

EDUCATIONAL EDITION

Preserve for Reference

The Gospel Witness and Protestant Advocate

Authorized as Second Class Mail, Post Office Department, Ottawa

Vol. 29, No. 39

130 Gerrard St. E., TORONTO, JANUARY 18, 1951.

Whole Number 1495

WESTERN CANADA, BEWARE Wolves in Sheep's Clothing Approach

THIS edition of THE GOSPEL WITNESS is issued especially for the information of the four Western Provinces, and still more especially for Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia. We do not presume to be possessed of an intelligence superior to that of the people whom we address. But what is printed in this issue is the fruit of years of reading, study, and research.

The average person is so engaged with other matters that they have not the time, nor, in many instances, the facilities for such an investigation.

What is contained in this WITNESS may safely be taken as historically authoritative. We have avoided any tendency to superlative statements. We have aimed to assemble historical facts in respect to the School Question in Canada. Controversialists in this matter, whether in the Legislature, Municipal Councils, and Pulpit and Platform, may rely upon the statements made in this paper as being historically indisputable.

We quote at great length the history of the Separate School Movement, particularly in Ontario; for, while Ontario is not the Western Provinces, precedents established here may be invoked for their establishment yonder. It is wise, therefore, to let people know how Separate Schools came to be, and what fruit they are producing.

The Famous Manitoba School Controversy

We advert, first of all, to the famous Manitoba School Controversy, which agitated Canada about the turn of the century, a little before, and a little after. The facts were as follows:

The Province of Manitoba had not been erected as a Province when the British North America Act was passed in 1867. But that Act applies just as much to

the Provinces since erected, as it did to the partners of the original contract, as, for example in Section 93 on Education, sub-section three begins:

"Where in any Province a System of Separate or Dissident Schools exists by law at the Union or is thereafter established by the Legislature of the Province . . ." etc.

So that the B.N.A. Act anticipated, of course, the erection of other Provinces, and it was specifically provided that the principles applicable to Upper and Lower Canada should apply to all the rest.

After Manitoba had been erected as a Province; it established a system of religious schools. They were not like the separate schools of Ontario, but to all intents and purposes they were separate schools. In due course the Manitoba Legislature abolished these schools, not on religious, but on educational grounds, because they were not properly functioning as educational institutions. They existed to teach the dogmas of the Church to the children, and to teach them enough to understand the catechism, and to obey orders. But they were not in any true sense educational institutions, and they were abolished on that ground.

Special Privileges to Rome

The Roman Catholic Church, however, invokes the aid of the state; and when the Canadas, Upper and Lower, with the Maritime Provinces, were brought together by the Act of Confederation known as the British North America Act, education, in section 93 of that Act, was placed within the jurisdiction of the Provinces. Such special privileges as were then enjoyed by any religious sect were, by that act, perpetuated.

No Separate Schools in Maritimes or B.C.

But Separate Schools are unknown, at least in name, in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. About 1877 they were abolished in Prince Edward Island. British Columbia has no Separate Schools, and I believe never has had other than a system of national schools. Manitoba had Separate Schools of a kind when she was admitted to the Union three or four years after Confederation; but, by the Manitoba Act of 1890, Separate Schools were abolished. An appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of Canada, and then to the Privy Council of the Empire, during the years 1893 and 1894. In 1894 the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, endorsed by the Privy Council, was handed down. That judgment was to the effect that the Manitoba Act carried forward section 93 of the British North America Act into the Manitoba Act, and gave the religious minority in Manitoba the same status as though they had been parties to the Union.

Privy Council and Manitoba

The Privy Council held that, under the Act of Confederation, an appeal would lie to the Governor General in Council—which means, of course, the Federal Government—and that the Federal Government therefore was competent to adopt any remedial measure it might see fit, to redress the disabilities which the Roman Catholic minority alleged the Manitoba Act of 1890 in abolishing Separate Schools, imposed upon them. But the Privy Council was particular to say:

"The Governor General in Council has jurisdiction, and the appeal is well founded; but that the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authority to whom it has been committed by the statute."

That is to say, the Privy Council said the Federal Government had the right to interfere, but that no obligation was imposed upon it by the statute, and that it was really left to the discretion of the authority in question.

Laurier and Provincial Rights

What was the result? The Government at Ottawa, under Sir Charles Tupper, attempted to pass remedial legislation; but it never did pass the House, because Parliament was talked to death, and a general election was fought on the Separate School question. The Honourable Wilfred Laurier, later Sir Wilfred, of course accepted the Privy Council's judgment, but said, if he were returned to power he would not coerce Manitoba. "I believe in provincial rights", he said. Sir Charles Tupper was overwhelmingly defeated, Laurier was elected; and from then until now no Government at Ottawa has ever had the boldness to interfere with Manitoba.

(It ought to be said that Sir Wilfred Laurier later was responsible for the Autonomy Bills by which the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta were erected, and that, in the original draft of those bills provision was made for separate Roman Catholic education from the primary schools to the University. The original draft, of course, was modified, but the principle of Separate Schools was established in the new Provinces).

Incidentally, I may remark that when crossing to England in 1928, I fell in with a Canadian National official from England, who had been conducting a party of tourists across Canada. He told me that he spoke as

a Canadian National official, and without any political bias; but asked me if I could explain why the emigration authorities at Ottawa at that time afforded every facility for the bringing to Canada of immigrants from Southern Europe and Roman Catholic countries, while they seemed, at the same time, to put every possible obstacle in the way of getting British immigrants into Canada. They were sending them out to Saskatchewan and Alberta, establishing them in colonies of their own around the Separate Schools—a little bit of Austria, or Italy, or France, as the case might be. The depression stopped the flow of immigration, but beyond any doubt, it was the far-seeing purpose of the Roman Catholic Church to build up, in Saskatchewan and Alberta, a great Roman Catholic Empire like the French-Canadian Roman Catholic solid block to the east; and in due time Ontario would be at their mercy.

Separate Schools Could Be Abolished

But my main insistence at this point is that Prince Edward Island and Manitoba, subsequent to Confederation, abolished Separate Schools; and that Manitoba at least was held to be in a position analogous to that of the original parties to the Union, and that the schools abolished in 1890 have never been re-established; and that no Government, whether Liberal or Conservative, that has ever taken power at Ottawa, has dared to interfere with the Province's decision. And it would be possible to abolish Separate Schools in Ontario. I have studied the decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; and I know, of course, that if Separate Schools were abolished in Ontario, by that decision, the Roman Catholic minority in Ontario would have the right to ask Ottawa to override the decision of Ontario, and to establish Separate Schools in this Province in opposition to the will of the majority of its people. They would have the right to ask the Ottawa Government to do it. The Ottawa Government of the day would, indisputably, have the right to do it if they were asked; but I venture to say that no Government will ever take power in Ottawa, of any colour, Liberal or Conservative, who would have the temerity to enact legislation in direct opposition to the people of Ontario. I therefore affirm that it is within the competence of the electors of Ontario to elect a Government and to give that Government the mandate absolutely to abolish all sectarian schools within the Province. And, were it done, I do not believe any Ottawa government would re-establish them.

I have thus called attention to the Manitoba precedent at the outset, to show that even where Separate Schools now exist, they can be abolished by Provincial authority, and I venture to repeat that I believe no Government at Ottawa would attempt to coerce a Province against its will.

The abolition of such Separate Schools would involve no injustice to our Roman Catholic population. For the most part it is the Church, and not the people, who wants them. And both in Toronto and Ottawa, and I doubt not in other places, some thousands of Roman Catholics have chosen to have themselves assessed as Public School supporters, rather than supporters of the Separate Schools; and therefore they send their children to the Public School in preference to the Separate School.

In our main article, beginning on page 12 we discuss fully the principle and history of Roman Catholic Separate Schools in Upper and Lower Canada.

INCREASED GRANTS TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS

In this education number of THE GOSPEL WITNESS I have included a summary of the history of Roman Catholic Schools in Ontario from before Confederation, up to this hour. I shall not have time to read it: I have endeavoured to collect a mass of information on this subject which I hope will not only be informing to the person reading it, but will enable such person to combat the present proposal.

Included in the information to which I have referred, I have set out a number of tables compiled from the Municipal Statistics of 1941, and for convenience of reference I have designated them Table Number One, Number Two, Number Three, and Number Four. Table Number Two gives a summary of Separate School assessment and levies for the year 1941. The assessment on Roman Catholic property for school purposes was \$237,687,294.00. The average mill rate for all of Ontario was approximately fourteen. The Separate School tax levies amounted to \$2,926,795. That is the amount which Roman Catholic ratepayers raised for their own schools.

In Table Number Three there is given a list of grants to Public and Separate Schools of various classes, such as counties, districts, villages, towns, cities, etc. There are 6,214 Public Schools in Ontario and 821 Separate Schools. The grants to Public Schools totalled \$3,859,795.00, and to Separate Schools, \$1,210,784.00—nearly \$4,000,000.00 given to 6,214 Public Schools, and nearly a million and a quarter to 821 Separate Schools!

The amount of money raised by Separate School tax levies was, in round figures, \$3,000,000.00. If the Ontario Government pays half the expense of education, it will give \$1,500,000.00 for Separate Schools, over and above the special grants of one and a quarter million dollars—nearly two and three-quarter million dollars given out of the public treasury for the support of Roman Catholic Separate Schools. That, at three per cent interest, in round figures, would amount to a gift of \$90,000,000.00 to the Roman Catholic Church.

Grants to Separate Schools Increase 120 Times

In Table Number Four we have set out the grant to Public and Separate Schools from 1867 to 1941. At the time of Confederation, the grant to Public Schools was \$117,160.00, and to Separate Schools, \$9,903.00. That has steadily increased until the grant to Public Schools in 1941 stood at \$3,643,000.00, and the grant to Separate Schools at \$1,210,000.00. That is to say, the Government grants to Public Schools, from 1867 to 1941, increased by twenty and a half times; in the same period, the Government grants to Separate Schools increased over one hundred and twenty times—and still they ask for more!

Here and there our Roman Catholic friends single out certain municipalities where the Separate School tax rate is high, as for instance in Sudbury, where the Separate School tax rate is about eighty mills. But in Sudbury there are two thousand Public School children, and twenty-five hundred Separate School children. The Government grant to the Public Schools is \$6,000.00, or \$3.00 per pupil; while that to the Separate Schools is \$18,500.00, or \$7.40 per pupil. Of course, in individual cases, if the Roman Catholic Church is determined to

enjoy the luxury of a special school of its own, it may cost them somewhat more to keep their children thus segregated in a Separate School, than if they were to send them to the Public School.

50 Municipalities Average Only \$50.00 a Year in Separate School Taxes

But there is another side to this story. In fifty municipalities, the total assessment for Separate Schools is \$341,711.00, and the tax levy against that assessment, \$2,570.00. In round figures, these nearly fifty municipalities pay an average of \$50.00 per municipality—or less than \$1.00 a week—for the privilege of having a Separate School. Understand, that is not \$50.00 per person, but is \$50.00 per municipality. Can anyone say that there is "undue burden of taxation" for Separate School supporters?

A Few Examples

Let us take two or three examples. East Oxford and Goulburn, as municipalities, raise the magnificent sum, by taxation, toward their Separate Schools, of \$9.00 per year. St. Vincent in Grey County raises \$12.00 per year. East Zorra and Dereham in Oxford County, and Elmsley South, Leeds County, each raised \$17.00 per year. The municipality of Woolford in Grenville County, raised by their Separate School tax the magnificent sum of five dollars for a whole year! And the public treasury, including a proportion of our taxes, makes up the balance in these nearly fifty municipalities with their average of \$50.00 per year.

Separate School grants total \$1,210,000.00 for 100,000 pupils, or \$12.00 per pupil. Public School grants total \$3,646,000.00 for 550,000 pupils, or \$7.00 per pupil. Separate School grants have increased one hundred and fifty per cent in the last ten years, while Public School grants have increased by only ten per cent. Separate School taxes have remained at about \$3,000,000.00 per year for the past twelve years, in spite of an increase in Government grants of almost one million dollars.

The Case of Delhi in Norfolk County

But now, let me give you an example of what is taking place in Ontario. Years ago I was Pastor for three years in the village of Delhi, in Norfolk County. It had then a population of perhaps roundabout eight hundred or a thousand people. It had no Separate School, nor do I remember that there were any Roman Catholics in the place. As recently as ten years ago, the village of Delhi had only a Public School, and received a Government grant of \$1,500.00. Taxes raised for school purposes amounted to \$7,500.00. Later, according to the 1942 Public Accounts, a Separate School was set up. Now the Public School grant has been reduced from \$1,500.00 to \$900.00; but the Separate School grant is \$2,100.00. Delhi Public School supporters still raise \$7,500.00 in taxes as before, for their school; while Separate School supporters raise only \$793.00 in taxation—but receive a Government grant nearly three times the amount they raise for themselves. The average attendance at the Public School in Delhi is 212; and the average attendance at the Separate School is 48—and yet for the 48 pupils, the Separate School receives—I repeat—an annual grant of \$2,100.00; and for the 212 Public School pupils, the Public School receives an annual grant of \$900.00.

Separate Schools Will Multiply

It is well to keep in mind, not only conditions which now obtain, but which will be created if the Drew programme is executed. Separate Schools will spring up everywhere if the Roman Church is assured that the Provincial Government will assume half the cost. In Norfolk County alone, of recent years, to other Separate Schools have come into existence, one in Simcoe, and one in Langton; and in that electoral riding there are approximately five thousand Belgians, having twelve to fifteen hundred votes, which are largely Roman Catholic.

I have a vivid recollection of the "erection" of the Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, in 1905, because I engaged in public discussion of the educational provisions of the Autonomy Bills at that time. After a general election, having given no pre-intimation of his intention, Sir Wilfred Laurier brought in these Bills, fastening the upas tree of separation on the two new Provinces. He had yielded Manitoba, to give the Roman Catholic Church an empire, and it was doubtless planned to colonize the two Provinces with Roman Catholic immigrants, and perhaps with the surplus population of Quebec, and by means of the separate school, establish Roman Catholic cells of influence throughout the West. The separate schools were designed to perpetuate, and propagate Roman Catholicism in the West; and their principle of establishing Roman Catholics in colonies, under the direction of the priests, would give the Church blocks of electors, which would be used to compel the Government to do the Hierarchy's will.

The strange weather that visited the Western Provinces, blowing away some of the farms, and then World War I, followed by the great depression, were, in disguise, a blessing to the Prairie Provinces, because it postponed the fulfilment of the Hierarchy's dream.

But two things put the Western Provinces, at the present time, in great jeopardy. Thousands of displaced persons will be brought into this country, after they have been "screened" by Roman Catholic priests in Europe. They will be settled throughout Canada, in Roman Catholic colonies, to be dragooned by the priests to do the Hierarchy's will.

In addition to this, Alberta is now shown to be possessed of fabulous wealth. The extraordinary oil development will attract people from all parts of the world. But no one will be more attracted, nor more certain to settle upon that Province, than the vulture of the Roman Catholic Church.

In all probability oil will yet be discovered in Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, and the Prairie Provinces will become one of the richest parts of the Dominion. And from their wealth the Roman Catholic Church will endeavour to recoup her European losses.

Elsewhere in this issue, on page 23, we publish an article written some years ago on the Peace River District, which illustrates Roman Catholic designs there.

We publish also in this issue a somewhat long article discussing the principle and history of Separate Schools in Ontario. (Page 12.)

When the privilege of Separate Schools was conceded by The British North America Act of 1867, the privileges granted the Roman Catholic Church in this respect were definitely limited. The only thing that was guaranteed to them was this: Roman Catholics were allowed to designate their education tax raised by the municipi-

ality as for public or separate schools, as they liked. If sufficient money from taxation in any given district was paid by Roman Catholics to meet the expense of a Separate School, they were privileged to have one. But if not, they had no option but to send their children to a public school. But in The British North America Act no provision was made to force Protestants to pay taxes to support Separate Schools to propagate Roman Catholicism.

The principle of supplementing the income from taxation by Government grants followed in due time; and the Hierarchy has kept everlastingly at it until now the Provincial grants for Separate Schools in some cases are as high as 95 per cent. of the cost, and in not a few cases are larger than the grants made to public schools. (See Tables on page 21).

We have printed this History that our friends in the Western Provinces may see that when the Roman Catholic Church is given an inch, it takes a mile. It is never satisfied, and what may be conceded as a special privilege to-day, the Church will claim as a right, tomorrow. That practice inheres in the whole philosophy of Roman Catholicism. The Church claims to be the master of the State. It claims that the State exists to support the Church. Hence, it claims it is within its rights if it can, by any means, fair or foul, compel the State to maintain Separate Schools.

Our Western friends know what efforts the Roman Catholics have made to secure French-language broadcasts, and special privileges in every direction. They will be well advised to begin at once, in every community, to set up an organization in support of public schools, and against any further extension of Separate Schools, and, if possible, to effect the abolition of them altogether. They should proceed on the principle that "prevention is better than cure".

Ecclesiastical Vultures

These ecclesiastical vultures will soon be swarming over the rich Provinces of the West, endeavouring to steal them for themselves. The arrogant presumption of the Papacy is shown in the quotation we have made from the Pope's pronouncement respecting the assumption of Mary:

"We have consecrated the entire human race to Her Immaculate Heart in public ceremonies."

Could a more insolent presumption be imagined, that this man in the Vatican claims, to have authority to consecrate the entire human race to the immaculate heart of Mary—whatever that is!

We ask all our friends in the West to distribute this paper as widely as possible, in order that non-Catholics may be on the alert to defend themselves against the encroachments of Rome.

GOSPEL WITNESS PUBLICATIONS

(Reprints)

"The Antichrist—His Portrait and History", By Baron Porcelli50
"The Greatest Fight in the World", by C. H. Spurgeon, 64 pages25
"Bakkeney's Popery in Its Social Aspect", 312 pages	1.00

The Gospel Witness

130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2 - Canada

The Jarvis Street Pulpit

"He As God Sitteth in the Temple of God, Shewing Himself That He Is God"

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

Preached in Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto, Sunday Evening, January 14th, 1951

The third sermon on, The Present Antichrist

(Electrically Recorded)

"Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition;

Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." 2 Thess. 2:3, 4.

I STOPPED at my gas station about a week or so ago, and the proprietor said, "Have you seen that big Lincoln car about?" I said, "I haven't noticed it." "Well there is one," he said, "A great car. It is being driven about by two F.B.I. men," (officers of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the American Scotland Yard.) I said, "What are they doing here?" He said, "There has been a bit of a flood of counterfeit bills, American twenty dollar and ten dollar bills set in circulation, and they are trying to discover the source from which these bills are circulated in Toronto, and if possible, to find the men or others who are distributing them."

How uncharitable that was of the F.B.I. men! How utterly intolerant! Why should not the counterfeiters be allowed to ply their nefarious trade without molestation from anyone? It is a free country, and if independently of all bank deposits or reserves of gold, or of value of any kind, they want to print counterfeit bills, and foist them upon the unsuspecting public, then let them alone! Would you agree to that? Don't you think it is the duty of government officials to discover and apprehend and prevent further deception by men who are counterfeiting the government's coinage or currency, behind which there is a sufficient deposit to redeem every good note that is in circulation? Behind the counterfeit there is nothing at all. And surely it is the duty of the bank teller at his wicket, when a bill is presented to him, especially when he knows there are counterfeit bills in circulation, to scrutinize every piece of money that he may not be deceived, but may distinguish between the counterfeit and the genuine.

I was in Philadelphia and New York yesterday, and I saw in a New York paper that the government had issued orders to exercise strict examination over all passengers coming by ship or plane from Great Britain. Was it an unfriendly act? No. There is an epidemic of 'flu on the European Continent, and in rather a virulent form in the British Isles, and many are dying daily from influenza, so the government of the United States said, "We are sorry, but keep that plague away from us if possible." Don't you think they were right in doing so? But religiously, as we read tonight, there are people who will believe anything, and never come to a knowledge of the truth. Nothing is easier than to deceive people religiously. The greatest charlatans on earth, the greatest deceivers are people who practise

their deception in the name of religion. It is the duty of the Christian teacher to exercise care to distinguish and differentiate between the counterfeit and the genuine. We are admonished not to believe every spirit. The Bible deals negatively with some things, as well as positively. Don't believe everything you hear, "but try the spirits whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world." There are many counterfeiters. Nor are we to accept a cleverer counterfeit for a clumsy one. Some may be so clumsy that they are readily recognized; some others may be very cleverly done, and it will require an expert, perhaps with a microscope, to discover the falsity of the note before him.

And so, dear friends, there are many very subtle religious deceptions, and we need to exercise care, and in swinging away, as I have said, from some clumsy counterfeit, we must not allow ourselves to accept another kind of counterfeit that is not the genuine. I remember, when in England, if you went to the Bank they would pay your cheque, if it was large enough, in gold, and they did not count it, they would just pull open the drawer, take a shovel, and shovel it out, and pour it into a scale. If there was a defective sovereign there it would not balance, or perhaps a genuine one that was overmuch worn. I have seen the man spread them out, and pick one out, then he would put them in the scales to see that they were all sound. So we need to learn to weigh things that are offered for our acceptance in the balances of the sanctuary. We are not to believe what men have said simply because some other people have accepted it; we should learn to go directly to the word of God itself, and to see what the Bible teaches. And if what we are asked to accept is contrary thereto, let us reject it, no matter what it may cost.

I have already shown you in other addresses that the spirit of Antichrist has been present from the beginning. The Incarnation is spoken of as the "mystery of Godliness," "God manifest in the flesh." But the "mystery of iniquity" was contemporary with the manifestation of God in the flesh. There was a "mystery of Godliness," and a "mystery of iniquity," and in apostolic times side by side with the mystery of Godliness there operated this mystery of iniquity. But it was not full-fledged; it was not revealed as yet, and this chapter

tells us that his revelation was hindered or let, an archaic use of the word "let." Sometimes it means permission, but in this sense it meant hindrance; there was some restraining power that prevented the mystery of iniquity from displaying itself to the full, and "he who now (hindereth) will (hinder), until he be taken out of the way."

Now do not be angry with me if I run counter to some of your pet theories. There are those who tell us that the hinderer is the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit in the church, and when the church is raptured and taken out of the way, and the specific ministry of the Spirit is terminated, then Antichrist will be revealed. Certainly the church has not been raptured yet, and praise God, the Spirit of God has not left us, for while it remains possible for one soul to be converted, we may be sure that the Holy Ghost is still with us. No one else can do it. And on the other hand, surely the mystery of iniquity is working overtime in these days. Can you survey Europe and Asia, and the world at large, without recognizing that some kind of anti-Christian system and power is at work? Surely the most prejudiced must admit that.

I will tell you what I believe. Don't accept it because I say it; don't accept it, but just give it thought. That is all I want you to do. All I try to do at any time is to make people think. A lot of people do not go to church to think, they go to church to sleep, or in other words, to say "Amen" to whatever they are told. They may be told one thing one Sunday, and the very opposite the next, but they say "Amen" to both. I remember when I was in London I had a man in my congregation who was very loyal, and one Sunday morning he met me at the door, and said, "That was fine. You know I say 'Amen' to everything you say." I said, "I noticed that all the time I was speaking you were nodding your assent," for he had been fast asleep all the time. He didn't know a thing of what I had said. It seems to me that a lot of people go to church to get a kind of religious anodyne or opiate, and if they stamp enough, and make noise enough, they are hysterically aroused, and they say, "Oh, we have got the truth." They may be a million miles from the truth. I am going to tell you what I think about this matter, and all I ask you to do is to give it careful thought.

I have not the slightest doubt in my own mind that the restraining power referred to here was the all but universal power of Rome, that is the Roman Empire. In those days no competitor or rival of Caesar was permitted anywhere. You remember that the enemies of Christ said that He had made Himself a King, and when it was written over His head "This is Jesus the King of the Jews," they said, "Write not, The King of the Jews; but that he said, I am King of the Jews." Pilate said, "What I have written I have written". Now our Futurist friends tell us that the Lord Jesus came to earth with a deliberate intention of establishing a temporal kingdom, and setting Himself up as King to rule over them, and that if the Jews had accepted Him He would then have become their King. You remember the disciples rather expected that: "Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on the left, in thy kingdom." Peter said, "Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee." "What shall we have then? When you come into power what are we going to get?" I believe that Judas expected some

place in the Kingdom. From the time that Jesus began to tell His disciples that He was going to die, they began to see a little more clearly that there was to be no temporal kingdom. From that time Satan entered into Judas, and Judas said, "There is going to be no kingdom, and I am going to get what I can while the getting is good," so he went to the chief priests and said, "What will you give me?" Now I submit that if that contention had been true; then the Jews were very wise in charging Jesus with attempting to make Himself King, and technically they would have been justified in the charges of sedition that they brought against Him. "He is going to make Himself a King," they said, and they appealed to Caesar. You remember how they said, "We have no king but Caesar." They were ultra-loyal, notwithstanding they hated Caesar. But when the Roman Empire declined in about the sixth century, the Papacy took its place. I cannot go into all the historical detail; I haven't time, but I would like to. But they took over the power of Rome, and the Antichrist was soon revealed as claiming to be the king of kings and lord of lords.

I.

Let us have a look at the portrait given us of this man of sin. To begin with, HE IS A LAWLESS ONE; he knew no law. I think one of the advantages of making a study of Roman Catholicism is that it so exactly the antithesis of everything that is Christian that you cannot study one without studying the other. What have we in Him whom we worship? Not a lawless one. He was "made of a woman, made under the law, To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." In the beginning in the Temple when they missed Him and found Him, He said, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" He put God first. The first and the greatest commandment is that we should love God with all our hearts. Then he went down into Nazareth "and was subject unto them," and the first precept of the second table of the Law which relates us horizontally to our neighbours is "Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." And so He yielded obedience to both tables of the law; He kept the law, and worked out a righteousness for us, and the righteousness which He imputes is a righteousness which He Himself wrought for us under the Law. As I have so often said to you, He fulfilled our life's day for us, fulfilled our duty to the letter, and then gave us His seamless robe, which, if I may dare to say, He had woven for us in the loom of the law, that our nakedness might be covered; and that we might appear as righteous before God. Always He was fulfilling the law: "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?" He expounded to them in all the scriptures, the law and the prophets and the Psalms, the things concerning Himself, and fulfilled them to the last particular. Why? Because of course, He was the law-giver, the source of law; "And he is before all things, and by him all things consist."

But this Antichrist is the lawless one; he is of Satanic origin, "whose coming is after the working of Satan"; he is a man of sin, he is the son of perdition. The pope

speaks about the "authority of blessed Peter." He ought to say that "I do these things by the authority and example of the cursed Judas." He is the successor, not of Peter, but of Iscariot! Of Satanic origin, the son of perdition.

"After the working of Satan." Surely if you read the record of the papacy it fulfils the picture exactly, for its whole bloody record is "after the working of Satan," right up to date. I remember in the early part of the second world war I read the paper one morning, and I said to myself, "Here is a very interesting thing." The premier of Yugoslavia had just made a broadcast urging the Serbs and the Croats, the two elements of Yugoslavia, to stand together against the enemy. "Now," I said, "If my theory is right, they will not stand together, but it looks as though I am wrong in this case. Here is the premier himself asking them to stand together. Now all the people of Yugoslavia are of Slavic origin; the only difference is that the Serbs are Greek Orthodox, and the Croats are Roman Catholic, and the division between them is not racial, but religious." A day or so passed and the Germans advanced on Zagreb, the Capital, and the very man who had urged them to stand together threw wide the gates of the Capital city and welcomed the invaders. Then they set up a puppet kingdom of Croatia, made an Italian Duke nominally king, and Andrei Pavelich premier. Pavelich was the man, who a few years before had engineered and effected the assassination of King Alexander of Yugoslavia, together with the French foreign minister who was trying to check-mate the machinations of Rome in Europe. When Alexander came to Versailles and the French foreign minister went to meet him, they were both assassinated, and Andrei Pavelich was the man. He escaped to Italy, and when they set up this kingdom of Croatia he became premier.

I read a book last week* of what was accomplished in Yugoslavia, when under the direction of the infamous Archbishop Stepinac, and the other Roman Catholic priest in Croatia, about two million Serbs were ruthlessly murdered. They went from village to village and murdered everyone, all under the direction of the priests of Rome. If possible, Romanists hate the Greek Orthodox more than they hate Protestants, because the distinctive difference between Greek Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism is that the Greek church will not acknowledge the supremacy of the pope.

Now, I say, the working of this system is surely the working of Satan, not only in ancient times, but right up to this minute it is doing the same deadly work.

"With all power and signs and lying wonders." What signs and lying wonders emanate from the papacy? You have read about "Our Lady of Guadeloupe," and "Our Lady of Lourdes," and "Our Lady of Fatima," and "Our Lady of the Cape," and many others, and nearly all these so-called apparitions or visions of the virgin Mary were seen by little girls or little children; hence there is the Lady of Guadeloupe in Mexico, and Lourdes, and Fatima of Portugal, and of the Cape, in Quebec; the lady of this and that. Of course it is all one lady, what the Romanists call "Our Lady," but she is supposed to have appeared in these places, and then they set up a shrine, which is another collecting agency for Peter's

pence, that is all, just another way of getting money, another way of deceiving the people. They had it in the Marian Congress, at Ottawa, when the images of the virgin were carried around the streets of our Capital City, while tens of thousands of people prostrated themselves on their faces to the earth, as these images passed by. "Lying wonders," miracles of all kinds; bones and relics. Rags, bones and bottles! They have found Peter's bones now, under the basilica. Peter was never in Rome, but his bones got there somehow. But that doesn't make any difference. Just one of the "pretended" wonders. There is the house of the Annunciation at Loreto, in which the Angel Gabriel announced to Mary, the espoused wife of Joseph, when the house was in Nazareth, that she was to be the mother of Incarnate Deity, and the house in which this annunciation was made is now in Natz, the whole house. I remember when they were cutting Davenport Road through, there was a big apartment house right in the middle of it, built of brick, and without any of the people vacating it, they managed to lift it up and put it to one side. I thought that was an engineering feat quite commendable, but that is nothing to the miracles of Rome. They can pick up a house and transport it from Palestine to Italy. Oh no, the priests didn't do it; it was done by the angels. The angels carried it to Tirsato in Illyria in 1291 A.D., and three years later, again by angels it was carried to the vicinity of Recanti. (See Catholic Encyclopedia at end of sermon.) This is another of the "pretended wonders" of the antichrist. Time would fail me, to tell you about the Shrine at St. Anne de Beaupre, and of Brother Andre, and all the rest, always adding to them, and every one of them becomes a Judas over again: "What will you give me?" Everywhere just the same. The Papacy is the richest corporation on earth, and the shrewdest piece of commercialism to be found anywhere.

All this "with all deceivableness of unrighteousness." I am not blaming the people; I have no quarrel with individual Roman Catholics as such. I haven't any doubt that many of them are sincere and devout, but sincerely deceived, for "with all deceivableness of unrighteousness" this system works.

Judge for yourself whether what we know of the papacy, fits in with the Scriptural portrait of the Lawless One.

II.

THIS MAN OF SIN IS TO BE A RELIGIOUS PERSONAGE. Our Futurist friends describe him as a great political leader, a great military genius, a man on horse-back. The Bible does not say so. He is a religious person, he "sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." The Roman Catholic religion is basically a political system, but not avowedly so; it is a religious system. If we could strip the religious mask from the face of the papacy, Romanism would fail almost immediately around the world. Why we would as soon have a little Russia, or a little Italy, or a little China set up in our country, owing allegiance to a foreign potentate, as we would countenance a political Rome. But they claim special privileges, because they are religious; the pope is the vicar of Christ, the representative of Christ. It traffics in religion; it makes merchandise of the souls of men. That is what the Holy Year was. They were granted certain indulgences. That does not mean that they were free to commit sin, but it means

**Ravens Wolves*, by Monica Farrell, obtainable The Canadian Protestant League, Box 233, Winnipeg, Man.

that part of their sentence in purgatory, where they are supposed to endure temporal punishment for all the sins committed after baptism, part of that was remitted—a hundred days, two hundred days, or whatever it may be. But they were not given plenary indulgence—that is what I should like! A plenary indulgence is a detour around purgatory altogether. I do not want to go there even for six hundred years, like one of the Bishops. That is too long for me. But the Holy Year, and purgatory, for which there is not a shred of warrant in the word of God—wholly an invention, (one of their own priests called it the “priests’ Klondike”) and the Mass—the whole system is just a way of making money, and the church to-day is I suppose the richest corporation on earth, and there is not any trick on the midway or anything of black magic in Africa that is more certainly of the devil than this system.

“*He opposeth,*” *setteth himself in opposition*, is what it really means. Christ here, the Antichrist there, set in opposition and in competition. My dear friends, the Roman system is the antithesis of Christianity at every point. How? The Bible says: “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.” Rome says, “Be baptized, and that will save you; you cannot be saved without baptism.” As I have said to you before, they have even made provision for pre-natal baptism, lest a child should die without baptism, and never see the face of God. What a Satanic doctrine that is! Not a word of Scripture in it. Repentance—what is repentance? It is a grace wrought in the soul by the Spirit of God; a spiritual quality, whereby a man’s whole attitude toward God and the things of God is changed! “Repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.” Rome has converted that into “penance”. Repentance is something God does for you; penance is something you do for yourself—works, mortifying the flesh. The Mass was the Lord’s supper, a memorial feast celebrating the finished work of Christ, that is all. Just to keep Him in remembrance. What is the Roman Catholic Mass? A sacrifice. And by the Mass atonement is made for sin. Some of their writers say that the sacrifice of the Mass is even more efficacious than the sacrifice of the cross. I haven’t time to go on with that.

He “*exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped.*” Can you tell me, has there ever been a system in the world’s history that exalted its head as the Roman system exalts the pope? “Above all that is called God, or that is worshipped.”

I have a book here—I have all its information on my shelves in the works from which he quotes, but it is summarized in a book that just came to my hand by a Roman Catholic priest.* This is from the Council of Trent:

“We define that the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff holds the primacy over the whole world, and the Roman Pontiff himself is the successor of the Blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles, and the true vicar of Christ, the head of the whole church, the father of all Christians; and that to him, in the person of Blessed Peter, was given, by Our Lord Jesus Christ, full power to feed, rule, and govern the universal church as is contained also in the acts of the ecumenical councils, and in the sacred canons.” (Council of Trent.)

**Ins and Outs of Romanism*, by Joseph Zacchello (an ex-priest), Christian Literature Depot, Box 203, Winipeg, Man.

“All names which in the Scriptures are applied to Christ, by virtue of which it is established that he is over the church, all the same names are applied to the pope.” (Bellarmine “On the Authority of Councils.” Vol. 2, p. 226; ed. 1619.)

“Hence he (the pope) is said to have a heavenly power, and hence changes even the nature of things, applying the substantial of one thing to another—can make something out of nothing—a judgment which is null he makes to be real, since in the things which he wills, his will is taken for a reason. Nor is there any one to say to him, Why dost thou do this? For he can dispense with the law, he can turn injustice into justice by correcting and changing the law, and he has the fulness of power.” (Decretals of Gregory IX, Book 1, Title 7, Chap. 3.)

That is by one of the popes. He says that of himself; very modest, isn’t he?

“Peter and his successor have power to impose laws both perceptive and prohibitive, power likewise to grant dispensation from these laws, and when needful, to annul them. It is theirs to judge offenses against the laws, to improve and remit penalties. This judicial authority will even include the power to pardon sin. For sin is a breach of the laws of the supernatural kingdom, and falls under the cognizance of its constituted judges.” (The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. 12, p. 265.)

“We hold upon this earth the place of God Almighty.” (Pope Leo XIII in the Encyclical Letter dated June 20, 1894.)

“The pope is of such lofty and supreme dignity that, properly speaking, he has not been established in any rank of dignity, but rather has been placed upon the very summit of all ranks of dignities.

“Hence the pope is crowned with a triple crown, as king of heaven and of earth and of the lower regions.”

There was Another Who said, “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.” The pope claims to have that.

“Moreover the superiority and the power of the Roman pontiff by no means pertains only to heavenly things, to earthly things, and to things under the earth, but are even over angels, than whom he is greater.

“So that if it were possible that the angels might err in the faith, or might think contrary to the faith, they could be judged and excommunicated by the pope.”

That is the solemn word of a Roman Catholic authority.

“The pope is as it were God on earth, sole sovereign of the faithful of Christ, chief king of kings, having plenitude of power, to whom has been intrusted by the omnipotent God direction not only of the earthly but even of the heavenly kingdom.

“The pope is of so great authority that he can modify, explain, or interpret even divine laws. Whatever the Lord God Himself, and the Redeemer, is said to do, that His vicar does.” (Extracts from Ferraris’ Ecclesiastical Dictionary, article on the pope, published in Rome 1899 at the Press of the Propaganda.)

“For what is the subject in dispute when we discuss the primacy of the pontiff? In a few words, it is the sum and substance of Christianity. The inquiry is nothing less than, whether the church ought any longer to maintain its existence, or to be dissolved and to fall to ruin? What is the difference between asking whether it is expedient to remove the foundation from a building, the shepherd from his flock, the general from his army, the sun from the stars, the head from the body; and asking whether it is expedient that the building should fall, the flock be scattered, the army

routed, the stars darkened, the body prostrate? (Bel-larmine, "On the Chief Pontiff.")

"We have no right to ask reasons of the pope, any more than of Almighty God, as a preliminary of our submission. We are to take with unquestioning docility whatever instruction the pope gives us." ("The Catholic World," Aug. 1877.)

Some of us are in a bad way, if all this could be true, or even a fraction of it.

"Faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic Religion, and the salvation of Christian people, the Sacred Council approving we teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks ex-cathedra, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith and morals to be held by the universal church, by the divine assistance promised him in the Blessed Peter, is possessed of the infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed from defining doctrine regarding faith and morals; and that, therefore, such definitions of the Roman Pontiffs are irrefragable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church." (Vatican Council on The Church of Christ, Chapter LV, July 18, 1870.)

Parts of the Bull of Boniface VIII, *Unam Sanctam*

"We are compelled to believe with urgent faith and to hold one holy catholic and apostolic Church. Therefore, the one and only Church has one body and one head, not two heads like a monster, viz., Christ and the vicar of Christ, Peter and Peter's successor. We are instructed by the Gospels that there are in his power two swords, viz., the spiritual and the temporal. For when the apostles said, 'Behold here are two swords' (Luke xxii. 38), viz., in the Church; when the apostles said so, the Lord did not respond, 'There are too many' but 'Enough.' Certainly, he who denies that there is in the power of Peter a temporal sword has paid poor attention to the word of the Lord, who said, 'Put up the sword into the sheath' (John xviii. ii). Therefore, both are in the power of the Church, both the spiritual and the material sword. But this is to be wielded for the Church, that by the Church; that by the hand of the priest, this not by the hand of kings and soldiers, but at the nod and patience of the priest. Moreover, sword should be under sword, and the temporal authority should be subject to the spiritual; for when the apostle says 'There is no power except from God; the powers which be are ordained of God' (Rom. xiii. 1); they are not ordained except sword be under sword. For on the testimony of truth, the spiritual power has to institute the earthly, and to judge it, if it is not good. Thus, the prophecy of Jeremiah concerning the Church and the ecclesiastical power is verified, 'Behold, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms,' etc. (Jer. i. 10). Therefore, if the earthly power deviates from the way, it shall be judged by the spiritual power; if the inferior spiritual power deviates, by its superior spiritual; but if the supreme by God alone since it cannot be judged by man, on the testimony of the apostle, 'The spiritual man judgeth all things, but is himself judged of no man' (1 Cor. ii. 15). Whoever, therefore, resists this power, thus ordained by God, resists the ordination of God; unless he feigns that there are two principles, like Manichaeus, which we judge false and heretical, because, on the testimony of Moses, God did not create the heavens and the earth in several principles but in one principle (Gen. i. 1). Then, to be subject to the Roman pontiff, we declare, say, define, and pronounce to be absolutely necessary to every human creature to salvation."

You must submit to the pope or be damned. He "exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped." *Pontif ex maximus*, the chief priest, and all priests theoretically derive their authority from the pope. And so when the pope (that is the teaching

of Rome) commands the Lord of Heaven to come into his little box, into a wafer, and into a cup of wine—the teaching of Rome is that Jesus Christ Himself cannot disobey the pope. He "exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God."

What Is the Temple?

"I daresay some of you here tonight will say, 'Aha, we have got you now. Of course there is going to be a temple built in Jerusalem, and the sacrifices of blood are to be restored, and Antichrist will sit in that temple.' I have no words adequately to express my rejection and my abhorrence of that doctrine. The word used for temple here is not the word used for the temple building. I will not bother to give you the word, I could do so, but you would not understand it anyway, but it is a word that describes the inner sanctuary, and this idea of a literal temple in Jerusalem where Antichrist is to sit is, it seems to me, as contrary to reason as it is to revelation. The word for the temple used here is a very different word, and it is exactly the same word as is used in such passages as this: 'Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?' " "And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; In whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." That is the kind of temple, a spiritual temple. That is what the true church is. I am a Baptist, and I do not apologize for that, but I know hosts of people who are not Baptists who are living stones in this temple beyond all peradventure.

I was asked to go to New Jersey to preach the funeral sermon of Sir Arie Kok, a Dutch knight, who was chancellor of the Dutch embassy in Peiking for nearly forty years. He was General Secretary of the International Council of Christian Churches, and one of the noblest men I ever met in my life. Ministers were there from all over the Continent just to pay respect to this great man.

Now the temple of God is the church of Christ, the mystic body of Christ, and every one, I do not care what his name is, or what his color, every one who has really been born of the Spirit and washed in the blood, is "fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."

A year ago I was in Australia, on the last lap of my journey around the world, and I had been with Christians of all colors, in Egypt, India, Siam, Singapore, Hong Kong, Indonesia, and elsewhere, people whose language I could not understand, but I knew that the Spirit of God was with them; I was sure they were Christians. There is a Divine instinct put in the true child of God that recognizes that same thing in another, and you cannot come into association with these devout people—I never met people like the Chinese in Singapore in my life. They had received Christ, and they were out of the world—everything was given up to Christ. I preached to them day and night, even the day before Christmas in the afternoon. They said, "You are to preach in the afternoon," and I said, "What is the use? They will all be shopping." I went in the afternoon

and the place was packed; they were eagerly waiting upon the word of God. They were part of the temple of God, I am sure of that.

Rome Claims To Be the Only Church

The Roman Catholic church says there is no such church; the Roman Catholic church says, "We are exclusively the temple of God; the Roman Catholic church is the only church," and all outside are apostate, schismatic, and I know not what else. And this man "sitteth in the temple of God." I have been there, and I saw him carried on a chair, while hundreds of thousands bowed down to him as though he were God. I went through the Vatican, I suppose the greatest storehouse of gold and of jewels in the whole world. Read Revelation and see about it. Not Christian by any means. He "exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God."

You have never read the pope's declaration of the assumption of Mary. I have it here in full, it is in the Jesuit Magazine for February, 1951. Try to imagine who is speaking. He can change the laws of God; he can do anything at all; he can make something out of nothing we read tonight, and so he thinks it proper that the assumption of Mary should be defined, that means that she died but her body did not see corruption—it was carried into Heaven. And so she is in Heaven with her Divine Son, the mother of Jesus, and our chief mediatrix. Jesus is represented sometimes as being rather savage, so you must present your prayers through the mother of Jesus, and she will intercede with her Son. What a lie that is! "For there is . . . one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." Not many, only one! But listen to the modesty expressed in this, and in these proclamations the pronoun is always capitalized, capital W in we, capital O in our, just as we do for the Deity:

"We, who have placed Our Pontificate under the special patronage of the Most Holy Virgin, to whom We have had recourse so often in times of grave trouble, We who have consecrated the entire human race to her Immaculate Heart in public ceremonies,

(What presumption! Who is this man who presumes to "consecrate the entire human race to her (Mary's) Immaculate Heart"? Could any one exceed such insolent presumption?)

and who have time and time again experienced her powerful protection, are confident that this solemn proclamation and definition of the Assumption will contribute in no small way to the advantage of human society, since it redounds to the glory of the Most Blessed Trinity, to which the Blessed Mother of God was bound by such singular bonds. It is to be hoped that all the faithful will be stirred up to a stronger piety toward their heavenly Mother, and that the souls of all those who glory in the Christian name may be moved by the desire of sharing in the unity of Christ's Mystical Body, and of increasing their love for her who in all things shows her motherly heart to the members of this august Body. And so we may hope that those who meditate upon the glorious example Mary offers us may be more and more convinced of the value of a human life entirely devoted to carrying out the heavenly Father's will and to bringing good to others. Thus, while the illusory teachings of materialism and the corruption of morals that follows from these teachings threaten to extinguish the light of virtue and to ruin the lives of men by exciting discord among them, in this magnificent way all may see clearly to what a lofty goal our bodies and souls are destined. Finally, it is our hope that

belief in Mary's bodily Assumption into heaven will make our belief in our own resurrection stronger and render it more effective.

"We rejoice greatly that this solemn event falls, according to the design of God's Providence, during this Holy Year, so that We are able, while the Great Jubilee is being observed, to adorn the brow of God's Virgin Mother with this new gem, and to leave a monument more enduring than bronze of Our own most fervent love for the Mother of God.

"For which reason, after We have poured forth prayers of supplication again and again to God, and have called upon the Spirit of Truth, for the glory of Almighty God Who has lavished His special affection upon the Virgin Mary, for the honor of her Son, the immortal King of the Ages and the Victor over sin and death, for the increase of the glory of that same august Mother, and for the joy and exultation of the entire Church; by the authority of our Lord Jesus by Our own authority, We pronounce, declare, and de-Christ, of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and fine it to be a divinely revealed dogma: that the Immaculate Mother of God, the ever Virgin Mary, having completed the course of her earthly life, was assumed body and soul into heavenly glory.

"Hence, if any one, which God forbid, should dare wilfully to deny or to call into doubt that which We have defined, let him know that he has fallen away completely from the Divine and Catholic Faith.

I dare to deny it, and call into doubt, and say it is another of the infamous falsehoods put forth by "The man of sin, the son of perdition."

"In order that this, Our definition of the bodily Assumption of the Virgin Mary into heaven, may be brought to the attention of the Universal Church, We desire that these, Our Apostolic Letters, should stand for perpetual remembrance, commanding that written copies of these, or even printed copies, signed by the hand of any public notary and furnished with the seal of a person constituted in ecclesiastical dignity, should, when they are tendered or shown, be accorded by all men the same reception they would give to these present Letters.

"It is forbidden to any man to change a page of this, Our declaration, pronouncement, and definition or, by rash attempt, to oppose and counter it. If any man should presume to make such an attempt, let him know that he will incur the wrath of Almighty God and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.

"Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, in the year of the Great Jubilee, 1950, on the first day of the month of November, on the Feast of All Saints, in the twelfth year of Our Pontificate.

I, Pius, Bishop of the Catholic Church, have signed, so defining."

Where in history can you find anything approximating so nearly the portrait of the Antichrist, as given in the Scriptures I have read to you tonight?

We Turn to "Jesus Only"

And with this, we turn away to Jesus only. He is the only manifestation of God, the express image of the Divine Person, the image of the invisible God; the only One. And He is the only Mediator: "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." You cannot be saved by believing in the pope, or by trusting Roman Catholic sacramentarianism. You must trust to Jesus only. I repeat, Jesus only is our sole authority. We will set the word of Jesus Christ against the word of all councils and ecclesiastics, of all priests and prelates and popes, against all scholarship, against

everything and everybody; we will abide by the word of the Son of God. He is the only One who can forgive our sins. The only way I know I am saved is because the Judge of the Supreme Court, against whose decision there is no appeal, has acquitted me, and I know now that my sins are forgiven, and I am just as sure of Heaven as though I were already there. My dear friends, He is the only King of Kings. All authority is given to Him in heaven and on earth, and He is with us always, exalted to the right hand of God, some day He will come again, and we shall see Him. No, no, I do not believe He will set up His throne in Jerusalem, do you?

I said a thing in New York a few years ago I have never repeated here I think, but I venture to do it before I close. Some expert insisted upon my speaking upon the Second Coming, and I said, "If you can keep cool I will, but tomorrow night I will come down to the front here and we will have a class; I will be the teacher, and you shall be the pupils. You can ask me any question under the sun, and I will try to answer it." So, with many others, an expert came, and he knew all about the Second Coming. He had swallowed Scofieldism, "hook, line and sinker." Alpha and Omega, and he knew every bit about it. I forget what it was I said, but then he submitted this poser: "You haven't told us anything about the throne in Jerusalem, from which Jesus is to reign over the whole earth." I said, "You believe that?" He said, "Yes."

I said, "I am a Britisher, and I am talking to Americans, and I will say something that we Britishers are not very proud of." Up to then I had never said it before, but since certain articles have appeared in "Life", I do not mind saying it. I said, "There was a man who sat upon a throne that represented the greatest Empire in the world, and he was titular ruler of more than six hundred millions of souls. - And for the illicit love of a woman he stepped down from the throne and went into exile voluntarily. Then after a while he came back, and what to do with an ex-king nobody knew; it was a new experience in British history. So at last they sent him to little Nassau, an island in the West Indies, and made him governor, and the whole population of Nassau would not make a fair sized town. The man who had been King Emperor over six hundred millions steps down to be governor of Nassau." I said, "The Christ, whom I worship, is exalted to the throne of the Universe, and He has assured me that all authority is given unto Him in Heaven and on earth. You ask me to believe that the King of Glory will step down from the throne of the Universe to sit on a material throne in Jerusalem?" I said, "You have only to state the case to answer it." It is utterly contrary to everything revealed in God's Word. If you are going to believe that kind of nonsense you might just as well go all the way and take the pope. No, no, Christ will come, "and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him," and at His coming this iniquitous system will be consumed by the breath of His mouth, and destroyed by the brightness of His coming, and "the kingdoms of this world (shall) become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever."

I call you to Christ. This is our church motto this year, you know: "Jesus Only." Let us pray.

O Lord, we thank Thee for this sure word of prophecy, whereunto we do well to take heed, as to a light that shin-

eth in the dark place until the day star arises in our hearts. We thank Thee that Thou hast wrought in the hearts of Thy believing people such certitude that we are able to say, "We know whom we have believed." The Lord bless our meditation, for His Name's sake. Amen.

Explanatory Note

Here is Volume Thirteen of the Catholic Encyclopaedia. If I were to say this you would not believe it, but here it is with the imprimatur of the church, approved as an authoritative word, on questions of Roman Catholicism:

Santa Casa di Loreto.—Since the fifteenth century, and possibly even earlier, the "Holy House" of Loreto has been numbered among the most famous shrines of Italy. Loreto is a small town a few miles south of Ancona and near the sea. Its most conspicuous building is the basilica. This dome-crowned edifice, which with its various annexes took more than a century to build and adorn under the direction of many famous artists, serves merely as the setting of a tiny cottage standing within the basilica itself. Though the rough walls of the little building have been raised in height and are cased externally in richly sculptured marble, the interior measures only thirty-one feet by thirteen. An altar stands at one end beneath a statue, blackened with age, of the Virgin Mother and her Divine Infant. As the inscription, *Hic Verbum caro factum est*, reminds us, this building is honoured by Christians as the veritable cottage at Nazareth in which the Holy Family lived, and the Word became incarnate. Another inscription of the sixteenth century which decorates the eastern facade of the basilica sets forth at greater length the tradition which makes this shrine so famous. "Christian pilgrim," it says, "you have before your eyes the Holy House of Loreto, venerable throughout the world on account of the Divine mysteries accomplished in it and the glorious miracles herein wrought. It is here that most holy Mary, Mother of God, was born; here that she was saluted by the Angel, here that the eternal Word of God was made Flesh. Angels conveyed this House from Palestine to the town Tersato in Illyria in the year of salvation 1291 in the pontificate of Nicholas IV. Three years later, in the beginning of the pontificate of Boniface VIII, it was carried again by the ministry of angels and placed in a wood near this hill, in the vicinity of Recanatì, in the March of Ancona; where having changed its station thrice in the course of a year, at length, by the will of God, it took up its permanent position on this spot three hundred years ago (now, of course, more than 600). Ever since that time, both the extraordinary nature of the event having called forth the admiring wonder of the neighboring people and the fame of the miracles wrought in this sanctuary having spread far and wide, this Holy House, whose walls do not rest on any foundation and yet remain solid and uninjured after so many centuries, has been held in reverence by all nations." That the traditions thus boldly proclaimed to the world have been fully sanctioned by the Holy See cannot for a moment remain in doubt. More than forty-seven popes have in various ways rendered honour to the shrine, and an immense number of Bulls and Briefs proclaim without qualification the identity of the Santa Casa di Loreto with the Holy House of Nazareth. As lately as 1894 Leo XIII, in a Brief conceding various spiritual favours for the sixth centenary of the translation of the Santa Casa to Loreto, summed up its history in these words: "The happy House of Nazareth is justly regarded and honoured as one of the most sacred monuments of the Christian Faith: and this is made clear by the many diplomas and acts, gifts and privileges accorded by our predecessors. No sooner was it, as the annals of the Church bear witness, miraculously translated to Italy and exposed to the veneration of the faithful on the hills of Loreto than it drew to itself the fervent devotion and pious aspiration of all, and as the ages rolled on, it maintained this devotion ever ardent." If, then, we would sum up the arguments which sustain the popular belief in this miraculous transference of the Holy House from Palestine to Italy by the hands of angels, we may enumerate the following points: (1) The reiterated approval of the tradition by many different popes from Julius

II in 1511 down to the present day. This approval was emphasized liturgically by an insertion in the Roman Martyrologium in 1669 and the concession of a proper Office and Mass in 1699, and it has been ratified by the deep veneration paid to the shrine by such holy men as St. Charles Borromeo, St. Francis de Sales, St. Ignatius Loyola, St. Alphonsus Liguori, and many other servants of God. (2) Loreto has been for centuries the scene of numerous miraculous cures. Even the sceptical Montaigne in 1582 professed himself a believer in the reality of these (Waters, "Journal of Montaigne's Travels", II, 197-207).

(3) The stone of which the original walls of the Santa Casa are built and the mortar used in their construction are not such as are known in the neighbourhood of Loreto. But both stone and mortar are, it is alleged, chemically identical with the materials most commonly found in Nazareth. (4) The Santa Casa does not rest and has never rested upon foundations sunk into the earth where it now stands. The point was formally investigated in 1751 under Benedict XIV. What was then found is therefore fully in accord with the tradition of a building transferred bodily from some more primitive site.—Vol. XIII., page 454.

THE SEPARATE SCHOOL QUESTION

Its Principle and History

By Dr. T. T. Shields

(In this article I have assembled material from several public addresses on the Separate School Question given on different occasions from 1936 forward. The substance of this article, however, was reprinted February 24th, 1944, when we were dealing with the menace to religious liberty involved in the policies then being advocated by Mr. George Drew. Here and there Mr. Drew's name may occur. It is, however, much to the point that his attitude on such matters should be known, for if ever he should become Premier of Canada, which does not appear to be an immediate probability, and the Roman Catholics of the West should appeal to the Federal authority, one would have a fairly good idea of what Mr. Drew's attitude would be. However, he and the Ontario Government are but incidental to the thesis of this article, which is designed to show that the Roman Catholic Church assumes it has the exclusive right to control education, and that it also has the right to compel the State to pay for it.

The Roman Catholic Church is probably the richest corporation on earth, and it is still piling up its wealth, while, by clever political manipulations, it extracts the greater part of the cost of training its children in the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church out of the pockets of the Protestant population.—T.T.S.)

LONG ago I resolved that I would take no position, nor allow myself to be put in any position, which even an enemy might construe as being inconsistent with my primary duty of absolute loyalty to the Bible as the Word of God; and that I would refuse any association which would interfere with my full liberty to proclaim its principles and precepts, and to order my course in life in harmony therewith.

Loyalty to the Bible

It is indeed only loyalty to the Bible, and to the principles thereof, which moves me to speak on this occasion. The Bible is an encyclopaedia of universal knowledge. It is the raw material, and the finished product, of all true philosophy; a compendium of history; a well of wisdom; and a treasury of biographical lore. All the art galleries of the world, the rogues' galleries of the world's police, all the analyses of human character by the world's master minds, all the X- and other penetrative, discerning, and disclosing rays of all electrical therapists together, cannot equal the instrumental power of detection and portrayal of truth in principle, precept, and person, of this Holy Book.

The Bible is the most ancient of all books extant. It includes all Canada's "Who's Who"; their characters and careers, their origins and destiny, are fully described in the Bible's list of the "Who's" that were!

To exhibit only one snapshot of one of the idiosyncrasies of this amazing aggregation of political exploiters, I name this: "Bread of deceit is sweet to a man; but afterwards his mouth shall be filled with gravel." Political parties and Governments begin with sweet deceitful promises, and spend the later part of their term of office spitting out the gravel.

"Which Never Say: It is Enough"

Roman Catholicism is a creeping, aggressive, pervasive, persistent, predatory, parasitic, implacable, insatiable, thing. Like the daughters of the horseleach, it is ever crying, "Give! Give!" It is like Solomon's three things that are "never satisfied", and like the four which never say, "It is enough."

So then, I observe that OUR PROBLEM INHERES IN THE NATURE OF ROMAN CATHOLICISM ITSELF.

It is *essentially parasitical in its nature and habits*. Roman Catholicism is not, in any true sense—that is, in any biblical sense—Christian, but decidedly anti-Christian. Roman Catholicism is a paganized form of Christianity. While opposed to everything essentially Christian, Roman Catholicism appropriates the Christian name. It professes belief in the Bible while, by its interpretations, it prostitutes it to its own purposes. Roman Catholicism proclaims the Deity of Christ, while making Him subservient to the Virgin, and even to the priest. It pays homage to the ordinances of Christianity, but perverts them to a purpose the reverse of their significance. It professes human dependence upon divine grace: then sells salvation at a price. It subordinates the authority of the Word of God to the authority of a pagan church. It arrogates to itself the right to be the supreme arbiter of human existence and destiny alike of the individual, the family, and the nation. It proclaims the Pope to be the head of all peoples, and calls all who refuse submission to his authority, heretics. It enthrones the Pope as sovereign of all, and exalts him above all that is called God, or is worshipped.

I repeat, Roman Catholicism is parasitical in its nature and habits. It fastens itself upon every state as a leech, and sucks its very life-blood. It infects the blood-stream

of every political party, and, like a deadly bacillus, destroys the red corpuscular principles by and for which the party lives, and reduces it to an anaemic mass of potential corruption. Like a cancer, Roman Catholicism insinuates itself into every government, and wraps its parasitical and strangling tentacles about every governmental organ, converts it into a banqueting house for political buzzards, and makes it a stench in the nostrils of every lover of righteousness.

From the shops of industry, the offices of commerce, and the council-chambers of finance, Roman Catholicism, by its ventriloquial, sepulchral, threatening, voice, invades the Board-rooms of nominally Protestant churches, institutions, and denominations; and, by its menacing, ubiquitous presence, silences the pulpit, and terrorizes dependent officials into speechlessness. It impoverishes and befouls every non-Catholic system of education by diverting its supplies to the support of its own systems of propaganda.

Roman Catholicism attempts to censor or control every organ of public expression, amplifying every whisper of approval; and reducing, silencing, or smothering, every voice of dissent. It is a printer's devil which, openly or disguised, finds a place in nearly every newspaper establishment—in short, it seeks to inject the virus of its paralyzing fear into the whole round globe, and stretches out its fangs toward the stars. I do not exaggerate, but speak the plain, sober, truth, when I say, that the only right the Roman Church has to the title "Catholic" consists in the universality of its malignant influence.

The question arises, HOW OUGHT WE TO RELATE OURSELVES TO THE SITUATION CREATED BY THE PRESENCE OF ROMAN CATHOLICISM?

As a religion, Roman Catholicism is entitled to the freest exercise; and its devotees, to full liberty of conscience. We have no quarrel with Roman Catholics as men and women. There is, I trust, nothing personal in our discussions. We are protesting against a system. But that system needs analysis and definition; for even as a religious system, Roman Catholicism must be accorded equality with all other religions, under the law. I will have no part in persecuting or penalizing any man for his religious faith. Roman Catholics, in my view, are wrong religiously—they are terribly wrong, I am convinced. I repeat, their religion is pagan, and not Christian. But wrong as they may be, it is their inalienable civil right to be wrong, if they so choose. Repeatedly have I said I would fight for any and every man's freedom to worship God as his conscience directs, however widely his standards may differ from mine, and however wrong I may believe him to be.

And I would insist upon his having freedom to propagate his faith. I hate religious Modernism, for example, as I do Roman Catholicism; but I must insist that a man has the civil right to be a Modernist or a Roman Catholic if he wants to be such. These matters of religion belong to the realm of conscience, and into that sphere no man or government has a right to intrude. Let us demand religious liberty for ourselves, and accord the same liberty to all others.

But do not misunderstand. Most strongly I object to anyone's propagating a religious system which is repugnant to my conscience, at my expense, whether he be a modernist professor in an evangelical college, or a Roman Catholic teacher in a Separate School. While I demand

the right for myself and others to refuse to concur, I insist also that in matters of religion, no one has the right to compel. Therefore it is with the political character of Roman Catholicism we are at war—and must ever be at war.

Roman Catholicism a Political System

Once more, let me declare that Roman Catholicism is a political system. It propagates itself by carnal means, by means of the thumb-screw, the rack, the fagot, and the sword, in times past; and now, restrained from the use of such weapons, the Roman Catholic Church manipulates politics and governments, and through them extracts from the pockets of non-Catholics much of the money by which their paganism is propagated.

What Is Roman Catholicism?

What is Roman Catholicism? As a religion, it is entitled to the utmost freedom of exercise. I believe in absolute liberty of conscience. I believe that the consciences of men should be subject to no human inhibition. I would contend with the utmost earnestness for the freedom of Roman Catholics to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. So would I for the liberty of conscience of any man, whether Roman Catholic, Mohammedan, Jew, or any and every form of religion that is called Christian.

But Roman Catholicism differs essentially from pure Christianity in that it is a religio-political system. It is just as truly a political system as it is a religious system.

During the Great War I went into the Westminster Roman Catholic Church in London. On a book stall in the entrance I saw a little booklet by Cardinal Mercier, of Belgium. I think the title of the booklet was, "The Duty of Catholics". Cardinal Mercier was very much in the public eye at the time, and I threw down my penny, and took the booklet. On reading it later I discovered that Mercier said it was the duty of all Catholics to encourage their children to marry at maturity, and to produce a population for the church. I have never seen the distinction between Christianity in the New Testament sense, and Roman Catholicism, more clearly defined. Christianity is propagated, and Christians are multiplied, by a spiritual birth: "Ye must be born again." Roman Catholicism is propagated always by carnal, or natural, means. It is essentially a carnal, or natural, religion; and the weapons of its warfare are always carnal weapons.

Rome's Claim to Temporal Power

I need not argue the point, but merely assert the fact, that the Roman Catholic Church has always claimed temporal power for its Pontiff. It is the teaching of Rome that the Pope is the representative of God on earth, His vicar or vicegerent; and that he is really superior to all earthly kings. And, indeed, that the head of any nation who holds his position of rulership otherwise than by the sovereign Pontiff's consent, is an usurper.

Europe's Bloody History

I need only cite Europe's bloody history for nearly a thousand years in attestation of that fact. It is the teaching of Rome that all who are not Roman Catholics are heretics, and that all Roman Catholics owe their primary obedience and loyalty to the Pope; that his is the supreme authority on earth, and that all other authorities are

secondary and subordinate to him. It follows therefore that no truly loyal Roman Catholic can, in the nature of the case, be a loyal subject of any non-Catholic government.

I think no one would charge that John Wesley was an illiberal or intolerant man. The founder of Methodism was, indeed, the reverse. Yet this is what John Wesley has to say upon this subject:

TOLERATION OF ROMANISM

The following appeared in the *Public Advertiser* in 1780, and now that public attention is drawn to this subject, in connection with Parliamentary and other matters, the letter will be read with special interest:—

"Sir; Some time ago a pamphlet was sent me, entitled, 'An Appeal from the Protestant Association to the People of Great Britain'. A day or two since a kind of answer to this was put into my hand, which pronounces 'its style contemptible, its reasoning futile, and its object malicious'. On the contrary, I think the style of it clear, easy, and natural; the reasoning in general strong and conclusive; the object or design kind and benevolent. And in pursuance of this kind and benevolent design—namely, to preserve our happy Constitution—I shall endeavour to confirm the substance of that tract by a few plain arguments. With persecution I have nothing to do. I persecute no man for his religious principles. Let there be as 'boundless a freedom in religion' as any man can conceive. But this does not touch the point. I will set religion, true or false, utterly out of the question. Suppose the Bible, if you please, to be a fable, and the Koran to be the Word of God. I consider not whether the Romish religion be true or false; I build nothing on one or the other supposition. Therefore, away with all common-place declamation about intolerance and persecution for religion! Suppose every word of Pope Pius' creed to be true; suppose the Council of Trent to have been infallible; yet I insist that no Government not Roman Catholic ought to tolerate men of the Roman Catholic persuasion. I prove this by a plain argument (let him answer it that can). That no Roman Catholic does or can give security for his allegiance or peaceable behaviour, I prove thus: It is a Roman Catholic maxim, established, not by private men, but by a public council, that 'No faith is to be kept with heretics'. This has been openly avowed by the Council of Constance; but it never was openly disclaimed. Whether private persons avow or disavow it, it is a fixed maxim of the Church of Rome. But, as long as it is so, it is plain that the members of that Church can give no reasonable security to any government of their allegiance or peaceable behaviour. Therefore they ought not to be tolerated by any Government Protestant, Mohammedan, or Pagan. You may say, 'Nay, but they will take an oath of allegiance'. True, five hundred oaths; but the maxim, 'No faith is to be kept with heretics', sweeps them all away as a spider's web. So that still no governors that are not Roman Catholics can have any security of their allegiance. Again, those who acknowledge the spiritual power of the Pope can give no security for their allegiance to any Government; but all Roman Catholics acknowledge this; therefore they can give no security for their allegiance. The power of granting pardon for all sins, past, present, and to come, is, and has been for many centuries, one branch of his special power. But those who acknowledge him to have this spiritual power can give no security for their allegiance, since they believe the Pope can pardon rebellions, high treason, and all other sins whatsoever. The power of dispensing with any promise, oath, or vow, is another branch of the spiritual power of the Pope. And all who acknowledge his spiritual power must acknowledge this. But whoever acknowledges the dispensing power of the Pope can give no security for his allegiance to any Government. Oaths and promises are none; they are light as air; a dispensation makes them all null and void. Nay, not only the Pope, but even a priest, can forgive sins! This is an essential doctrine of the Church of Rome.

But they that acknowledge this, cannot possibly give any security for their allegiance to any Government. Oaths are no security at all; for the priest can pardon both perjury and high treason. Setting, then, religion aside, it is plain that, upon principles of reason, no Government ought to tolerate men who cannot give any security to that Government for their allegiance and peaceable behaviour. But this no Romanist can do, not only while he holds that 'no faith is to be kept with heretics', but so long as he acknowledges either priestly absolution or the spiritual power of the Pope. 'But the late Act' (you say) 'does not either tolerate or encourage Roman Catholics'. I appeal to matter of fact. Do not the Romanists themselves understand it as a toleration? You know they do. And does it not already (let alone what it may do by and by) encourage them to preach openly, to build chapels (at Bath and elsewhere), to raise seminaries, and to make numerous converts day by day to their intolerant, persecuting principles? I can point out, if need be, several of the persons. And they are increasing daily: 'But nothing dangerous to English liberty is to be apprehended from them'. I am not certain of that. Some time since a Romish priest came to one I knew; and, after talking with her largely, broke out, 'You are no heretic; you have the experience of a real Christian'. 'And would you', she asked, 'burn me alive?' He said, 'God forbid! unless it were for the good of the Church'. Now what security could she have had for her life, if it had depended on that man? The good of the Church would have burst all ties of truth, justice, and mercy; specially when seconded by the absolution of a priest; or (if need were) a papal pardon.

"If any one please to answer this, and set his name, I shall probably reply. But the productions of anonymous writers I do not promise to take notice of.

"I am, Sir,

Your humble servant,

"John Wesley."

"City Road, January 21st, 1780."

A Father of Confederation

But that was in the eighteenth century, and this is the twentieth century. Let me quote then from a pamphlet written by Sir Alexander T. Galt, one of the Fathers of Confederation, published only nine years after Confederation, 1876, and entitled, "Church and State". He quotes as follows from the fifth Provincial Council of the Hierarchy held at Quebec in 1873:

VOICE OF QUEBEC HIERARCHY IN 1873

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

—p. 21 *Church and State*.

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

"Each one of you can and ought to say in the interior of his soul, 'I hear my Curé; my Curé hears the Bishop;

the Bishop hears the Pope, and the Pope hears our Lord Jesus-Christ, who aids with His Holy Spirit to render them infallible on the teaching and government of His Church'."

—p. 23 *Church and State*.

Sir Alexander Galt thus summarizes his argument:

"The extracts given prove in the most authentic manner possible, that the Roman Catholic Church in Quebec extends its demands—

1. To the general assertion of the superiority of ecclesiastical over civil authority.
2. To positive interference with both voters and candidates in the Elections.
3. To the exercise of proscription against the press.
4. To the condemnation of freedom of speech, in opposition to the judgment of the Privy Council.

"And Lastly.—To the extraordinary proposition that the Divine assistance claimed to be given to the Pope alone, when speaking *ex cathedra* on 'faith and morals', descends with undiminished force to the Bishops, Priests and Cures."

—p. 24 *Church and State*.

What Has Rome Done For the Nations?

We may reasonably ask—and to ask the question is to answer it—What has Roman Catholicism done for the nations which have become subject to it? There was a time when there was scarcely a government in Europe which did not recognize and acknowledge the supremacy, and indeed the sovereignty, of the Holy See. The Reformation did much to deliver Europe from the domination of the Pope. It liberated Germany, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Finland, England, and other countries, from the dominance of Rome.

But there were some countries which resisted the principles of the Reformation, and became the instruments of the Roman Catholic Church in her efforts to regain those countries of which the Reformation had deprived her. Italy, Austria, Spain, Portugal, and particularly France, were among those which were employed by the Roman power in its endeavour to recapture Europe. The most formidable of these was France, the most trusted child of the church. To refer to one conspicuous example of her zeal, we need only mention the massacre of Saint Bartholomew, with its fifteen thousand dead in Paris, and its upward of sixty thousand Huguenots who perished in that bloody persecution throughout France.

The Price of Devotion to Rome

But what happened to those countries? They all paid the price of their devotion to Rome, France being the last so to do. And when France turned upon the instrument of the church, at last, in terrible vengeance, more than a million perished in the bloody French Revolution. But by these events the temporal power of the Papacy in Europe was largely broken and repudiated.

The Napoleonic wars were really a phase of the French Revolution, and issued in the loss of Rome itself to the Popes.

WHAT LORD MACAULAY SAID

"During the last three centuries, to stunt the growth of the human mind has been her (the Roman Church's) chief object. Throughout Christendom, whatever advance has been made in knowledge, in freedom, in wealth, and in the arts of life, has been made in spite of her, and has everywhere been in inverse proportion to her power. The loveliest and most fertile provinces of Europe have, under her rule, been sunk in poverty,

in political servitude, and in intellectual torpor, while Protestant countries, once proverbial for sterility and barbarism, have been turned by skill and industry into gardens, that can boast of a long list of heroes and statesmen, philosophers and poets. Whoever, knowing what Italy and Scotland naturally are, and what, four hundred years ago, they actually were, shall now compare the country round Rome with the country round Edinburgh, will be able to form some judgment as to the tendency of Papal domination. The descent of Spain, once the first among monarchies, to the lowest depths of degradation, the elevation of Holland, in spite of many natural disadvantages, to a position such as no commonwealth so small has ever reached, teach the same lesson. Whoever passes in Germany from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant principality, in Switzerland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant canton, in Ireland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant county, finds that he has passed from a lower to a higher grade of civilization. On the other side of the Atlantic the same law prevails. The Protestants of the United States have left far behind them the Roman Catholics of Mexico, Peru and Brazil. The Roman Catholics of Lower Canada remain inert, while the whole continent round them is in a ferment with Protestant activity and enterprise. The French have doubtless shown an energy and an intelligence which, even when misdirected, have justly entitled them to be called a great people. But this apparent exception, when examined, will be found to confirm the rule; for in no country that is called Roman Catholic has the Roman Catholic Church, during several generations, possessed so little authority as in France."

Victor Hugo on the Papacy

No nation has known more intimately the power and effect of the Papacy than France. Hear what Victor Hugo said of the influence of Rome:

"And you claim the liberty of teaching. Stop! be sincere; let us understand the liberty which you claim. It is the liberty of not teaching. You wish us to give you the people to instruct. Very well. Let us see those your pupils. Let us see those you produced. What have you done for Italy? What have you done for Spain? For centuries you have kept in your hands, at your discretion, at your school, these two great nations, illustrious among the illustrious. What have you done for them? I shall tell you. Thanks to you, Italy, whose name no man who thinks can any longer pronounce without inexpressible filial emotions—Italy, mother of genius and of nations, which has spread over all the universe all the most brilliant marvels of poetry and arts, Italy—which has taught mankind to read—now knows not how to read! Yes, Italy is of all the states of Europe, that where the smallest number know how to read! Spain, magnificently endowed Spain, which received from the Romans her first civilization; from the Arabs her second civilization; from Providence and in spite of you, a world America—Spain, thanks to you, a yoke of stupor, which is a yoke of degradation and decay; Spain has lost this secret power which it had from the Romans; this genius of art which it had from the Arabs; this world which it had from God, and in exchange for all you have made it lose, it has received from you the Inquisition—the Inquisition, which certain men of the party tried to-day to re-establish; which has burned on the funeral pile millions of men; the Inquisition which disinterred the dead to burn them as heretics; which declared the children of heretics infamous and incapable of any public honors, excepting only those who shall have denounced their fathers; the Inquisition, which, while I speak, still holds in the Papal library the manuscripts of Galileo sealed under the Papal signet. These are your masterpieces. This fire which we call Italy you have extinguished. This colossus that we call Spain you have undermined—the one in ashes, the other in ruins. This is what you have done for two great nations. What do you wish to do for France? Stop! you have just come from Rome! I congratulate you, you have had fine success there. You came from gagging the Roman people, and now you wish to gag the French people. I understand.

This attempt is still more fine, but take care, it is dangerous. France is a lion, and is still alive!"

Rome's Attitude Toward Education

We come now to a consideration of the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church toward education.

It is not surprising that she should always insist upon the education of her people. The necessity for her doing so inheres in Roman Catholicism itself. Roman Catholicism is a paganized form of Christianity. It abounds with superstitions and idolatries, and it can survive only as it is deeply rooted in the minds of little children. The Separate School primarily exists to inculcate in its scholars the doctrines of Roman Catholicism. The Roman Catholic Church is always more concerned about the children than the adults. She knows that if she can implant her superstitions in the minds of little children, if in the formative years, they can be taught that the priest is the representative of Christ, and has power of absolution, and absolute authority over their souls, and if they can prejudice the young minds, as they do, against every other form of religion, threatening them with all kinds of penalties should they open their minds to anything contrary to the teachings of Rome, they have secured a hold upon the children which it will be very difficult in later years to break.

In the last year of the Great War I made a tour of Ireland, and had the opportunity of discussing the Irish problem with leaders of all sorts, in the North and in the South.

Interview With Lord Carson

But following that tour of Ireland, I had what I then thought—and still think—the distinguished honour of receiving an invitation from Lord Carson to have dinner with him in London. I gladly accepted the invitation; and, sitting with him at his own table, discussed the Irish question. He asked me for my opinion, and I expressed my reluctance to state an opinion to such an expert. He smilingly replied, however, that he would like to hear what I thought of the matter. In brief, I said to him, "Well, I believe that, fundamentally, your Irish problem is an educational one." He asked the ground for that opinion. I replied that I found many of the people of Ireland still living in the days of Oliver Cromwell; that they became furiously angry as they referred to the terrible Oliver, and to all that he had done in Ireland.

I then pointed out that it is unusual for people to live two hundred and fifty or more years behind their time, and unnatural unless they were being taught so to do. I said that somebody was teaching the people of Ireland to nurse the grievances of two hundred and fifty years ago, whether real or imaginary, and that it was that fact which had led me to believe the Irish problem was an educational one. "Thus far," Lord Carson said, "I believe you are quite correct. What remedy would you prescribe?" To which I replied, "I would take education out of the hands of Roman Catholics and Protestants alike. I would arrange a system of purely secular education, making all religions equal under the law, and allowing all churches to teach with absolute freedom their own tenets—at their own expense."

As I paused, Lord Carson said, "And what else would you propose?" To which I answered, "Twenty-five years of impartial, inexorable, British rule." To that he answered, "If you could do that, you could solve the Irish

problem. But you propose an impossibility. The Roman Catholic Church will never surrender its control of the education of her own people; for the reason that her very life depends upon it."

History of Education in Canada

That is borne out by the history of education in Canada—not in Ontario only, but in Canada as a whole. The history of the development of our educational system in Ontario is a record of long conflict with the Roman Catholic hierarchy, from 1841 until now. Sometimes the battle has raged fiercely, sometimes there has been a certain quietness for a little while! but ever and anon the Hierarchy has gone "on the rampage again".

PRINCIPLE OF SEPARATE SCHOOLS

It may be appropriate at this point to consider some of the principles involved in Separate School education. If it be true—and I hold that it is indisputable—that the Separate School is essentially a religious school, existing primarily for the purpose of propagating the tenets of Rome, then it follows that under that system the Roman Catholic Church enjoys a privilege which is denied to all other religions. If Roman Catholics have a right to demand that they should be relieved from the support of the public schools, and permitted to divert their school taxes to the support of schools under the direction of their own church, which shall teach the doctrines of their church, then members of all other religious bodies have an equal right to the same privilege. The Jews have a right to their own schools. People of no religion at all have the right to send their children to a purely secular school.

I think I am within the truth when I say that if all the tax-payers who belong to this church were permitted to withhold the amount of their school taxes from the public schools, and pool them in an educational fund, the members of this church would probably be able to secure money enough to maintain a Baptist school in which our children could be taught the principles for which we stand, not Sunday morning alone, but every day of the week. But we, under the law, have no right to do so. Whether we like it or not, we are compelled to support the public school system.

National Schools Desirable

I would not be misunderstood. Personally, I am of the opinion that there should be no denominational primary schools. I believe when people of different nationalities congregate in this country, and families grow up about them, that all these children should be fused into one common citizenship in a system of national schools.

Separation of Church and State

I believe in the absolute separation of church and state. I do not believe in the exemption of church property from taxation; for by such exemption additional burdens are placed upon the shoulders of the people generally, and indirectly they are thus compelled to pay to the support of churches.

This church, for a number of years, assessed and taxed itself, and voluntarily paid about \$1,200 a year to the City Hall. It paid a total of more than \$20,000 into the city treasury, in the hope of setting an example to

other churches, and creating a public sentiment which would result at last in the taxation of all church property.

No Part of the State's Function to Teach Religion

Furthermore, it is no part of the function of the state to teach religion. The consciences of men should be free, and people should not be compelled to pay taxes for the support of a system of education which teaches religious tenets of which their consciences do not approve.

Public school teachers, by virtue of their employment as teachers, are servants of the state; and, while they are of sound moral character, and educationally fitted for their position, they are not necessarily competent to teach religion. There are many preachers and teachers of religion in Toronto who do not agree with me in matters of religion, and with whose views I strongly disagree. To me, the Bible is the word of God from beginning to end. I believe in its absolute infallibility, and therefore that it is of supreme authority in matters of faith and practice. But I should strongly object to a Modernistic school teacher being paid by money supplied out of my taxes to teach the children that the Bible is not the word of God.

Special Privileges to Rome

The Roman Catholic Church, however, invokes the aid of the state; and when the Canadas, Upper and Lower, with the Maritime Provinces, were brought together by the Act of Confederation known as the British North America Act, education, in section 93 of that Act, was placed within the jurisdiction of the Provinces. Such special privileges as were then enjoyed by any religious sect were, by that act, perpetuated.

Are Separate Schools Superior?

It is contended by our Roman Catholic friends that the public schools are unsafe; that as secular schools they are godless and dangerous to the morals of the children. So long ago as eighteen hundred and seventy-one the then Roman Catholic Bishop of London, said:

"No Catholic parent living within the legal limits of a separate school shall send his children to mixed or common schools, they being adjudged by the Canadian hierarchy as dangerous to faith and morals. Should any Catholic parent unfortunately persist in violating this ordinance, he shall be refused the Holy Sacraments until such time as they shall consent to obey the Church in this matter."

I think it might even be proved that Roman Catholic people generally do not want separate schools. Large numbers of them send their children to the public schools in preference. The separate schools are wanted by the priests and officials of the Church to aid them in the propagation of their religion. But if the contention of the Roman Catholic Church be correct, that the public schools are godless and dangerous to the children's morals, then we have a right to expect that the Roman Catholic Separate Schools, in which the tenets of Rome are taught, will produce superior character in those who attend them.

Canadian Penitentiary Population

What are the facts? For the year ending September thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety, the penitentiary population of Canada was three thousand six hundred and fifty-six. Of that number one thousand eight hundred and ninety-six were listed as Roman Catholics, and

all other religions and no religion at all put together made up the other one thousand seven hundred and sixty. At that time Roman Catholics formed two-fifths of the population of Canada, but supplied more than half the convicts to the penitentiaries. In nineteen hundred and twenty-one the census gave the population of Canada as being eight million seven hundred and eighty-eight thousand four hundred and eighty-three. Classified religiously, of that number three million two hundred and eighty-nine thousand six hundred and thirty-six were Roman Catholics, and the balance was made up of all other religions and no religion at all. The percentage of Roman Catholics to the total population of Canada in nineteen hundred and twenty-one was thirty-eight decimal fifty-seven. In the same year the penitentiary population of Canada was two thousand one hundred and fifty, of which one thousand and fifty-two were classed as Roman Catholics, or but a fraction less than fifty per cent of the penitentiary population, while only thirty-eight and a fraction per cent of the total population of the country were Roman Catholics. According to the last census in nineteen hundred and thirty-one the total population of the Dominion was ten million three hundred and seventy-six thousand seven hundred and eighty-six, of which four million two hundred and eighty-five thousand three hundred and eighty-eight were Roman Catholics, or a Roman Catholic percentage of forty-one decimal thirty per cent of the whole population. For the year nineteen hundred and thirty-one the penitentiary population of the Dominion was three thousand seven hundred and fourteen, of whom one thousand eight hundred and ten were Roman Catholics. Again, but a fraction less than fifty per cent of the penitentiary population was Roman Catholic, while the total Roman Catholic population of the Dominion was only forty-one per cent.

Everywhere the Same Story

The same statistical story is told in Great Britain and the United States.

We are not unfair in instituting such comparisons. The Roman Church's charges against our schools, compel us.

Villeneuve on Separate Schools

Cardinal Villeneuve in the *Semaine Religieuse de Quebec*, issued the following order:

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

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

"Catholic parents who reflect will be quickly convinced. Just as a plant does not thrive outside its own climate, so the religious sentiment of a child runs a strong risk of becoming weakened or even exhausted in a school neutral or foreign to its faith. An unhappy experience has long since proved it to be so. That is the reason why the church is so severe in this matter. Catholic parents, or those who take their place, if they knowingly educate or instruct their children in a

non-Catholic religion thereby incur excommunication at the discretion of the Bishop, (Canon 2319, paragraph 1, 40), and will moreover fall under suspicion of heresy. (paragraph 2.) The Church also forbids Catholic children to attend non-Catholic, neutral or mixed schools because of the danger of perversion that they may run and it reserves to the Bishop the care of decreeing, in accordance with the instructions of the Holy See, in what circumstances and at the cost of what precaution the thing may be tolerated, always in such a way as to prevent the danger of perversion. (Canon 1374).

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

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

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

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

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

The Fruits of a R.C. School System

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

Ontario	2.71
Quebec	6.21

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

British races	0.88
French	6.18

Seven Times the Illiteracy Among R.C.s. as Among Protestants

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

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

"1. More than 30,000 children from 7 to 13 years of age have not attended rural schools at all during the year 1938-39.

"2. Of 282,865 who are enrolled, 16 2/3 % have been absent, on an average, each day. That is to say, the majority of the pupils have missed about one day per week.

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

The R.C. Church Wealthiest Corporation

The Roman Catholic Church is, in all probability, the wealthiest corporation on earth to-day. You will find in this city it never lacks funds to buy any property it wants. Go to the sparsely settled districts of this Province, and you will see huge structures costing thousands and thousands of dollars, rising always in the most prominent position in the whole community. The priests are never poor; they live in good houses. The church always has plenty of money.

It makes merchandise of the souls of men. It taxes them to the limit of their endurance in life, and puts a mortgage on their souls, and pursues them through their imaginary purgatory, compelling those who remain, and who, in their Separate Schools have been taught to believe this horrible superstition, to pay to their last dollar for the saying of masses for the dead, that their stay in purgatory might be shortened.

The great John G. Paton, apostle to the New Hebrides, once told me that he asked a Roman Catholic priest, an acquaintance of his, how it was that, in the most poverty-stricken districts of the earth, the Roman Catholic Church was always able to erect magnificent buildings, and to supply itself lavishly with all the material equipment it needed. He said the priest smiled and answered, "Were you to believe and teach as we do, the doctrine of purgatory, you could build just such churches as we."

Nor is the Ontario Legislature the only place where the Roman Catholic hierarchy is exercising a tremendous influence to-day. I cite the example of *The Toronto Globe*. In re-examining the documents upon which this address is based, I was struck by the frequency with which *The Toronto Globe* was quoted, back to the days of its founder, the Honourable George Brown; and always, in those earlier days, it was a champion of the people's rights. It pleaded always for equal rights for all, and special privileges to none.

The Ever-Recurring Demand of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy

I have no time to rehearse all the steps by which we have come to our present position in this Province in respect to education. Let it be sufficient to state that from the introduction of the Separate Schools principle in 1841, down to this present hour, there has been an ever-recurring demand for further concessions to Roman Catholic schools. In 1853, following the granting of one of these concessions, a Toronto paper addressed Dr. Ryerson, Minister of Education, in these terms:

"And did this third concession to the claimants of Separate Schools satisfy them? Was your oft-repeated

assurance realized, that 'the existence of the provision for Separate Schools' in the national system prevented 'oppositions and combinations which would otherwise be formed against it'? On the contrary, the separatists only advanced in the extent of their demands, and became more resolute in enforcing them. The very next year, the matter was again brought to a crisis—a general election came on—Bishop Charbonnel pressed his demands—and Mr. Hincks consented to bring in yet another Sectarian School Act."

That complaint, that the Hierarchy could never be satisfied, but was an Oliver Twist, always asking for more, was written by the Honourable George Brown, Editor of *The Globe* of that day.

Rome Always Asking for More

In 1863 an act was passed which, by common consent, was supposed to effect a final settlement. Commenting upon this matter in a pamphlet, "Remarks on the New Separate School Agitation", in his "Prefatory Notice", Dr. Ryerson said:

"Each successive Separate School Law agitation, during the fifteen years from 1850 to 1865, has been commenced by attacks upon the Education Department, and the Separate School Law for the time being . . .

"I have felt it due to the supporters of our Public School System, to furnish them with materials for refuting the statements put forth for showing the unreasonableness of the demands made. . . This I deem to be the more necessary now, as a formal agitation for the extension of the Roman Catholic Separate School System has been inaugurated in various parts of Upper Canada. Already influential meetings of Roman Catholics, to promote this object, have been held in Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, Perth, and other important towns, and resolutions of a more sweeping character than usual passed unanimously."²

And after making a survey of the successive Roman Catholic School agitations of 1851, 1852, 1857, 1858, 1860-63, in regard to the last he said:

"The present Separate School Law was passed, and accepted on the part of the Authorities of the Roman Catholic Church 'as a final settlement of the question'. But, in less than two years, in 1864-65, the old agitation is recommenced, and the old terms of denunciation against the Separate School Law, and against the Chief Superintendent, are again (indulged in) and put to work in the service of a fresh agitation, as pointed out."³

He then implies in a further statement that what was supposed to be final from time to time, was never really intended to be so; for he remarks:

"Can it be that acute Ecclesiastics and learned lawyers, and able Statesmen of the Roman Catholic Church, have been deceived thus, time after time, as to the import and character of Laws which they themselves have framed and advocated (or have agreed)?"⁴

Dr. Ryerson asserts that since 1852 the Roman Catholic Church assumed a threefold position essentially different from what it had ever before professed. He says:

"1st. They have advocated Separate Schools, not as a protection against wrong in particular cases, but as an institution and agency of their Church and as a dogma of faith and a rule of duty binding upon all their adherents and in all places."

"2nd. They have advocated the support of these schools by municipal taxation as well as by Legislative grants and that according to the number of their church population and not according to the number of children they might teach, or even according to the number of those who might desire Separate Schools for their children—thus leaving their own Church adherents without

any right of individual choice and the municipalities or Common School Trustees without any power to levy a school rate to erect a school house or furnish a school or support a teacher or for any school purpose whatsoever unless a corresponding sum, according to population, was given in support of the Roman Catholic Church Schools."

"3rd. They have, in order to build up their own schools at the expense of the Public Schools and to promote the other objects of their Church organization, attacked the character of the Common Schools generally as nurseries of vice rather than of virtue, as sinks of iniquity instead of fountains of knowledge, and avowed their great and ultimate object to be the destruction of the National School System of Upper Canada and have invoked aid from Lower Canada to accomplish it."⁵

In corroboration of the foregoing Dr. Ryerson quotes from an official circular issued by the Roman Catholic Bishop of Toronto to the clergy and laity of his church:

"Catholic electors in this country who do not use their electoral power in support of Separate Schools are guilty of mortal sin. Likewise parents who do not make the sacrifices necessary to secure such schools or send their children to mixed schools. Moreover the confessor who would give absolution to such parents, electors or legislators as support mixed schools to the prejudice of Separate Schools would be guilty of mortal sin."⁶

The attitude of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Toronto was accompanied by furious attacks on the school system of Upper Canada by priests and press who avowed the destruction of the Public Schools and declared that "the days of the Common School System are numbered; its dissolution is only a question of time".

The Montreal *True Witness*, the newspaper organ of the Roman Catholic Church, avowed again and again that their object was the destruction of our Public School System, designated our schools as "hell begotten Common Schools", declared that "the public opinion or strong feeling of Protestants of Upper Canada in favour of the actual iniquitous school system is in our ears, but the blatant bellowing of a brutal and ignorant rabble", and concluded with the words, "Come what may State Schoolism must be crushed". (See Montreal *True Witness*, Feb. 19th and March 5th, 1858.)

The same paper on May 7th quoted from certain attacks in the *Toronto Daily Colonist* and added, "What is our object in citing these opinions of Protestants? Our object is to encourage our Catholic readers to persevere, and to renew activity in their opposition to the Common School System of Upper Canada by showing that they will not have to fight the battle singlehanded. That we are not left to fight that good fight alone is the great fact which we wish to impress upon our readers. We have allies in the Protestant camp; more allies than we wot of, etc."

Rome Asks for as Much as She Thinks She Can Get At a Given Time

Most certainly the Hierarchy knew that it was unwise to ask for too much at a time. Hence they have proceeded slowly, but continuously, always demanding more. No doubt Mr. Hepburn was advised by the Hierarchy not to press his intermediary school legislation at the last session, and was reminded that another day would come.

This brings us to Confederation, or nearly so. In a speech on the resolutions relating to Confederation,

referring to the Separate School settlement of 1863, the Honourable George Brown, Editor of *The Globe* of Toronto, said:

"Now it is known to every honourable member of this House than an Act was passed in 1863 as a final settlement of this sectarian controversy. I was not in Quebec at that time; but if I had been there I would have voted against that Bill because it extended the facilities for establishing Separate Schools. It had, however, this good feature, that it was accepted by the Roman Catholic Authorities and carried through Parliament as a final compromise of the question in Upper Canada. When, therefore, it was proposed that a provision should be inserted in the Confederation Scheme to bind that Compact of 1863 and declare it a final settlement so that we should not be compelled, as we have been since 1849, to stand constantly to our arms awaiting fresh attacks upon our Common School System, the proposition seemed to me one that was not rashly to be rejected."⁷

An Eighty-Year-Old Programme

The action of the Hepburn Government was only what the Roman Catholic Hierarchy has been demanding for about fifteen years. The further concession which Mr. Hepburn did not press, that of secondary, or Roman Catholic high schools, was claimed about 1921. But even that was an attempt to revive an old proposal. So long ago as 1866 a Mr. R. Bell, without notice or warning, introduced into the House of Assembly, a new Separate School Bill for Upper Canada, which provided for a Separate School System "from the alphabet to the doors of the university". The Bill was defeated; but, referring to the section relating to Roman Catholic Separate secondary schools, Dr. Ryerson said:

"I will not advert to the provision relative to colleges and higher seminaries, except to observe that the wedge is there apparent, which it has been long sought to get inserted in our system of Public Instruction, to separate the Roman Catholics 'as a body' from the rest of the population in school matters and thus to accomplish a favourable ultra-montane object."⁸

I have quoted this to show you that the unchanging Church has had its heart set on what it is now demanding in Ontario, for at least eighty years. Fifty-four years later—to be exact, February 9th, 1922—a Toronto paper, referring to speeches by Bishop Fallon, of London, Ontario, and the late Archbishop McNeil, of Toronto, said:

"Bishop Fallon would change the entire basis of taxation for school purposes so that corporations whose shareholders might all be Protestants would be required and compelled by law to devote a portion of their school taxes to the support of Separate Schools. Such a complete surrender of the right of the taxpayer to elect whether he shall support Public or Separate Schools is not to be expected of the people of Ontario."⁹ (Italics ours.)

Can you, by any possibility, guess in what paper that strong statement occurred? It was none other than *The Toronto Globe*! And it occurred at a time when the Drury Government was in power, its term of office being from 1919 to 1923.

Robbing Public Schools to Support Separate Schools

In this connection I quote *The Globe* of Toronto of twenty-one years ago, when I say, "Such a complete surrender of the right of the taxpayer to elect whether he shall support Public or Separate Schools is not to be

expected of the people of Ontario". Well said, *Toronto Globe*, of twenty-one years ago!

The Bilingual Concession

The bilingual concession of a few years ago, by the Ferguson Government, was another surrender to Roman Catholic demands. I shall not at this point discuss it, and refer to it here because of its bearing upon the present situation. The population of Quebec is rapidly increasing. It is overflowing into the eastern and northern parts of Ontario, especially perhaps into the North. What of it? I affirm that it is useless to contend that Quebec is loyal to British institutions and to British connection. The first Great War absolutely demonstrated that; and the present War has confirmed it. The French-Canadian people would be loyal enough were they left alone. But the Roman Catholic Hierarchy has never been loyal, and one of the instruments which they constantly employ for their policy of separatism is the Separate School. *A Roman Catholic Hierarchy can never be loyal to any non-Catholic government, and it must be especially disloyal if that government be a democracy.*

Have We Anything to Fear From Quebec?

Have we anything to fear from Quebec? I have shown you that in this school question the Roman Catholic Hierarchy never changes its mind, nor swerves from its purpose. It steadily pursued the plan which culminated in the Hepburn legislation for not less than seventy years. And now they ask for still more. Therefore, whatever the Hierarchy has said on these matters within such a period is germane to the subject in hand. The statement which I now read appeared in *The Winnipeg Telegram* of a few years ago, and went unchallenged. It is not the voice of the Hierarchy, but of an influential journal. *The Winnipeg Telegram* said:

"The Quebec element opposed to aiding the navy of Great Britain is also the element which talks seriously of the disintegration of Confederation. The late Mr. Tardival's book, 'Pour la Patrie', advocating the organization of a French republic on the north-east corner of the American continent, which book was designed to imbue the rising generation in Quebec with the idea of separation from the English-speaking portion of Canada, is still the subject of very general comment east and west; \$360 was spent by the Quebec Legislature to distribute this book as prizes among the children of the schools of Quebec."¹⁰

Mr. Tardival's book was later elaborated by the Rev. Father Hamon, whose work was approved by Archbishop Taschereau. From that book we take the following extract:

"It is within the range of the possible that there will be a break up when Quebec, New Brunswick, Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and possibly Eastern Ontario will constitute a distinct republic, French and Roman Catholic, Quebec giving a spirit and character to the new republic. Thus it may be, in the order of Providence, that there will be regained by the observance of nature's laws of increase and religious fidelity and love of country that which in September, 1759, the sword wrested from the French-Canadians on the Heights of Abraham."¹¹

For confirmation of that sentiment, I may quote the Honourable Honoré Mercier, of whom the Right Honourable Sir Wilfred Laurier said, "He is the greatest Canadian since the time of Patineau." He was Premier of Quebec. He was a powerful advocate of cutting the

tie with Great Britain, and declaring Quebec a great French-Canadian nation to which he believed those of his compatriots who had gone to the New England States would return. Speaking in Montreal, he said:

"I advise my compatriots to ask for independence. You have colonial dependence; I offer you independence. You have ruin and misery; I offer you fortune and prosperity. You are now only a colony, ignored by the entire world; I offer you the opportunity of becoming a great people, respected and known by all free nations. French-Canadians owe nothing to England. If they have prospered, it is in spite of England, not because of her, and if England has done them any good, it has also done them still greater harm."¹²

It may be said that these echoes of Roman Catholic Hierarchical sentiment have no application to the present time. But I have already shown you that there is a sinister consistency and continuity in Roman Catholic policy; and whatever be the sentiment of the rank and file of the Roman Catholic people of Quebec and Ontario, there is no doubt in my mind that the one purpose of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in Canada is so to strengthen through Separate Schools, and by other means, and enlarge and establish the Roman Catholic Church in Canada, that it may be in a position to dictate to the Government of every Province in Canada.

The Importance of Ontario

I think we shall all agree that there is no Province in Canada more important than Ontario. It is high time that Ontario should assert itself. I believe we ought not to be satisfied with the repeal of this tax measure—that might well be a first step—but we ought to work toward the complete abolition of Separate Schools in Ontario as our objective.

The Hierarchy No Respect for Civil Law

The Roman Catholic Hierarchy in Canada has shown that it has no respect for any civil law. In Quebec Province the civil law is set at naught; the decisions of the Supreme Court of the Empire are defied; and ecclesiastical law is exalted above all. Marriages are annulled, and families declared illegitimate. Sellers of Bibles in Quebec, or colporteurs selling religious books of any kind, are thrown into prison. Ministers who expose the idolatries of the Papist system are convicted of blasphemy.

Years ago, as I have shown, a book approved by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy included Eastern Ontario as part of a new French Roman Catholic republic, to be set up in the north-east corner of the Continent. Sooner or later Ontario will have to accept the Roman Catholic challenge, and fight for her life. There never was a better time to begin than now.

Rome is the Constant Disturber of the Peace

I shall be charged with stirring up bad feeling, with appealing to religious prejudice. It is not I who has stirred up bad feeling, nor appealed to religious prejudice. I speak as I do in defence of our national schools, and of our own religious freedom. Once again, it is the Roman Catholic Hierarchy which has broken the peace. It is they who are attempting to direct the Legislature, and bend the Government to their will.

It is quite evident that Rome must be opposed on political grounds. How is she to be opposed? There is only one way of effecting a reformation: educationally and politically in this Province, and that is by sending

a Government to Queen's-Park who will do the work.

If the Roman Catholics want their Separate Schools, let them have them—and pay for them. And so of all denominations. The Bible admonishes us to be "as wise as serpents, and as harmless as doves." We can at least learn this from the Roman Catholic Hierarchy: to formulate a definite programme, and to determine it shall be carried out, no matter how long it may take.

The Public Must be Informed

To this end, *the public must be informed*. False statements must be corrected, and false impressions removed. Let us this evening highly resolve that we will enlist in this war. I suggest that meetings ought to be held all over this city, large meetings and small, wherever people can be assembled—in churches, in halls, and everywhere. Let us evoke such an expression of sentiment that Maple Leaf Gardens will not be large enough to contain the militant Protestants bold enough to declare themselves openly. And when we have done that, let us carry our message to every city, town, village, and hamlet—to every riding in Ontario, from one end of the Province to the other.

¹ The Legislation and History of Separate Schools in Upper Canada, p. 70.

² The Legislation and History of Separate Schools in Upper Canada, p. 193.

³ Ibid, p. 194.

⁴ Ibid, pp. 194-5.

⁵ The Wedge, by Hon. J. W. Edwards, M.D., p. 39.

⁶ Ibid, pp. 39-40.

⁷ The Wedge, by Hon. J. W. Edwards, M.D., p. 49.

⁸ The Wedge, by Hon. J. W. Edwards, M.D., p. 66.

⁹ Ibid, p. 69.

¹⁰ The Wedge, p. 97.

¹¹ Ibid, p. 98.

¹² The Wedge, p. 98.

MUNICIPAL STATISTICS, 1941 Re—Separate School's Burden of Taxation

An examination of Municipal Statistics shows that there are about *fifty municipalities* where the Separate School assessment for the *whole fifty* amounts to \$2,507, making an average of fifty dollars' tax levy for a whole municipality. Who, in his right mind, can claim that this is an excessive burden?

The figures in these tables, in some cases, are in round numbers, in the interests of simplicity.

Table No. 1

For Townships in Counties (Population Under 5,000)

Official Number	Municipality	County	Assessment for Separate Schools	Tax Levy for Separate Schools
9	Trafalgar	Halton	\$ 14,000.00	\$ 28.00
13	Sarnia	Lambton	6,200.00	70.00
14	Ancaster	Wentworth	21,650.00	91.00
35	Charlotteville	Norfolk	nil	94.00
40	Dereham	Oxford	5,400.00	17.00
54	Elizabethtown	Leeds	8,400.00	60.00
58	East Zorra	Oxford	5,700.00	17.00
68	N. Dumfries	Waterloo	32,950.00	97.00
95	Hamilton	Northumber'd	8,025.00	51.00
103	Leeds & Lans.	Leeds	12,200.00	62.00
109	S. Dumfries	Brant	17,350.00	43.00
126	Colchester S.	Essex	5,100.00	38.00
135	Bentlnck	Grey	2,925.00	44.00
148	Fitzroy	Carleton	5,950.00	67.00
149	Minto	Wellington	8,600.00	52.00
164	Cramate	Northumber'd	4,850.00	49.00
167	Whitby	Ontario	12,050.00	79.00
171	St. Vincent	Grey	2,150.00	12.00
173	East Oxford	Oxford	1,400.00	9.00
176	Pittsburgh	Frontenac	9,740.00	97.00
192	Goulburn	Carleton	4,450.00	9.00
204	N. Easthope	Perth	20,000.00	91.00
211	Blanchard	Perth	12,900.00	65.00

216	West Zorra	Oxford	14,720.00	63.00
220	Alice & Fryer	Renfrew	4,725.00	61.00
229	Bathurst	Lanark	4,700.00	42.00
252	Blandford	Oxford	6,675.00	18.00
253	Drummond	Lanark	6,350.00	62.00
256	Goderich	Huron	2,500.00	23.00
274	West Luther	Wellington	10,400.00	68.00
276	Duoro	Peterborough	11,435.00	89.00
293	E. Wawanish	Huron	3,200.00	34.00
303	Lyndoch	Renfrew	3,725.00	67.00
306	Colborne	Huron	7,200.00	55.00
312	Woolford	Grenville	500.00	5.00
355	N. Elmsley	Lanark	7,000.00	64.00
362	Elmsley S.	Leeds	2,100.00	17.00
387	Galway & Cav.	Peterborough	nil	75.00
400	Dalton	Victoria	nil	89.00

For Townships in Districts (Population Under 5,000)

Official Number	Municipality	District	Assessment for Separate Schools	Tax Levy for Separate Schools
13	Chapple	Rainy River	\$ 3,100.00	\$ 40.00
20	Paipoonge	Thunder Bay	2,325.00	27.00
49	Cosby & Mason	Sudbury	2,322.00	46.00
82	Nipissing	Parry Sound	3,650.00	59.00
124	Baldwin	Sudbury	4,675.00	50.00

For Townships Over 5,000 Population

Official Number	Municipality	District	Assessment for Separate Schools	Tax Levy for Separate Schools
10	Stamford	Welland	nil	\$ 60.00
25	Vaughan	York	\$ 5,900.00	32.00

For Villages in Counties

Official Number	Municipality	District	Assessment for Separate Schools	Tax Levy for Separate Schools
104	Lucan	Middlesex	nil	\$ 45.00
141	Erieau	Kent	\$ 10,850.00	60.00
145	Erie Beach	Kent	1,669.00	14.00
Totals			\$341,711.00	\$2,507.00

Fifty municipalities with total assessment of \$341,711.00 pay in taxes \$2,507.00. An average of \$50.00 per municipality.

No evidence here of burden of taxation for Separate School supporters.

SUMMARY OF SEPARATE SCHOOL ASSESSMENTS AND LEVIES, 1941

Table No. 2

Assessments	Approx. Rate in Mills	Separate School Tax Levies
Cities	14	\$1,862,440.00
Towns in Districts	9	46,607.00
Villages in Districts	20	273.00
Townships in Districts	27	72,467.00
Townships, County, Suburban	13	131,270.00
Townships, Rural, in Counties	11	21,686.00
Townships in Districts	13	40,989.00
Towns in Counties	14½	199,296.00
Towns in Districts	28	124,849.00
Villages in Counties	12½	8,208.00
Separated Towns	12	26,236.00
Townships in Counties	8½	271,627.00
Towns in Counties	13	89,468.00
Villages in Counties	12½	31,379.00
Totals	Average 14	\$2,926,795.00

Figures herein are taken from Public Accounts and Minister of Education Reports for 1941.

GRANTS TO PUBLIC AND SEPARATE SCHOOLS

From Public Accounts, 1942

Table No. 3

	Public Schools	Separate Schools	Reference Page
Counties	\$1,906,571.00	\$ 237,137.00	C13
Districts	890,092.00	309,663.00	
Cities	349,937.00	228,106.00	
Towns	297,646.00	301,242.00	C14
Villages	167,425.00	30,267.00	C15
Assisted	9,227.00	50,255.00	
Dist.	13,802.00	16,709.00	C16
Trans.	28,037.00	2,101.00	
Dist.	19,238.00	2,244.00	
Agric.	22,796.00	6,626.00	C17
M.T.	21,700.00	5,893.00	C18
Aux.	63,964.00	9,639.00	C19
Trv.	7,295.00	2,252.00	
Cons.	5,963.00	2,088.00	C21
5th Class	46,102.00	16,562.00	
Totals	\$3,859,795.00	\$1,210,784.00	

Rates For Separate Schools

Municipal Statistics show that there are a few municipalities with an excessive mill rate. In one municipality this reaches 80 mills while the Public School rate is only 28 mills. Is it reasonable or just that provincial funds should be used to compel Public School supporters to pay 50% of the above difference of 52 mills? The remedy here is for all children to attend the Public Schools.

Municipality	District	Assessment	Tax Levy	Rate
McKim	Sudbury	\$117,010.00	\$6,056.00	50½
Hanna	Sudbury	35,872.00	1,141.00	30
Dowling	Sudbury	5,525.00	444.00	80

Table No. 4

Comparative Table

Showing the Number of Public and Separate Schools and Their Respective Grants

Year	No. of Public Schools	No. of Separate Schools	Government School Grants	Separate School Grants
1867	4,261	161	\$ 177,160.00	\$ 9,993.00
1872	4,490	171	212,091.00	12,327.00
1877	4,955	185	238,355.00	13,607.00
1882	5,013	190	251,356.00	14,382.00
1887	5,277	229	251,914.00	16,808.00
1892	5,577	312	262,748.00	21,043.00
1897	5,574	340	339,863.00	26,675.00
1902	5,671	391	353,194.00	30,472.00
1907	5,819	449	614,715.00	40,524.00
1912	5,939	513	790,432.00	51,846.00
1917	6,103	548	844,719.00	63,127.00
1918	6,136	559	901,971.00	68,613.00
1919	6,179	559	1,217,481.00	99,047.00
1920	6,207	594	1,479,165.00	133,672.00
1921	6,280	621	2,257,735.00	196,283.00
1922	6,289	656	2,780,749.00	195,963.00
1923	6,334	688	3,048,963.00	217,621.00
1924	6,361	708	3,150,895.00	241,657.00
1925	6,389	716	3,162,520.00	239,345.00
1926	6,410	723	3,073,879.00	271,429.00
1927	6,427	724	3,108,370.00	296,277.00
1928	6,450	743	3,208,992.00	299,415.00
1929	6,466	770	3,318,071.00	368,230.00
1930	6,403	761	3,396,681.00	356,818.00
1931	6,411	761	3,614,516.00	487,932.00
1932	6,424	764	3,312,585.00	535,111.00
1933	6,385	776	2,812,963.00	543,353.00
1941	6,214	827	3,646,000.00	1,210,000.00

AN ANONYMOUS GIFT

Thank you, once again, Regina, for your good gift of \$20.00 which is most gratefully received.

READ THE GOSPEL WITNESS

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE PEACE RIVER VALLEY

IN our issue of December 14th, 1944, we published an article from the *Toronto Evening Telegram* of December 2nd, 1944, as follows:

Opposition in Alberta to Creation of Local French State

"One Quebec," says the *Calgary Albertan*, "is enough for Canada." Its reference is to the proposed creation of "a Western French-Canadian state" in the Peace River district of Alberta. Already there are a number of French-Canadian communities of from 50 to 250 families in this region, and a move is now under way under the auspices of the Peace River Colonization Association, of Drummondville, Quebec, to fill up the Peace River Valley with French-Canadian settlers. Rev. Father C. St. Pierre is the prime mover behind it, and its literature is distributed through provincial government offices in Montreal and Drummondville.

"Is it not a worthy task," asks one of the Association's pamphlets, "to work for the expansion of the reign of Christ and French influence in our dear Canada?" Quebecers who might be inclined to go to the United States are urged to go West instead, and are reminded that it would be better for them, to retain their identity in "a Western French-Canadian state" rather than lose themselves among the Americans. They are assured that, "There is nothing to fear as regards language, because we are grouped, and the priests are all of the language of the colonists. Most of the teachers are of our language, which is spoken throughout the district. The agronomist is bilingual, the lands agent, the school inspector are bilingual. We have our doctors, lawyers, merchants, justices of the peace, postmasters, registrars, elevator representatives—all are French-Canadians."

The issue created by this movement does not involve the right of French-Canadians to settle anywhere in Canada they please. As Canadians they have that right. But the creation of a French-Canadian state in the West is another matter. Of that the *Calgary Albertan* says:

"This scheme will certainly not be welcome to the present inhabitants of Alberta. We have no desire to see the Northern portion of our province turned into a French-Canadian stronghold. We want the undeveloped lands in the Peace River country kept as a heritage for our own people, and especially for our returning soldiers. We do not want them turned into a dumping-ground for people who greedily appropriate the benefits which Canada offers, but who will not defend their country in its hour of peril. Most Alberta people envisage another future for the North than that of being 'a fine French-Canadian province'."

So far as homesteading is concerned, the Government of Alberta has already taken action. To preserve for returning soldiers the first choice of homestead lands, homesteading has been halted for the duration for everybody but old Albertans. That, it seems, is as it should be.

—*Toronto Evening Telegram*, Dec. 2nd, 1944.

On the occasion of our visit to the West about that time, there were a number of people who came all the way from the Peace River Valley to Edmonton to our meeting. One man said that a very large number of the French-Canadians who were sent West to work on the Yukon Highway, were kept there; when it was finished, as settlers. Houses had been built for them; and our informant said that the occupants declared that they had been provided for by the Church.

On a later date, a Bill was introduced in the Alberta Legislature for the incorporation of some new French Language Society for the promotion of the French language in the Province of Alberta. Protests were made by the Protestant League in Calgary, and in Edmonton,

with the result that the Bill was withdrawn. We have no doubt, however, that the work of settling Roman Catholics as a solid bloc in the Peace River Valley goes on apace; for the Roman Church is really not particular whether the settlers be French-Canadian, or some other nationality, if only they can form a Roman Catholic bloc in Alberta.

We suggest to our Social Credit friends in Alberta that they had better be wide awake and watchful, day and night, for while men sleep, the enemy always sows tares.

We have several times spoken of the danger of opening the doors for the admission of the Roman Catholic soldiers comprising General Anders' Polish Army, who refused to return to Poland because of Russia's anti-Roman Catholic attitude. We have been informed that preparations are made for settling some four thousand of these Polish soldiers somewhere in the Eastern townships of Quebec. There could be no objection to receiving these Polish soldiers were it not for the Roman Catholic Hierarchy's policy of segregating its people, keeping them in solid colonies to become a bloc of Roman Catholic voters. That is what will happen to these Polish soldiers. They will have their Separate Schools, and their own churches, where they will speak the Polish language, and the Hierarchy will do everything possible to prevent their assimilation and absorption into the general life of Canada.

—From THE GOSPEL WITNESS, July 18th, 1946.

A MUCH-APPRECIATED LETTER

A valued Vancouver subscriber writes as follows:
December 4th

THE GOSPEL WITNESS,
Toronto, Ont.

Dear Friends:

Just a note to advise you that a mistake appears in the sermon given December 24th, 1950, by Dr. Shields, when he states on page 3 of 571, that "Andrew Jackson . . . became President of the United States when Abraham Lincoln was assassinated".

Andrew Jackson was President of the United States from 1828 to 1836, and died in June, 1845. Lincoln was shot in April, 1865.

The good Doctor's historical matter is usually so accurate that I am at a loss to know how he slipped up this time. I am quite sure he has been already advised of the slip; but we also keep a tab on things.

Yours very truly,

We greatly appreciate this letter. The reference was wholly impromptu, not in any way premeditated. Whether it was a slip of the preacher's tongue, or a typographical error, we are not quite sure. We are aware that Andrew Jackson was elected to the Presidency, and served on the dates named by our correspondent; whereas Andrew Johnson was elected as Vice-President, and succeeded to the Presidency on the assassination of Lincoln.

There was another slip in the paragraph referred to. Andrew Johnson was not a harness-maker, but a tailor.

We repeat, it was wholly an impromptu reference, and "harness-maker", instead of tailor, could not have been a typographical error. So we rather think the preacher's memory was perhaps a little dull on that occasion.

We appreciate our correspondent's compliment that we are usually accurate. We try to be. It is not difficult to see how one might easily slip from Jackson to Johnson. "Jack" is a nickname for John anyway! Horace acknowl-

edges that, "Honest Homer nods sometimes: he is not equally awake in every line". But Homer's somnolence is no excuse for historical inaccuracy. But we feel like borrowing an inquiry from Lot, when he asked permission of the angels to escape into a certain city. He said, "Is it not a little one?"

We are highly gratified to know that our readers read carefully and critically. Please continue to "keep a tab on things" and let us know when we slip.

THE DUTIES OF A CHURCH CLERK

THE GOSPEL WITNESS receives many inquiries about church matters, as to Pastors, and Deacons, and Church Clerks, etc. What is the duty of a Church Clerk?

In a Baptist Church, by which we understand a New Testament Church, there are but two offices, that of Pastor, and Deacon. The Church Clerk is not an official: he is a servant, whose duty it is to record the Minutes of meetings, and to keep a faithful record of official resolutions, and to carry out instructions given him, by Pastor, or Deacons, or both, or by the Church itself. A Church Clerk has absolutely no right to call a Church meeting. Such meetings are authorized by the Pastor, or Deacons, or both. Where a Church has a written constitution, it usually defines the duties of the Church Clerk, and various committees. But where there is no constitution, the above practices obtain. A Church Clerk is altogether exceeding the limitations of his position, when he acts on any church matter without instruc-

tion from the Pastor, or Deacons, or both, or from the Church.

ANOTHER GOOD LETTER

Edmonton, January 13th, 1951

Dear Dr. Shields,
and GOSPEL WITNESS Friends:

I am enclosing \$3.00 for renewal of THE GOSPEL WITNESS. I should feel lost without it. To me it seems like a Christian visitor each week. It does so much for me. It increases my knowledge of the Bible, magnifies our wonderful Saviour, enriches my personal spiritual life, and reassures my faith in Him.

May God bless you with abounding health, Job 33:25, and guide you in all your work, is my daily prayer.
Your friend,

BOOKS AND BOOKLETS

By DR. T. T. SHIELDS

"Other Little Ships"	\$2.00
"The Prodigal and His Brother, or The Adventures of a Modern Young Man"	1.00
"The Plot That Failed"	2.00
Special Illustrated Number of Sept. 2825
"Russellism or Rutherfordism", 71 pages25
"The Papacy in the Light of Scripture", 26 pages25
"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"05

The Gospel Witness

130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2 - Canada

Special Offer to New Subscribers

This paper is a printed missionary, and carries no advertisements. The regular issues contain 16 pages. The subscription price is \$3.00 for 52 issues. With every new subscription we will give one of the three following books as a premium:

1. **Blakeney's Manual of Romish Controversy**, by Dr. R. P. Blakeney, 316 pages.
2. **Popery in Its Social Aspects**, by Dr. R. P. Blakeney, 326 pages.
3. **The Prodigal and His Brother, or The Adventures of a Modern Young Man**, by Dr. T. T. Shields, 132 pages.
4. **The Priest, The Woman and The Confessional**, by Father Chiniquy, 144 pages.

All but "The Prodigal and His Brother" were out of print and unobtainable and were republished by THE GOSPEL WITNESS.

You may choose any one of the four as a premium. If you would like any or all of the other books, you may have them at one dollar each.

You may order the paper and one of the books sent you for a month's trial without sending any money. If you are not satisfied return the book or send us \$1.00 and we will charge you nothing for the paper for the month.

ORDER FORM

- (a) Please send to the undersigned for one month's trial THE GOSPEL WITNESS and Premium No. _____
- (b) Please send THE GOSPEL WITNESS and Premium No. _____ to the undersigned for which find \$3.00 enclosed.
- (c) And also books (or book) numbered _____ for which find \$ _____ enclosed.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____