

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum.
United States & Europe—\$2.00
Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.

Editors: Rev. James T. Foley, B.A.
Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.

Associate Editors: Rev. F. J. O'Sullivan,
H. F. Mackintosh.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted,
etc. 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to
accompany the order.

Approved and recommended by Archbishops
Falconio and Shear, late Apostolic Delegates to
Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston,
Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London,
Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, N. Y.,
and the clergy throughout the Dominion.
The following agents are authorized to receive
subscriptions and canvass for the CATHOLIC
RECORD:

General agents: M. J. Hagarty, Vincent S.
Cox, and Miss Sara Bailey, Resident agents:
George E. Hawtson, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs.
W. E. Smith, Halifax; Miss Brice Saunders,
Sydney; Miss L. Heringer, Winnipeg; E. E.
Castello, 2256-5th ave. West, Vancouver, B. C.;
S. J. Johnson, 211 Rochester st., Ottawa; Miss
Rose McKenney, 149 D'Aiguillon street, Quebec.
Mrs. George E. Smith, 2393 St. Urban street,
Montreal; and M. J. Mervin, situations wanted,
etc. 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to
accompany the order.

Subscribers changing residence will please give
old as well as new address.

In St. John N. B. single copies may be
purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 249 Main
Street, John J. Doyle, 103 Brussels street.

In Montreal single copies may be purchased
from J. Milloy, 24 St. Catherine street, west.

LONDON, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1916

ORDER AND LIBERTY

"It must ever remain a mystery to Protestants how intelligent and freedom-loving Roman Catholics can be content to allow a man of another race, and sometimes out of sympathy with freedom, to dictate to them what they shall or shall not do in grave national questions. Of course the Pope is supposed to be supreme only in regard to moral questions, but we notice that it is never hard to make a national question a moral one. No doubt Le Pays will in the end quietly submit, or be put under the ban."

With this philosophic reflection does our Methodist contemporary, The Christian Guardian, conclude its comments on an insignificant anticlerical paper's ill-tempered criticism of the Pope's recent letter on the bilingual question.

Perhaps we should give briefly what leads up to our Methodist contemporary's sad but resigned conclusion about those incomprehensible Roman Catholics.

"Since this Ontario school question," quotes the Guardian from Le Pays, "is a national question, we do not see why we should be silenced by this strange request of the Holy Father." The Guardian continues:

"And then, after sarcastically advising the French people to continue sending their money to 'the millionaire of the Vatican,' he declares in hot indignation that 'if the French-Canadians were men they would leave their churches rather than listen to the reading of the document.' For a Roman Catholic editor this is going pretty far, and yet we presume that the French-Canadian bishops will feel like echoing his words in private while at the same time they will be compelled to condemn them in public."

This is sufficient to show the spirit in which this "Roman Catholic editor" writes as well as that in which the Methodist editor comments.

The Papal Letter in question was characterized by the Toronto Globe as "a statesmanlike document"; and by the Hamilton Spectator as "a masterpiece of consecrated common sense."

These two great dailies, differing in politics, owned, controlled and edited by Protestants, may be taken as typical of clean Canadian journalism. And we are glad to note parenthetically that the qualified term includes practically all Canadian newspapers.

Widespread, universal indeed, as was the comment, we have yet to read a single editorial utterance in English criticising the Pope's Letter adversely. And to the Guardian we are indebted for the exception in French.

Now as to the insinuation in the mendacious term "the millionaire of the Vatican." It is a fact, interesting alike to Catholics and Protestants, that the administration of ecclesiastical affairs in Rome is carried on at a cost less than that of the stationery required for the British Government. And there is not a capital in the world the administration of whose civil affairs equals in magnitude, importance or infinite detail the worldwide ecclesiastical administration of the capital of Christendom. It might tend to allay the "hot indignation" of Le Pays, and perhaps cool the warm sympathy of The Guardian, to know that Quebec contributes annually considerably less than five cents a family to Peter's Pence.

The Guardian's assumption with regard to the French-Canadian bishops is entirely gratuitous and grossly insulting to a body of able and learned Catholic gentlemen and self-respecting fellow-Canadians.

It is, however, the Guardian's concluding paragraph quoted at the head

of this article that we wish to consider. It is characteristically Protestant. There is the familiar assumption of Protestant superiority and the usual Protestant inconsistency. It reminds us of some of the charges now in great measure abandoned, but common in our boyhood days. In venerating the cross or crucifix we unreasoning Catholics were told were that we were paying superstitious reverence to a bit of wood, and this by people who proudly boasted of respect and reverence for their country's flag—a bit of cloth. The erection of statues to civil heroes was a natural and reasonable way of honoring and perpetuating their memory; whilst the Catholic practice of having statues of heroic servants of God in their churches was a violation of the First (or as they called it the Second) Commandment. The "mystery" of our perversity in these and many other matters is now, to a considerable extent, cleared up.

But it is still (and "must ever remain") "a mystery" how we can "allow a man of another race to dictate to us what we shall or shall not do in grave national questions."

The grave national question in this case is the Ontario bilingual school question. Well it so happens that this same grave national question was submitted to the judgment of the Law Committee of the Privy Council. And these men of another race dictated to freedom-loving French Canadians what they shall or shall not do in this grave national question. It must, presumably, ever remain a mystery why they allow it. They even dictated to the free Government of this freedom-loving province which appointed a Commission to replace the rebellious Ottawa Separate School Board. And the Government quietly submits. But then, of course, in this case all are of the same race, so some time or another the mystery of why they allow it may be cleared up.

The whole thing is as un-Protestant as it will can be. The Protestant rule of faith is the Bible (or what is left of it). Each and every man has the sacred and inviolable right of Private Judgment.

In the grave national question under consideration the proper Protestant course of procedure would be to give to each and every one concerned a copy of the Separate Schools Act, a copy of the British North America Act, and, perhaps, also a copy of the Treaty of Paris (1763). Let private judgment do the rest. It must ever remain a mystery to Catholics why Protestants do otherwise if they have any faith or confidence in their own system.

All sane men admit, however, that instead of being a boon to freedom-loving people such a system in the civil order would result in confusion and chaos. In the order of religion, freedom-loving Roman Catholics see that the Protestant system results in disintegration, division, dissolution,—in a word, Protestantism as it is to-day. And that is why in religion they prefer that well-ordered liberty which in civil matters all rational men prefer to anarchy.

There is just another bit of Protestant inconsistency—delicious at the present moment—in the last sentence: "No doubt Le Pays will in the end quietly submit, or be put under the ban."

In passing, The Guardian is so free in its assumptions that we presume it merely assumes that the editor of Le Pays is a Roman Catholic. He may be, for aught we know. But there are French-Canadians—and Le Pays talks like one of them—who are very much farther from being Roman Catholics than is the editor of the Christian Guardian. But why the Guardian's note of hopelessness, of pessimism, when predicting Le Pays' submission to the requests expressed by the Holy Father in that "masterpiece of consecrated common sense," "that statesmanlike document," that Letter which, unless memory fails us, The Guardian itself commended?

And what more natural, if it prove contumacious, than that Le Pays should be "put under the ban"? A whole series of papers were "put under the ban" by the Governments of Great Britain and Canada only a week or so ago—the Hearst papers. Other papers have been suppressed or suspended. We recall that at least one Canadian paper was put under the ban and obliged to suspend publication because its freedom-loving editor presumed to criticise the actions of the Canadian Government with regard to a grave national question. We have had a whole Index Expurgatorius of publi-

cations "put under the ban" since the beginning of the War.

Neither race nor national boundaries nor language nor color can impose limits on the Church Catholic. And that "mystery to Protestants" may not appear so much like an unreasoning Catholic perversity if they would bear in mind that the sanity and good sense of Catholics and Protestants, Jews and Pagans,—be they never so freedom-loving—endorse and demand well-ordered liberty with its necessary limitations rather than anarchy, individualism run mad, with every man his own Supreme Court.

"It must always remain a mystery" to Catholics, but, nevertheless, it cannot be denied that there are anarchists and, in another order,—Protestants.

THE NEW BRITISH ENVOY TO THE HOLY SEE

Two years ago when the British Government appointed Sir Henry Howard as its accredited representative to the Holy See there was amongst a section of English Protestants an outburst of noisy protest. It is worthy of note that on his recent recall the appointment of his successor, the Count de Salis, seems to have left the protesting Protestants quite unexcited, at all events quite silent. This is all the more worthy of remark since the Foreign Minister quieted their fears over the first appointment with the assurance that Sir Henry was going to the Vatican on a Special Mission.

A Special Envoy was not altogether an innovation. On the occasion of Queen Victoria's Jubilee in 1887 Mgr. Ruffo Scilla, Leo XIII's Special Envoy to the Court of St. James, was accorded a gracious reception; and subsequently the Duke of Norfolk as Representative of Her Majesty was commissioned to convey to His Holiness Queen Victoria's congratulations and good wishes on the occasion of Pope Leo's Episcopal Jubilee. These missions, which after all were merely the interchange of official courtesies, nevertheless marked an epoch in the post-Reformation relations between England and the Holy See.

Of course semi-official, semi-diplomatic intercourse between the British Government and Rome had from time to time obtained. But at this time there was a very serious disposition on both sides to establish open Diplomatic Relations between England and the Holy See.

Twenty years ago the biographer of Cardinal Manning wrote:

"But Diplomatic Relations with the Holy See are to-day not within the range of practical politics, as Lord Salisbury soon discerned on discovering that the Irish Catholic members to a man, in their blind jealousy of English influence at the Vatican, would oppose by their votes in the House of Commons, a Bill for the establishment of Diplomatic Relations with the Holy See. Nationalists and Orangemen would work together hand and glove, and oppose with ferocity any government, Whig or Tory, which might introduce such a Bill. Irish Catholics and Orange bigots would, moreover, be helped and blessed in their hostility to the Pope by the Nonconformist Conscience in England, awakened once more by a proposal to establish Diplomatic Relations between England and the Vatican."

"The idea or suggestion of such relations found in Cardinal Manning an opponent more determined even than the Irish Nationalists, though his opposition was inspired by motives higher than theirs."

In Manning's Diary under date July 10th, 1887, is a Note dealing with the subject in which these sentences occur:

"The Catholic Church in the English-speaking world rests not on Courts but on the people; and its independence of all Civil Powers is its strength."

And later on:

"The anti-Catholic bigotry of England is not dead, but disarmed by the admission of Nonconformists and Catholics to absolute equality in the public life of the Kingdom. In the social life it still exists widely. When it is mitigated it is so as a religion and so long as we keep within the sphere of religion we have perfect liberty. But if we were to enter the political sphere for any private Catholic interest or for any privilege beyond the common law of the land, we should provoke a storm of suspicion and antagonism. The three centuries of persecution are over; and the peace of the Church has come. We should lose the sub-

stance in snatching at a shadow if we put in risk the liberty founded upon equality before the Law for any diplomatic relations."

The opposition of Cardinal Manning was evidently sincere and deliberate, based on his exceptional knowledge of religious conditions in England and on his intimate and personal familiarity with the religious sentiment and religious prejudice of Englishmen.

The sympathies, antipathies and painful limitations of the accidental little biographer of the great Cardinal are well known. Abstraction made, however, of the evident animus and the savage tone, the paragraph from him quoted above contains substantial truth.

Two or three decades have evidently made a profound change in the conditions affecting the merits of the question of establishing diplomatic relations between the Court of St. James and the Vatican.

For one thing Ireland has now her proper and unquestioned place on the map of the world; and the misrepresentation of her position and motives possible a few decades ago is quite impossible to-day.

When it is recalled that Leo XIII's decree condemning some of the methods of the Plan of Campaign against rack-renting Irish landlords as immoral was due, at least in some measure, to unofficial English diplomacy at the Vatican there is a touch of irony in the fact that the present accredited English Representative at the Vatican is an Irish landlord. At least he was an Irish landlord until a few years ago when his estate in the County of Limerick, like most of the land in Ireland, passed under the Land Purchase Act into the possession of those who cultivate it. Nor was he ever a landlord of the type that has made Irish landlordism a by-word and reproach throughout the world. On the contrary his name is held in benediction by his former tenants.

The 1st Count was Envoy of the Grisons at the Court of Queen Anne. The Grisons, now the most easterly canton of Switzerland, for centuries played a part in European history altogether disproportionate to its size. Like the rest of Switzerland its importance lay in its strategic position with relation to the surrounding great powers. The 2nd Count was naturalized in England by Act of Parliament in 1730, and for the past two hundred years the family seat has been in Ireland at Loughrath, County Limerick.

The present British Envoy to the Holy See is a diplomat of wide and varied experience and a recent convert to the Catholic Church.

HOME RULE AT ONCE?

As we go to press the cable brings what may be momentous news about Ireland.

Following is the gist of the despatch:

"London Nov. 25.—The central part of the idea is the immediate enforcement of Home Rule, which has been on the statute books for over two years. This move would do much to remove dissatisfaction in Ireland and would, unquestionably, lessen the distrust of England. The next step, it is suggested, would be to make an effort to carry on the Government of Ireland for the time being by a committee of six, giving two members to each of the three main sections in Ireland."

"Redmond and Devlin would, of course, represent the Nationalists, Carson, and possibly Colonel Craig, might represent the Ulsterites. There is good reason to believe that the Sinn Féiners would be content to leave themselves in the hands of George Russell, the Irish poet, and Sir Horace Plunkett. If these six could be induced to work together it seems as though a large amount of union could be obtained in Ireland."

After the debate on Redmond's resolution it became evident that England stood at the bar of the world's judgment convicted of pursuing with regard to Ireland the very policy she condemns in unmeasured terms when that policy is Germany's. We know that it is the bad old England, who are guilty of Prussian methods. But that only adds the opinion, sentiment and judgment of the British democracy to the pressure impelling the British Government to take the plunge and by one great act of statesmanship and justice recover at once the good opinion of the world, the confidence of the British democracy, and the good-will of the Irish people.

George Russell and Sir Horace Plunkett are Protestants; but they are Irishmen, able and devoted to Ireland, who both enjoy and deserve the respect and confidence of the

Irish people. They have as well understanding and sympathy.

Altogether the despatch indicates that the outlook for Ireland is more cheering and hopeful than the most optimistic had dared to hope for.

There is always the danger that Ireland exasperated and resentful may look upon the whole proceeding as merely a means of getting Irish recruits. And this danger will be very real if the Lansdownes of the Cabinet accentuate Irish feeling by restrictions and conditions of the old, familiar, stupidly malignant kind.

It would be an act of reparation, statesmanlike in its generosity, if the Government were to take Professor Eoin MacNeill from prison and place him amongst the six responsible for the government of Ireland. But that is, perhaps, too much to expect of the Tory element in the Coalition Government. It would be tantamount to asking Tories of the obsolescent Die-Hard type to recognize that Irish Catholics are entirely human.

WHAT OF THE MULTITUDE?

The lot of the most of us, in Ontario at least, is cast in the midst of non-Catholics. We are in the minority. The multitude is not of the Faith. Sunday after Sunday they throng past the house wherein Christ dwells to their cold, unattractive conventicles. We meet them; we converse with them; we work side by side with them on week days. We associate with them in charitable and patriotic undertakings. We even number many of them among our dearest friends, and we love those little children that we meet daily on their way from school. Each of us then must have put to himself the question: what of their eternal salvation? Of course, it would be temerity to judge in any individual case, because God alone knows the heart and will render to each one according as he has followed the light he has received, the dictates of his conscience. But there are certain rules, founded upon the infallible teaching of the Church, that should direct our attitude of mind towards those without the fold keeping us free from the two extremes of being unnecessarily severe in our condemnation of all who do not believe and worship with us, or from compromising, through a false sense of charity or perhaps through moral cowardice, in setting forth the teachings of the Church on this matter, thereby confirming our friends in error and perchance dimming the lustre of our own faith.

In recent years there has been a decided change in the attitude of non-Catholics towards the Church. From a social and political standpoint she is being attacked even more bitterly than in the past; but controversies on points of doctrine are becoming very rare. The original teaching of our separated brethren was that faith was the essential thing and that works counted for nothing. Their present attitude is the very antithesis of this. Now it does not matter what you believe so long as you lead a good life. Some Catholics are deceived in imagining that his abandonment of attack upon Catholic doctrine is due to a spirit of tolerance, whereas it is a necessary withdrawal from a position that is recognized to be no longer tenable. This cessation of hostilities is also due to the fact that Protestants no longer consider doctrine of sufficient importance to quarrel about it. Religious controversies, though they had many disagreeable features, were at least an evidence of life. It were foolish for us to suppose that because Catholic doctrine is not attacked that the attitude of the world towards it is becoming more friendly. True it is that many have embraced the faith in recent years and that many ministers, whose sincerity we have no reason to doubt, say many complimentary things about our holy religion which are duly acknowledged. This interchange of compliments has blinded many Catholics to the evil of heresy which is all the more dangerous to all parties concerned, because it has ceased to be religiously militant. It were well, therefore, to consider this matter in the light of Catholic teaching, so that we may remain orthodox without ceasing to be charitable.

In viewing this subject we should never lose sight of this fundamental truth that the ordinary means of salvation instituted by Our Divine Lord is membership in His visible Church, and that all who are saved outside

of the body of the Church are saved by extraordinary means. Further-

more, these extraordinary means are only applicable in the case of those who, through no fault of their own, are outside of the body of the Church, and thereby deprived of the efficacious graces of the sacraments. Those who are guilty of wilful heresy are guilty of one of the most grievous of sins. St. Jerome says that there is nothing that so far separates a man from God as formal heresy. The reason for this is that it springs from pride, which is especially detestable in the sight of God. The moral law demands of us the homage of our heart; while faith demands the homage of our intellect. Unwillingness to submit our intelligence to God is all the more sinful because it is our noblest faculty, and because we thereby repudiate the testimony of Him Who is Truth Itself. A man may be honored in the community, esteemed for his natural virtues of honesty and benevolence; his courteous and gracious manners may have won for him a host of friends, but if he has wilfully rejected the gift of faith he is not in the way of salvation. All this is but the expression in other words of this portion of the tenth chapter of Butler's Catechism.

Q.—Can persons who deny outwardly the true religion or Church in which they inwardly believe, expect salvation while in that state?
A.—No; "whosoever," says Christ, "shall deny Me before men, I will also deny him before My Father Who is in heaven." (Matt. x. 33.)
Q.—Is a person in the way of salvation, who believes in the true Church, and says that in his heart he is attached to it, but through pride, human respect, or worldly motives, does not make open profession of it, or does not comply with its essential duties?
A.—No; St. Paul says "with the heart we believe unto justice; but with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." (Rom. x. 10.)
Q.—Will strict honesty to every one and moral good works insure salvation whatever church or religion one professes?
A.—No; good works must be enlivened by faith that worketh by charity.

Q.—Why must our good works be enlivened by faith?
A.—Because the Scripture says without faith it is impossible to please God.

Leaving out of the question unbaptized persons, in whose case the Church teaches that baptism of blood or baptism of desire will take the place of the sacrament, we will consider the case of baptized non-Catholics, who are in good faith. They are not guilty of heresy, for they have never wilfully repudiated any revealed doctrine. They have faith, because they believe in the truths that are essential as a means to salvation. So long as they remain free from mortal sin, or have recovered grace through perfect contrition, they belong to the soul of the Church and are thereby in the way of salvation. While there is no gainsaying the fact that a large number are excluded from this category because they are insincere in their profession of belief, or because they live according to the flesh; yet we may not err in generosity in estimating the number of those who are thus associated with the Church; for even in places where it is at their door inherited prejudices may have kept many from giving it any serious consideration. We would like to believe and have reason to believe that the kindly old Scotch lady that gave us hot biscuits on our way from school, the honest old neighbor in whom there was no guile and the many sincere friends of our youth and maturer years who have shared with us the joys and sorrows of the little world in which we have moved, will receive grace and mercy from the Saviour of us all. We must not, however, lose sight of the fact that just as unbaptized children are deprived of the Beatific Vision through no fault of their own, so, in like manner, these sincere souls may not drink of the sacramental fountains of grace, may not know the spiritual exhilaration that comes from a good confession, or may not share in the indulgences which the Church offers to her children. The thought of this sad privation should make us doubly grateful for God's gratuitous gift to us and prompt us to pray earnestly that they too may share in it.

THE GLEANER.

If it were given to man to see virtue's reward in the next world, he would occupy his intellect, memory, and will in nothing but good works, careless of danger or fatigue.

Every flower is a hint of God's beauty; every grain of wheat a token of His beneficence; every atom of dust a revelation of His power.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

WE DEVOTED several paragraphs a few weeks ago to the reported discovery in Cuba of a cure for leprosy. Further details which have since come to hand point to the confirmation of the report, and as the subject is of universal interest we make no apology for laying these details before our readers.

It was stated that a number of patients in the Leper Hospital at Havana were, on the strength of Angel Garcia's own reputed recovery from the disease, being treated with his remedy, under the supervision of leading physicians. These physicians, officially connected with the Sanitary Department of Cuba, have now made a preliminary report in which they all agree that every one of those taking the cure has shown a very decided improvement.

This is substantiated by one of the Havana papers which had been investigating the subject on its own account. "We have been investigating for some time," says the journal referred to, "the cure for leprosy by the treatment employed by Angel Garcia, and we know the cure is a fact, but we have been waiting for the analysis which has been conducted under the authority of the noted Dr. Aristides Agramonte, so that when it was finished we would be able to give our readers the result. Dr. Agramonte has now directed an official communication to the director of the hospital, San Lazaro, in which he states that he and his colleagues had at different times examined the blood of Angel Garcia to assure themselves that he did not now have leprosy, and that they have not been able to find in it the bacteria of Hansen."

THE CLAIM put forward by some persons that Garcia never was a leper, but has claimed to have been one for the purpose of attracting notice to himself and profiting by the notoriety, does not fit in with the fact that, as already stated, he has turned over his formula to the Cuban Government without asking recompense of any kind. But to allay any misgivings of this kind the investigation was extended to include Garcia's past history. It was established beyond doubt that he had been admitted into San Lazaro Hospital on Aug. 24th, 1904; that on Sept. 7th following there is recorded in the books of that institution a bacteriological examination by the head of the laboratory which showed that in the blood of Angel Garcia was encountered the bacteria of Hansen; that Dr. Manuel F. Alfonso, who was at that time director of the Hospital, certified that Garcia was then a leper in an advanced stage; that there are still in the hospital many lepers who were companions of Garcia, and several nursing sisters, who are prepared to affirm positively that he was a leper. "Therefore," concludes the aforesaid journal, "we can affirm that Garcia is cured of the disease, and that his claims for his formula are substantiated."

THAT the *el plan Garcia* has been taken seriously by the medical authorities of Cuba and by the public generally is evidenced by the decision of the Sanitary Department of the Government to erect a new leper hospital where the *plan* can be thoroughly tested under the best possible conditions. This hospital is to be erected on Juan Tomas Island, situated in the Bay of Cabañas, on the north coast of Pinar del Rio, about 50 miles from Havana. This location, being high above the water with good drainage and a constant sea-breeze, is considered most suitable for the purpose. An interesting feature of the project is that the lepers are to be given the freedom of the island, and to be encouraged to cultivate the 500 acres of very fertile soil which it contains. The experiment will be watched with interest not only by those directly concerned but by the medical profession throughout the world and by all interested in the relief of the unfortunate and the welfare of the race.

THE DEATH of Emperor Francis Joseph has set many journalistic pens a-scurrying in denunciation of his part in precipitating the present colossal and disastrous war upon the world. The exact responsibility which rests upon him for the great upheaval will be adjudicated by the historians of the future, but in the meantime the world can afford to temper its judgment with some degree of compassion for the pathetic