

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum. United States and Europe—\$2.00. Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D. Editors—Rev. James T. Foley, D.D., Thomas Coffey, L.L.D. Associate Editor—H. F. Mackintosh. Manager—Robert M. Burns. Address business letters to the Manager. Classified Advertising 15 cents per line. Remittance must accompany the order. Where THE CATHOLIC RECORD BOX address is required send in cents to insure postage upon replies. Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents. The Editor cannot be held responsible for unsolicited manuscripts. Every endeavor will be made to return rejected contributions when stamped addressed envelopes are enclosed. THE CATHOLIC RECORD has been approved and recommended by Archbishops Faloutsos and Sbarretti, late Apostolic Delegates to Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshawa, St. Y. and the clergy throughout the Dominion. To St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 210 Main St. and John J. Drayton, 211 Main St. In Montreal single copies may be purchased from J. Milloy, 241 St. Catherine St. West. In Ottawa, single copies may be purchased from J. W. O'Brien, 141 Nicholas St. In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be purchased at Murphy's Bookstore. In Glace Bay, N. S., single copies may be purchased at MacDermott's Bookstore. The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and payments for THE CATHOLIC RECORD: General Agents—Stephen V. James, George J. Quigley, Miss Brice Saunders, Resident Agents—H. Chamberlin, Hilson Ave., Phone 385, W. Ottawa; J. E. South, 2383 Manoe St., Montreal; Miss Anne Hoagan, Hillon St., St. John's, Nfld.; John E. O'Farrell, 115 Carter Ave., Quebec City; Thos. Lavallee 331 Casgrain St., Montreal.

LONDON, SATURDAY, FEB. 9, 1924

TWO STIRRING ADDRESSES

An Ottawa newspaper just to hand carries a summary of a "stirring address" by Mr. Vincent Massey to the members of the Canadian Club of that city which had for the occasion a quite unusual gathering of distinguished guests. As we read through the summary of Mr. Massey's address we become more and more conscious that it stirred depths left untouched by the common or garden variety of stirring addresses to which we have become painfully accustomed.

In the first place there was not a trace of Jingoism from the beginning to the end.

Here, remembering that a younger generation of readers is always with us, we inject a definition of Jingoism. It originated in 1877 during the weeks of national excitement prelude to the despatch of the British Mediterranean squadron to Gallipoli, thus frustrating Russian designs on Constantinople. While the public were on the tip-toe of expectation as to what policy the government would pursue, a bellicose music-hall song with the refrain:

"We don't want to fight  
But by Jingo if we do,  
We've got the men, we've got the ships,  
And we've got the money too"

was produced in London by a singer known as "the great MacDermott," and instantly became very popular. Thus the war-party came to be called Jingo, and Jingoism has ever since been a term applied to those who advocate a national policy of arrogance and pugnacity.

The Rev. Dr. Cody, President of the Board of Governors of the University of Toronto, and ex-Minister of Education for Ontario, in a very stirring address recently advocated the exclusion or rather the expulsion of Longfellow's "Evangeline" from Ontario schools. Now we are not going to say a word about Dr. Cody's chivalrous attack on "Evangeline" chiefly because J. P. C. in the Manchester Guardian, whose article we reprint elsewhere in the RECORD, has left not a word to say. J. P. C. is a scholarly Englishman—not a Canadian imperialist nor a Celtic Anglo-Saxon—who speaks with authority; and he spurns the "Jingo pedantry" and "emasculated history" that Dr. Cody brings to the defence of "British justice, chivalry and administration."

But the scholarly English journalist and the Canadian educationist and divine are two; and Dr. Cody may not be halted by the Englishman's satire, ridicule and open contempt of his self-assumed task as defender of "The Empire." And so we have hastened to define Jingoism before it is absolutely "Verboten." (For the very young, again, "verboten" is the German for "forbidden" whose use, we learned a few years ago, was so common as to irritate or amuse all-free-born Englishmen but which was patiently endured and obeyed by the slavishly docile Germans). Though not, as yet, forbidden should it savor of political heresy to the great unofficial censor of English (and American) literature, we enter herewith the plea in extenuation that we have taken the aforesaid definition verbatim from an unexpurgated edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica which we

have so far been allowed to retain.

As we have said, in Mr. Massey's address at Ottawa there was not a trace of Jingoism. And while we should be astonished if we heard Dr. Cody get through an address on Patagonia or Cuba root without the "British Empire" or "The Empire" or some other variant rolling sonorously from his eloquent tongue, Mr. Vincent Massey mentioned the British Empire only once and then to laugh at a Jingo policeman. The Citizen summary thus tells the story:

"We have inherited spiritual qualities," he said, "and one of these was the liberty of the individual. The example of the last few days, he said, gave one added confidence in the political influence of the race. Then there was freedom of speech, as to which Mr. Massey told of an experience which greatly delighted his distinguished audience and drew loud applause. He said he was in Hyde Park, London, and as he sat in his car he listened to one of the typical orators asking for the demolition of the present economic order. It happened that the car he was sitting in was a Ford, and the sounds of the engine were considerably audible, so much so that a policeman went up to him and asked him to kindly move his car a little farther away as the noise of it was preventing the crowd from hearing the speaker. Yet that policeman was there as a representative of the very order the speaker wanted destroyed, added Mr. Massey, when the laughter had subsided.

"He thought in Canada they had a fairly good idea of this kind of thing, he said, though he did notice some time ago that a man had been arrested in a certain city for calling the British Empire the British Vampire. But he thought that only tended to make the man a martyr and the police ridiculous."

The subject of the address was "Some Canadian Problems." At the outset he stated that he would emphasize the word Canadian rather than Problems. He dismissed the material problems, wasting little sympathy on the pessimistic or unduly optimistic view of them. He quoted D'Arcy McGee, whom he called the Mazzini of Canada: "You have sent your young men to guard your frontiers: have you got a principle to guard your young men?" In the rediscovery of the spiritual significance of Canada they might find strength for the job before them. They should define Canada's ideals, the things that characterized Canadian life and justified their being a separate entity. The spirit of Mr. Massey's address was admirable. He dwelt on higher things than material problems or material progress. In Canada and Canadianism the speaker found ample matter for a heart to heart talk with fellow-Canadians. His Canadianism was robust as well as enlightened. The one reference to the Empire had its pointed lesson for Canadians. He seemed to be ignorant or oblivious of the fact that the latest and supreme achievement of Evolution was the development of the Englishman of very composite origin into the superman, the pure and unadulterated Anglo-Saxon who is now stooping from his lonesome height to absorb the "Nordic" races. He went further:

"I should say we have made far too little of the French-Canadian qualities in our national life," said the speaker, amid applause. "To him it was a humiliating point how few of them could speak the language of the French-Canadians, for no one could understand the problems of Canada unless he learnt their language."

There isn't a doubt in the world, though he did not say it, that Mr. Massey has read and enjoyed "Evangeline" and would discuss with French-Canadians that great human poem with sympathetic appreciation of the effect of the historic event therein commemorated on his fellow-Canadians of French origin. Indeed the spirit that pervaded the whole address would warrant the inference that he might regard the reading of "Evangeline" an excellent corrective of prejudice and stimulus to sympathy for English-speaking Canadians even—or should we say, especially—in their impressionable years.

Here is another sample brick:

"He wondered whether there was not a tendency to rely too much on statutory salvation. Churches were falling into the habit of relying on the coercive machinery of the State

to help them in the moral reformation.

"Recalling the saying of the man who said he did not care who made a nation's laws if he could write its songs, Mr. Massey remarked he thought they had too many laws and not enough songs. The spirit of self-reliance was a characteristic they could rely upon, he thought, but they were leaning very heavily on legislation in Canada. He pointed out that it had been figured there was one law-maker to every 9,000 of the people. We are asking governments to do impossible things, he said, from inviolable institutions to making men good by statute."

Such sanity of thought must make its way. There are sane and intelligent prohibitionists or there were before the experiment was tried. But few thinking men now pretend that to abandon moral sanction for the coercive machinery of the State is an open confession of defeat, an abject surrender; an acknowledgment that moral forces are impotent to develop the character or to cultivate those virtues that pre-Christian pagans esteemed and practised. Mr. Massey favors our cherishing and developing our own traditions, British and French, rather than giving way to the influence of our neighbors the Americans who broke loose from these traditions and started afresh.

"Sixty years ago," he said, "it used to be urged that the British colonial office was the greatest obstacle to the development of true Canadianism. But the foe today was not Downing street, but Main street."

Older readers will remember when a more virile generation of Canadians used in their fight for greater national freedom, the political slogan: "No dictation from Downing Street." "Main Street" is a reference to an American novel wherein the author paints a drab and dreary picture of debasing materialism. Each and every character is snugly self-satisfied with the pettiness and sordidness of such a life. The author left the picture unrelieved probably not because he believed it to be true but the better to serve his purpose of satirizing a growing evil tendency. Few will deny that Canadians have at least some of the virtues and some of the vices of Americans and that Canada may be powerfully affected by its very close neighbor.

While rejoicing at the better mutual understanding and esteem that now obtains between Canadians and Americans he claimed that the boundary line is not an imaginary one; "that we are fundamentally a different people."

"We have to develop a new self-determination," said Mr. Massey, who urged that Canada was the expression of certain ideas. In the 19th century Canada made a great contribution to politics and national thinking, and two races were now living in amity and co-operation side by side.

"Mathew Arnold had even claimed that the great contributions to the world had been made by small nations. 'We have got to find today a common denominator which will unite the spiritually scattered sections of this country,' urged the speaker. He claimed it was the intangible things which united people and the material things which divided.

"He said they needed the prophetic note in Canada and they had got to rediscover the vision of the fathers of Confederation for themselves.

"Our economic ills need economic solutions, of course, but the wise physician never overlooks the mental side. We must be fully conscious of the psychological ills, but faith will give us consciousness of what we stand for, and it will enable us to fight the battles that lie ahead. With faith there is nothing which we Canadians cannot do. At the same time it was only a very robust kind of Canadianism that would be able to resist the subtle encroachment of American magazines, American made movies, and the latest scientific development, the radio, through which Canadians were able nightly to listen in on political speeches of another country.

"Mr. Massey recalled a cartoon he had seen portraying John Bull and Uncle Sam as two distinct personalities, and Jack Canuck as an amiable young man. He thought it was a warning against merely accepting second-rate ideas, and such as had

largely been discarded by the Americans themselves."

It may have been intended to indicate the immature youth of Canada. Too many Canadians would look on that as quite a matter of course. Is it not time that Canadians should put aside childish things and quit themselves like men.

We are glad to be able to give so much of Mr. Massey's inspiring address; it has its appeal, should we not say an especial appeal to Canadian Catholics.

We are glad, too, to say that Mr. Massey is a fellow townsman of Dr. Cody. Toronto and England and Ireland and Quebec are precise and accurate as geographical terms; but in an age when loose thinking is as general as half-education they are often personified, and then an adjective or two supplies the place of knowledge. We ascribe to them love and hatred, narrowness and breadth of view, culture and ignorance and so on. Such personification is often misleading and always dangerous. It fosters those very prejudices that militate against the development of true Canadianism. So it is well to remember that "Toronto" speaks through Mr. Vincent Massey as well as through the Rev. Dr. Cody.

Dr. Cody is a scholarly man, a fluent and forceful speaker, with a mastery of the English language. In pitiable contrast is the intellectual and cultural poverty of the author of the Jingo song who, however, gave a permanent place in the language to a new and useful word, a new and useful family of words. Nonetheless the Rev. Dr. Cody and "the great MacDermott" are brothers under their skins; while Mr. Massey and J. P. C. of the Manchester Guardian are kindred spirits; may their tribe increase.

Mr. Massey by his sturdy Canadianism and J. P. C. by his outspoken condemnation of spurious imperialism renders each in his own full measure the most intelligent service to his own country and to the British Commonwealth.

Perhaps even Dr. Cody may repent and give evidence of that English manliness that can confess a fault.

"SOCIALISM" IN ENGLAND

A short time ago there were vehement exhortations in England that both the old parties should unite to prevent the advent to power of a Socialist government which portended ultimate ruin. But the "Socialists" are in power and the alarmists are quieting down. It is not fair to call the Labor party socialist; they do not themselves assume that name nor do they adopt a socialist policy, and all who work with hand or brain are welcome to their ranks. Catholics to a large extent supported Labor and in the House of Commons the greater number of Catholic representatives are found in that party. Nevertheless there are Catholic alarmists who invoke Pope Leo's condemnation of Socialism as a reason why Catholics should withdraw their support from the party of their choice. Socialism is an elastic and equivocal term. The socialism that is condemned is that which denies and would destroy the right of private property. To some public ownership of public utilities is socialism. A score of other things were denounced as socialist which are now generally conceded to be enlightened and necessary advances in social legislation.

As school boys we were taught to look on the great Reform Bill of 1832 as an unprecedented advance in democratic freedom. As a matter of fact it reformed only the grotesque abuses of the "rotten boroughs" and extended the franchise only to a small fraction of the English people. There was far more democracy in the 14th century in England than in the 19th. A considerable advance was made in 1884 but it was not until 1918 that Great Britain had what we on this continent would recognize as a democratic franchise. Even yet there are strange anomalies, some constituencies having ten times the population of others.

The Catholic Times, London, England, has this week comment on the present situation:

"In view of this alarmist outcry it is interesting to look back to an earlier crisis in English politics. In the years after Waterloo had ended the long series of wars with France, though there was much traditional boasting about the glories of the British constitution and the freedom of the English

people, the country was really governed by a small oligarchy of peers and wealthy commoners. The mass of the people had no voice in its government. Birmingham had no representative in Parliament, while a solitary shepherd living in a hut on the margin of Salisbury Plain, and voting by order of his employer, returned to the House of Commons two members for the city of Old Sarum, whose abandoned site for centuries had been marked only by its grass-grown rampart. An agitation for Parliamentary Reform was met by a series of coercion measures. At last, when England was on the verge of armed revolt, a very moderate measure of Reform was passed in 1832, and the Liberalism came to power. There were widespread predictions that this meant the ruin of the country, the disappearance of its trade, the re-enactment before long on English ground of the horrors of the French Revolution. Sir Walter Scott, broken in health, wrote that he was not sorry to think that his end was near and that he would not live to see the loss of all that had made Britain a land of freedom, order and happiness. The story of the country during the ninety years that have passed since then shows how baseless was the alarmist outcry of 1832. If the wood-pulp paper on which the Daily Mail is printed holds together for another ninety years, those who turn over its files in future days will wonder at Lord Rothermere's panic-stricken cries of today as we wonder at Scott's sad forecast in this earlier crisis."

Catholic alarmists, we take it, are chiefly Catholic Tories and some other enthusiasts who become confused in their thinking because they have never learned to define clearly their terms. Right reasoning is impossible without such clear definition. Labelling a party "Socialist" and then invoking the Pope's condemnation is not fair, and not honest unless excused by ignorance. We had a precisely similar experience in Canada with the term "Liberal." But ours was a much more serious religio-political question than is ever likely to arise in England.

The Catholic Times shares not at all the fear of the "Socialists."

"We are," it says, "not as a body in any way committed to the Labor party, but if it deals wisely with the problems of the day and fulfills—as we anticipate that it will fulfill—the pledges given by so many of its members at the elections that it would respect our educational rights, it can count upon an increasing measure of Catholic support."

"Estimating the probable trend of their programme by the ideas their responsible leaders have advocated, we feel that we have much common ground on which to base our support of them. On many points their programme on labor reform runs on parallel lines with the principles laid down by Leo XIII. in his Encyclical on the Labor question, and on the all-important matter of peace and good will among the nations their policy is that of Benedict XV. and of Pius XI. We do not mean to read into the policy of a Government that will be mostly, if not entirely, formed of non-Catholics a distinctly Catholic programme, but it is well in practical affairs to be ready to recognize points of contact and to avoid exaggerating points of difference."

That seems to be a sane and unbiased review of the political situation on the other side of the ocean. May it not in some ways point a moral for us on this side?

TOO MUCH ABUSE

By THE OBSERVER

Readers of newspapers cannot have failed to note that the gravest crises that arise in the relations between employers and employees are avidly seized upon by political partisans for the purpose of making political points against their opponents. Good citizens cannot fail to resent this unpatriotic practice. The relations between capital and labor go deep into the bases of the welfare of this country. The probable results of partisan misuse of the occasions that such relations afford for arousing passion, are so grave that any man who attempts such misuse is as little worthy of public confidence as would be the man who should toss a lighted match into a vast magazine of powder.

This is so true, and so plainly true, that hardly any intelligent school boy in the land can possibly mistake it, and yet there are only too many signs to be seen that this class, unfortunately, includes men who are highly placed as well as some who are in lower places; are not only willing, but eager, to take the risk of doing irreparable damage to the future peace and welfare of this country, if, by inflaming the minds of one class or another they can increase the chances of their party's winning a temporary success.

The disputes between employers and employees are so serious in these days, that one might expect to find at least the most prominent men in every party resolved to be moderate in their utterances, just to those on whom at the time the responsibility rests of governing a province or the whole country, and generally helpful in matters in which, if they cannot be helpful, they had far better hold their tongues. It is surely time that politicians began to perceive that much of the bitterness that is now to be seen in social discussions on such problems as wages and conditions of labor, is due to the methods that have been employed by political partisans in the past, and can be traced directly to that source.

When a demagogue addresses a great meeting in tones of real or simulated passion, when he holds up his opponents to ridicule, scorn and contempt, when he exaggerates every circumstance which can by exaggeration be made to tell, or to appear to tell, against the class he is attacking, what is he doing but imitating a practice that has been set him for generations past by a large proportion of lesser politicians and by not a few of a higher class? There has been altogether too much abuse in the past amongst partisan politicians; too much sniping; too much determination to twist and distort the simplest and most innocent facts to the discredit and disadvantage of opponents. It is not surprising that these evil practices should be imitated by some of those who are attacking all political parties in the supposed interests of the working classes.

But, it would seem that there are public men, and some of them in high places, who so far from reading the plain lessons of the times, are still determined to exploit the passions of capital and labor in the hope of turning them to the advantage of their party. So it is that when there is a tense conflict between workmen and their employers, we see political papers and political speakers, whilst they pretend to be much concerned for peace and for good understanding between all classes in the country, slyly inflaming the feelings they pretend to wish to allay and soothe. They say, with an appearance of sincerity, that they are eager to see justice done, and then proceed to insinuate that justice is not to be expected by anyone until they and their friends are entrusted with power in the political world.

With an affectation of concern for the restoration of peace, they proceed to inflame the feelings of distrust which have done so much to disturb peace and to prevent mutual concession and understanding between the employers and the employees. With an appearance of strongly desiring to uphold the authority of law and the constitution of the country they proceed to direct the anger of those who are discontented with conditions against the party which happens to be in power at the time. It is, unfortunately, not alone the more insignificant papers, and the most unimportant public men that are from time to time engaged in this dishonest and unpatriotic work; sometimes one is shocked to see men of very high position in the political world toss their matches into the open bulk of powder, seemingly not caring in the least what evil results may follow to the country and to its best interests, how much the prospects of future peace, socially, may be injured, if only a passing advantage, in the shape of votes, can be had for the party they support.

It is always an evil thing to lower in the mind of the public that respect for law and for authority which is essentially necessary for the maintenance of our free political institutions. That authority has, in the past, been materially weakened by the unscrupulous tactics of scheming politicians; and

this is not a time to weaken it further.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

It has all along been a source of some surprise to us that the natural scenery of Scotland and Ireland has been so little utilized on the screen. It now appears that a leading European film-actor, Henry Victor, who himself plays the part of Haddess Creegan in the Stoll production of "The Colleen Bawn," the exterior work of which was done in Ireland, expresses preference for that country over France for the exterior work in the picture, "Henry, King of Navarre," now in the process of making. His views on this point will bear reproduction.

"I think Ireland is full of wonderful backgrounds," he says, "and it seems to me a pity that more Irish stories, or stories in Ireland, are not converted into pictures. There is a wonderful scenery in the south of France, but there is also wonderful scenery in Ireland, and the atmosphere of the Irish scenery is to my mind better, because it is natural, whereas the atmosphere of the Riviera is artificial. The Riviera is a pleasure resort, full of gamblers and *nouveaux riches*, but in Ireland you get back to rock-bottom nature. The people are poor, but sincere—and natural."

"As a film actor," continues Mr. Victor, "I am essentially temperamental, I suppose, and my surroundings influence me. I like to portray the natural passions, love, hate, greed, fear, and so on. And in Ireland the passions have full play, largely, I believe, because the Irish have suffered. Even in England we are much more natural in our passions today than we were before the War, and this is because we have suffered. Suffering strips us of our artificiality; but in the south of France, (because of the preponderating tourist traffic) everything is clothed in it. Even the scenery looks artificial, because it is cultivated. In Ireland, on the contrary, and largely because of its past sad history, the scenery is wild—and I like wildness, because it is natural." Coming from an Englishman, these views, though not necessarily correct in every particular, are of unusual interest.

REFERRING to the changing complexion of political and social conditions in England, as typified by the advent of Labor to Governmental control, the learned editor of the Catholic Herald of India recalls the fact that the book which first inspired English democracy as it is known to-day, and was the basis of Milton's celebrated "Defensio," was written by the Jesuit, Father Robert Parsons. This was his celebrated "Conference." The book was first published in England in 1594. King James convened the Convocation of 1603-10 expressly, as the summons has it, to counteract "the principles laid down in that famous book of Parsons, the Jesuit," which, it should be added, was reprinted in England in 1648, 1655, and 1681, and solemnly burned at Oxford in 1683. So that as things go, the real founder of modern British democracy was a Jesuit.

IT SHOULD not be forgotten either, avers the East Indian editor, that for centuries the Anglican Church has been essentially the bulwark of Royal autocracy, and that by her "Constitutions and Canons" (1610) her clergy were ordered to at least four times a year preach that "the most sacred order of Kings is of divine right," and that "any precept of setting up under any pretence whatsoever any independent co-active power, either Papal or popular, whether directly or indirectly, is treasonable against God as well as against the King."

OUR REFERENCE three weeks ago to the interesting circumstance that there are at least "four" Catholic Premiers in the British Dominions at the present time has excited much comment in the Maritime Provinces. We have received several communications calling attention to what one writer terms a "singular" omission on our part in making no mention of the name of the Premier of New Brunswick, the Hon Peter Veniot, who is, as one Glace Bay correspondent puts it, "not only a Catholic, but a representative of the Acadians of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, whose forefathers suffered persecution for their Faith."