
No gate of pearl, no branch of palm I merit,
Nor street of shining gold.

Suffice it if—my good and ill unreckoned,
And both forgiven through Thy abounding grace—
I find myself by hands familiar beckoned
Unto my fitting place,—

Some humble door among Thy many mansions,
Some sheltering shade where sin and striving cease,
And flows for ever through heaven’s green expansions
The river of Thy peace.

There from the music round about me stealing
I fain would learn the new and holy song,
And find at last, beneath Thy trees of healing,
The life for which I long.

— John Greenleaf Whittier, 1807-1892.

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

The Loveliest Word in Any Language

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, February 22nd, 1948.

(Stenographically Reported)

"Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."—Matthew 11:28.

SOME advantages, and some disadvantages, accrue to the preacher when he announces a particularly familiar text. Perhaps the main advantage is that we come to it like meeting an old friend to whom an introduction is unnecessary. On the other hand, there is danger that people may feel that they have already heard all that the text has to say; that it has been exhausted of its meaning, and that to listen again is but to listen to vain repetition. Even if that were true, it could have no application to the word of the Infinite, for there is a durability, an everlastingness about the word of God that is like unto its divine Author: it never wears out.

The other day, by accident, we turned the dial of the radio—it is very seldom I listen to it, but I listened then to a programme of old-time familiar melodies. My wife said of one of them, the first we heard, "I used to play that when I was a tiny little girl, and yet it is just as sweet to-day as it was then." Some of the old tunes never wear out, and they bring back to our minds very often many precious memories. That is especially true of many of the hymns of Zion. We can repeat them from memory. We do not need to use a book when they are sung. Who does not know:

"Abide with me; fast falls the eventide"; or

"Jesus, Lover of my soul,
Let me to Thy bosom fly"; or

"Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee"; or

"Jesus, the very thought of Thee
With sweetness fills my breast"; or

"How sweet the name of Jesus sounds
In a believer's ear!"

I could go on by the hour, and you would all agree that not one of these sacred melodies has wholly fulfilled its day. It is still fresh and melodious to the ear of faith. So if we were to dwell on the old truths it would be well worth while, would it not? "Ask for the old paths, where is the good way, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest to your soul." Surely to the believer any aspect of gospel truth is sweet and inspiring! We never weary of hearing it. If we had to come to this text this evening, and say nothing more than you have heard a thousand times, it might well be most profitable to say it again. But do not be too sure that treasure stored in any word of this inspired Book has been wholly exhausted. There may still be more light to come forth from that part of God's word. There may still be fresh water to be drawn out of that well of salvation. I have frequently turned to a very familiar text

whose very familiarity almost forbade me essaying the task of speaking upon it, only to discover that there was some new facet to the diamond that I had not seen before, some new significance in a tense, or some other part of the text that was worth dwelling upon.

But even if we must shut ourselves up to these familiar things, always remember that a tune or a hymn that has lasted for half a century without wearing out, must have some wearable quality in it; and the texts of Scripture that have been especially well worn you may be sure are full of precious truth. If you stopped by the wayside, when you were thirsty, and, looking for a well from which you might draw water, you would not be attracted to one if the path leading to it were overgrown with long grass, suggesting that no one used it. But if the path were well worn, you would say, "Aha, there is water in that well! Let us go and quench our thirst."

I read a story of a gold mine whose wealth was supposed to have been exhausted generations before. The owners at that time had given up its operation. They said, "We have extracted all the gold there is in this mine"; and so it was sold for a song. But the one who bought it dug in a new direction, or a little deeper, and came upon such a vein of gold as the original owners had never discovered. The mine that had been so long regarded with contempt, was found to contain many fortunes.

If you come upon a well-worn passage of Scripture, my recommendation to you is to dig a little deeper. Study it a little more carefully, and you may discover a vein of gold that has escaped earlier miners.

Having said that, let us come to our text: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

I.

Our Lord addresses the invitation of this text to A CERTAIN CLASS OF PEOPLE, WHOM HE SIMPLY, AND YET COMPREHENSIVELY DESCRIBES. He speaks to those who "labour and are heavy laden".

I remind you that the word of God in every part of it, is true: "Every word of God is pure". No matter what the subject that word deals with, the scriptural statement respecting that subject is the last word. It is true. If it be a matter of history, even though it may seem to be a casual allusion to an historical fact, and not designed specifically to teach history, yet in the fact that history, even a segment of it, is held under review, you may be sure that the allusion itself is historically accurate. If it deals with natural phenomena, whether it be the clouds above us, the circuits of the wind, the movements of the waters, the realm of meteorology; or of mineralogy, the

things that are under the earth, the gold, or the silver, or precious stones; or the things that come out of the earth from the tillage of the soil; you may be sure that no historian, no scientist, no meteorologist, no mineralogist, no agriculturist, can improve upon that which is written upon that particular subject in this inspired and infallible word of God.

I like to use this Authorized Version as the highest of all authorities on our English tongue. I feel I have a higher authority for the proper use of a word if I can find how it is used in the Bible than if I find the same word in Shakespeare, or in any other master of the language. This is *true*. Hence, when the Bible undertakes to describe any aspect of human nature, and human experience, you may be sure that it is correct.

When our Lord speaks of certain people as labouring, and being heavy laden, you may be certain that He describes what now we call a cross-section of human life. Through all generations men have had to labour, and they have been heavy laden; and notwithstanding all our labour-saving devices, we are still labourers, and still bearers of burdens. This ancient text has not lost its appositeness, nor its applicability to present-day human conditions.

What does the Lord mean by labouring, I wonder? You say, "Surely you are not going to spend time trying to define that familiar word!" But it needs definition. It is a word that is very frequently misused, and very frequently misunderstood. Is He speaking of physical labour? Perhaps! There may be a physical element in the sum total of the significance of this text. Is He speaking of labouring at bricklaying? They used to call that a skilled trade; and the man who carried the hod was just a "labourer". Perhaps! I expect he did labour. It would be labour for me, I know. You have heard of the Irishman settling in this country, and writing home to say that he had the finest job in the world. He had nothing to do but carry bricks up a ladder, and the man at the top did all the work!

What does He mean by labour? Perhaps I shall awaken your interest by telling you that this word is never in the Bible, in the Old or New Testaments, predicated of God. Nowhere in all the Book is it said that God laboured. The word translated "labour" in the Old Testament, and the other word translated "labour" in the New Testament, is never used to describe the going forth of divine energy. We read of "the work of God", of "the works of God". Our Lord Jesus said, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work". But never does the Bible speak of God's working as an act of labour. This word carries within itself the significance of fatigue, of irksome and arduous toil, of weariness.

I have heard this text often misquoted: "Come unto me all ye that are (wearied) and are heavy laden". Verbally it is a misquotation; but as to its significance, it is not. That is exactly what it means: All ye that in your labour are fatigued, and weary, and all but worn out. It is a word addressed to people who have a job which is too big for them.

Work is not labour to the strong man. Work is one of the most priceless privileges in the world. I pity the man who has no work, and who is under no necessity of working. We ought all to be working men and working women. Even before sin entered, when God had created man in His own image and likeness, do not forget He gave them a job to do. He put Adam into the garden to dress it, and to keep it. Before sin entered, the dressing and the keeping was a pleasurable employ-

ment, a delightful piece of work. It was the entrance of sin, with all its implications and involvements that converted work into labour.

That being understood, what sort of labour is the Lord speaking of? Oh, not the daily task, though there may be labour in that. It may be a tiresome job, an irksome undertaking. Quite true, the housewife may weary of her job, until it becomes a real labour; or the man in his daily toil, who is shut up, perhaps, to some task he does not like. If his spirit rebels against it, he has no joy in it, and what would be to someone else perhaps a piece of interesting work, becomes to him a piece of difficult and distressing labour.

But surely our Lord is not speaking of specific acts of work, or even of labour. *Is He not speaking of the sum total of that human energy and activity that makes of life a job of living?* We work to live. Sometimes our work becomes the most enervating labour, until we are weary of the whole business.

Let us leave that for a moment, and look at the other descriptive phrase: "heavy laden". What sort of burden does He mean? Have you not envied the strong man who seems to lift a great load with ease? A Deacon of mine once said to me when I was going away on a vacation: "One of the joys of vacationing to me is identifying the jobs I do not want. Try it, and you will learn to be thankful." I have seen many jobs I do not want. When I see a man taking a big bag of coal on his shoulders, I say, "That is one". When I see a man with a great receptacle, filled with ashes, and another man turning it upside down, until one can hardly see him for ashes, I say, "There is another job I do not want." There are many such occupations. I do not want to discourage anyone who lifts those ashes. You have my warmest and perpetual thanks. I do not use coal, therefore someone else will thank you for that. But it is a joy to see a man take his burden lightly. You have one burden; I have another. Some perhaps may carry theirs lightly; and some may carry their burdens with much groaning.

I heard of a man who was assistant manager of a very large department in a tremendous industrial plant. He was not the manager of his department. He was one of the assistant managers. About three o'clock, or a little after, in the afternoon, his work was finished. His desk was cleared away, and he would sometimes go away to the golf course. After a while this was reported to the manager-in-chief. One day he came to this man, and said, "Mr. So-and-So, we are very pleased with your work. I hope you are satisfied with the Company's treatment of you. You receive a very substantial salary." "Yes," said the man, "I have no complaints to offer." Then the manager-in-chief said, "It has been observed by the management that you get through your work apparently with great ease and comfort by about three o'clock in the afternoon, and then you go away. They have thought perhaps you had not enough work to do, or that perhaps you would not mind accepting a reduction in your salary." "Not at all," said the man. "Reduce it as much as you like. Reduce it to nothing. You have my resignation." "Oh, no; we do not want that. We are not complaining." "But," said the man, "the slightest suggestion of that sort is enough for me. Here is my resignation." "But we do not desire that at all." The man was firm in his decision. He said, "Good-bye", and left.

They tried to fill his place, and before they got through they had twelve men trying to run that part of the de-

partment, and paying the twelve men, in the aggregate, three or four times the salary they paid that one man. Why? Because he was a master. He drove his work, and never allowed his work to drive him. He was more than equal to his responsibilities. He carried his load easily. They found out that it took twelve men to carry it; and he had carried it alone, easily. He knew how. He was "laden", but he was not "heavy laden". It is a blessing when you can carry the load of life lightly and joyously, and feel that you are not overburdened.

But again I say, Our Lord was speaking of something far deeper and broader, and of more lasting significance than the little daily task, or let me omit the adjective, the daily task, whether it may seem little or big. He was speaking of some kind of load that does become heavy, and that no human skill can make light: "All ye that labour and are heavy laden".

I care not what your occupation, underlying it all there is that deep-seated consciousness, a weariness that somehow or another, almost breaks your spirit. Then perhaps you say, "I have got to make a go of it. I cannot run away. There is no escape. If I give up this job the next one may be worse. If I leave this place the next may be still less congenial." The fact is, there are elements in life which convert all our activities at some time or other into painful labour, and make the burdens of life to press upon us with such heaviness that they almost crush us.

Do you remember that phrase in Isaiah, chapter sixty-one, "The spirit of heaviness"? Did you ever have a "spirit of heaviness"? "What is the matter?" "I do not know." "Anything wrong at the office to-day?" "No." "Something wrong in the workshop?" "No." "Are you feeling out of condition physically?" "Not unusually so." "Then why the gloom?" "I do not know. It is just a kind of 'spirit of heaviness'. Everything I do to-day seems to be such a burden, such a labour." Ah, my dear friends, that is part of our constitution. When the Lord Jesus addressed this word to those who labour and are heavy laden, He was not speaking of these superficial things that change with the passing of the day. What is it that makes our activities so fatiguing, so wearying?

There is a condition of life that is described in the Bible in this way, "the grasshopper shall be a burden"—that little thing that seems to have almost no substance at all. It rests on your shoulder, and you don't know it is there. Put it on the scales, and it will scarcely affect the balance. But the Bible says a man may come to such a condition that even a grasshopper may weigh him down. "Strong men shall bow themselves", "The almond tree shall flourish, and the grasshopper shall be a burden". Even, I am bound to confess, and I dare say I should have a good many who would join me in the confession—I am bound to confess that there are some things I used to do very very easily, and scarcely knew I was doing them. It was not a job. They used to tell me I had the job of ten men. I did not think so. Sometimes when I look back on those days, I have to say, "I could not do it now." I used to travel fifty thousand miles a year, be pastor of a church, edit THE GOSPEL WITNESS, preside over a Seminary, serve as president of the Bible Union of North America, and many other things. It came easily then. It was not hard. But there comes a time when the strong men bow themselves, and the grasshopper becomes a burden.

There is a good deal of the "old man" in you. Do

you know that? The Bible speaks of the "old man", and the "new man". Have you any idea how old that bit of the old man in you is? I will tell you. The old man in you is just as old as Adam; and that old man in you makes Methuselah seem but as an infant of days. When the "old man" asserts himself in any one of us, everything becomes a labour, and every burden becomes heavy. Hold that in your mind for a moment. I shall return to it.

I think what the Lord Jesus is speaking of is the sum total of human effort which is involved in the great task of living, just living, just getting through the day, and the week, and the month, and the year. Sometimes you are half inclined to say, "Well it is just hardly worth while". But I am sure of this, that there is not one here this evening, even the youngest, who cannot claim this letter from the Post Office as directed to yourself! It is directed to those who "labour and are heavy laden".

II.

WHAT DOES HE SAY? "Come unto me." That is very simple; but that is the message of the gospel always, everywhere. "Come unto me." I read the discussions, as you do, of the possible, or impossible, solutions of the problems of the day. "This is a job for the Educators—this for the Economists—this for the Church." What is the Church? "The Church must do something"; "The Church" must somehow or another take the pain, and the fatigue, and the weariness out of labour, and the weight out of the loads that press. "The Church" can do nothing of the kind. The Church never did; the Church never will. The Church was never commissioned so to do. The Church, if it be the Church of the New Testament, is made up of believers in Christ. I care nothing for these ecclesiastical organizations that are made of anything, and everything—ecclesiastical machines, composed of dead elements wired together, organizations with no life in them. I care nothing for them. They never will do anything. But "the Church of the first-born", the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ—even we, if we believe on Him, and have been born again, even we were never commissioned to relieve the labourer of his fatigue, or the burden-bearer of his heaviness. We were never told to do that: we were commissioned to direct them to the only One Who can do it. It is not, "Come to the Church". That has its place. It is, "Come unto me"; and He Who said that, Who later died on the cross, and was buried, and rose again, and ascended into heaven, still lives, and He still says the same thing, "Come unto me", not to the Church, not to ordinances, not to creeds. They all have their place, but these intermediaries are of value only as through them we come to a living Christ. Nobody else can teach us how to work in such a way that our work will not be labour, how to carry the loads of life so that they will be light. Only the Lord Jesus can do that. That is a truism; that is a simple commonplace, yet it is one thing that needs tremendous emphasis in these days.

You remember how Jesus, when He was but a Youth, was lost by Mary and Joseph in the temple. The living Christ has been lost in the church, until to-day men are exhorted to turn to nearly everything but to the Person of the living Saviour. But still the invitation stands: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light."

Did you ever hear a man say of a certain piece of work, "Well, rather than do that I will dig"—as though anyone could dig. Try it, and you will soon find out. Talk with men who are accustomed to lifting things, whether a piano mover, or a coal heaver, or anyone else. The man who is accustomed to lifting things will say, if you try to help him, "No; no; you leave it alone." Why? He knows how. He has learned how to put his shoulder to a load and lift it without breaking his back. The well-intentioned person who would try to help him would probably crush him.

There never has been any other than the Lord Jesus Who has fully known the meaning of life, and how to live life in right relationship to God, to men and women about him, and to the world of nature: how to fit in to the divine economy; how to live as a man ought to live. No one has ever known that but the Lord Jesus: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden." "Take my yoke upon you, and I will tell you how to fulfil life's day without weariness of spirit. I will tell you how to get under the burdens of life, and carry them manfully. My yoke is easy, and my burden is light." There is something to be learned, I grant you. There is an art of living, and only One can teach us, and that One is the Lord Jesus Himself: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden."

Have you come to Him? Does someone say, "I am not interested in the church." I am not concerned about that; or, "I am not interested in religion". I am not concerned about that. I do not wonder that people turn from the church, and from religion when there are so many counterfeits actually using the name of Christ, who are yet leagues removed from Him. My question is, "Have you come to Him? Have you really "tried out" Jesus Christ? Have you really tested Him as a Saviour? Have you ever given Jesus Christ an opportunity to show what He can do in your life?"

III.

Then what? Then YOU HAVE THIS PROMISE, "I will give you rest".

If I were to ask you to define that word "rest" do you think you could do it? "Rest"! I doubt whether you could. You go to a summer cottage for a rest—and you come home more tired than when you went. You engage in other things, and then you need to take a second vacation to recover from the first. Do you know what it is to go to bed at night, and get up more tired in the morning than when you went to bed? A man says, "The moment I put my head on my pillow I am asleep. I know nothing till morning." When you count your blessings, do not forget to number that one, and name it, that God still gives you sleep. It is a great boon to be able to sleep.

Are you sure you are rested when you get up? You go to your work, and perhaps by about nine o'clock if you are a foreman, or a superintendent, some of the workers are saying, "Did he get out of the wrong side of the bed this morning? What is the matter with him?" Crabbed! You say you had a good night's rest. You wakened up fresh and ready for the day's work. What is the matter? "I don't know." No; it takes more than a comfortable bed to give a man a night's rest. I saw an advertisement once with which I deeply sympathized. It said; "What is the use of a million dollars if your feet hurt?" I have never been much troubled with that sort of thing. But I have known people who have been. You may have the best fitting shoes that ever were

fitted, and the most comfortable bed possible, and altogether the most congenial surroundings imaginable; and yet—and yet, you have not rest. Yes; there is something more than the physical.

A lawyer said to me once, "I used to take my work home with me. I used to take my law books home, and ponder my cases at night. But I found it did not pay, so I left them all in the office, and when I closed my office I left my profession behind me, and went home." He thought he did, but in reality he did not. That same man, one time when I was proposing the appointment of someone to a certain task, said, "Well, gentlemen, what I want to know is, who is going to live with this job?" I said, "What do you mean, Doctor?" He said, "Who is going to carry the job home with him, and live with it?" "Is that necessary?" "Yes; it is necessary to success"—he had forgotten what he had told me formerly. I knew he did not leave office matters in the office. I have tried it. The best sermons I have ever preached, I have preached at night when I could not sleep. If I could only have got at you then, I could really have preached to you. But unfortunately you were fast asleep, while I was wide awake.

My dear friends, there are mothers and fathers here, business men, people of all walks of life, and you know better than I can tell you, that you cannot throw things off. You carry them with you, and they stay with you.

Have I said enough to suggest to you that there is something that enters into human life, which does destroy our rest, and which no physical comfort, no amount of money, no circumstantial ease, can possibly alleviate? There is no rest, after all, real rest, I mean.

But, broadly, how do we enter into rest? The Bible says, "He that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his". The burden is laid down; the work is done.

What work? The labour of paying the debt we owe, the full debt incurred by our sin; and the labour thereafter of trying to keep out of debt, and live as we ought to live; in short, the labour of learning to live, and to live so that at last we can stand without fault before the throne of God.

Are you still thus labouring? If you are, you are bound to be tired folk. What is the truth? This One Who bids us come to Him tells us, "I have already fulfilled your life's day; I have done your full duty; I have fulfilled the law for you; I have paid all your debt. All the work that you are labouring at, if you only knew it, is already finished."

Let me have the ear of you women. Do you like wash day? Is it a holiday, an especially enjoyable experience? Do you enjoy washing dishes? Do you enjoy running the vacuum, sweeping, and dusting, downstairs, upstairs, everywhere? Not a bit of it. Would it not be fine if some day when you go home, saying to yourself, "There is all that washing down in the cellar, and all those dishes in the kitchen that had to be left. There is all that dusting and cleaning. I do not know how ever I can get it done," if when you go in and, looking around, you were constrained to say, "Why, who has been around here? The place is all swept and dusted." You go into the kitchen, and find everything in perfect order, every dish is washed and in its place. Everything is bright, and shining. You say, "I have yet to go down to that washing." But some angel has been there ahead of you, too. The washing is done, and everything is put away. Then somehow or other, as Andy says, you

"unlax". Why? "It is all finished!" Would not that be a restful experience? "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Do you not see that is why we must come to Him, to the Person of Jesus Christ. The cleansing is done: The blood of Jesus Christ (God's) Son, cleanseth us from all sin.

I had a friend once, some of you knew him. He was my neighbour for some years, then he was my associate for a number of years, and right to the end of life, my very dear and intimate friend. I refer to Rev. C. M. Carew. We used to get together as often as we could. Sometimes we talked about the uncommon and the abstruse, and had a delightful time. Sometimes we talked about the commonplace, and the simple. But it did not make any difference what we talked about, there was something about that man's personality that fitted in to my own. He was kind enough to say there was something about mine that fitted into his. When we got together we had a lovely time. After an hour or two with Mr. Carew, I used to feel as though I had had a most refreshing vacation. Ask me to explain it. I cannot. I do not know why.

There is in this place One greater than the temple; there is a matchless Personality, Who knows what you need, and what I need; and all who come to Him find they are at home, not only with Jesus Christ, but at home in Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is the only Home of the soul; and we shall never have perfect rest until we come to Him, and coming to Him, somehow or another, I cannot explain it, you will have to experience it, He, so to speak, wraps His Personality about us. He touches us where we are weak, and makes us strong. He soothes us where we are sore. He calms us when the mind is troubled. He ministers peace to us in the hours of our foreboding. When we come to Him, and yield ourselves to Him we find the fulfilment of this promise: "I will give you rest". By and by we shall be "absent from the body, and present with the Lord". And that word present means simply to be at home!

I said I would speak to you of the most beautiful word in any language. What is it? Love! Rest! Home! Yes. They are all beautiful words, but the greatest of these is "rest", because it includes all the others.

Loved as only Christ can love us! At home with Him as we can be at home with none other, we enter into rest.

This is my testimony, if you will let me give it:

I heard the voice of Jesus say,
"Come unto Me, and rest:
Lay down, thou weary one, lay down
Thy head upon My breast."
I came to Jesus as I was—
Weary, and worn, and sad:
I found in Him a resting-place,
And He has made me glad.

I heard the voice of Jesus say,
"Behold, I freely give
The living water—thirsty one,
Stoop down, and drink, and live."
I came to Jesus, and I drank
Of that life-giving stream;
My thirst was quenched, my soul revived,
And now I live in Him.

I heard the voice of Jesus say,
"I am this dark world's Light;
Look unto Me, thy morn shall rise,
And all thy day be bright."

I looked to Jesus, and I found
In Him my Star, my Sun;
And in that light of life I'll walk,
Till travelling days are done.

Amen.

Let us pray:

Lord, we thank Thee for this truth, for this love which passeth knowledge, for this truth which cannot be described or defined, or even imagined, but which can be blessedly experienced. O Lord, lead us all into the reality of it.

Bless us with that salvation which is only to be found in Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen.

DREW GIVES MILLIONS MORE TO R.C. SCHOOLS

PRIME MINISTER GEORGE DREW of Ontario estimates, according to *The Globe and Mail*, that provincial grants to school boards this year will approximate 32 million dollars. "This year," he said, "the grants will be somewhere in the neighbourhood of four times the grants paid in the last year before we attempted to tackle the problem." In the fiscal year before his government came into power, the total amount of all grants for education from the province to local authorities was \$8,315,000, whereas last year it was \$28,775,000.

Local school boards doubtless welcomed the relief which these increased grants afforded them, and we have no word of criticism on this score, though we do think they ought to remember that increased grants inevitably mean increased control and in the end, if provincial grants continue to increase and local rates to decrease to the disappearing point, the same ratio must hold between provincial control and local control. As the Province pays more, it will acquire more control as the local boards continually surrender their authority to it. It also follows, just as sure as two and two make four, that what is saved in local school rates must be paid in taxes to the provincial government.

Our objection in this matter is that these provincial grants are made alike to both Separate Roman Catholic Schools and to Public Schools. That means that public money which is received from all taxpayers, irrespective of religion and on a purely secular basis, is converted to purely religious ends of the Roman Catholic Church. The Prime Minister remarked, as the above reports says, that "his government has gone far beyond its pledge to pay 50 per cent of the cost of education, in that it extended the payment to include the expenditures on new school construction."

We ask our readers to consider the significance of that last statement. Figures of Ontario finances are not available until long after they have lost the greater part of their present interest, but if our readers wish to visualize the meaning of the above statement, let them think of all the Roman Catholic schools they have noticed under construction, or reported as being under construction, of late years. Then, with the inflated costs of building in mind, let them recall that Protestant Ontario (77.4 per cent non-Romanist) has been compelled by Mr. Drew to pay fifty per cent, and perhaps more, of the cost of these

**HAVE YOU ANSWERED THE EDITOR'S
ANNUAL LETTER YET?**

edifices built for the sole purpose of putting little children under the surveillance of nuns and priests in order to make them obedient subjects of the pope of Rome.

Our Ontario Schools, both the Public Schools and the Roman Catholic Separate Schools, derive their support from the public purse through two channels: First, from the taxes paid to the local school boards by the rate-payers. Second, from the grants made by the provincial government, which in turn comes from taxes levied on all citizens irrespective of their religious affiliations. We hold it an injustice that a particular denomination should be singled out for the very great special privilege of being allowed to use state machinery for the collection of money for its sectarian institutions. That high privilege pays millions of dollars to the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in Ontario. Unjust as it is, it may at least be said that this source of revenue for Roman Catholic schools comes from Roman Catholics who are given the option of diverting their taxes to the support of Roman Catholic schools. But the same cannot be said of the second source of revenue tapped by Roman Catholic Schools. This money actually comes for the greater part from Protestant purses; none of it is collected for religious purposes nor from Roman Catholics as such. It is in fact made up of contributions from citizens of this province for the support of a government that is neither Protestant nor Roman Catholic, and it is not paid with the intent of supporting any religion. Yet this general tax money is turned over to a particular sect for the propagation of its peculiar doctrines and system. And the matter is further complicated by the fact that the amount to be turned over to the Roman Catholic Schools is determined almost exclusively by considerations of political expediency. Public tax monies are used by venal politicians as a bribe for the Roman Hierarchy to instruct the "faithful" to vote for the party that is willing to make most liberal terms with the priests. While Mr. Drew appears to be giving relief to hard-pressed local schoolboards—against which nothing can be said—yet actually he is also increasing by millions the forced contribution of Ontario citizens to the coffers of the Roman Church.—W.S.W.

FRENCH GOSPEL SERVICE

THE usual monthly Gospel Service in the French language will be held next Sunday, February 29, in Greenway Hall of Jarvis Street Church, at three o'clock in the afternoon. Entrance is from the centre door on Gerrard Street. A cordial welcome is extended to French-speaking persons and to all interested in the French language.

McMASTER BALLROOM CROWD

WE have continued to point out how far the Baptist university established by the generosity of Senator McMaster "has got out of hand", as a certain prominent Baptist recently said, one evidence of which is the constant, if not complete, drift to worldliness. If we needed more proof, we have it in the invitation sent the Toronto alumni to attend a dance at a certain well-known ballroom on March 5th at three dollars a couple:

"Already the idea of having this dance has been enthusiastically received. We shall expect an enormous crowd of the younger people in our alumni group. Your Executive is working hard to make this a memorable evening."—B.

R.C. PRELATE ASSAILS PROTESTANT MANIFESTO

ARCHBISHOP McNICHOLAS of Cincinnati, spokesman for the key Catholic Action organization in the United States known as the National Catholic Welfare Conference, is reported to have attacked in bitter language a statement on the separation of church and state recently issued by a group of Protestant ministers. Here is a sample of the virulent words hurled by this papal mouthpiece at the Protestant ministers:

"Only God can judge the motives of the framers and the signers of the manifesto," he continued, "but whatever be their intent, they have issued a document, not as crude as those issued by know-nothing-ism or A.P.A.-ism or Ku-Kluxism, but certainly one bound to arouse intolerance, suspicion, hatred and conflict between religious groups."

"National Self-Interest"

Taking one-by-one the points raised by the manifesto, Archbishop McNicholas denied "absolutely and without any qualification" that the Roman Catholic Church seeks a union of church and state or is trying to obtain "special advantages or privileges within the government."

As for the appointment of Myron Taylor as special ambassador to the Vatican, the archbishop said Roman Catholics never have considered the mission a religious one, but rather, as established by the late President Roosevelt, a policy of "enlightened national self-interest." Taylor is a Protestant.

"If the presidential mission has become a religious issue in this country," the archbishop said, "it has been made so not by Roman Catholics."

In striking contrast to the statement in the last paragraph quoted above, is the oft-repeated assertion of Canadian Roman Catholics that this country ought to have a representative at the Vatican because it is forty-three per cent. Roman Catholic. In this country, the Romish Hierarchy regards the papal embassy as an almost purely religious question, in the United States the Romish Hierarchy denies that the same matter is a religious issue. If one of the two Hierarchies is right, then the other one is guilty of deceit. Which alternative to accept, we leave to our readers.

And what shall we think of the accuracy of the Archbishop's denial, "absolutely and without qualification . . . (that) . . . the Roman Catholic Church seeks a union of church and state or is trying to obtain 'special advantages and privileges' within the government." For the refreshment of the Archbishop's memory we quote the following texts of papal encyclicals, which he and every other Roman Catholic is bound to acknowledge as infallibly authoritative:

Complete Submission to the Pope as to God

In the Encyclical entitled, *On the Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens*, dated January 10, 1890, Pope Leo XIII said:

But the Supreme teacher in the Church is the Roman Pontiff. Union of minds, therefore, requires, together with a perfect accord in the one faith, complete submission and obedience of will to the Church and to the Roman Pontiff as to God Himself. This obedience, however, should be perfect, and cannot be given in shreds,—

HAVE YOU ANSWERED THE EDITOR'S ANNUAL LETTER YET?

nay, were it not absolute and perfect in every particular, it might wear the name of obedience, but its essence would disappear.

One of the earlier popes, Gregory VII, wrote in 1081 to the Bishop of Metz, the following exposition of the papal view of the relation of Church and State:

Should not an authority founded by laymen—even by those who do not know God,—be subject to that authority which the providence of God Almighty has for His own honour established and in His mercy given to the world? . . . Who can doubt but that the priests of Christ are to be considered the fathers and masters of kings and princes and of all the faithful? Is it not clearly pitiful madness for a son to attempt to subject to himself his father, a pupil his master; and for one to bring into his power and bind with iniquitous bonds him by whom he believes that he himself can be bound and loosed not only on earth but also in Heaven?

The last statement exhibits the close and necessary connection which exists between the admission of the religious claims of the popes and their assumption of political power. The nation or the individual who bows the neck to the priests' sacerdotal pretences of forgiving sins and opening the gates of heaven, will by the logic of circumstances be soon enmeshed in their political schemes and so become their puppet to dance the tune they may choose to call.

Pope Innocent III, who was not as innocent as his name might suggest, wrote as follows of the Empire and the Papacy, under the figure of the relationships of the sun and the moon. He said:

These dignities are the pontifical power and the royal power. Furthermore, the moon derives her light from the sun, and is in truth inferior to the sun in both size and quality, in position as well as effect. In the same way the royal power derives its dignity from the pontifical power.

The Temporal Authority Subject to Rome

The Bull *Unam Sanctam* of Pope Boniface VIII is still recognized as an integral part of Roman Catholic doctrine in our day. The following is what this papal statement has to say on Church and State and their relations:

And we learn from the words of the Gospel that in this Church and in her power are two swords, the spiritual and the temporal. For when the apostles said, "Behold, here" (that is, in the Church, since it was the apostles who spoke) "are two swords"—the Lord did not reply, "It is too much," but "It is enough." Truly he who denies that the temporal sword is in the power of Peter, misunderstands the words of the Lord, "Put up thy sword into the sheath." Both are in the power of the Church, the spiritual sword and the material. But the latter is to be used for the Church, the former by her; the former by the priest, the latter by kings and captains but at the will and by the permission of the priest. The one sword, then, should be under the other, and temporal authority subject to spiritual. For when the apostle says "there is no power but of God, and the powers that be are ordained of God" they would not be so ordained were not one sword made subject to the other

Are we to suppose that the Archbishop of Cincinnati is not acquainted with the above papal pronouncements, or are we to suppose that he wishes us to believe that he is a "liberal" who has thrown off the yoke of his foreign master? We cannot accept either of these two alternatives. We are compelled to think that the spokesman for the Roman Hierarchy in the United States has not been frank and candid in his sweeping denial. He hopes to escape criticism as a priest, trusting that Protestants will charitably assume that a clergyman never deliberately makes false statements. And he is well aware that

few Protestants are sufficiently instructed in the history of his church to have the historical documents at their finger tips to confute his specious arguments and empty assertions. It is for that reason that we have quoted the above texts from Roman Catholic sources, in order to show the utter perversion of the truth of which the Archbishop of Cincinnati is guilty.

And if concrete illustrations of these principles are needed in their actual out-workings, we refer to the story reported in these columns only a few months since, of how in the very archdiocese of Mgr. McNicholas, a thoroughly organized attempt was made to seize a public school and convert it into a Roman Catholic school. The case aroused nation-wide interest. This prelate who made these statements must think that the public memory is indeed short and the common level of intelligence very low.—W.S.W.

THE MILLENNIUM

"O, blessed Saviour, what strange variety of conceits do I find concerning Thy thousand years' reign! What riddles there are in that prophecy which no human tongue can read! Where to fix the beginning of that marvellous millenary, and where the end, and what manner of reign it shall be—whether temporal or spiritual, on earth or in heaven—undergoes as many constructions as there are pens that have undertaken it; and yet when all is done, I see Thine apostle speaks only of the souls of the martyrs reigning so long with Thee, not of Thy reigning so long on earth with those martyrs. How busy are the tongues of men—how are their brains taken up with the indeterminable construction of this enigmatical truth, when in the meantime the care of Thy spiritual reign in their hearts is neglected! O my Saviour, while others weary themselves with the disquisition of Thy personal reign here on earth for a thousand years, let it be the whole bent and study of my soul to make sure of my personal reign with Thee in heaven to all eternity."

—Bishop Hall (1574-1656).

Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 12 First Quarter Lesson 10 March 7, 1948

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

NAAMAN THE SYRIAN

Lesson Text: 2 Kings 5:1-14.

Golden Text: "Who forgiveth all thine iniquities, who healeth all thy diseases."—Psalm 103:3.

Supplementary Reading: Matt. 10:1; Mk. 3:14, 15; 16:18; Acts 3:7; 5:16; 9:34; 14:10; 16:18; 19:12; 28:8; 1 Cor. 12:9; Phil. 4:6, 7; 1 Tim. 5:23; 2 Tim. 4:20.

I. Naaman and the Captive Maid: verses 1-7.

Naaman, the victorious Syrian general, had been instrumental in bringing deliverance to his people from their enemies. He was rich, famous, and courageous, but he was a leper. Unless God should intervene, he would be doomed to a life of isolation, shame and misery, and destined to die a cruel, creeping death. Sin brings woe and death to all—high and low, rich and poor, great and lowly (Rom. 3:21-23).

God had already made provision to meet the need of Naaman. In the home of Naaman was an Israelite maid, taken captive by

HAVE YOU ANSWERED THE EDITOR'S ANNUAL LETTER YET?

the Syrians in one of their raids into the neighbouring land of Palestine (1 Sam. 30:1; 2 Kings 13:20; 24:2). God loved us ere we sinned, and He planned redemption for us from all eternity (Rom. 5:8; 2 Tim. 1:9, 10; 1 Pet. 1:18-20; Rev. 13:8).

The name of the little maid is not recorded, but her worth may be judged by the fact that she was chosen to wait on Naaman's wife. She did not rebel against the adverse circumstances of her life (Rom. 8:28, 37), nor was she influenced by her heathen surroundings, or silenced by the formalities of court life (Dan. 1:8). She was not ashamed to confess her relationship to God (Matt. 10:32; Lk. 9:26; Rom. 1:16), or her connection with the prophet (2 Tim. 1:16-18). The maiden remained true to the Lord Whom she had been taught at home to love, revere and obey. She loved her captors, and became concerned for them; their need she took to heart, till it became a burden. Then, she did what she could (Mk. 14:8). If only we should desire more fervently to be of service to others, the opportunities would soon appear.

The maiden bore testimony to the mighty power of God to save (Mk. 5:19; Lk. 24:46-48; John 15:26, 27; Acts 1:8). Her simple witness brought hope to those in despair. Multitudes who now live in the darkness of death would welcome the message of light and life which every Christian has the privilege of proclaiming (Isa. 52:7; Matt. 28:18-20). Her words had a profound effect, influencing the mighty captain, the king of Israel and the prophet Elisha (1 Cor. 1:27-31).

The king of Syria took matters into his own hand, and he scorned to follow the directions of the captive maid. He followed the customs of diplomacy, sending presents to the king of Israel to win his favour. But there is only one way of salvation (John 14:6; Acts 4:12). The king of Israel, too, misunderstood the message and the manner of its delivery. He viewed the situation with alarm and dismay, fearing that his failure to respond to the demand that he cure Naaman would incur the anger of the Syrian king. But, notwithstanding all difficulties, the Spirit of the Lord brought about the desired meeting between Naaman and Elisha.

II. Naaman and the Great Prophet: verses 8-14.

The prophet Elisha was not afraid to rebuke the king for his folly (Prov. 22:29), and in doing so he magnified his office as the representative of the Lord. He had faith that God would work a miracle for His glory.

Naaman the Syrian was tested as to his sincerity; only those who seek the Lord with their whole heart shall find Him (Psa. 27:8; 40:16; 119:2; Jer. 29:13). They must be willing to humble themselves and become as little children (Matt. 18:3, 4). Not

only was the great captain instructed to go personally to the home of the prophet, but he must also submit to the humiliation of doing his business through a messenger. No attention was paid to his imposing retinue. He, the noted Syrian officer, was to go and wash seven times in the Jordan River.

But Naaman had his own ideas as to how he wished to be saved. He had planned a spectacular scene with himself as the centre of attraction, but not the object of ridicule, as he would surely be, if he should go down to the river in the sight of all. Moreover, if he must wash in a river, were not the rivers in his own country superior to those in Israel? Many to-day are tempted by the Adversary to find fault with God's revealed plan of salvation. If we are to be saved at all, we must be saved in God's own way and time. He is Lord, as well as Saviour.

Naaman's servants saved the situation by their common sense. They took his attention away from the details of the method, and directed his mind to the fact of salvation. To be healed would be a blessing for which he should be willing to endure all hardships (Matt. 16:26).

Naaman went down—literally and metaphorically; he was willing to stoop down and obey the word of the Lord through the prophet (Matt. 16:24, 25; Lk. 14:11). He washed seven times in the Jordan (John 9:7), the washing being symbolic of the washing of regeneration, whereby sins are washed away (Psa. 51:7; Acts 22:16; Tit. 3:5). The ravages of sin were counteracted; he was cleansed and healed (Mk. 1:40-42; Lk. 17:12-14). His healing illustrates the salvation of a soul from death. It was a miracle performed by the power of God (Eph. 2:8-10), through the instrumentality of His servant who had proclaimed the word (1 Cor. 1:21-24), and on condition of faith and obedience on the part of Naaman (Mk. 1:15; Rom. 10:9, 10; 1 Pet. 1:22, 23). By grace he was completely renewed and restored.

DAILY BIBLE READINGS

- March 1—Jesus Healed the Leprous Matt. 8:1-4.
- March 2—Jesus Healed the Palsied Matt. 8:5-13.
- March 3—Jesus Healed the Blind Matt. 9:27-31.
- March 4—Jesus Healed the Demonized Matt. 8:28-34.
- March 5—Jesus Healed the Paralytic Matt. 12:9-14.
- March 6—Jesus Healed the Blood Stream Matt. 9:18-26.
- March 7—Jesus Healed All Diseases Matt. 9:35-38; 15:29-31.

SUGGESTED HYMNS

The whole world was lost. A ruler once came. What can wash away my stain? Come, every soul. I hear the Saviour say. Out of my bondage.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS
130 Gerrard Street East,
Toronto 2, Ontario, Canada.

ORDER FORM

\$2.00 per year

Enclosed find \$_____ to be applied as follows:—

- Renew or Extend my present Subscription to THE GOSPEL WITNESS.
- I should like to SUBSCRIBE to THE GOSPEL WITNESS.
- To the support of Toronto Baptist Seminary.
- To French Evangelization Work.
- Renew my Membership in the Canadian Protestant League (\$1.00 per year).

NAME _____

STREET _____

CITY OR TOWN _____ PROVINCE _____

The following books are offered as premiums to subscribers to THE GOSPEL WITNESS. Check the one you wish to receive:

- 1. *The Priest, The Woman, and The Confessional*, by Father Chiniquy.
- 2. *The Greatest Fight in the World*, by Rev. Chas. H. Spurgeon.
- 3. *Russellism, or Rutherfordism (Jehovah's Witnesses)*, by Dr. T. T. Shields.