

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$1.00 per annum. United States & Europe—\$1.50. Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, LL. D. Editors: Rev. James T. Foley, B. A., Thomas Coffey, LL. D. Associate Editors: Rev. F. J. O'Sullivan, R. F. Mackintosh. Manager—Robert M. Burns.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to be made in advance. Where CATHOLIC RECORD is required send 10 cents to cover postage and return copies. Quotations and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 10 cents. Approved and recommended by Archbishops of Toronto and Montreal, the Bishops of Kingston, Ottawa, Peterborough and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion. In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McQuinn, 219 Main Street, and John J. Dwyer. In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be purchased at Murphy's Bookstore. Montreal single copies may be purchased from J. Milroy, 343 St. Catherine St., West. The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and canvass for the CATHOLIC RECORD: General agents: M. J. Haggarty, Vincent S. O'Connell and Miss Jeanne Doyle; resident agents: Mrs. W. E. Smith, Halifax; Miss Brie Saunders, St. John's; Miss T. Hagan, 367 Longside Street, Winnipeg; R. H. C. Silas, 208 1/2 Ave. West, Vancouver; B. C. Silas, 211 Rochester St., Ottawa; Miss Rose Kennedy, 149 1/2 Argillite St., Quebec; Mrs. Geo. Smith, 208 St. Ursula St., Montreal; M. J. Mervin, Montreal; E. P. O'Leary, Montreal, Sask., and J. J. Murphy, Box 123, Saskatoon.

LONDON, SATURDAY, AUGUST 23, 1919

EDUCATION SUNDAY

At their last meeting, some few months ago, the Bishops of Ontario resolved to take measures to stimulate the interest of the faithful in the matter of providing their children with higher education. With this laudable end in view it was decided that a certain Sunday in August should be selected upon which this important matter should be presented to the consideration of the faithful.

While many Catholic parents are availing themselves of the educational facilities placed at their disposal for the training of their children, the fact cannot be overlooked that in proportion to our population, the number of Catholics in such walks of life as the legal, medical, and teaching professions, is far below what it should be.

Every year hundreds of bright and talented children pass through our Separate Schools, yet but too few in proportion continue their schooling. What the various causes of this are, may furnish matter for speculation. One cause at least, and the one which our ecclesiastical leaders have set out to combat, is the apparent apathy, unfortunately manifested by some Catholic parents, in the matter of providing their children with higher education.

We have said "higher education" for we take it for granted that no parent, unless the victim of extraordinary circumstances, would fail to see that his child receive a complete primary education, which means that he at least complete the course preparatory for the High School Entrance Examination.

Without that training the child enters into life's struggle sadly handicapped. Formerly this may not have been so much the case; but now, year by year, it is becoming increasingly difficult, nay rather almost impossible, to succeed in life without the ground-work of a solid education.

Children, then, who upon the completion of their primary studies, display talents and personal inclinations towards fitting themselves for the various professions, should be given, if possible, a chance to pursue their studies.

Regarding the institutions in which this higher education is to be obtained, Catholic parents should obviously send their children to the Catholic Colleges and Convents with which our province is dotted, those of one's own diocese being naturally given the preference. In these institutions they will be assured of a splendid education, received under thoroughly Catholic auspices. Since one's associates constitute so important a feature in any training, they will there have the additional advantage of associating and forming friendships with those who are destined later on to play an important role in the Catholic life of the province.

Should it, however, be impractical to send the child to a Catholic institution of learning, it ought to be borne in mind that the High Schools and Collegiate of the province belong to us as well as to our non-Catholic neighbours. Catholic taxes have helped to build them and likewise contribute to maintain them. Hence our people should avail themselves of the educational advantages which they offer. The absence of religious teaching in these schools may and should be supplied by instruction at home and also where possible by the Sunday Catechism Classes, known in many localities as the "Advanced Class."

There have been established in Ontario, in recent years, what are known as Technical Schools, and the future will undoubtedly witness an increase in their number. Advantage should likewise be taken of these when parents find that their children have an aptitude and desire for the life for which that education qualifies them.

What the hearty cooperation and, in some cases, sacrifices of parents will accomplish for the future generation of Catholics is aptly expressed by His Lordship Bishop Fallon. He writes: "Watchful supervision over and careful direction of the boys and girls in College, Convent, High School and Collegiate Institute, should result in a large increase of vocations to the priesthood and to the religious sisterhoods, and is the only means whereby the woeful dearth of Catholics in professional life, whether as Doctors, Lawyers, Dentists, Engineers and Teachers, can be transformed into a condition that will be a credit to the Catholic people."

We sincerely trust that this all-important question will be given that consideration which it merits and that for the sake of the few paltry dollars which children are able to earn, they will not be deprived of the benefits of education.

We do not wish to be understood as holding that all should embrace the professional life. Whilst we appeal to parents and wish to impress upon them the necessity for higher education we are not oblivious of the fact that many there are whose manifest calling it is to follow the honoured profession of tiller of the soil, or to learn a useful and profitable trade for which also special education and training are necessary.

CHURCH UNION

An Associated Press despatch furnishes the information that a recent issue of the Acta Apostolicae Sedis, the official organ of the Holy See, publishes two letters written in 1864 and 1865 by Cardinal Patrizzi, Vicar-General of Pius IX., regarding the much mooted question of Church Union.

These letters explain that the Catholic Church, being the original and only Church founded by Christ, cannot, upon terms of equality, discuss a union with other churches; but that those which left her must return to her, unconditionally. Cardinal Patrizzi's letters are of especial interest at the present time, as they are substantially the same as the explanation given by the present Holy Father to the commission of American Protestant Bishops, headed by the Rt. Rev. Boyd Vincent, of Southern Ohio; the Rt. Rev. Charles P. Anderson of Chicago and Bishop Weller of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, who recently visited the Pope and invited him to send delegates to a world conference of churches for the discussion of questions touching faith and order.

In commenting on the Holy Father's refusal, the members of the commission stated: "The Pope received us most cordially. The contrast between his personal attitude and his official attitude towards the conference was very sharp. One was irresistibly benevolent, the other irresistibly rigid. His Holiness himself emphasized the distinction."

Though there is nothing more ardently desired by the Holy Father than that all may be reunited in the one true fold of Christ, still that is only possible by those outside the Church submitting first to her authority. Our doctrines are definite and unalterable. Hence there is no need to sit in conference regarding them with dissenters from the faith. A father may make concessions to an erring son but he must always remain the father; so it is with the Church. Concessions may be made in non-essentials, in disciplinary measures which are not vital, but never, even in the slightest measure, in things doctrinal.

These overtures in the matter of reunion have likewise been made by certain Anglicans to the various other Protestant bodies but without results. Their proposals were considered and quickly turned down by the Lower House of the Convocation of York. Dr. Frere, of Mirfield, was loudly applauded when he said: "It was the fundamental defect of all short cuts to unity; they simply slobbered and said 'We are one,' whereas, as a matter of fact, they were not. Instead of bringing the causes of disagreement out into the light and healing them, these proposals merely drove the fever in and made things worse than before."

Subsequently, when both Houses met in Joint Synod the committee's report was indignantly referred back for further consideration—and so things remain as they were.

Lost time it is for our separated brethren to trouble themselves about reunion with each other, for as long as the principles of the Reformation are the guiding star of the sects, unity is impossible. The Reformation was a revolt against divinely constituted authority, which, by substituting private judgment for authoritative teaching, rendered unity of doctrine impossible, thus producing the babel of sects as existing at present.

When divine authority was gone, human judgment stepped into its place. It was no longer the Church that taught and governed in the name of Christ. Each self-constituted reformer—and soon their number was legion—sought to impose his own personal opinions on the multitude. Authority of some kind had to be assumed, and hence we find Martin Luther placing himself on a level with St. Paul. "My teaching shall be called into question by no one, not even by angels. Whosoever refuses to accept my teaching shall not be saved."

But no assumption of personal authority could ever avail to preserve unity of doctrine among those who had rejected the one infallible authority established by Christ. Before Luther finished his career, he saw the Reform split up into numerous sects, each of them hurling anathemas at all the rest. Today the sects are numbered by the hundred, though practically each individual is a law to himself in the matter of religion.

Outside the Catholic Church, unity of faith has vanished forever. There is no basis for unity, as private judgment and corporate uniformity must ever be at variance. This being the case, it is not hard to see that if reunion will ever take place, it can only be, by a repudiation of the principles of the Reformation and by all returning to the one true Faith of their Fathers.

THE ANGLICANS AND BENEDICTION

Another crisis has come to trouble the Anglican Church. That, however, is nothing new, for periodically crises occur which threaten to shatter whatever remnants of cohesion there remain in that institution, held together only by the bond of State establishment.

A couple of years ago it was the Kikuyu question over which feeling ran high. This time the difficulty is centred about the question of Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, regarding which the Bishops have thought fit to take a stand, deciding that Benediction cannot be tolerated within the Anglican communion. This decision has called forth the usual storm of protest from the "advanced clergy," who flatly refuse to obey the order of their ecclesiastical superiors.

This prohibition of Benediction will not deter the High Church clergy from carrying on this devotional service. It will tend, if anything, to render them more determined not to surrender this ceremony. Prohibitions have been issued before and the story is always the same. There is a tremendous disturbance, a veritable tempest, awful threats are hurled at High Churchmen by their hereditary foes, the Bishops, and it all ends by everyone carrying on as before. Laws are made and ignored from the outset; a thing forbidden and yet done.

Every cause must have its martyr and the Anglican martyr of Benediction is the Rev. Mr. Wason, Vicar of Cury-with-Ganwalloe. The reverend gentleman persisted in giving Benediction in his church, despite the prohibition of the Bishop. Consequently His Lordship of Truro proceeded against the refractory vicar. Usually, when Anglican prelates wish to show their annoyance they simply abstain from visiting a parish. But this time the Bishop was not content to let things alone and proceeded to deprive Mr. Wason of his parish. The latter refused to acknowledge this act of jurisdiction and though finally forced to hand over the keys of the church, still holds forth in the rectory of Cury.

The vicar as might well be expected has many sympathizers who are loud in their protests against the Bishop of Truro's action. They stoutly maintain that they will continue to hold Benediction services, all things to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. Wason's case tends to bring the question of Benediction very much to the fore. The Bishop of London has entered the arena by forbidding it in his diocese. Thus it seems that Benediction is to be the battle-ground for another struggle between the conflicting elements of Anglicanism.

Perhaps, as a result of it, some may see the inconsistency of Anglicanism and seek admission into the true fold of Christ, like the Monks of Caldey, who in 1918 did so, rather than give up Benediction and other Catholic practices. In the bosom of the true Church, without any fear of hindrance, they may peacefully enjoy that edifying and helpful form of showing devotion to Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament, which, in their own sect, would be impossible even were the authorities ever so willing; for, lacking a true priesthood, they also necessarily lack the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist.

THE FUTURE OF POLITICAL PARTIES

The convention of the Liberal party recently held at Ottawa was, no doubt, an important event in the history of that party; but we feel more interest in its importance to the country, since country should always be put before party by all good citizens.

The recent Liberal convention has an important significance for the future of the country; for good or for ill, according to the view one takes of the benefit or the detriment which a nation gets from a two-party political system. The impression is strongly conveyed by the event in question that the two-party system has survived the political disturbances which took their rise during the War, and that that system is not yet very markedly affected by the tentative steps so far taken towards the formation of other parties; farmers' party; labor party; western party, and others. Of course, one can hardly judge exactly how the old two-party system stands with the people until they have had a chance to go to the polls once more. If the new group movements have really taken any hold on the public, there will be indications of it in the next general polling.

But the general indications from the Liberal convention seem to be that the two party system is about to take on a new lease of life. And, with all its faults, it is not at all certain that that system has outlived its usefulness. Popular politics tend to become artificial and unreal in times when no great issues which strongly arouse public feeling are under discussion. At such times, party fights are made on platforms that are not substantial and that are framed with more regard to getting the ins and outs in than to the real welfare and the true interests of the nation. At such times, party war cries become little better than personal appeals, at their best; or than racial, sectional or religious squabbles, at their worst. Abuse takes the place of argument; and the masses of the people begin to feel a certain degree of contempt for politics in general.

During times of quiet prosperity, when no one has anything very definite to complain of, and no proposals are on foot which arouse general interest, the character of politics suffers; and the prestige of public men falls off. We think it is true that during a number of years, preceding the War, Canadian politics did not command due attention from the general public, under one government or under another, and there appeared in the public mind a sort of good-natured and half contemptuous indifference to public government. The members of the House might talk themselves hoarse; but the public in general were not listening to them very carefully.

The sudden coming up of problems of a vital and general character directed public attention to Ottawa, and what was done and said there, as it had not been directed during a number of years. Our public men, who for a considerable time had been neglected a good deal in public attention, found themselves in the spotlight as perhaps public men in Canada had never been before. Government and opposition leaders came under a strong glare of public opinion. Thousands of citizens who had had little but good natured ridicule for politics and for politicians, suddenly perceived the fundamental political truth, that public government is, next to religion, the most important thing that citizenship is concerned with. The people at large, we believe, perceived, more or less obscurely, perhaps, but still did perceive, that governments and parliaments reflect the tone and temper of the country and the times; and that much—very much—of what is wrong under any and every government is our fault rather than that, or as much as that, of the delegates we choose to be members or ministers.

The War set men thinking, and when the human mind is deeply and powerfully stirred men think of many things. So far as the average Canadian is concerned, a good deal of the artificiality and unreality of politics went overboard, and clearer views took their place.

Had the sound common-sense of average Canadian citizenship put all the blame on our elected rulers, when the unreality and the relative unimportance of some of the former party conflicts were perceived, the two-party system would probably have gone down never to rise again. But fortunately, as it seems to us, the fault has not been more in governments and in parliaments than in us who make and unmake governments and parliaments.

The two-party system seems to be going to survive. In the new-born impotence to be up and doing; to take up at last a score of great public matters which ought to have been taken up years ago; farm colonization; higher education; vocational training; more equal justice to labor; the restraint of inordinate commercial greed; the possibilities of co-operative enterprise; in the new enthusiasm for such measures, it looked for a time as though the two-party system would give place to political groups without a system. And it cannot be said, as yet, that that danger is wholly past.

Special interests; agriculture; mining labor; industrial unions; soldiers' unions; western interests; other interests; seemed, for a time, about to insist on separate group representation in Parliament. It is possible they may yet so insist; but at the moment the chances seem to be that they will seek expression by means of the two-party system. And, as between many and diverse interests, the only practicable solution comes through, first, understanding and second, compromise and accommodation, it seems more hopeful to continue the two-party system.

The experience of nations which have been governed under the group system,—if it can properly be called a system,—is not encouraging. Nor is the experience of those who have had the two-party system so very discouraging. The faults of the latter are common knowledge; one need not emphasize them. Its good and strong points are that it tends to harmonize conflicting interests; to moderate excesses; and to give us strength in public government where the group system would almost inevitably give us uncertainty and weakness.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THRIFT, ECONOMY, and return to plain-living point the surest way to the solution of after-war problems.

WHILE IN Britain and the United States a serious effort is being made to circumvent the profiteer and solve the high cost-of-living problem, the authorities in Canada seem to be content to let things take their course. Why?

THE PLEA of a bigamist arraigned in a New York court that his justification lay in the fact that certain patriarchs recorded in the Old Testament were permitted plurality of wives points to the folly of indiscriminate Bible reading when unaccompanied by that authoritative guidance, the need of which is apparent throughout the sacred volume.

A WRITER in one of the big dailies queries why, on the principle that "all services rank the same with God," those high in command during the late War, who have enjoyed large emolument throughout and have issued from the conflict laden with honours, should now be singled out for huge money grants, while the soldier in the ranks who has devoted three or four of his best years at the merest pittance to his country's service and has returned to civilian life with impaired constitution, should be handed out what is in comparison the merest pittance.

THERE IS, opines the same writer, something wrong with the social system under which such a state of things can go unrebuked. All who sacrifice for their country should be placed in the same category, subject only to degrees of sacrifice upon the greatness of the sacrifice, the greater award being due, naturally, to those who have laid down their lives for the cause. Especially true is this of those who, trained to the arts of peace, have at their country's call sacrificed position and all hope of material advancement for the drudgery, the monotony, and the peril of a soldier's life.

ALL THIS may be conceded in principle, and yet the answer lies ever on the surface that so it always has been, and while society is constituted as we know it, is likely to continue to be. "To those that have shall it be given" is, despite the dreams of social theorists, the mark of our civilization more now than ever in the past. Selfishness and greed and the worship of the material are increasing characteristics of that civilization. A man is measured now as never before by his ability to transmute everything in life into gold. He may be a poet or a philosopher, or a scientific genius of the first order, or may have spent his life in doing good to his fellow-man, yet if he lacks the faculty of acquisitiveness, or has not learned to apply his talent to material gain he is very apt to be looked askance at as an "unsuccessful man."

SO IN regard to service in war. There is a glamor about high position that has ever attracted the multitude, and the deed done in the limelight elicits the applause which if man were not man would be shared with the quiet deed of heroism performed at the sole behest of duty. We are far from saying that things as they are are right, or that there is no room for reform. On the contrary we are in perfect accord with the writer quoted in lamenting the disparity of reward as between the officer and the man in the light of their common sacrifice. The soldier's life is as much to him as the commander's, and while the latter's responsibility is the greater and merits recognition it is none the less true that his reward is often at the expense of the hero of the ranks who has given his all. But in a world ignoring God these things seem inevitable. In return to the maxims of the Gospel lies the only solution.

THE PRESENT STATE OF RUSSIA

RECENTLY several prominent men gave their views about the present condition of Russia. Mr. David R. Francis, American Ambassador to Russia, believes that unless the League of Nations helps the Russian people to select a government and then sees that it is supported, the country will quickly go to ruin and drag down the rest of the world with her. He estimates that Lenin does not represent more than one-tenth of Russia's 180,000,000 population. Mr. Francis continued:

"The Russians are tired of fighting. Men are compelled to serve in the Bolshevik army by a tyranny as relentless as that of the Czar's Government. It is the only means of their staying (starvation for men in the cities. They must serve the dictatorship or starve. If the decision of the League were given to the Kolchak Government, and to the other anti-Bolshevik forces, there would be enough men in the Bolshevik territories who would welcome the help to obtain their freedom."

Mr. Boris Bakhtostoff, who may be considered Russia's Ambassador, on his default, to the United States, on returning to Washington after an eight months' sojourn in Paris looks back "with confidence and satisfaction" on the late progress of events in Russia. He finds that since last December when anti-Bolshevik groups were struggling independently of one another conditions are improved. For now

"A great unifying effort has been exerted. As a result, all the regional formations have recognized the Government of Admiral Kolchak as the Russian Government, and have pledged loyalty and subservience. The armies which are fighting in Siberia, in the South, in the North, and around the Baltic are but parts of one huge military body gaining in organization and unity of command. Moreover, the purpose of national action has been defined and announced beyond misapprehension. Its aim is to save the country from moral and material ruin and give the people of Russia the opportunity to establish their destinies according to their own choice through a freely elected Constituent Assembly.

"The process of healing and reconstruction has clearly revealed itself. The national movement has found its own and found its leader. The outcome is certain—a country liberated from anarchy and national life

reconstituted on firm foundations of law and self-government. Another most important point is the definition of policy toward Russia which has found expression in the recent exchange of correspondence between the Powers and Admiral Kolchak. An end has been put to hesitation and uncertainty. It has done away with the prospect and attempt to solve the Russian problem through "persuasion of Bolshevism." The Powers have openly proclaimed that reconstitution of Russia is bound to the success of the national movement. Admiral Kolchak has been acknowledged as the leader of National Russia and the Powers have pledged their support and assistance to his Government."

Colonel Winston Churchill, speaking in the House of Commons, July 29, undertook to defend England's policy in Russia, promising that "British troops would be removed from North Russia at the earliest possible moment consistent with their safety and British honor." He said that failure to support Kolchak and Denikin would have strengthened the Bolsheviks and developed a formidable situation. For the Bolshevik forces, if unattacked, would have made war on new weak states.—America.

COMMENTS OF ENGLISH NEWSPAPERS

ON SIR EDWARD CARSON'S THREATS

Catholic News Service. The political fireworks which Sir Edward Carson let off at Holywood, near Belfast, on the occasion of the celebration of the Battle of the Boyne, went off with a loud noise and after that fell flat. The fact seems to be that the Ulster chieftain has made the mistake of thinking that what was possible in 1914 is also possible in 1919. The solemn warning uttered by Cardinal Bourne at the Peace Thanksgiving service on the Sunday before, is an indication that the English Catholics will no longer tolerate the present conditions in Ireland, and that an immediate change is desirable.

But if the great Ulsterman expected to find support in the English newspapers that might have encouraged him in 1914, he was grievously disappointed. The Times, which since the signing of the Peace has been calling for a liberal and generous solution of the Irish question, comments on Sir Edward Carson's threats as follows:

"Has he forgotten the immediate consequences of his former military preparations—the creation of the Nationalist Volunteers, the Irish Volunteers, the Citizen Army of Dublin, and eventually, the Easter Rebellion? In those days he may not have been able to foresee the danger of playing at soldier in Ireland. He has no such excuse today."

"When Sir Edward Carson tells America to mind her own business he courts the rebuff that the wishes of the 15,000,000 Irish Americans in the United States are a part of her business, that their doings form one of her own questions at home; and that had it not been for British mismanagement of Ireland in the past, there might today be fewer Irish Americans animated by ill-will towards this country."

The Daily Express, which has not always been distinguished for a hearty advocacy of the Irish cause, says:

"The threat of rebellion if any sort of Home Rule is granted to Ireland is belated and out of date. The world is weary of wars and armed revolt. That sort of thing could be discussed in cold blood in 1914, but since then we have learned too much of war. Great Britain will never forget the prowess of the Ulster regiments. Nor will she ever forget that Irishmen from the other Provinces rivalled their brothers from the North in courage and devotion. . . . At a time like this, when any spark may set things afire, Sir Edward Carson's threat of civil war is simply indefensible."

The Daily Mail says: "It is an important factor on the good feeling between this country and the United States, and more over, between this country and our Dominions, that we should satisfy all these freedom-loving peoples that we are honestly desirous of burying this old feud and setting up a free National Government in Ireland."

"Sir Edward Carson's sabre-rattling can only be intended to arouse passion against a quiet and just consideration of the Irish problem. The Government will make their path all the easier in Ireland and in this country if they let it be known that they intend to deal as firmly with Bolshevism among ex-Ministers as among Labour agitators."

RIDICULE LED TO CONVERSION

Dr. Alma Webster Powell, Ph. D., LL. B., A. M., Mus. B., prima donna, sociologist, lecturer, suffragist and traveler, whose home is in Brooklyn, has joined the Catholic Church. She was baptized at the Church of St. Francis Xavier, Sixth Avenue and Carroll Street, of which the Very Rev. Monsignor David J. Hickey is rector.

Dr. Powell received her instructions in the faith from Rev. Joseph L. Williams, a curate at St. Francis Xavier's, who also administered the sacrament of baptism to her. The noted musician's conversion came about in a strange manner, it became