

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum. United States & Europe—\$2.00.

Advertisement for teachers, situations wanted, etc. sends each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.

Approved and recommended by the Bishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION. Apostolic Delegation.

Mr. Thomas Coffey, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your admirable paper the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Mr. Thomas Coffey, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your admirable paper the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Mr. Thomas Coffey, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your admirable paper the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Mr. Thomas Coffey, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your admirable paper the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Mr. Thomas Coffey, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your admirable paper the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Mr. Thomas Coffey, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your admirable paper the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Mr. Thomas Coffey, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your admirable paper the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Mr. Thomas Coffey, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your admirable paper the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Mr. Thomas Coffey, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your admirable paper the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Mr. Thomas Coffey, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your admirable paper the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Mr. Thomas Coffey, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your admirable paper the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Mr. Thomas Coffey, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your admirable paper the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Mr. Thomas Coffey, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your admirable paper the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Mr. Thomas Coffey, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your admirable paper the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Mr. Thomas Coffey, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your admirable paper the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Mr. Thomas Coffey, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your admirable paper the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Mr. Thomas Coffey, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your admirable paper the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Mr. Thomas Coffey, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your admirable paper the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

which he read in 1901. From this time the conviction grew on him that Christ was something more than man, that He was the Eternal Son of God.

And, as he says himself, "from this one fixed standpoint all other deductions of Professor Harnack's book, so far as they contradicted the old Faith, were overthrown."

He first accepted the fundamental teachings of Christianity common to positive Protestant Christianity and Catholic Christianity.

"From that moment," he writes, "I felt the blessings arising therefrom in a manner hitherto ineffectually imagined nor expected."

I was filled with a joy and happiness such as worldly successes had never given me.

These precious experiences, which I would rather not enlarge upon, convinced me not only my reason, but my innermost soul, that in order to acquire peace of mind, true happiness, and a sure judgment in all difficulties of life, it is necessary to accept dogmatic truths; that furthermore such faith includes striving after moral perfection and that true morality cannot be obtained without it.

He was not yet a Catholic but continued to read liberal theological literature, but he avers that he never doubted again.

I did not shrink from putting the newly acquired truths to every possible test. . . . But when I attempted to satisfy my longing for a warm and continual worship of God I suffered many a disappointment.

That my frequent going to the Protestant Church was criticized and even strongly censured, did not surprise me so much.

Any one who is not himself a believer would naturally think it strange especially in a man of science. But what puzzled me was that even pious Protestants thought I was overdoing it.

At this time he tells us "I often envied the Catholics their richly appointed form of worship, especially the daily early Mass, which I sometimes attended when I travelled abroad. But to adopt the Catholic faith seemed an impossibility, because from my early youth I had been taught to look upon it with the utmost disfavor."

After tracing his lonely, unguided progress towards Catholic truth he says: "For years I remained in this unsatisfying half-way condition, never even by chance getting hold of a Catholic book or publication that might have set the stone rolling. I was a Catholic so far as it is possible to be without personal contact with the Catholic Church."

How he finally came into the fullness of the peace and unity of the Church of Christ with all her vivifying and consoling spiritual influences, is best told by himself in the remarkable book from which we have quoted. In "Back to Holy Church" we have also this distinguished historian's treatment of the religious disintegration that followed the Reformation.

As another famous convert, Mgr. Robert H. Benson, who wrote the preface to the English translation, remarks: "History, perhaps of all the sciences, tends most to make its students broad-minded and impartial; and to give a view of religion, as a whole, on wide lines, very different from the mere individualist or devout."

Such is the equipment of Dr. Albert von Ruville to treat matters religious and historical. And yet the Guardian has the assurance to dismiss the conclusions of Professor Ruville with this comment:

"This may be good theory, but if history reveals it we confess we have failed to read it aright."

A little humility would make this confession good for the Guardian's soul.

EDUCATION IN QUEBEC AND ONTARIO

For a couple of generations many of the clergymen of the sects and many of the newspapers in the province of Ontario have been bewailing the backwardness of the educational system in the sister province of Quebec.

It might have been that in some places in that province the standard of education was not quite as high as it ought to be. As a general rule, however, the people there, who are blessed with large families, who live close to nature and close to nature's God, did the best they could with the small allotment of this world's goods placed at their disposal.

All the while the taunts of certain people in Ontario might justly have been placed in the hypocritical column. There is a large class who are in the habit of looking for spotless linen on their neighbor's persons whilst they are very careless about their own.

Mr. Newton Rowell, the leader of the Opposition in the province of Ontario, a prominent Methodist, in a recent speech in Glengarry, speaking of education in the province of Ontario said: "One cannot but view with apprehension the decline in our rural schools and the large number of children in our province who, according to the statistics of the Department of Education, are not obtaining even a common school education."

Some there are who might make the claim that as Mr. Rowell is a politician, his pronouncement should not be taken seriously, as it aims a blow at the government. We have other evidence, however, which goes to prove that in certain sections of the province there is a lamentable backwardness in educational equipment.

We were wont to hear in many quarters the assertion that the Catholic Church was to blame for conditions in Quebec. Would it be fair to assume that in this province the Protestant church must be held responsible? The Separate School system of the province of Ontario is carried on under the guidance of the Bishops and priests of the Catholic Church, and we have abundant proof that in many quarters Separate school work is superior to that of the Public schools.

We need but cite one example. At the last Entrance examination in this city a young girl twelve years of age, Elsie Jensen, a pupil of St. Mary's school, taught by the Sisters of St. Joseph, obtained the highest number of marks in the city, and not only this, but the highest number ever obtained at any examination in London. She made the record of 600 out of a possible 650. We do not wish to decry Public school work. As a general rule the teachers are hard-working and conscientious and do the very best they can under the circumstances. There is something, however, in the system which is faulty. It is for educationists to find the remedy.

A CLASH

The Toronto Globe and the Christian Guardian are at daggers drawn. The immediate cause of the battle is the election in North Grey. The Globe, as might be expected, favors the policy of Mr. Rowell, leader of the Opposition, whose programme is to abolish the bar. This being its creed the Guardian contends that it should not publish advertisements of liquor dealers. We offer no opinion as to whether the charge of the Christian Guardian is any weight. In justification the Globe editor says: "Of the daily papers published in the important centres of population in Canada, only one—the Montreal Witness—has refused to publish liquor advertisements. Notwithstanding a most urgent appeal from the publisher for the support of friends of moral reform the Witness was left to die in the ditch while the priest and levite passed by on the other side."

This is undoubtedly a vigorous and telling blow at the clientele of the Christian Guardian, as showing that there are many good people who will not put their principles into practice. The tone of the Guardian article would lead one to suppose that it is going into politics. We are sorry for this. We would like to see it take the same course as the CATHOLIC RECORD and leave politics and politicians severely alone. A religious paper should be far removed from the mire of party strife. One thing is very notable in the discussion of the liquor question, and that is the utter insincerity of many of those who are found on the side of prohibition. They would abolish the bar—they would prevent the manufacture and sale of intoxicants—they would make it a high crime and misdemeanor not only to sell but to consume that beverage—like Artemus Ward, they would sacrifice all their wife's relations in the cause—but when put to the test on polling day they will quietly drop their ballot for their party candidate even if he is friendly to the liquor interest. We do not claim that all temperance people would act in this manner but enough of them do so to make the temperance cause a weak and sickly thing.

The Globe of the 11th makes this vicious stab at the Christian Guardian: "The Methodist Bookroom does the Whitney Government printing. The Methodist Guardian is silent on the North Grey election, and criticisms of the Whitney Government are as rare in its columns as snowstorms in July."

We are sorry to see our esteemed contemporaries of Toronto engaged in this unseemly strife. It is unbecoming. Meantime good subjects

for discussion in debating clubs would be: "Is a newspaper publisher who does job work for a government justified in assuming a friendly attitude towards that government in the discussion of public questions?" and "is a newspaper which advocates temperance justified in publishing business announcements for liquor dealers?"

TORONTO'S CIVIC GOVERNMENT. "According to a correspondent of The New York Nation, the recent municipal election in Portland, Oregon, has resulted in the choice of men of high standing to administer the municipal affairs of that city, and the defeat of men who have been in the habit of rendering service unsatisfactory to the electors. . . . It is not going too far to assert that in Toronto the average of the municipal electorate stands just as high as it does in Portland or in any other American city, and therefore there is no reason to suppose a preferential system would not produce a like result in this city.—Globe."

We fear our contemporary is going too far when it expects that Toronto will follow the example of Portland. In the last named city they have not the Orange and Sons of England problem to solve. Toronto is a beautiful city and growing space. A pity it is that there is to be found within its limits such a goodly percentage of the narrowest kind of puritanism as well as a stalwart hatred of everything Catholic. The political schemers have taken advantage of this condition to organize oath-bound secret politico-religious associations and now the city is practically at their mercy. We are sincerely sorry that this condition obtains in Toronto. Our great provincial metropolis is a city we ought to be proud of, but narrowness and intolerance on the part of some of its inhabitants has made it a byword throughout the American continent. We hope the great bulk of its citizens will some day arise in its might and throw off this incubus. It will be a huge job, however, as evidenced by the proceedings on Saturday last. Bigotry nursed the wind and now it is reaping the whirlwind.

A NEW MOVE

A very strange despatch was sent from London, England, under date of July 9. It would seem that the Marquis of Lansdowne, leader of the Unionist Party in the House of Lords, has stepped down from his high estate and adopted the tactics of the low political tricksters. We are told that when the Home Rule Bill reaches the Lords, he intends to move "that this House declines to proceed with the consideration of the Bill until it has been submitted to the judgment of the country." The contention of my Lord Lansdowne and his fellow Unionists is that if they simply do nothing whatever with the Bill it cannot therefore become law. But have they not reckoned without their host? Have not Mr. Asquith and his followers a weapon which they may use in such an emergency? Can they not create enough peers to carry the measure over the heads of the House of Lords as at present contemplates? These people are making a brave fight for the retention of their vested wrongs.

A NEW DEPARTURE

A despatch from Los Angeles, published in the Detroit Tribune of July 11th, tells us that at the meeting of the Christian Endeavor Society, at which were present ten thousand delegates, representing nearly every part of the Christian world, Rev. Charles M. Sheldon, Congregationalist Minister, made a pronouncement which will, we think, be received by our non-Catholic fellow-citizens with consternation—the introduction into Protestant churches of a confessional. The proposed confessional, however, it would be well to remember, is far removed from that in use in the Catholic Church. It will be merely an advisory institution. We give the despatch as it appeared in the Tribune: Speaking on "What has Christianity Accomplished?" at the First Congregational church, Rev. Charles M. Sheldon, the noted Congregational pastor, lecturer and author of Topeka, Kas., advocated the confessional for all Protestant churches. He ascribed the power of the Catholic Church to the confessional and the fact that the Catholic Church is under one head. He recommended the wiping out of all Protestant denominational lines, and the assembling of all churches under one head. Dr. Sheldon told his congregation in answer to questions from his audience, which consisted of Sunday school teachers and Christian workers, that he had used the confessional in his own church in Topeka, Kas., and had found it a means to great good. All sorts of conditions of applicants ranging from marital woes to college troubles. Because they had confided in him, better results had been obtained than the confessors had expected. After the meeting Dr. Sheldon was asked to explain what he meant by a Protestant confessional. He wrote the following statement: "By the Protestant confessional I mean the opportunity given by the pastor to his congregation of counseling with him on any subject where they need help or advice. "The time for this confessional may be Sunday afternoon when the people generally would be at liberty to come. In general this confessional would give opportunity for much helpfulness between pastor and the people." This is a step Romeward; very slow and hesitating and timid, to be sure, but yet Romeward. We pray other steps may follow.

THE GIFT OF SYMPATHY

Man's inhumanity it is that makes this world so largely a vale of tears. Life would not be such a continual grind, so many hearts would not be heavy with grief, so many feet would not be travel-weary, if men were only the kinder to one another, for it is a tired hand that will not respond to the touch of friendship, and the clouds are heavy, indeed, that will not melt before the smile of sympathy.

Sympathy is one of the things that costs no money, but yet it is one of the dearest things a man can possess. Our hearts crave for it. We hunger for a kind word, an encouraging smile, and if we are denied this gift of gifts, all else is but fairy gold, turning to leaves and counters at the touch. Want of sympathy is responsible for most of the heart-breaks of life. We too often forget that "a heart broken sighs for affection and not for gold"—that a word that is kindly spoken, even a little word, is better than wealth untold. "Never morning wore to evening but some heart did break" for sympathy denied.

It is only the strong nature that can dispense with sympathy, and strong natures are rare as soaring mountain peaks. For most of us, who are fashioned of ordinary clay, sympathy is as necessary as the breath of life. It is the talisman that can change the face of the world. All our hills are plains when we are in step with a friend.

If there is one place more than another where we expect to find sympathy it is in the home. It matters little whether it be cottage or palace, if it is rich in sympathy it will always be to us an oasis to which we turn for rest and refreshment. It will be a sanctuary into which the cares [of the work-a-day world] dare not intrude. It is the want of this golden bond of sympathy that makes of so many homes a hell. If the husband, when he returns from his daily toil, finds no sympathy in the home circle, he will seek it elsewhere, in the bar-room or the club. If the wife cannot win a smile from her husband she will eat out her heart in silent anguish. And if there is no one to whom the child can open its heart it will become warped and twisted in the cross currents of the street.

If we do not cultivate this gift of sympathy we not only make it harder for others, but we make it harder for ourselves. We miss half the joy of life, for the world belongs in its fullness only to the sympathetic. Who will not say that Scrooge was not happier after he had shed the husk of selfishness? COLUMBA.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

ONE HAS but to glance at any overseas newspaper these days to realize how large Canada has loomed in the estimation of the people of Britain in recent years. In a late issue of an English Catholic exchange for example, out of nineteen paragraphs summarizing the world's news, ten have to do with Canada. This is the more remarkable since less than a generation ago the location of this country on the map of the world was unknown to a large proportion of the English people. This assertion may seem an exaggeration, but it appears to be substantiated by a collection of envelopes and newspaper wrappers recently shown to us, all from mercantile houses in England, addressed "Canada, U. S. A."

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR, "Tay Pay," the well-known journalist and Irish Member of Parliament, is responsible for the following amusing illustration of the current Belfast concep-

tion of "religion" and "toleration." Hughie M'Gerraghty is the son of a signer of the "League and Covenant." He recently emigrated, and when Mrs. M'Gerraghty was asked why he had done so she replied: "Poor Hughie worked on the Isle of Man, and when he was gone till his work was done he met wan o' them Papishes, an' Hughie, that wuz always a good religious boy, knocked him down and then he kicked him. After that a policeman cum along an' poor Hughie wuz tuk up, an' wud ye believe it?—he got a month! So when he cum out, 'Mother' says he to me, 'Am goan away,' says he, 'out o' this place altogether,' says he. 'Am blowed,' says he, 'if a cud stop any longer in a country where a hev till suffer for my religion.'"

We are not aware that the story has heretofore been told in this country, but, if so, it is none the worse of repetition. Who that has any acquaintance with the gentry in question can doubt its substantial accuracy in spirit at least.

THE EX-ABBOT in his statement in "Pax" is mainly concerned to vindicate the good faith of the monks in regard to their conversion, and especially his own as their recognized superior. It was charged that he had had the step in view for a long time past and had consciously worked towards it—the same charge, it will be noted, that was laid to the door of John Henry Newman in his day, and which the "Apologia" so effectually refuted. It was further charged against Abbot Carlyle that he had designed to lead as many as possible of the monks along the same path and had brought undue pressure to bear upon them to effect this, both of which imputations fall to the ground in the light of the published statement. Whatever chagrin, therefore, may be felt by Anglicans over the outcome of the experiment, the charge of insidiousness or bad faith sought to be fastened upon those concerned will not hold.

TO MAKE THIS PLAIN we cannot do better than make an excerpt or two from Bro. Carlyle's article. Referring to Bishop Gore's final communication, he says: "On the next day our Brethren were to meet to discuss the Bishop's letters—of which each Brother had a copy given him on the previous Sunday (February 16th), with a request to write thereon any remarks he might have to make, giving his own personal opinion of what he thought should be done. On the 19th, when we all met together, I had already made my own decision, and was prepared to act upon it. I had said nothing to anyone previously, and when I met the Brethren I thought it best to tell them at once the conclusion I had arrived at. I was not in the least prepared for the fact that so many of the Community had themselves come to the Chapter with their own minds quite made up; and when I saw their written notes afterwards I found that individually they had reached the same conclusion. There was only one thing to be done, to write at once to Bishop Gore and tell him that we could not meet his requirements, and must act upon what we believed to be God's will for us."

And on the question of pressure or undue influence he further writes: "It has been said that I have had this step in view for a long time past and had consciously worked towards it; that in doing so I had carefully designed to lead as many as possible with me, and to this end had brought undue pressure to bear upon those who were gathered about me. I reply that there is not a grain of truth in this and such like statements, and that all through the community the decision that was made was a matter of individual guidance and choice. The very fact that so unanimous and so definite a decision could be made was to us all a strong assurance that we had received true and right guidance. Controversy has always been discouraged among us, for we knew it to be a danger to the spiritual life and to prayer; and it was out of prayer alone, and in the light of actual facts, that the decision was made."

This of itself, apart altogether from the observations of independent witnesses, should forever set such ill-natured reflections at rest.

THEN, AS to the property, it is the expressed opinion of competent counsel that the monks would have been quite within their right to retain all the property without question or discussion. The Abbot, however, did not take that view, and to place the matter beyond cavil, offered to return certain donations if it were so desired. This, it may be added, he has actually done to the extent of 2,000 pounds. But, as to the main fact, he says "there can be no question that the Island of Caldey and by far the greater part of the buildings legally and morally remain the possession of the community."

AS A FINAL adjustment of every point in dispute the Abbot has readily acquiesced in the suggestion of Lord Halifax that all documents and accounts should be submitted to a

very specious plea, it must be said, and one which authentic documents were necessary to substantiate. But if the contention was so self-evident as its upholders claimed, one could not forbear asking

why the Church of England clings so tenaciously to the loot of the Reformation? In that event there was no question as to whose was the rightful title to the temporalities so ruthlessly appropriated or destroyed. Fifteen hundred years of possession and the unmistakable bequests of innumerable generations of faithful Catholics who put that beyond doubt. Yet, as Lloyd George said in Parliament on an occasion fresh in memory, their present occupants hold them as a heritage from those "whose hands were steeped deep in sacrilege."

The Caldey monks, as their attitude now makes abundantly clear, have no such restricted view of their position in regard to the property on Caldey Island.

Even Canadian Presbyterianism, with all its unctuous spirit of boastfulness, as exemplified by the late Congress in Toronto, stands somewhat aghast at the increasing shrinkage of the 'ism' in Scotland. "The situation," says the Presbyterian, "calls for serious thought." "Church reports," it continues, "disclose the fact that in Scotland the Roman Catholics and the Anglicans are gaining ground and all the Presbyterian Churches losing. The Church of Scotland, Established, reports a decrease in membership of one thousand and thirty six, and the births and baptisms have fallen off. This is true also of the United Free Church." In the light of the history of the past four centuries and of the dogmatism of the Westminster Confession the lament takes on something of the pitiful. It certainly ill accords with the vain assertion of that document as to the whereabouts of the Elect and the "undoubted truth and verity" of Calvinistic teaching. And who can say that there is not a nemesis in it all?

The Canadian Churchman (Anglican) gives considerable space in its columns to a sermon by the Rev. Prebendary Webster, on "The Gift in the Lord's Supper" in which the proverbial vagaries of Anglican doctrine are strikingly illustrated. We are not concerned to controvert the preacher's peculiar notions as to Catholic teaching on the subject of the Real Presence. That is neither here nor there, and is, of course, not affected by any misconception on the part of these theological weather-cocks. What does occasion us some surprise, however, is that so ordinarily reverent a periodical as the Churchman should without any suspicion of its incompatibility with the first principles of religion, natural or revealed, give place to so audacious and blasphemous an utterance as the following:

"It is not possible that that which Roman Catholics declare could be true. You say, All things are possible with God. It is quite possible for God, if He think fit, to change a piece of bread into the glorified Body of Christ, but it is not possible for God to change it into the Body of Christ and leave it exactly the same in shape, and taste, and color, and smell as it was before."

We are much mistaken if in this the Churchman, through the Prebendary, voices the sentiments of any considerable body of its readers. But it unmistakably points to the gulf that yawns open before every form of heresy and schism.

In the current number of the Benedictine periodical "Pax," now for the first time appearing under Catholic auspices, with Dom Bede Camm as editor, the Rev. Brother Elred Carlyle, who was Abbot of the community as an Anglican organization, gives his promised explanation of all the circumstances which led up to the secession of himself and brethren from the Church of England and their reception into the Catholic Church. He also fully elucidates their position in regard to the property on Caldey Island, their title to which, it will be remembered, was disputed by the authorities of the Anglican Church. It was claimed that it was given to them for the use and benefit of the Church of England, and since the monks had ceased to be members of that church their title lapsed with their secession.

A VERY SPECIOUS plea, it must be said, and one which authentic documents were necessary to substantiate. But if the contention was so self-evident as its upholders claimed, one could not forbear asking

why the Church of England clings so tenaciously to the loot of the Reformation? In that event there was no question as to whose was the rightful title to the temporalities so ruthlessly appropriated or destroyed. Fifteen hundred years of possession and the unmistakable bequests of innumerable generations of faithful Catholics who put that beyond doubt. Yet, as Lloyd George said in Parliament on an occasion fresh in memory, their present occupants hold them as a heritage from those "whose hands were steeped deep in sacrilege."

The Caldey monks, as their attitude now makes abundantly clear, have no such restricted view of their position in regard to the property on Caldey Island.

Even Canadian Presbyterianism, with all its unctuous spirit of boastfulness, as exemplified by the late Congress in Toronto, stands somewhat aghast at the increasing shrinkage of the 'ism' in Scotland. "The situation," says the Presbyterian, "calls for serious thought." "Church reports," it continues, "disclose the fact that in Scotland the Roman Catholics and the Anglicans are gaining ground and all the Presbyterian Churches losing. The Church of Scotland, Established, reports a decrease in membership of one thousand and thirty six, and the births and baptisms have fallen off. This is true also of the United Free Church." In the light of the history of the past four centuries and of the dogmatism of the Westminster Confession the lament takes on something of the pitiful. It certainly ill accords with the vain assertion of that document as to the whereabouts of the Elect and the "undoubted truth and verity" of Calvinistic teaching. And who can say that there is not a nemesis in it all?

The Canadian Churchman (Anglican) gives considerable space in its columns to a sermon by the Rev. Prebendary Webster, on "The Gift in the Lord's Supper" in which the proverbial vagaries of Anglican doctrine are strikingly illustrated. We are not concerned to controvert the preacher's peculiar notions as to Catholic teaching on the subject of the Real Presence. That is neither here nor there, and is, of course, not affected by any misconception on the part of these theological weather-cocks. What does occasion us some surprise, however, is that so ordinarily reverent a periodical as the Churchman should without any suspicion of its incompatibility with the first principles of religion, natural or revealed, give place to so audacious and blasphemous an utterance as the following:

"It is not possible that that which Roman Catholics declare could be true. You say, All things are possible with God. It is quite possible for God, if He think fit, to change a piece of bread into the glorified Body of Christ, but it is not possible for God to change it into the Body of Christ and leave it exactly the same in shape, and taste, and color, and smell as it was before."

We are much mistaken if in this the Churchman, through the Prebendary, voices the sentiments of any considerable body of its readers. But it unmistakably points to the gulf that yawns open before every form of heresy and schism.

In the current number of the Benedictine periodical "Pax," now for the first time appearing under Catholic auspices, with Dom Bede Camm as editor, the Rev. Brother Elred Carlyle, who was Abbot of the community as an Anglican organization, gives his promised explanation of all the circumstances which led up to the secession of himself and brethren from the Church of England and their reception into the Catholic Church. He also fully elucidates their position in regard to the property on Caldey Island, their title to which, it will be remembered, was disputed by the authorities of the Anglican Church. It was claimed that it was given to them for the use and benefit of the Church of England, and since the monks had ceased to be members of that church their title lapsed with their secession.

A VERY SPECIOUS plea, it must be said, and one which authentic documents were necessary to substantiate. But if the contention was so self-evident as its upholders claimed, one could not forbear asking

why the Church of England clings so tenaciously to the loot of the Reformation? In that event there was no question as to whose was the rightful title to the temporalities so ruthlessly appropriated or destroyed. Fifteen hundred years of possession and the unmistakable bequests of innumerable generations of faithful Catholics who put that beyond doubt. Yet, as Lloyd George said in Parliament on an occasion fresh in memory, their present occupants hold them as a heritage from those "whose hands were steeped deep in sacrilege."

The Caldey monks, as their attitude now makes abundantly clear, have no such restricted view of their position in regard to the property on Caldey Island.

Even Canadian Presbyterianism, with all its unctuous spirit of boastfulness, as exemplified by the late Congress in Toronto, stands somewhat aghast at the increasing shrinkage of the 'ism' in Scotland. "The situation," says the Presbyterian, "calls for serious thought." "Church reports," it continues, "disclose the fact that in Scotland the Roman Catholics and the Anglicans are gaining ground and all the Presbyterian Churches losing. The Church of Scotland, Established, reports a decrease in membership of one thousand and thirty six, and the births and baptisms have fallen off. This is true also of the United Free Church." In the light of the history of the past four centuries and of the dogmatism of the Westminster Confession the lament takes on something of the pitiful. It certainly ill accords with the vain assertion of that document as to the whereabouts of the Elect and the "undoubted truth and verity" of Calvinistic teaching. And who can say that there is not a nemesis in it all?

The Canadian Churchman (Anglican) gives considerable space in its columns to a sermon by the Rev. Prebendary Webster, on "The Gift in the Lord's Supper" in which the proverbial vagaries of Anglican doctrine are strikingly illustrated. We are not concerned to controvert the preacher's peculiar notions as to Catholic teaching on the subject of the Real Presence. That is neither here nor there, and is, of course, not affected by any misconception on the part of these theological weather-cocks. What does occasion us some surprise, however, is that so ordinarily reverent a periodical as the Churchman should without any suspicion of its incompatibility with the first principles of religion, natural or revealed, give place to so audacious and blasphemous an utterance as the following:

"It is not possible that that which Roman Catholics declare could be true. You say, All things are possible with God. It is quite possible for God, if He think fit, to change a piece of bread into the glorified Body of Christ, but it is not possible for God to change it into the Body of Christ and leave it exactly the same in shape, and taste, and color, and smell as it was before."

We are much mistaken if in this the Churchman, through the Prebendary, voices the sentiments of any considerable body of its readers. But it unmistakably points to the gulf that yawns open before every form of heresy and schism.

In the current number of the Benedictine periodical "Pax," now for the first time appearing under Catholic auspices, with Dom Bed