

# The Gospel Witness and Protestant Advocate

Authorized as Second Class Mail, Post Office Department, Ottawa.

Vol. 26, No. 46

130 Gerrard Street East, TORONTO, MARCH 11, 1948

Whole Number 1347

## GOWIT AND SEM

**I**N THESE days of high and ever-rising prices we have great sympathy with the parents of large families. Even before they get into their 'teens, children often develop voracious appetites; and in the middle and late 'teens what tremendous supplies they need to maintain their growth! What a cheery sight it is to see healthy and hungry children enjoying their meals! Who but a wretched long-faced misanthrope would desire to limit their capacities of consumption? Certainly not their parents. Yet in these days parents of large families must have many an anxious hour considering how and where they are to find means of supplying these hungry mouths.

This writer has a fellow-feeling for all such parents; for while we cannot boast of a Quebec family, and are not eligible for any kind of "baby bonus", we have two growing children who have tremendous appetites.

### About GOWIT

The elder of the two is GOWIT. He is by no means a babe—in fact he is quite grown-up; but still he abides under the parental roof. He is a lusty lad of tireless industry and determined will. He has a heavy job, but we think he does it well. His name affords some index both of his character and his vocation. He is always *going*. He goes everywhere, and all the time. He goes to church; he goes to Parliament. Occasionally he goes to nine legislatures. He even knocks at the Cardinal's door and does not pass by the Bishop. He often visits the priests, and as for preachers, he seems to have a special affinity for them, for he has vast numbers on his calling list. GOWIT goes to hospitals, too. He calls quietly at the homes of the sick, the aged, and the infirm. He calls upon college presidents and professors; and he is particularly fond of visiting the country, and hosts of farm houses almost buried in snow in the winter time welcome GOWIT'S call at the mailbox. Time and space would fail us to give full details of his peregrinations.

### GOWIT Has His Wits About Him

GOWIT must always have his wits about him. He can never afford to be dull or stupid. While he has hosts of friends, they are most exacting, and would regard a mistake by GOWIT as inexcusable. He must be accurate in everything; and because of this very quality of accuracy, GOWIT is often called as a witness—that is part

of his name. He is quoted in newspapers and magazines. He is both discussed and cussed in Parliament. In religious circles his testimony is often invoked, and even in political matters GOWIT is regarded as a thoroughly reliable witness.

Notwithstanding his arduous labours, GOWIT is a voluntary worker. He gets no salary. He counts himself fortunate if his friends assist him in paying all his bills. We do not know how we could do it, but it would be interesting to discover how many hundreds of thousands of yards of paper it takes to make up a weekly coat.

GOWIT is especially on the *qui vive* just now because he knows that we have written to all the people upon whom he calls weekly, virtually asking their opinion of his visit, and whether they would like to express their appreciation with a gift. Every day he inquires what the mail man has brought; whether the letters say any kind things, or contain something kinder than words. We have told him of some of the kind things that have been said about him, and he has said to us,

"You write and tell them, Pop, that I hope they appreciate me enough to send something to keep me going."

We gladly pass on GOWIT'S suggestion.

### GOWIT'S Brother SEM

GOWIT has a hungry brother named SEM. This hungry brother is worthy of the family to which he belongs. He has rather a scholastic air about him. He generally has an armful of books. He is a devout lad. Like his brother, he loves the Lord and His word, and loves them both so deeply that he not only never questions their absolute truthfulness, but is specially engaged in study, with a view to supporting their claims upon heart, and conscience, and intellect.

While SEM does not go quite so far afield, he travels almost as much as GOWIT. But he suffers this disadvantage, that while GOWIT gets a cheap ride in the mail wagon, SEM has to pay his fare.

They both teach the same thing, but GOWIT delivers his message in print, and SEM by word of mouth. SEM is quite as popular as his brother. He is really in great demand; and wherever he goes once, they want him back again. SEM in many cases delivers his message in French, but GOWIT, out of pity for his readers, translates the French into English.

### Victims of Rising Prices

Both these boys have this in common, that they are the victims of rising prices, and also that they have to meet them, and cannot pass on the increase to anyone else. SEM is growing in stature and influence, and it will be found roundabout May that he has attained to new degrees of honour.

No family was ever prouder of two sons, or brothers, than is the Jarvis Family. GOWIT and SEM are not the only children. They have others who are missionaries, and still others who are preparing to join SEM in the more serious study of the Word, by and by.

### A Pertinent Question

Someone will ask, "Why have not these two sons set up housekeeping for themselves?" That is a very pertinent question. But who has not heard of the housing shortage? GOWIT ought to have his own house, a complete establishment, in which to do his work. So ought SEM. SEM has a sleeping place, it is true; but GOWIT has nowhere to lay his head, except at home. The Jarvis Family live in a large house; and they need every foot of space in it for the family's activities. Such a big house costs a lot to keep up. It takes four janitors to keep the place clean and in order. It takes thousands of gallons of oil to keep the place warm. The Jarvis electric light bill is a considerable item. It takes a lot of money to keep GOWIT at his job week by week, and SEM has a number of tutors who have to be paid. The Jarvis house is a little different from some. There are not many private houses that must keep an office staff of ten or twelve constantly busy.

### "Pop" and "Mom"

Well, that is only an outline picture of the Jarvis household. "Pop" and "Mom" never ask anything for themselves. They have been rather independent. The house they live in is now all paid for; but inasmuch as GOWIT and SEM spend their lives serving other people, rather than their own family, they feel it is only proper that the many friends of these splendid boys should contribute to their support. The whole family always looks forward anxiously to the thirty-first of March, for that is when all the family accounts are made up and balanced.

One cannot pick up a newspaper without reading about the Reds somewhere; and we do not welcome them anywhere. But we do not want any Reds in our books when the thirty-first of March comes.

While "Pop" and "Mom" never ask anything for General Expense, outside the family circle, if friends were to take it into their heads, or their hearts, to send them something, we do not believe they would be too proud to accept it. But whether or no, their chief concern is for GOWIT and SEM. These boys are looking for the postman every day. If you have not sent them a letter yet, see that you send a good fat one as soon as you can, to each of them, and not later than March thirty-first. We assure you that GOWIT and SEM are two very hungry boys, and as worthy as they are hungry.

### THE EDITOR'S CORRESPONDENCE

THE Editor has been indisposed for a couple of weeks. This will explain why much correspondence remains unanswered. Most of it is acknowledged, and will be answered as soon as the Editor can get back to his desk.

## 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

### RED AND BLACK

WE DO not like red as a political colour, whether it be called, as it is called only, "Liberal", "Liberal-Progressive", or "Communist". We have some sympathy with the Oxford costermonger, who, during an election time, led a donkey by the head, through the streets of Oxford. The donkey was attached to a cart, both donkey and cart being gaily decorated with the Liberal colours. Someone stopped the costermonger with his donkey and cart, saying, "Why, Jack, I am surprised! I did not know you were a Liberal!" He said, "I am not", but, pointing to his donkey, he said, "He is"! At the same time turning back one side of his coat he revealed a rosette in the Conservative colours.

We are not speaking against Liberalism, or Conservatism as political philosophies. We rather like the term Liberal-Conservative, meaning Liberal in the truest sense of that great word, and Conservative in the sense of being determined, having proved all things, to hold fast that which is good.

For the Red of Communism we have no liking at all. We have said it a hundred times, but we must keep on saying it, lest we be called a Red: for it has become popular to tack the name "Communist" upon all opponents, and to charge every one who pleads for fair play, with being a Red. No words could be found in any dictionary too strong to describe our abhorrence of Communist ideology. We hate it with perfect hatred.

Communism in Europe particularly is giving such evidence of its aggressive spirit, that all the world is alarmed. We are not. We do not believe that Communism can ever generally prevail, although it may increasingly prove a great nuisance. In every country where it holds sway, outside of Russia, it is in the minority, and we may believe that there is an influential and active majority Fifth Column always at work opposing it. We should be more afraid of Russia if she moved less swiftly.

We remember a man who, in boom time, thought he

was a shrewd real estate dealer. He bought and sold property on the same day, always making a profit; and, putting together his profits, he bought two or three other properties. This he continued until he became what was called "land poor". He had an equity in an enormous number of properties, but he owned nothing outright. His equity was, if we may so say, a minority: that is, in many cases it was much less than fifty percent of the property's value. Then came the depression, and with it the time when instalments had to be paid, and covenants kept; and when failure to do so meant forfeiture of the property, because of his minority holdings, he lost everything.

When Mussolini began his rape of Ethiopia we preached a sermon on the text: "Who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead?" in which we ventured to say that Italy, in general, and Mussolini in particular, were embarking upon a career of self-destruction. We were careful to specify no time when the modern Ahab should "fall at Ramoth-gilead", but only that he would fall.

A friend in England wrote us saying it was dangerous to prophesy; to which we agreed; for we had merely expounded a principle, and showed how that principle always works out in the end. Our friend of shorter vision, as he saw Mussolini prosper, insisted that we were wrong. We believed we were right then. We are still more sure of it now. Mussolini's greed and ambition and pride were as surely his destruction as they were Ahab's.

The same will be true of Communism; and it may well be that the more widely it spreads itself, the more vulnerable it will become—which is not to say that we should not withstand it, and take every precaution to protect ourselves against it. We are still of the opinion that Russia is not the greatest menace to the world's peace. A certain American columnist has this to say about Communism, with all of which we entirely agree:

Czechoslovakia fell because she had entrusted the defense of the State to men subject to the control of another state. She was, therefore, entirely defenseless both internally and externally. The richest and greatest power on earth—the United States—would, were its government posts in similar hands, be equally defenseless.

The lesson to be learned from Czechoslovakia, as we should have learned long ago from Germany and others, is that democracy is a system which must be defended by power. It cannot protect itself by its own mere functioning. Popular government—based on the right of all the people, regardless of class, to participate through elected representatives, form parties, strike through them a balance of interests, and rule through political majorities while protecting the right of political minorities periodically to challenge the majority—cannot tolerate the entrance into government of totalitarian parties whether or not they are, at the same time, partisans of another state.

#### State Overthrew Itself

In the modern world the state only can be overthrown by the instruments of the state itself. Once enemies of the very concept of the state are in control of state instruments, the will of the people ceases utterly to function. The state alone has the power, the force, by which a revolution can be consummated, all opposition crushed, and every courageous mouth silenced. Let those stupid people who asked why the Germans did not "rebel" ask themselves now why the overwhelming non-Communist majority of the

Czech people do not rebel—and why they are rushing to join the Communist Party.

The force of the state must be at all times on the side of the people's freedom and be used ruthlessly against all totalitarian enemies; or, by using the political means of the democratic state, the totalitarians will enter it to turn its force against the people.

#### Totalitarian Vaticanism

We quote the above, not for its self-evident application to Communism. It needs no such application—it applies itself. We quote it for the sake of its applicability to totalitarian Vaticanism. Elsewhere we have quoted the decree of the Consistorial Congregation in Rome, issuing its commands to "the faithful" of all the countries in the world, ordering them how to vote. The representatives of that impudent state do exactly as the Communists have done: they worm their way into official positions. They secure control of communications, and defence, and finance, and all external affairs, and thus commandeering the forces of Government, use those forces for the enslavement of the people they are supposed to serve. That is precisely what is going on in Canada to-day. The Roman Catholic Church is an enemy Fifth Column everywhere.

#### THE BRIGHT LIGHT IN THE CLOUDS

THOSE of us who believe the Bible to be the inspired word of God, feel confident that our God is never taken by surprise. The Bible abounds with passages assuring us that all the movements of nations, and the actions of men, and even the thoughts they think in the night watches, are all known to God.

We are not expert in deciphering the details of the Divine programme for the future. We know that the race began its career in a Garden; that the Garden was spoiled by the slime of the serpent; and we know that there is not a page of human history which does not verify the story of Eden: "That old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world" is no myth; and never was his work more evident than to-day. Notwithstanding, the race reaches its consummation in a city which comes down from God out of heaven, from which all evil is forever banished; in which there shall be neither death, nor pain, nor tears, neither shall there be any night there.

Of the beginning of the creation it was said: "The evening and the morning were the first day." That has always been the divine order. God has always moved from night to morning; and He is so moving now. Whatever troubles may intervene, whatever perplexities may harass us, the present universal chaos is not greater than that which was reduced to order, and beauty, and light, and life by the divine Spirit in the beginning. And though India, and Asia in general, and Europe, and Palestine, and Britain, and the United States, and Canada, present problems which baffle the wisest statesmen, yet it must be true of all the world, even of Quebec, it shall come to pass that at evening time there shall be light.

I believe that every flower in a garden, which is tended by a wise gardener, could tell of some particular care that the gardener takes of it. He does for the dahlia what he does not for the sunflower; somewhat is wanted by the rose that is not required by the lily; and the geranium calls for an attention which is not given to the honey-suckle. Each flower wins from the gardener a special culture.—C. H. Spurgeon.

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

## IT IS SAID THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH ESCHEWS POLITICS

**T**HE Papacy is as a poor, innocent, and defenceless lamb, in the midst of a world of wolves! It has no politics! Its interests are not temporal, but spiritual! What nonsense! Every page of history for a thousand years exclaims, still more strongly, "What a lie"! The Vatican is a wolf in sheep's clothing. It is a political, governmental, system first, and a religious system only as a disguise.

Now the Vatican appears to be nervous at the advance of Communism. Perhaps it has reason to be. We do not want Communism to succeed anywhere but in Italy. But if it can succeed in stripping the sheep's clothes off the ferocious, papal wolf, we can only wish it success. Such Communism would not last very long at the longest. We frankly say we should like to see the Pope driven out of Italy, and the Vatican completely destroyed. Someone may say, "But is not that a terribly unchristian attitude toward anyone?" We do not think so. The Vatican, and practically all in official positions there, are dripping with the blood of millions, and from the Pope down, many of them ought to have been hanged, as the Nuremberg war-criminals were.

It remains to be seen how things will go in Italy. We call special attention to the last paragraph of the report printed below. The Consistorial Congregation includes among its members, Cardinal McGuigan, of Canada, and Cardinal Spellman, of New York, and we suppose all other cardinals beside. The decree commands all Catholics to support only such candidates as will serve the interests of the Church. They are to put the Church, and all other considerations, above the State; and this decree is said to be "valid for Catholics throughout the world, as well as in Italy".

That includes Canada. A company of foreigners in Italy, including one Canadian, issues an order telling all Canadian Catholics how to vote, and the one criterion is to make sure that their vote will count in the interests of the Church, no matter what happens to the State. Thus so far as their numbers will permit it, the issue of the election in Italy is determined before the people go to the polls. We only hope that a number of voters, sufficient to give the Vatican a thorough trouncing, will prove immune to the authority of the decree.

We remind our readers that this applies to Canada. The issue of the majority of our elections, Provincial and Dominion, is determined by the instructions given by the priests on the Sunday at mass, before Monday of election-day. Even *The Canadian Register* reports that, "Communist Shadow Darkens Vatican Threshold".

### VATICAN BARS CATHOLIC VOTE

Vatican City, March 3 (AP).—A decree from the Vatican's consistorial congregation was published today warning Roman Catholics the world over to vote for only those candidates who defend the rights of the Church.

The decree from what may be considered the most important administrative organization at the Vatican did not mention communism by name. But it definitely placed Vatican approval on the efforts of cardinals, bishops and other prelates who have been urging Catholics to vote against the Leftists when Italians choose their first republican parliament April 15.

The Communist press tonight bitterly assailed the decree, calling it the beginning of a clerical offensive to prevent the success of the Popular Front—an alliance of Communists, Left-Wing Socialists and other Leftist groups who are presenting a single list of candidates.

Vatican sources said the decree was valid for Catholics throughout the world, as well as in Italy.

Originally drafted in 1945, the decree was confirmed

March 31, 1947, and was published in the Rome press for the first time today.

The decree said that the sacred congregation, "considering the dangers to which religion and public good are exposed, whose gravity demands the united collaboration of the honest, warns all those who have the right to vote, in whatever condition, sex or age, without any exception, that they are in conscience strictly and gravely obliged to make use of that right.

"Catholics may give their vote only to those candidates and to those lists of candidates from which there is the certainty they will respect and defend observance of the divine law and rights of religion and the church in private and public life."

The Leftist press again today attacked Alfredo Ildelfonso Cardinal Schuster, Archbishop of Milan, who recently ordered priests in his diocese to refuse absolution to adherents of the Communist Party.

The attack on the cardinal was carried to a meeting of a central committee of major political parties recently formed to police a truce on political violence during the campaign. Leftists charged that the cardinal's letter violated Italy's electoral laws.

*L'Osservatore Romano*, Vatican City newspaper, last week defended the cardinal, saying the church would be failing in its duty if it were silent before heresy that raised a political banner.

A pastoral letter signed by Alessio Cardinal Ascalesi, Archbishop of Naples, 17 other archbishops and 55 bishops of Southern Italy, recently declared nobody can at the same time be a good Catholic and a Socialist.

Vatican sources said the decree applies to Catholics throughout the world. The pope himself serves as prefect of this congregation. Its members include James Cardinal McGuigan of Toronto and Francis Cardinal Spellman of New York. The decree of the consistorial congregation—a body whose functions include discipline and administration—was described by Vatican sources as "normal" guidance for the faithful in political elections.

The decree followed pastoral letters by the archbishops of Milan and Naples warning against voting for Communist candidates. Leftist leaders attacked the letters as violations of the electoral laws.

## ABOUT THE VIRGIN BIRTH

**T**HIS is a doctrine which is always assailed by those who deny the divine inspiration and supreme authority of the Bible. When questions are raised on this subject, they provoke a great deal of discussion. Where a minister is charged with denying it—many thousands do—usually some august religious assembly appoints a Committee, or a Commission, to investigate the matter.

What an unnecessary procedure! It ought not to take a man long to make it clear to everyone whether he believes, or does not believe, in the Virgin Birth of Christ. We should suppose that no minister would be ashamed of his position in respect to that great doctrine. If he does not believe it, he ought not to be ashamed to say so. If he does, he ought to be equally willing to confess it, and save all the labour and expense of a Commission.

We are perfectly sure that if anyone were to charge us with denying the Virgin Birth, we could settle the question once and for ever in less than five minutes. We should say: "I believe the truth of the Virgin Birth of Christ is inherent in every word of Scripture; but specifically, and to place the question beyond all possibility of doubt or misunderstanding, I affirm that, without reservation, I accept the records of the nativity in Matthew, and Luke, as being factual, and indisputably true in every particular; and I so affirm because I believe that Matthew and Luke are integral parts of the divinely inspired, infallible, and supremely authoritative word of God."

If a man believes that, he ought to count it a holy privilege to confess it; and if he does not, he ought not, in all honesty, to be willing to acknowledge his unbelief.

# The Jarvis Street Pulpit

## The Virgin Birth

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, December 23rd, 1923  
(Stenographically Reported)

*(Dr. Shields has been indisposed for a couple of weeks, and out of his pulpit for two Sundays; but we have hundreds of unpublished sermons, transcripts of stenographic reports in our files. This sermon on the Virgin Birth, however, is selected with the very definite purpose of showing its relation to the whole body of gospel truth. It will be noted the sermon is twenty-five years old; but we republish it without revision.)*

"And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."—Luke 1:35.

I WANT to speak to you this evening of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth of our Lord Jesus Christ — a doctrine which is everywhere being assailed, and which, by many, is said to be no necessary part of Evangelical faith. Those who contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints, are described very often as contentious persons. We are contentious in the sense that we contend for the faith. We are described, too, as disturbers of the peace; but what are the facts of the case? We have fallen into the habit of describing the deniers of the faith as "modernists". I have felt like taking a week off from other duties, to see if I could find in any dictionary a name that would be more fitting. I think the term "modernist" is altogether too complimentary. I do not think it carries with it all that ought to be embodied in the name that is given to this present movement in opposition to Evangelical truth. We might, perhaps, more appropriately describe those who would destroy the foundation of things as insurgents, as insurrectionists, as rebels, for they are not the King's loyal subjects—as theological revolutionaries—or, if you like, as theological bolshevists; because this thing that calls itself Modernism is anything but progressive: it is the philosophy of religious reactionaries; it is a movement that, so far from delivering us into a larger liberty, would carry us back again into the darkness of the middle ages, or, indeed, into the outer darkness of paganism itself. I say, those of us who contend for the faith are described as disturbers of the peace sometimes. There was an editorial in one of the city papers during the week on the conflict between Fundamentalism and Modernism, in which the writer paid me the compliment of quoting something I had said. And, in that connection, he said that this conflict was being waged with much bitterness. He ought to be a little more careful of his terms. There is no bitterness necessarily involved in strong speech; although the man who speaks plainly of this issue is in danger, I suppose, of being misunderstood. I said in New York the other day that, so far as I was concerned, I refused absolutely to fraternize with those who denied the Deity of my Lord; I would accord them no recognition as Christian teachers or even as Christians—that I would refuse to number them among my friends, nor would I eat their bread. Is that what you call "bitter" speech? Can you imagine any of the disciples breaking bread with Judas Iscariot after that terrible act of his? Can you imagine anyone who knew and loved the Lord Jesus extending the hand of fellowship

to Pontius Pilate—the man who washed his hands in innocency, and said, "I will have nothing to do with it"? It was even necessary for Peter himself publicly to confess his allegiance to Christ, and implicitly to acknowledge his fault, before he was restored to the full confidence of his fellow-disciples.

Before the war, Lord Roberts frequently warned Great Britain that she was in danger, and that it was necessary that she should arm, that she should be careful of her defences; and everywhere he was described as a militarist, as a man who loved war. Probably there was not a man in the world at that time who knew what war was better than Lord Roberts; nor, therefore, who hated war more intensely; but he had sense enough to face the facts of the international situation; and he warned his country, as a true patriot, not to shut its eyes to the impending danger.

In the Spring of the year in which the war broke out, I was travelling to Ottawa, and I met a gentleman who had been Speaker in the House of Commons. He took from his bag a speech which he had delivered in the House of Commons, opposing our making any contribution to imperial, naval, or military defence. I did not read the speech then, but I said, "Give me the gist of it." "Well, it is simply this," he said, "that human nature has changed, and that war on a large scale is now impossible." I said, "What do you make of a man like Lord Roberts?" "Oh, he has war on the brain," he said; "he is a professional soldier, he loves fighting, and that is why he talks like that." "Well," I said, "what do you make of the great editors of the leading London dailies, for instance—men who ought to feel something of the responsibility of their position, who are constantly warning the country of the peril to which they believe we stand exposed?" "Oh," he said, "they are simply in the pay of the Armament Trust." I then told him that I was present in the British House of Commons just the year before, when I heard some man deliver a speech in criticism of the government's proposals for the expenditure on armaments, and he declared that it was a waste of money, that it was a disgrace to a civilized country to appropriate so much money for the army and navy. After he had delivered his speech, I heard Mr. Lloyd George reply, and in his reply he said in effect: This gentleman's speech reflects great credit upon his sentiments, upon his feeling toward other nations, and he wished very much that he could join with him in believing that there was no danger; but he said that

those who were charged with the responsibility of maintaining the inviolability of His Majesty's dominions could promise no reduction. "We regret to have to tell the country," he said, "that so far as we are able to judge of the present situation, we shall probably have to spend much more money in the future in national defence." And I said to my friend on the Ottawa train, "What do you make of a man like Lloyd George? He was looked upon as a pacifist at one time. During the Boer War he boldly avowed his opposition to that campaign." "Oh," he said, "he is in the same category. He, too, is in the pay of the Armament Trust." I then said to him, "If that be true, that these great editors and leading statesmen and soldiers are in the pay of an Armament Trust, if there is such a trust, it is the most damning characterization of human nature I have ever heard in my life, and you had better get ready for war." That was in April, 1914. In 1917 I made a few political speeches, the only political speeches I ever made in my life; but I was especially asked to go and stand on the platform beside this man who had said there would be no war, and plead for his election in order that he might reinforce the government in prosecuting the war to victory. And I told the audience on that occasion of the talk I had had with this ex-Speaker about war.

What has this to do with the subject before us? Simply this: that the day will come, and it is not far distant, when multitudes of Christian people will awake to a realization and a recognition of the fact that the people called Fundamentalists have been the seers; they have seen the sword coming; they know the implications of this assault upon the foundations of the faith, and are calling upon the citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem to put on the whole armour of God that they may be able to stand in the evil day.

We are told that the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, for instance, is no necessary part of Evangelical faith. That is a favourite position of men like Dr. Fosdick and Dr. Faunce. They, of course, do not take the position of openly denying the Deity of Christ and making an assault upon the whole body of Evangelical truth; but they say there are certain parts of what is called the gospel that do not belong to a modern man's thinking. Dr. Fosdick says, "The virgin birth involves a biological miracle which is unthinkable to the modern mind." Now, does it matter? That is my point this evening. I have said again and again that I have no fear for this Bible. Men will be preaching from that Bible, if the Lord tarries, centuries after the last Modernist has been buried and forgotten. This is "the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." We have no fear about that; and, as a matter of fact, if it were possible to gather every single copy of this Book and make one great bonfire of it so that there should not be left anywhere upon earth a solitary copy of the Word of God, God could produce it again the next morning without one jot or tittle omitted, for He has a copy which He keeps Himself: "Forever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven." We do not fear the theological seminaries, nor all those blatant infidels who strut around calling themselves professors and college presidents: the Word of the Lord stands. But, I say, it is well for us to ask how much we can wisely surrender, or whether we can surrender anything in the interests of peace.

The attitude of a great many people is simply this: I believe the Bible; and I believe the great body of truth which Evangelical Christianity has always represented.

But, then, is there not some halfway place of meeting? Can we not, somehow or another, have peace? Why this contention about the things of God? I remind you that the gospel was given to the world in contention. Paul disputed in the synagogue; he argued; he did exactly what my friend Dr. Straton is doing in New York—he debated the great fundamentals of the faith with those who held contrary opinions, and trusted to the power of the Holy Ghost to carry that truth to the hearts of the people. In the days when the Church was worthy to be called a militant Church, it had victories to its credit; but nowadays we are told that if there is any way by which we can maintain our positions as Christians and not insist upon acceptance of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, by all means let us do it.

I am reminded of the great prescience of that man of God, C. H. Spurgeon, who knew more in five minutes than some of these men will know if they live to be as old as Methuselah. He had the gift of spiritual discernment; and in one of his great addresses on this down-grade controversy long ago, when those whom we call Modernists had taken positions which would be classed to-day almost as conservative, Spurgeon, dealing with this principle of being willing to surrender this, that, and the other thing, in order to placate the enemy, said: Yonder, galloping over the plains of Russia, there is a sleigh drawn by six or eight horses. A pack of hungry wolves are in pursuit. The driver lashes his horses in an endeavour to make headway and get away from the devourers. But he sees the wolves are gaining upon him, their cry comes ever nearer; and he sees his only salvation is to stop for a moment and cut loose two of the horses and leave them to the wolves. He does so; he takes off the first team, and presently he hears the pack as they hungrily feed upon these two horses. But when they have gorged themselves with them he hears them in full cry again. Again he is being outclassed in speed, and he decides to cut off another two horses. And so he turns back two more, and goes on with the remaining four. Presently the wolves gain on him again, and now he makes the last desperate effort, and he cuts off the third team, leaving only two horses harnessed to the sleigh. Then the driver urges his horses on and they gallop along with what remaining strength they have; but his sacrifices have been in vain; for presently the cry is heard again. "What shall he do?" says Spurgeon. "He has only two horses left.—What shall this driver do? Do? Why, man, do the only thing now possible, throw out your wife, of course!" Exactly!

What are we to do? Give up the inspiration of Scripture? Give up the Virgin Birth? Give up the Deity of Christ? Give up the Vicarious Atonement? Give up the doctrine of the Resurrection? Give up the doctrine of the New Birth? Give up the promise of His coming again? Give up everything, and throw it all to the wolves? Not for a minute! We might as well stop first as last. There is a point beyond which we cannot go; and I shall endeavour to show you, by giving you the simplest possible outline, that this is a doctrine which cannot be surrendered without surrendering the whole body of Evangelical truth.

Let me remind you, my friends, that the Modernists are not especially concerned with the Virgin Birth alone; they direct their attacks upon that, upon the inspiration of Scripture, upon the Deity of Christ, upon the Second Coming of Christ, or some other aspect of Evangelical truth. And they are disposed to say, "Now, if you will

yield us this, we will be content." But anybody who knows the history of this movement, anybody who is at all conversant with the currents of the time, knows that the difficulty is, that the type of mind that is opposed to the Virgin Birth is opposed to every doctrine of supernaturalism. It is simply the natural against the supernatural. And when Dr. Fosdick says that the virgin birth involves a biological miracle that is unthinkable to the modern mind, I say, "Yes; only I would like to change one word: it involves a biological miracle unthinkable to the carnal mind—that is, entirely beyond the ken and experience of natural men. It belongs to a realm which they have never even glimpsed; they have never caught sight of it; they do not know of its existence.

I suppose I ought to stop now. ("No!") One cannot resort in a sermon even to such technicalities as perhaps are allowable in a lecture; nor can one deal with a subject like this from the pulpit as one would be justified in dealing with it in a classroom. Therefore I shall try to give you a simple outline of a subject upon which volumes have been written, and upon which volumes more may yet be written. Will you allow me to say this? There is one advantage, at least, to a congregation in having the messages of the pulpit printed; for if a man gives the result of years of thinking, it is not likely that the average hearer will grasp all that is said in one hearing. He gets the impression, he remembers much; but he goes away, if he has been interested at all, saying, "I wonder what the speaker meant by such a statement? I wonder what was the connection? I wish I could recall exactly what he said." But when it is reported and written down, you can take and study it. I hope you will take that message of last Sunday evening—a very simple statement; but I want you to think of that which differentiates Evangelical Christianity from Roman Catholicism. Study it for yourself, and think it out for yourself. And do the same thing with this subject.

### I.

Now, let me state this simple proposition: THAT THE NEW TESTAMENT AFFIRMS AND NOWHERE CONTRADICTS THE DOCTRINE OF THE VIRGIN BIRTH. It is set forth in detail, of course, in the gospels of Matthew and Luke; and if you carefully study those two narratives you will find they are mutually complementary. One evangelist records what another has omitted to mention; but if you put the two together you will find they are in perfect agreement, and they complement each other. Now, we believe in the inspiration of Scripture; but inspiration does not necessarily preclude the possibility of the writer's receiving information from human sources; inspiration does not necessarily require that every word of that which is written should be directly received by divine communication: it does require that in the writing of that record, the writer should be so completely directed by the Holy Spirit that he would write exactly what God willed should be written. But he may have received his information respecting certain matters through human channels. Where did Matthew and Luke get their information about the virgin birth? That sacred secret belonged to two people: it belonged to Joseph and to Mary herself—and to nobody else, except as they learned it from their lips, unless, indeed, by direct divine communication. And I do not think it requires a very keen observer to recognize, when you come to read Matthew's story of the birth of our Lord, that Matthew is writing

that story from Joseph's standpoint. It looks as though he had talked with Joseph. Joseph has told him certain things, and Joseph has told him his own fears, of how he himself was shocked at a certain discovery, until God came to him and explained it all. Then, when you come to read this matchless story contained in Luke's gospel—and for beauty of expression and noble reticence, I question whether you can find a sublimer passage in literature than Luke's account—when you come to read the story of Luke you will find that Luke is writing from the standpoint of Mary. Mary has opened her heart. She has communicated her secret. And these two writers write the story as they have learned it.

Into the details of that I cannot go, except to say this: that these stories of the virgin birth of Christ are integral parts of the gospels. You cannot delete that story from Matthew or from Luke without invalidating the whole gospel narrative. There is the same authority for that as there is for any word in the gospel. There is no part of either of these gospels that is more firmly settled, that is more generally attested, than the fact that these birth-stories of Jesus, in the oldest manuscripts, are part and parcel of Matthew's gospel and Luke's gospel; and if you delete them you may delete everything in those two gospels. Dr. Fosdick says that the apostles never made the virgin birth a fundamental; that the apostles never preached it; that only two evangelists record it; that if it had been so important a matter, it certainly would be in all the gospels. It is not necessary that God should say anything more than once. In the beginning, He said, "Let there be light: and there was light." He did not need to repeat it; and if that be the Word of God, it is quite enough for me to have the complete story written once without having it written over and over again.

Take Mark's gospel. Mark does not say one word about the early years of Jesus. He does not refer to the infancy of Jesus at all. He begins with His public ministry, with His baptism; but how does he begin? "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." Surely we are justified in saying that it is there by implication! Then, when we come to John's gospel, oh, what a wonderful word that is! Somebody says, "But John did not say anything about the virgin birth?" No; but do you remember that on the cross the dying Saviour looked at His mother and at John and He said: "Woman, behold thy son! Then saith he to the disciple, Behold thy mother! And from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home." Don't you think that somehow or another the sacred secret came out? How does he begin? "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not." Is John speaking of a mere man, think you, in those words? And you remember how he goes on: "He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name; which was born, not of bloods (R.V. Marg.) nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." He says that those who received Jesus were born from above; and that "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." And in that matchless

chapter, the third of John, John records as having come from the lips of Jesus the great doctrine that inasmuch as Nicodemus and all like him were born of the flesh, they must also be born of the Spirit.

Why was it not necessary for Jesus to be born again? Why? Because He was begotten of the Holy Ghost. He was human, but He was divine: He was both God and man. And this marvellous miracle which John in his first chapter insists must take place in the experience of every one who receives Jesus had already taken place in the experience of Jesus Himself, because He was born from above: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." "The Word was made flesh"—what does he mean? "The Word was made flesh, and tabernacled among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth." And then, if you will follow all the way through John's gospel, as through Mark's, you will find that if in so many words the virgin birth is not stated, it is certainly there by implication; and one cannot by the wildest stretch of the imagination, it seems to me, conclude that Mark or John has said a single word that is contrary to the two records we have in Matthew and Luke which declare that Jesus was virgin born.

But these men say that the apostles did not make it a fundamental of the faith, and that Paul had nothing to say on this subject. I am not at all sure of that. You take that wonderful passage in the first of Romans — and I will not weary you much longer with these matters—that wonderful passage in the first of Romans where he says he is writing of the gospel of God "concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh: and declared—or defined, or proclaimed—to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead." Dr. Orr points out in his book on the Virgin Birth that in the passage which I have quoted as a text this evening, the definite article is omitted; that it is not "the Holy Spirit" but "Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee." And a similar phrase occurs here: He "was made of the seed of David according to the flesh"; and then He was "declared—defined, proclaimed—to be the Son of God with power, according to Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." That is to say, the resurrection from the dead was the revelation of that fact; but He was the Son of God according, not to the Spirit of holiness, but according to Spirit of holiness. He "was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh," but the Son of God by "the power of the Highest,"—and that fact was declared, manifested, by His resurrection from the dead. Thus, if I had time to take you through Paul's Epistles and to remind you of the many times in which he refers to the pre-existence of our Lord Jesus, God sending His Son into the world, and saying that He was made of a woman, made under the law to redeem those which were under the law, I think I could show you that implicitly the doctrine of the Virgin Birth runs all through Paul's Epistles.

Take, for example, the fifth chapter of Romans, which I referred to in our baptismal service this evening. Paul there plainly declares that "as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." There

is no exception to it in Paul's theology: he speaks of Jesus as the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, exempted from the stain of sin, coming into the world as no other man did ever come into the world. If I carry you forward into the Epistle to the Hebrews—"He took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham"—He took on Him deliberately the seed of Abraham, identified Himself with us.

## II.

Let me now ask this question: WHAT PRACTICAL BEARING, AFTER ALL, HAS THIS DOCTRINE UPON THE BODY OF TRUTH WHICH WE ARE TO BELIEVE IF WE ARE TO BE SAVED?

We are represented, particularly in newspapers, sometimes, as men who are quarrelling over shibboleths, striving about words to no profit. But, my friend, these words represent certain truths. If you are entering into a contract, if you are buying a house, for instance, when the lawyer puts the title deed before you, you say, "Wait a minute, I must get my glasses." And if he says, "Don't bother about the words"; you reply, "I must see what I am going to sign. These words mean something, not as words, but they represent certain obligations I assume." Our Lord Jesus said: "Every idle word that man shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." We need, therefore, to be careful of our words. We are not striving about mere words, but we are trying to strive for the body of truth which these words represent. We are not thinking of a dead Christ, of some historical figure. One brother got up last night in our prayer-meeting and read an excerpt from a speech delivered in London in 1888—something about the Jews and their persecution in the Russian Empire. The trouble with it all was, that the Jews who were then persecuted were dead, the Russian Empire was no longer, and the man who made the speech had passed away. We are not talking about something that belongs to the dim and distant past: we are talking about something that is of vital interest to every believer to-day. What vital relation has the doctrine of the Virgin Birth to the body of Evangelical truth?

In the first place, if you reject the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, you reject the inspiration and authority of Scripture. Is that anything? It is impossible for any man to call that in question without denying the divine authority of the Book that records the fact. Of course, when he has done that, he has paved the way for the denial of everything. Anybody can understand that. There it is in Matthew and Luke, plainly stated; implied through the whole New Testament; declared, I omitted to say, in Matthew, to be the fulfilment of prophecy: "A virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Emmanuel—God with us." Thus, you not only deny the inspiration and authority of the New Testament but of the Old as well. So far as I am concerned, I part company absolutely with the man who does that. I would put him out of any pulpit if I could. The man who denies the inspiration and authority of the Bible has no business in any Christian pulpit; he has no right in any Christian college as a teacher. And I will try to make it easy for him to get out and to make it as difficult as possible for him to stay in.

What else? *What relation has that to the Person of our Lord?* If He was the Son of Joseph and Mary, what then? What bearing has that upon His sinlessness?



How can He possibly escape the taint of sin? I do not mean to say that the Virgin Birth necessarily itself implies sinlessness. In order to effect that, the Roman Catholics have invented the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception: they have taught that Mary herself was sinless; but that only puts the matter back another generation. All have sinned—Mary included; but “The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.” A miracle! Of course, it is a miracle; but how else could Jesus have escaped the taint of sin? That He was sinless, there is no question; but, my friend, had I time I could point out to you that this affects the whole record of His life. Let it be sufficient to say that the gospels represent the Lord Jesus as a supernatural Person from beginning to end, supernatural in the sense that He was free from sin as no other man was free from sin; His birth, according to the record, was accompanied by supernatural manifestations—the star, the angel; not the birth of a man only; it was the birth of a God. “This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory; and his disciples believed on him.” As Dr. Orr points out, there are some who are fond of saying that John did not teach the doctrine of the Virgin Birth; Mary had “kept all these sayings in her heart.” Mary knew that this child of hers was superhuman, that He was more than a natural child: what He was she may not clearly have understood; but she kept these sayings in her heart. She was always wondering what would come of that Boy of hers. When in the beginning of His ministry He came to that marriage feast, “and when they wanted wine, the mother of Jesus saith unto him, They have no wine. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come. His mother saith unto the servants, Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it.” Oh, I think just at that moment Mary wanted to tell her secret. She knew the power that flowed from those fingers, that life itself would spring from that word of His. How and to what extent, she did not know. But it is John who records her as almost standing back in awe and wonder to see what this marvellous Son of hers would do.

What bearing has it upon His miracles? Granted that He was supernaturally born, miracles are quite explicable. I do not mean to say the Virgin Birth is necessary to the record of miracles. Elijah performed miracles; so did Elisha and the apostles.

*But it does have a bearing upon His death.* What was the meaning of His death? What was the meaning of His resurrection? In a word, it seems it is necessarily involved in the whole doctrine of the Incarnation, and the doctrine of Reconciliation, that “God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself.” And let me remind you that whoever puts his finger upon that doctrine, and professes a rejection of that as well as any other aspect of the supernatural life of our Lord, that it is not that particular doctrine he is assailing, but the carnal mind is in rebellion against the whole revelation of God in Christ. It is not a question whether we are to have a Christ Who was virgin born or not virgin born: the whole question is whether ultimately we are to have any Christ at all; whether we are to have a revelation from God, or a light from heaven.

Well, my friend, it not only affects the Person of Christ, the Deity of Christ, and His atoning work, but it affects your personal experience as a Christian. Are

you a Christian? What happened when you were saved? Anything? “Well, I just changed my mind, I changed my religious opinions, and I came to accept things I had formerly rejected.” If it was but a change of mind, you have never been saved. It is “with the heart man believeth unto righteousness.” And if I were to ask you to tell me just now what happened, I think, first of all, there would be a profound silence; and if I could take you one by one, you would say, “Pastor, I would like to have a month to think about it, because something happened that I cannot easily explain”; “The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit.” The miracle of the virgin birth was repeated in your conversion. The miracle of the virgin birth is no greater miracle than the conversion of the soul dead in trespasses and in sins; and it takes God to do both. You will always find that those who attack the doctrine of the Virgin Birth attack the whole body of Evangelical truth: they attack the doctrine of sin and regeneration—the whole matter of Christian experience; and they leave us utterly out in the wilderness.

I want you to remember, therefore, that these things are of practical importance, and that we do not propose to let the men who have removed themselves from the actualities of life to discuss these things in theoretical fashion before their classes in classrooms, to have it all their own way; because if some of these gentlemen would try their theories out on the poor man who needs help, who is dead in trespasses and in sins, they would find it would not do. We need an almighty Saviour; we need a supernatural Saviour; we all need the power of the Holy Ghost to overshadow us. What is salvation? Not a change of mind only; not a change of religious opinion; but “Christ in you, the hope of glory.” There is no other hope of glory but that Christ shall be born within your heart.

Thus everything is at stake; but we are glad that some of us have not any doubt about it. I like to make my confession of faith sometimes. This is a grand old Book. I have no doubt whatever of its inspiration. When I come upon a subject such as I have been discussing this evening, and begin to look into the marvellous depths of God’s Word, I feel like saying that if God Himself did not write this Book it must have been written by a lot of clever men; that if some of those men who call themselves “scholars” can get men to discuss what they have written for twenty centuries to-

### BOOKS AND BOOKLETS BY DR. T. T. SHIELDS

"Other Little Ships" .....	\$2.00
Beautifully bound in blue cloth with gilt letters, 280 pages.	
"The Plot That Failed" .....	2.00
Special Illustrated Number of Sept. 28 .....	.25
"Russellism or Rutherfordism", 71 <sup>1</sup> pages .....	.25
"The Papacy in the Light of Scripture", 26 pages .....	.25
"The Oxford Group Analyzed" .....	.05
"Does Killed in Action Mean Gone to Heaven?" .....	.05
"The Christian Attitude Toward Amusements" .....	.05
"The God of All Comfort" .....	.65

*The Gospel Witness*  
130 Gerrard Street East  
Toronto 2 - Canada

gether and keep at it, they may be entitled to a little respect. Their books wear out and pass away. The Bible is still here, and you had better believe it. What, then, does the story of the Virgin Birth mean?

That God came down, was begotten of the Holy Ghost, born of a virgin, lived our life for us, died our death for us, went down into the grave for us, came out in resurrection power and glory, ascended into the heavens, commissioned His disciples to go to all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, to bid every poor sinner to look to the Cross, and believe and rest upon the promise of God Who cannot lie; and to believe not only that our sins are forgiven, but that some day these bodies of ours will rise again in the likeness of His body, glorified, separated from sin, and that He Himself will again come down the skies! For my part, I am going to stand by that old Book. There is nothing else worth preaching; and it is because I believe it to be true that I want everybody else in the world to believe it too.

I want somebody to believe it to-night. Hear this testimony in the Name of the Lord. It is a true Gospel, and Jesus will be your Saviour; but if you do not yield to Him, He will be your Judge. Jesus is coming again. May we all be numbered among those who love His appearing.

### COLLEGES IN QUEBEC

A "DRIVE" for \$11,000,000. was lately put on by "the University of Montreal", a Catholic institution. There is now great jubilation over the fact that the objective has been over-subscribed. *The Montreal Gazette* breaks up the total sum, and shows where it has come from.

\$4,300,000. of it was donated by Mr. Duplessis' Government in Quebec, from the moneys derived from the taxes of the Province, 75% of which comes from English-speaking and Protestant people and institutions. \$2,000,000. was donated by the City of Montreal, where the proportion of taxes is about the same. \$1,800,000. was contributed by English-speaking Protestant people, and business firms of Montreal. That means that over \$8,000,000. of the objective has come largely from English and Protestant pockets, leaving but \$3,000,000. to be subscribed by the French people of Quebec.

McGill University because of the tremendous inflow of "vets", nearly nine thousand altogether, is almost \$1,000,000. "in the hole"; but not a word of help from Quebec. Bishops College, Lennoxville, has been out on a drive for \$2,000,000. The last report they had not reached \$1,000,000.; but not a word from Quebec; and no great contributions from the big institutions of Montreal. To the University of Montreal several of the Protestant places of business gave \$30,000. but so far there are no such contributions to Bishops College.

Surely THE GOSPEL WITNESS is doing a great and badly needed work in trying to awaken the English-speaking Protestants of Quebec.

Sincerely,

(Rev.) W. D. REID.

### SEND US NAMES PLEASE

Frequently we receive names from GOSPEL WITNESS readers, who request that we send sample copies to such persons. We invite our friends to send us lists of persons who may become potential subscribers.

## SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE ISSUE

(From *The Watchman-Examiner*, February 26.)

A barrage of criticism is flowing daily and weekly from the Roman Catholic press against the manifesto issued by the spokesman for Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State. But one theme seems to permeate all of the criticism, and that is that they regard this manifesto of Protestant conviction concerning separation of church and state as "malicious" and "anti-Catholic". Without discussing the merits of the issue, Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of Boston, in an address before the Knights of Columbus, diverts attention from the issue to discuss the possible communistic relationships of the signers of the manifesto. This would make it appear that all critics of Roman Catholicism in regard to its political aspirations are regarded by the hierarchy as communist sympathizers. Archbishop Cushing said: "Sometimes the very names which appear in the list of those organized against us ought to appear in the special pleaders in behalf of the reds." He also charges that the critics of the church are a "threat to the future faith and freedom of our children". The editor of the *Catholic World*, Rev. James M. Gillis, in more ironic form, condemns "loose" statements which allege that the Catholic Church is breaching the wall of church and state separation because it supports legislation providing bus transportation for parochial school students and because the United States is represented at the Vatican. He shows us the devious thinking, however, which leads the Catholic Church into political action. He states: "Politics is a branch of ethics dealing with the relationship of one nation with another. Ethics deals with morals and as soon as you mention morals, then you let the Church in. Our obligation is to keep all nations on the straight and narrow moral path. The Church is not concerned with military tactics, but when the state does something immoral, such as the bombing of helpless people, whether that wrong is done by Germany, Italy, or the United States, the Catholic Church is going to tell the one who does the wrong." This is far afield from the original starting point, but that does not confuse the imperial thinking of Roman Catholicism. Concerning the last statement, one wonders why the Vatican was so silent when Italian bombs were being dropped on Ethiopians and they were being defeated and slaughtered with mustard gas. Was it because the Italian troops had paraded in review before the man who was then pope and had had their battle flags blessed by the "vicegerent" of the Prince of Peace before they crossed the Mediterranean?

### BIRDS OF A FEATHER

A PRESS dispatch says that Mayor O'Dwyer will give a luncheon at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, Tuesday, to honour former Irish Premier Eamon de Valera, who is en route to San Francisco at the invitation of that city to attend a reception in his honour. He is to lunch with Mayor O'Dwyer privately on Monday. Then it is said, "He will be officially welcomed at the city hall Tuesday". Tuesday evening Mr. de Valera will be the guest at a dinner party given in his honour by Cardinal Spellman.

Eamon de Valera, the Spanish-American Catholic hater of Britain, and of all things British, did his utmost to embarrass Britain in the conduct of the war; and his policies beyond question cost thousands of British lives. Mayor O'Dwyer is also an Irish Catholic, nurtured among people whose religion consists in blessing the Pope, and hating England. Coming now to New York, de Valera is to be honoured by Cardinal Spellman. Cardinal Spellman is a prince of that political ecclesiastical state, which was really one of the Fascist powers, the enemy of Britain always, by her own confession, but especially of Britain during the last thirty-five years.

But people like de Valera and Judas Iscariot, invariably, by natural, moral gravitation, go to their own place. Eamon de Valera and Spellman will find the company of each mutually agreeable.

## "THE GOSPEL WITNESS" DISCUSSED IN PARLIAMENT

IT IS not unusual for THE GOSPEL WITNESS to be discussed in Parliament. On more than one occasion it has been quoted not only on the floor of the Federal House at Ottawa but also in the Provincial Legislatures of the Provinces. Last week, on March 1st, an ardent political disciple of the King-St. Laurent axis, referred to our issue of February 19th, "Sounding an Alarm for All Canada". This speaker, Mr. Leopold Langlois, a French-Canadian Roman Catholic for Quebec, attempted to place THE GOSPEL WITNESS in a Drew-Duplessis-Chalout organization arrayed against the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. St. Laurent. As a sample of the appeal to Quebec made by the King-St. Laurent Liberal Government, we herewith quote the last part of this gentleman's speech from *Hansard*, noting the following points of his defense of the present Liberal Government: Firstly, this French-Canadian Roman Catholic member lists twelve French-Canadians who hold the rank of Deputy Minister or equivalent. Secondly, he lists ten French-Canadian Roman Catholics who hold the title of ambassador or ministers in the diplomatic service. Thirdly, he mentions three French-Canadian Parliamentary Assistants out of a total of nine; and fourthly, he states that: "Out of eighteen members of the cabinet, six are French-Canadians."

His intention in giving these lists of high positions held by French-Canadian Roman Catholics, is to demonstrate that the King-St. Laurent Liberal Government has bestowed ample rewards on their Roman Catholic constituency of Quebec. Again we note that this ardent Liberal politician states: "I prefer the attitude taken by the religious leaders whom I have just quoted to that of our blatant patriot from Quebec." We wonder why French-Canadian Liberals become angry when we accuse Quebec of being priest-ridden. Is it not a definition of "priest-ridden" for a politician to admit on the floor of the House that he follows the directives of the Hierarchy? Again we note that he gives as a reason for his approval of Mr. St. Laurent that "one of our distinguished bishops of the Province of Quebec recently cited (him) as an example to the youth of his diocese and of the whole province".

The conclusion of Mr. Langlois' article is a perfect illustration of the thesis of the editorial from *Le Devoir*, a nationalistic paper as translated in THE GOSPEL WITNESS. Mr. Langlois said:

"I must assure the Secretary of State for External Affairs that he may rely on the full co-operation of all Quebec members. May I say to him in their name: We Canadians from Quebec are proud to have you as our leader . . ."

In the number of THE GOSPEL WITNESS to which Mr. Langlois referred, we quoted from a French paper which is notoriously nationalistic and Roman Catholic. The thesis of the *Le Devoir* article is that Mr. St. Laurent must have the solid support of all French-Canadians in Canada if he is to be successful in his candidature for the premiership. It was just that solid support from "all Quebec members" that Mr. Langlois, the Liberal, assured Mr. St. Laurent in his speech.

In other words, Mr. Langlois' speech runs true to the traditional line of the Liberal appeal to Quebec, mainly, that the Liberal party does more for French Roman Catholics than any other party could or would do, hence, the true French-Canadian Roman Catholic and Nationalistic party is the Liberal party of Messrs. King and St.

Laurent. With this we agree. *Le Devoir* on the other hand, feels that Messrs. King and St. Laurent have not done quite as much for Quebec as they should have done.

The purpose of THE GOSPEL WITNESS in quoting *Le Devoir* is to demonstrate that there is no essential difference between the final goal of Nationalists such as Mr. Duplessis and the final goal of the so-called Liberals of the King-St. Laurent party. The route they follow may differ somewhat from that of the Nationalists but their goal is identical. We have quoted Mr. Langlois' speech from *Hansard* because he, too, sets out to prove that the King-St. Laurent party has been very generous to Quebec and is therefore a more effective friend to that French-speaking, Roman Catholic province than the Nationalistic party or any other possibly could be. —W.S.W.

### French-Canadians in High Positions at Ottawa

From *House of Commons Debates*, Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. LANGLOIS: Needless to say I prefer the attitude taken by the religious leaders whom I have just quoted to that of our blatant patriot from Quebec.

Mr. Chalout ended his long list of alleged injustices by the dominion government against French-Canadians by stating that we had only one deputy minister in the whole federal administration. Mr. Chalout is unaware or forgets that there are French-Canadians with the title of deputy minister or the equivalent at the head of the following departments or departmental branches in Ottawa:

Transport, Mr. Brassard; Agriculture, Mr. Bouchard; Justice, Mr. Stein; National Defence, Mr. C. Mathieu; External Affairs, Mr. Beaudry; Labour, Mr. Ranger; Chief Electoral Officer, Mr. Castonguay; King's Printer, Mr. Cloutier; Clerk of the House, Dr. Beauchesne; Librarian, Mr. Durocher; Archivist, Mr. Lanctôt; Civil Service Commission, Mr. Thivierge. Others could be added.

Moreover, Mr. Chalout is quite unaware that we also have in the diplomatic service the following French-Canadians with the title of ambassadors or ministers:

The Honourable Victor Doré, Brussels; Chas. Hébert, Havana; Laureys, Denmark; Maurice Pope, Berlin; La-Fleche, Athens; Turgeon, Dublin; Desy, Rome; Dupuy, Holland; Vaillancourt, Yugoslavia, and finally, as consul general in Chicago, Mr. Turcotte.

Mr. Chalout forgets also that we have in the government of our country three parliamentary assistants out of a total of nine, that is in the departments of Labour, National Defence and Finance.

Finally, he forgets that out of eighteen members of the cabinet, six are French-Canadians, namely the ministers of External Affairs and Public Works, the Postmaster General, the minister of Transport, the Solicitor General and the minister of National Health and Welfare.

Mr. Chalout therefore does not tell the truth and I see no reason to bring evidence in order to prove that the rest of his statement is not according to facts.

As to his insults against Sir Wilfred Laurier, I shall not dwell upon them. Suffice it to say that they come from a man who, a certain day, has tried to blacken his own constituents. I have nothing to add to the judgment passed by history on Sir Wilfred Laurier but I may say to the man who has tried to tarnish his memory that he has nothing to fear from history. His name will not be mentioned.

Mr. Chalout concluded his remarks by an appeal to members of the Union Nationale, of the Bloc Populaire and Social Crediters to join their forces against the Liberals in the province of Quebec. The same appeal had come a few days before from a too well known Ontario pastor, in THE GOSPEL WITNESS of February 19.

Obviously they both have a common objective. They wish to cripple a man that brought so much credit upon us all since he began his political career, the right hon. minister of External Affairs.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LANGLOIS: Thus by pure accident, the Quebec pastor and the Ontario pastor found an identical providential mission.

Once again, Mr. Chalout and his leader, Mr. Duplessis, have shown that they truly fear the enormous ascendancy the Right Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs is gaining not only over the people of his own province

but over the population of the whole of Canada. They fear this man whom one of our distinguished bishops of the Province of Quebec recently cited as an example to the youth of his diocese and of the whole province.

I am speaking on behalf of all my colleagues from Quebec on this side of the house when I say that we do not fear any attacks from the Drew-Duplessis-Chaloult organization against the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I have no hesitation in telling these gentlemen, on behalf of my colleagues, that if they want a fight, we are ready for them, either in the federal or the provincial field.

I must assure the Secretary of State for External Affairs that he may rely on the full co-operation of all Quebec members. May I say to him in their name: We Canadians from Quebec are proud to have you as our leader, we are proud to fight by your side and we are sure of victory because we know that our province needs you, that our country needs you, that the whole world needs you.

### THE ROMAN CHURCH IS RELIGIOUS, NOT POLITICAL

**T**HE Pope, we are frequently told, never interferes in politics! The Papacy, by its own claims, is political first, and religious afterward.

### CATHOLICS ARE MOBILIZED TO WIN ITALY ELECTIONS

By CAMILLE M. CIANFARRA

(New York Times Special to *The Globe and Mail*)

(Copyright)

Rome, Feb. 22—Speaking to 1,500 street car conductors, Pope Pius XII today put in clearcut terms what, in his opinion, the issue will be at the national election—Catholicism vs. Communist atheism.

"Despite false rumours that have been circulated, the doctrine of Christian truth and faith is irreconcilable with materialistic maxims support of which, whether one likes it or not, and whether one knows it or not, means to desert the church and to cease being a Catholic," he said.

Mobilization of 4,500,000 Catholic Action members to bring about a victory of the pro-Catholic Christian Democratic Party at the April national elections was under way today with the approval and support of the church.

This decision stems from fears entertained in Vatican and Catholic Action circles that the Peoples' Democratic Front, a coalition of Communist and left-wing Socialists, may obtain a majority that would lead to creation of a government controlled by the anti-religious, anti-clerical and extreme left-wing parties. This danger has prompted Catholic Action to build a national electoral machine.

The plan of the new organization is stated to be so thorough as to supply in a few weeks an accurate estimate of how many votes will be cast for the Christian Democrats. It envisages creation of "local civil committees" in literally every city, town, village and hamlet of Italy. These committees will be composed of Catholic Action leaders and of members of other Catholic organizations, such as representatives of the Papal relief committee, welfare agencies, Franciscan Tertiaries and the like, chosen with the approval of Italy's 300 bishops.

In the next few days committees are expected to honeycomb Italy and their functioning, it is hoped, will be as efficient as that of the Communist Party to which they bear striking organizational similarity.

Although the civil committees will support Christian Democrats at this spring's elections, they will not be subservient or tied to any political party, it was stated. They will instead retain complete freedom of action so as to be able to act as a corrective influence in the event that any party, barring none, embarks on a policy that Catholic Action may consider contrary to the church's interests.

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

### PRIESTS' REQUEST IS REFUSED

**L**AST week we noted in these columns the request made by the Roman Hierarchy of Toronto for lists of names and addresses of Roman Catholic pupils attending the Public Schools of the city. (See "R.C. Priests Invade Toronto Public Schools", p. 1581). We are happy to note the following report that this unwarranted request was refused by the Toronto Board of Education.

Officials of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Toronto were refused names of children of mixed marriages attending public school by the Toronto Board of Education in public session last night. Although the names were requested by Father Murray Allen, supervisor of religious instruction, the trustees voted to decline on a point of board policy.

Dr. C. C. Goldring, director of education, was the only board official who spoke on the matter. In a prepared statement he pointed out that an examination of the Public and High School Acts failed to reveal any regulation which gives a board of education the right to prepare lists of parents, with their addresses, and give such lists to an organization which requests the information.

"It would seem that the parents would have every right to object if such a practice was carried out," he stated. "For many years—at least 25 or 30—it has been the practice of this board to refrain from giving such lists to any organization, although such requests are often received.

The statement of the superintendent of education confirms our suspicion expressed in last week's article to the effect that: "We question whether any Protestant denomination has been given lists of children attending the public schools." We would emphasize again that if other denominations had been given such lists, it would have made available a precedent which the Roman priests, backed by *The Toronto Globe and Mail*, would not have been slow to seize upon.

It is amusing to note that the representative of the Separate School Board assured the Public School Board that "there would be no hard feelings" on this score. If the Roman Catholic had assured the Board that there would be no further attempt at encroachments, it would have been more to the point.—W.S.W.

### "HIS IMPUDENCE"!

**T**HE man in the Vatican is called by "the faithful", "His Holiness". We could call him by many names, but one that would be appropriate would be "His Impudence", for no one in all the world so impudently interferes with everyone else's business as does he. Former King Michael of Roumania, and Princess Anne of Bourbon-Parma, it is currently reported, are soon to be married. Michael is Greek Orthodox; Anne is Roman Catholic. Their respective mothers sought a dispensation of the Pope. But papal consent, we are told "was being withheld until and unless Michael agrees to rear his first born son and heir as a Roman Catholic".

We are often amazed at the supineness of Roman Catholics. We are familiar with what they teach; but we cannot understand how people of any sense and independence, can consent to the impudent interference of the Pope in their domestic affairs. Surely the people love to be humbugged, and the prize humbug of all the ages is the Roman Catholic Church.

### EX-FINANCIAL HEAD OF VATICAN "HELD"

Rome, March 8—(Reuters)—Vatican circles have confirmed that Msgr. Giulio Guidetti, former financial head of the Holy See, who resigned a month ago, is now detained in his apartments in the Vatican.

When Msgr. Guidetti resigned after 12 months as secretary for the administration of the goods of the Holy See, it was suggested that there might be a change in Vatican administration.

## THE QUEBEC RESERVE

By SENATOR T. DAMIEN BOUCHARD in *Le Clairon*

Are we going to fall for the game of those who are out to turn our Province into an Indian reserve? The Quebec reserve is the form of political territory which is in process of being achieved until the dream of our separatists becomes a reality, if ever it can emerge from the realm of simple possibilities.

Modern progress is tending throughout the world towards the removal of useless frontiers separating men from their fellows. Everywhere, Governments are endeavouring to do away with racial and religious prejudices, with the preference in direction of mutual aid among mankind. Millions and hundreds of millions are being voted by the richer countries and by those which have been spared the ravages of war, to aid the people of foreign lands who have been brought to the very edge of the precipice through the folly of excessive racism. Man is becoming more humanitarian and an all-out nationalism is losing its adherents in almost all the upper ranks of civilized nations.

But a different picture is to be seen in the Province of Quebec. Here is a desire to live in a watertight compartment; the school which appears to be dictating the policy of our legislators is seeking to isolate us from our neighbours, to separate Canadians of French origin from their fellow-citizens who do not speak their language and do not practise their religion.

The Government of the National Union, more fittingly termed "of national disunion", has just pushed higher the fence surrounding the Quebec reserve. Outside loan agencies will not be able to advance funds to citizens desiring to profit from the provisions of a new Act whose purpose is to encourage the building of dwelling-houses.

We are in favour of granting to our local loan companies all the encouragement they deserve; it is an evidence of a good public spirit when we help our French-Canadian enterprises, but I have no more use for a forced patriotism than I have for a virtue imposed by law. The citizen should be free to make his own choice. He may have a hundred reasons for giving his custom to an outside company in preference to one of our own.

To shut out agencies which have paid for a permit to carry on business in our Province from the privileges accorded to local companies, is to display a narrowness of mind which is out of harmony with the progress of agreement with our neighbours so noteworthy in these last few years. And there is the question of reprisals to be taken into account, for no country can be completely independent of the others. What we do in the way of antagonizing our neighbours may, some fine day, rebound on ourselves and, in the far-reaching play of restrictive measures on liberty, it is difficult to forecast who, in the long run, will suffer the most.

The metropolitan dailies have just published a communication from a Baptist minister who complains that an end has just been made to time-honoured practice for the last half-century at Bordeaux jail with no other explanation than that it is by the order of the Attorney-General of the Duplessis Government that it should be immediately discontinued. Every Saturday, for an almost immemorial time, a minister of that sect has been allowed to gather together for religious service and common prayer all those prisoners who so desired. Nobody was forced to attend but it is reported that several prisoners were glad to meet for this purpose. We are wondering what harm could result from such a facility that these unfortunates should gratuitously be deprived of the benefits of this religious consolation.

If a similar restriction had been imposed upon Catholics in one of our English-speaking Provinces, there would have been shouts of tyranny. Might it be that we are in process of reviving the times of Huguenot persecution? It is true that the Union Nationale Government is going back there unwittingly, if we are to take note of an item communicated to Mr. Duplessis, our Prime Minister, some few days ago on the topic of our Provincial flag. This new flag which an ecclesiastic had discovered forgotten in one of the attics of Laval University in Quebec city is nothing less than an ancient banner of the Royal French Navy which is said to have been brought to New France at the time of Colbert, on a vessel bringing here a colony of Huguenots. It is clearly in ignorance that our Government of perfectionists has given such a great lesson in religious tolerance: the flag which has been imposed upon us by an

order-in-council of the Duplessis cabinet is that of the Protestants who were the first to unfurl it on the waters and soil of Laurentia.

It seems to us that seeing the Provincial Government has unconsciously given a striking proof of tolerance in regard to the Huguenots, it might consciously leave to our Baptists the favour of going on with the good work they have undertaken for so many decades in affording spiritual comfort to the unfortunate of their religious denomination whom an unfortunate destiny has cast into our prison.

The word has gone forth in our separatist circles to have it understood that those who do not belong to the race and the religion of the elect are intruders within the Quebec reserve.

## BRITAIN AND THE JEW

THERE seems to be a peculiar kink in human nature which leads it early to turn on its best friend, and tear him to pieces. The Jews have never had so true a friend as Britain has always been to them. She has no interest to serve in Palestine beyond the interest of peace. She was given the thankless task of "Interim-Moderator" after the first Great War. The Jews, who are seeking a home in Palestine, are not seeking it for religious reasons: Most of them are atheistic Jewish renegades.

Canada runs true to form, and welcomes some of Britain's worst enemies in the persons of representatives of the Jewish Agency for Palestine. But whatever the United Nations may determine, Jacob and Esau, and Isaac and Ishmael, will not long live together. The Arabs are Abraham's seed as truly as the Jews; and we frankly confess that in this matter our sympathy is with the Arabs.

## PROTESTANT LEAGUE MATERIAL

To the Editor of *The Star*:

Sir: THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE has been distributing its pamphlets to many Canadians. These pamphlets contain nothing but seditious anti-Roman Catholic doctrine based upon Roman Catholic intolerance of the Middle Ages. Surely we have matured enough to realize the naivety of such an argument. However, this organization's name would indicate that it is the organ of all Protestantism, a position to which it can lay no claim. It has been founded with the sole purpose of exposing the so-called "black hand of the Vatican" and attempts no constructive policy whatsoever. As Protestant students we are ashamed of such intolerance as is expressed by a small minority which seems to be gaining widespread support as the "voice of true Protestantism". We are writing this letter so that people who receive this material will have some insight into its real nature and will not be converted to a view which is not representative of Canadian Protestantism as a whole.

BETTY BELL  
LAURA MONSAROFF  
DOLORES BOOMER

(II. Psychology, University of Toronto).

## A REPLY

March 2nd, 1948.

To the Editor of *The Star*:

A letter entitled as above appeared in the March 1st issue of *The Star*, complaining that THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE does not represent all Protestants.

THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE has never claimed to be representative of anyone but its own membership; notwithstanding, its nearly twenty thousand members are several thousand times more representative of Protestantism than the three young lady students of Toronto University, whose names are set to the article in question, "Betty Bell, Laura Monsaroff, and Dolores Boomer", whose letter is reminiscent of "The Three Tailors of Tooley Street", who modestly identify themselves as, "We, the people of London".

(D. C. McLELLAND)

Secretary,

THE CANADIAN PROTESTANT LEAGUE.

## DECEITFULNESS OF THE ROMAN HIERARCHY

IN A dispatch reprinted here from *The Toronto Globe and Mail*, the statement of the official spokesman of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in the United States is referred to as "disingenuous". Our dictionary defines this word as follows:

"not free from concealment; not frank, sincere, or candid; wanting in openness and honesty; underhanded; deceitful."

—*Funk and Wagnall's New Standard Dictionary.*

The use of this word on the part of the committee of Protestant ministers reminds us of a story of a bishop who asked his secretary to answer a certain letter. "Tell him he is a fool," the bishop is alleged to have said, "only say it politely!" Disingenuous is a polite term that is equivalent to an Anglo-Saxon noun of four letters. For proof that it is justly bestowed on the Archbishop of Cincinnati we refer to our article of two weeks ago. (See issue of February 26, p. 1570: "R.C. Prelate Assails Protestant Manifesto".) Shakespeare speaks of "the equivocation of the fiend that lies like the truth". But the brazen assertions of this Romish prelate do not bear even the slightest resemblance to truth. His denial that the Roman Catholic Church seeks a union of church and state or is trying to obtain "special advantages or privileges within the government" flatly contradict the official statements of the popes and doctors of his church for centuries past. We quoted some of them two weeks ago with the remark that "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".

Roman Catholic priests count on the general ignorance of Protestants with respect to Roman Catholic history and the charitable assumption of many Protestants that a priest would not deliberately lie. The aggressiveness of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in the United States is compelling non-Romanists in that republic to take stock of affairs and to call a spade a spade. Those who inform the public of the true aims of the papacy, proving their charges by excerpts from authoritative sources, are performing a real service for the cause of liberty. We therefore intend to persist in our course of exposing the machinations of Rome in the hope of awaking slumbering Protestants before it is too late—W.S.W.

## CLAIMS CATHOLICS WORK TO UNITE CHURCH, STATE

(*New York Times* Special to *The Globe and Mail*)  
(Copyright)

Washington, March 7—Protestants and other Americans united for separation of church and state today released an open letter replying to the "pronouncement" of the National Catholic Welfare Conference issued by the Most Rev. John T. McNicholas, Archbishop of Cincinnati.

Archbishop McNicholas' statement had been made public in answer to the "manifesto" of the organization several weeks ago in which discontinuance of the United States ambassadorial mission to the Vatican was asked and an effort begun to prevent public support of sectarian schools.

In its letter the organization said "the Archdiocese of Cincinnati itself presents a clear and notorious instance of gross violence of the principle of the separation of church and state in our educational system."

"The story of the taking over of the public school system at North College Hill, a suburb of Cincinnati, is now well known," the letter declared, describing further how a Catholic majority on the local board of education "proceeded to incorporate a parochial school into the public school sys-

tem," with the archdiocese being paid \$6,000 rental for the building and the teaching nuns being placed on the public payroll.

The letter went on to describe how after a school strike, a local court took over the affairs of the school district, terminated the rental contract and "removed the nuns from the public payroll."

"What concerns us now is your disingenuous denial of the statement quoted from our manifesto. You say:

"We deny absolutely and without any qualification that the Catholic bishops of the United States are seeking a union of church and state by any endeavors whatsoever, either proximate or remote. If tomorrow Catholics constituted a majority in our country, they would not seek a union of church and state. They would then as now uphold the constitution and its amendments."

"We find it difficult to accept this denial as other than disingenuous. This is because of the nature of the constitution which, you declare, Catholics will always faithfully uphold.

"The constitution itself provides both for its amendment and its interpretation. . . . If tomorrow the church should possess the power, and had not meantime secured interpretations fully satisfying its demands, it could, and surely would, secure an amendment entirely repealing the separation of church and state as provided by the First Amendment. In doing so, it could still affirm its loyalty to the constitution."

## HAS BOARD OF EDUCATION ANY RIGHT TO COMPLY WITH REQUEST?

(From *The Evening Telegram*, Toronto, March 2, 1948)

With the announced desire of the Roman Catholic authorities to combat Communism in Toronto by the creation of a community centre where constructive training in good citizenship will be given there must be the heartiest assent from all loyal Canadians. But when they say that to further this plan they require the Board of Education to give them the names of Roman Catholic children attending public schools, they ask something the relativity of which to their plan is not immediately obvious and as to which there is grave doubt that the Board of Education has any right to comply.

In connection with this request it cannot be overlooked that it is a basic tenet of the Roman Catholic Church that education is within the jurisdiction of the church. So strongly is this tenet maintained that the communion has its own separate schools and is at present engaged in an ambitious plan to extend separation through the high schools. It is regarded as a misdemeanor, if not a sin, for Roman Catholic parents to send their children to schools other than those the church provides. It must be seriously questioned whether it is any business of the Board of Education to supply the church authorities with the names of Roman Catholic children who are not complying with the rules of the church.

It has been urged that because some principals are said to have provided Anglican and United Church clergymen with the names of children of these denominations attending the schools, the same information should be supplied to Roman Catholic priests in respect of Roman Catholic children, and that this information should be given to all or to none. But this is surely fallacious. If Roman Catholics were compelled by law to support public schools, as are taxpayers of all other denominations, the contention that all should be on one footing might be logically maintained. But Roman Catholics are by law given an option of supporting either public or separate schools. Anglican and United Church ministers are not supporters of a school system in competition with the public schools, whereas Roman Catholic priests can take no other position than that, where separate schools are provided, Roman Catholic children have no business in public schools.

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

## Among Ourselves

Devoted to Activities of Former and Present Students of  
TORONTO BAPTIST SEMINARY  
By W. Gordon Brown, Dean

It is not too soon to send in applications for next year's class. Already some have been received.

Professor W. S. Whitcombe and the Dean represented the Seminary at the welcome extended to Rev. J. Fullard at Waverley Road Baptist Church on Thursday, February 5th. It was a happy occasion and, we are sure, augurs well for the future of that congregation.

Sympathy of the Seminary family is expressed to Mr. E. A. McWilliams and his family in the death of his father.

Recent chapel speakers included Major Snowden of the Salvation Army Territorial Headquarters, who gave a heart-warming word from 1 Corinthians 13; Rev. Mr. Proudfoot, General Secretary of the Shantymen's Christian Association, who gave a brief presentation of their work; and Rev. J. Fullard, the new pastor at Waverley Road Baptist Church, who spoke on the work of the ministry as described by Paul to the Ephesian elders.

Rev. W. L. Hisey, pastor of Hespeler Baptist Church, on the invitation of Prof. W. W. Fleischer, recently gave a really acceptable lecture in second-year Homiletics.

Our student body is bringing out a Year Book, a large part of which will be pictures of student activities. We are sure that it will be of real interest to all of our friends. We understand that the price will be \$1.00.

Rev. Dalton Crosby was united in marriage with Miss Marguerite Reynolds at Bhongir, Deccan, S. India, on January 19th, 1948. A number of missionary guests were present. Mr. Crosby writes, "We are stationed at Bhongir (our Field Headquarters). My wife has charge of the Girls' School here and also takes care of the catering for quite a large number of missionaries. I have charge of the Field work and the activities around. I am supervising about twenty preachers and Bible women. The work keeps me stepping and the days do not seem to be long enough to get everything done. THE GOSPEL WITNESS and THE SEMINARIAN are coming through all right. I am glad to receive them."

Our hearty thanks are due to Mrs. Stanley Parker, Cottam, Ontario, for a gift of canned goods for the Seminary dining room.

Applications for degrees are coming in from former graduates to be dealt with by the faculty.

Degrees, made retroactive for those who have already graduated from us and are now engaged in Christian service, are given only upon application and payment of the degree fee of \$10.00. For those who wish to buy their own hoods we can purchase them at \$12.50 for an L.Th. and \$15.00 for a B.Th.

We are glad to hear recently from Miss Esther Peacock, of Shanghai, China. She writes: "So many have asked whether I am with the Door of Hope or Children's Refuge. As a matter of fact the Door of Hope Mission has four branches of the work. The Children's Refuge, while under the same mission is entirely separate, because they rescue little girls before they have entered a life of sin. Most of them come through the courts, some have been little domestic slaves, others abandoned children, some are war refugees, others are orphans. Most of the little girls come with tales too sordid to tell in detail. Some come with frail little bodies of ill-treatment. About forty little ones between the ages of 4 and 12 years have come within recent months. These little newcomers need special prayer that they may come to know the Lord.

"Chinese New Year will soon be here, and there will be special meetings led by Dr. Charlie Chi, of the Southern Baptists. There is always something going on in this 'big family',—a new child coming, or maybe one returning from hospital, or one or two being sent to hospital. Again, girls are adopted into outside families, others go off to be married, or to live with one of the 'married daughters' until a marriage can be arranged. It is good to have a ministry here, and I am sure the Lord will bless His Word as it is given out day by day. *But* I long to be out where Christ's name is not known and where they have never heard of the One Who died to save sinners. The other workers here cannot understand that deep longing because they have never done that type of evangelistic work."

Word has come that Rev. and Mrs. W. C. McIvor hope to come home on furlough this spring from Nigeria, where they have had a very busy term. Mr. McIvor writes: "My building programme to date: 200 leper huts, 14 larger houses of 4 rooms each, a church 90 by 46, 4 European houses, and some miles of road. This gives mission work a strange conception in the minds of some people. Very many people think it is going around dressed in white ducks and sitting under a palm tree! I've worn out more overalls on the field than any other clothing. This station at Oke-Ode is complete as far as main station and out-houses are concerned.

"Greatly thrilled to see in THE GOSPEL WITNESS that T.B.S. will be awarding theological degrees. That will be a greater incentive to the students. How I wish I could take the whole course again! It is only as you get out and begin to build on the foundation that you realize the value of the foundation, and the whole superstructure is only as strong as the foundation."

Mr. Wilfred Bauman, B.A., spoke on Missions in French Canada at the Missionary Conference of Toronto Bible College recently.

The Seminary Chorus made its first public appearance at the evening service of Forward Baptist Church on Sunday, March 7th, and at the after-church fellowship. That Sunday was the tenth anniversary of the pastorate there of Rev. J. Scott.

Rev. J. Scott concluded a series of special meetings on March 5th in Snowdon Baptist Church, Montreal, Rev. J. R. Armstrong pastor. Interest was good; there were some professions of faith and additions to the church. All were much encouraged in the work of the Lord.

On Sunday, March 7th, Rev. W. L. Hisey welcomed four new members into the Hespeler Baptist Church. Four others were welcomed at the Communion service in February.

The Dean addressed a fine noon-hour gathering of the V.C.F. at Victoria University recently.

We acknowledge with grateful thanks the gift of a library of some five hundred volumes, including sectional bookcases, from Mrs. George Reid, Toronto.

Christian workers are invited to make their purchases of new books and supplies through our Seminary Book Room. Ten per cent reduction is given to full-time Christian workers. For example, preachers who need sermon covers, 5½" by 8¼" when folded, may obtain the same at \$1.50 per hundred.

The Seminary's fiscal year ends March 31st. Our school never had brighter prospects, but our financial needs are pressing.

### BAPTIST IMMIGRANT

We have a letter from Holland from a Baptist fruit-farmer who desires to come to this country with his wife and four children, the oldest of which is eleven. In order that he may do so, he needs a sponsor to offer him a job and a place to live. The man will pay his own way and that of his family. He is specially anxious to work with an employer who is a definite Christian. Anyone who can help this man is asked to write at once to the Dean of the Seminary.—B.

# Bible School Lesson Outline

Vol. 12 First Quarter Lesson 12 March 21, 1948

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

## THE HOSTS OF THE LORD

Lesson Text: 2 Kings 6:8-18.

Golden Text: "Fear not: for they that be with us are more than they that are with them."—2 Kings 6:16.

Supplementary Reading: 2 Chron. 32:7, 8; Judg. 7:2; Psa. 55:18; Luke 9:50; Rom. 8:31; John 2:19.

### I. Secret Wisdom: verses 8-12.

The Syrians did not long remember the kindness of Elisha to Naaman, the captain of the host (2 Kings 5). At that time they came as friends, but they soon returned as foes.

Jehoram, king of Israel, who reigned from 851-842 B.C., found himself at war with Benhadad, king of Syria. Syria in the north and Egypt in the south were powerful rival kingdoms, with Palestine as a buffer state, the bone of contention between them. Each of these two kingdoms wished to strengthen its position by gaining Palestine as an ally or as a possession, that it might provide passageway, troops and supplies. The two kingdoms of Judah and Israel had to be constantly on guard against the bribery or threats of either Syria or Egypt.

In his worldly wisdom Benhadad thought that he could easily conquer Israel by sending bands to ambush the king. But his schemes were being frustrated, since the Israelites, being forewarned, sent out troops to protect the threatened position, while the main army avoided that section.

Benhadad also erred in judgment; he was balked, not by the treachery of his own forces, but the cleverness of his foes. God had revealed the secret counsels of the king to His prophet (Dan. 2:47; Amos 3:7). Thus, Elisha was more valuable to his king than a whole army; he was like the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof, even as Elijah had been (2 Kings 2:12). Who can estimate the contribution which godly men and women make to the welfare of their country simply through their piety, their prayers and their spiritual perception (1 Timothy 2:1-3)?

### II. Secret Power: verses 13-18.

Benhadad's hatred was focussed upon Elisha; he realized that he could not defeat Israel so long as Elisha was active. If Elisha was of more value to Israel than a whole army, he was likewise of more danger to the foe than a whole army. The man who takes an active part in the work of the Lord will soon find himself the target for the shafts of Satan (Matt. 3:17; 4:1; 10:24, 25; 16:15-23), whereas the Adversary does not trouble the multitudes who do not oppose him.

Although Elisha was humble in his own estimation, Benhadad tacitly acknowledged his greatness by sending against him horses, chariots and a mighty host. The great prophet, to human eyes, was entirely surrounded by the forces of the foe.

Gehazi, the servant of Elisha (2 Kings 5:27), had evidently been replaced by a new servant who had not witnessed the power of God and who feared the hosts of Syria. A wholesome fear of our Arch-Enemy is not out of place, for we must ever remember that he has tremendous power (Matt. 10:28; John 14:30; Heb. 2:14; Eph. 2:2), and it will not do for us to be over-confident. But he is a defeated foe; Satan is mighty, but Christ is almighty (Eph. 1:19-22; 1 John 4:4). We are commanded to be strong and not to give way to the spirit of defeatism (Isa. 41:10, 13; Hag. 2:4, 5) or to allow ourselves to be overcome by the oppression of Satan (Acts 10:38). We are to resist him, trusting in the Lord, whose arm is strong to defend us (1 Pet. 5:7-9).

Elisha was confident in the midst of danger (Acts 27:22-25), since his eyes were not upon the enemy but upon the Lord Who had surrounded him with horses, chariots and a mighty host to match the forces of the king of Syria. He prayed that the Lord would open the young man's eyes that he too might have faith to see the great host of angelic helpers who were on their side (Josh. 5:13-15; 2 Chron. 32:7; Psa. 34:7; 55:18; Rom. 8:31). The chariots of fire were symbolic of the Divine and holy presence (Exod. 3:2; 13:21, 22; 2 Kings 2:11; Isa. 66:15; Rev. 15:2), and the horses were symbolic of the Divine protection (Psa. 33:16-22; 147:10). We need to have such a vision as was given to the young servant of Elisha (Prov. 29:18; Hab. 2:3).

In answer to believing prayer on the part of Elisha, God smote the Syrians with partial blindness, so that they did not recognize the prophet as he led them to Samaria (Gen. 19:11). The prophet's statement concerning himself and the city was purposely ambiguous, but true in the sense that his real residence was in Samaria. In our warfare against Satan it is necessary for us to be wise as serpents and harmless as doves (Matt. 10:16).

The Lord had opened the eyes of the young man to see that he was safe because of the Divine presence and power, but He opened the eyes of the Syrian soldiers to see that they were captives because of the Divine holiness and wrath (compare verses 17, 20). God reveals Himself in mercy as a Saviour from sin (Rom. 1:16, 17), but those who refuse His overtures of mercy will find to their sorrow that He will deal with them in justice as their Judge (Isa. 45:22-24; Rom. 1:18; 2 Thess. 2:8-12).

### DAILY BIBLE READINGS

March 15—God's Heavenly Host	.....	Luke 2:8-20.
March 16—God's Host of Battle	.....	Isa. 13:1-11.
March 17—God's Host Captain	.....	Josh. 5:13-15.
March 18—God's Host of Might	.....	1 Chron. 12:8-22.
March 19—God's Host of Praise	.....	Psa. 148.
March 20—God's Earthly Host	.....	Psalms 103 (v. 21).
March 21—God's Host Marches On	.....	Exod. 12:41-51.

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.