

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
 United States and Europe—\$2.50.
 Single copies 10 cents.
 Editors: Rev. James T. Foley, LL.D.,
 Thomas Coffey, LL.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.
 Send 10 cents to prepay expense of postage upon replies.
 Ordinary 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 Falcioni and Sheil, late Apostolic Delegates to Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshawa, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

LONDON, SATURDAY, OCT. 28, 1922

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

"What is the situation of Protestantism today? Protestantism is like a man being asphyxiated; it is struggling for breath owing to division and owing to the inability to express itself in the organic way. The soul is dying out of a great mass of the people—cries of 'No, no!' through a lack of religious education and lack of knowledge of the Bible."

So, according to the press reports, spoke the Rev. Salem Bland, at the Methodist Conference recently held in Toronto. The Conference was considering the report of the Sunday Schools and Young People's Societies' Committee which recommended the teaching of religion in Public schools during school hours. There was, we are told, vigorous criticism of the proposal to carry the teaching of religious subjects into the day schools and a frank admission on the part of several delegates that it is impossible to get united action from the Churches. The Hon. E. J. Davis reminded his fellow-delegates of the fate, some years ago, of the Scripture selections prepared by religious leaders of the various denominations. The people of the province, he said, rebelled at the suggestion and refused to have these readings used in the schools. Older readers will recall that though the readings were selected by Protestant clergymen the compilation was submitted to the late Archbishop Lynch to ascertain whether or not Catholics had any objection to its use as an authorized school text-book in schools supported by Catholic taxes and attended by Catholic children. When that fact became known the fat was in the fire. The work of the Protestant clergymen was dubbed the Ross-Lynch Bible, the mutilated Bible; and zealous defenders of our civil and religious liberties against the encroachment of the Roman hierarchy declared loudly and emphatically for "the whole—Bible." The pitch to which unreasonable prejudice had been lashed may be judged from the fact that a noted Toronto preacher of the time tickled the ears of his hearers by declaring during his "sermon" that he would like to see some of "these disloyalists forced to take the oath of allegiance on a crucifix or a Ross-Lynch Bible or something they believed in." Well this modest attempt to introduce into the schools something of what the Methodists are asking today received that intelligent consideration usually given to any measure that is suspected of emanating from "Rome."

Yet in spite of warnings and opposition the Conference adopted the report, after it had been pointed out that the recommendation "was not framed so as to raise the issue in any political sense."

The outcome of the discussion, as reported by The Globe, was this cautious but definite stand taken by the Conference: After declaring "that our efforts in regard to religious instruction in connection with the Public schools should be directed chiefly, at this stage, toward the establishment of a system of instruction under Church auspices rather than as an integral part of the curriculum of the school," the document recommended that Committees of Religious Education be established in individual communities. This committee should ask the local School Board for permission to give religious instruction, within regular school hours, in the school building if possible. If this were objected to, then it was recommended that the committee should secure a building near the school and arrange a time for regular instruction that would most conveniently fit in with the regular school sessions.

It will be noted that there is a peculiar qualification of the "efforts with regard to religious instruction in connection with the Public schools." "At this stage," the Church does not contemplate abdicating its function of teaching

religion in favor of the State. It is to be inferred that a stage may be reached when "our efforts may be chiefly directed" to have religious instruction made an "integral part of the curriculum of the school."

We sympathize quite heartily with those earnest and clear-seeing Protestants who recognize that the divorce of education from religion is disastrous to Church and State. But what then becomes of the familiar and overworked argument against Separate schools for Catholics? It is precisely because of the claim that there is no religion at all in the public schools of Ontario that Catholics are told that these schools ought to be acceptable to them. One never gets far in discussing Separate school claims without meeting this fallacious argument. We are glad that the Methodists have placed themselves on record as agreeing in principle with the position unalterably held by the Catholic Church. No religion in the schools is bad; Catholics have always maintained that truth which is now becoming manifest to Protestants. It is difficult for Protestants to agree on any "fundamentals" or "essentials" of the Christian religion though the basic principle of all Protestant denominations is the same. It is quite impossible for Catholics and Protestants to agree on such teaching, for the basic principle of Protestantism is diametrically opposed to the exclusive claim of the Catholic Church to teach by virtue of the authority committed to her by her divine Founder, Jesus Christ. Therefore if we are to have religion in the schools there must be separate schools for Catholics and Protestants. That Protestants do not admit the claim of the Catholic Church in no wise weakens the argument. And even if all Protestants were forever satisfied with purely secular schools the Catholic Church, wise with the accumulated experience of nineteen centuries, would have the same conscientious objections to schools wherefrom the most important thing in life, the most vital element of education, is excluded.

THE FUTURE OF PROHIBITION

Premier Taschereau of Quebec resents what he interprets as the inception of an attempt to impose prohibition on his province. Dr. C. W. Saleeby of London, England, and the Rev. Mr. Spence of Toronto, have been telling the people of the lower province that the royal road to temperance is through legislative prohibition.

No one in Quebec went quite so far with these Prohibition apostles as Dr. Saleeby's countrymen with "Pussyfoot" Johnson but Mr. Taschereau figuratively put an eye out of the English doctor with this caustic comment on his supposed mission to Quebec: "I have no objection to English physicians preaching the great benefits derived from temperance and showing the evils of alcoholism. But if alcoholism is making in England and Scotland such ravages as those described by Dr. Saleeby, and if the Canadian race is as sound and strong as he described it, I do not see why he does not use his energy in trying to remedy the conditions existing in his own country instead of coming here to decry England."

And he added pointedly: "To convince Quebec that Prohibition is an effective remedy to alcoholism, it would take something different from the results produced in the United States and in the prohibitionist Provinces of Canada."

The results of Prohibition are, to say the least, disappointing. "For," asks a writer in the New York Times Magazine, "what have we gained by exchanging the bartender for the bootlegger? Have we abolished intemperance? Have we reduced crime? Have we saved the younger generation?" Have we decreased insanity or poverty? Have we established a higher standard of sex morality? Have we reduced jails, lunatic and orphan asylums, almshouses and reformatories?

"To ask these questions is to answer them for all except the wilfully deaf and blind. We were promised all these things in the name of prohibition, but not one of them has come to pass. The daily press is a daily witness to the intensification instead of the reduction of all of the evils mentioned. And on top of all these have come a spirit of unrest and disorder, a

prevalence of corruption among public officials, a disregard and contempt for law that threaten the very foundations of our temple of law and liberty."

As to the disregard and contempt for law, thoughtful and unbiased observers everywhere are becoming more and more seriously concerned. On those whose characters and habits of thought and life were formed before this extremist sumptuary legislation was enacted, the widespread contempt in which it is held by otherwise law-abiding citizens has little serious effect. But on those whose characters and habits of thought and life are now being formed, the contempt for the Prohibition law and the condonation of its evasion must often have a deplorable influence. Indeed many trace much of the growing evils of the day to this source.

Roger W. Babson, the statistician, in a special letter to his subscribers has this comment on the Literary Digest poll on Prohibition:

"Many good people are disturbed by the result of The Literary Digest's vote on Prohibition. The Digest mailed blank votes to nearly 10,000,000 telephone subscribers, and the returns so far are showing about 91% for repeal of the Prohibition Amendment, 41% for light wines and beer, and only 38% for a continuation of the present laws. Clients and others are justified in being disturbed; but they are not justified in being surprised. When surprised, it is because we are governed by our hopes rather than by our studies. We think others are like ourselves with the same tastes, motives and desires. We figure that after a 'law' is passed, we have nothing more to worry about. We forget that 'making' laws does not make men. We need something like this test by The Literary Digest to wake us up."

"The Digest's vote is simply another evidence that legislation and even Constitutional amendments are of little benefit excepting as the desires of men and women are changed. I believe in Prohibition—voted for it and always will vote for it 100%—but as a statistician I realize that the vote was put through under the stress of war and without changing the basic desires of a sufficient number of people. Until the desires (or what the preachers call the 'hearts') of people are changed, legislation does not accomplish much. Such legislation is like painting a building which has rotten timbers."

Hardly a day goes by that an urgent appeal does not come to me to 'join' some society, league or association with the purpose of putting across some reform. All of them are good, and they are being directed by good people.

All organizations are up against the same problem: viz., they are trying to change the activities of men and women without changing their hearts; or speaking statistically—their desires. That is why they have an up-hill fight and always will until the desires of people change. As this time approaches, people say that public sentiment is changing. This is why public sentiment is so powerful. But public sentiment is simply a popular way of saying that the desires of people regarding a certain thing are undergoing change. We all know how fickle is public sentiment. It will change almost overnight. It is very powerful while it lasts; but it is very treacherous. Every political leader knows this. What the nation needs is to permanently ingraft into the hearts of men and women right desires. Then all of these problems will solve themselves. Then with a proper system of education all the 'Anti' and 'Pro' leagues, associations and societies could disband.

"What does permanently change the desires of men and women? Only one thing—namely Religion. This has always been true throughout the ages and is true today."

We give this lengthy quotation, first because it expresses so well the prevailing Catholic view of such legislation, and secondly, because it shows that some even of the "100% dry" Prohibitionists are beginning to see the futility of substituting legislation for religion in raising moral standards.

Nor is this an isolated instance by any means. The Manufacturers Record, a strongly Prohibitionist organ, has recently issued a pamphlet, "The Prohibition Question," in which it publishes the replies to a letter sent out to a thousand leading men, who, five years ago, signed a petition to Congress in favor of Prohibition. The great majority of the letters published show that those of the thousand who answered (apparently less than one half) are still strongly Prohibitionist; but there are many and notable exceptions.

For instance, the President of the Seaboard National Bank, New York, writes:

"I started out as being entirely in favor of Prohibition, but in a short time its workings had so pro-

stituted the best instincts of our people that many of them became criminals, law breakers, crooks and confidence men, and so far from prohibiting—there never has been so much open drunkenness in our streets as now, and the conditions are still worse in private life! The majority are against it, but it is so surrounded with barriers that the fanatic minority close every effort for justice and fair play."

"I am, however, in favor of closing the saloons, and of temperance."

Another from Boston concludes his letter thus:

"I come to the conclusion, therefore, that Prohibition is impossible to make complete, that it is unfair and tends to make all law less sacred and that some other method of regulation should have been devised. I believe that the Eighteenth Amendment will ultimately be taken out of the Constitution and that some better method will be devised to confer the undoubted benefit of Temperance on the people and to obviate the serious faults of any sumptuary law."

Samuel Hopkins Adams writes: "The worst feature of the situation is the open contempt for the Law which is everywhere observable, and which, in my opinion, produces a reflex of contempt for all laws, subtly and perilously anarchistic."

George Blumer of New Haven bears testimony to the fact that contempt for the Prohibition laws is far from being confined to thugs and criminals; if it were the harm done would be negligible. He writes:

"Your quotation from President Harding expresses the beneficial side of Prohibition. There is another side of the question of which I have been acutely aware for some time, the side that was emphasized by Justice Clarke in the public press within the past few months. My personal experiences among my friends and acquaintances, who are mostly professional men and college professors, has led me to the conclusion that Prohibition has had a most disastrous effect on the attitude of many of our most respected citizens toward the law. I am aware from personal experience that many people regarded as representatives of the best citizenship are daily breaking the Prohibition Law."

"I think I may frankly and honestly say, therefore, that I regret having signed the petition in favor of Prohibition."

"I think I made two mistakes in signing it. In the first place I now feel that it is a mistake to put one's self on record in favor of a movement unless convinced that the principle underlying the movement is sound. Progress in matters of this sort must come through education and the development of self-control. In the second place I think that I, and probably a great many others who advocated Prohibition, failed to consider the psychological effect of the law and did not foresee the effects that its passage would produce on the respect for law in general."

Nevertheless all agree that the abolition of the saloon or public bar was a distinctly progressive step which must be irrevocable. And this, whatever be the future of the drastic laws now in force, is one solid achievement to be placed to the credit of the Prohibitionists.

While the law is in force it is the duty of all good citizens to obey it whether approving it or not; but the time is approaching when the whole matter will be reconsidered in the light which practical experience throws on the whole subject.

A GREATER PART OR A SMALLER ONE

By THE OBSERVER

Recent events in Europe will have done Canada some good if they bring home to us more clearly the position into which we have been drifting. Since the War we have given a formal and perfunctory consent to a number of treaties, the meaning and the importance of which have cost our statesmen hardly a thought; and still less have they given any concern to the ordinary citizen nor to anybody in this country at all. The two leaders of the old parties have disagreed as just what Parliament did do in regard to the Treaty of Sevres; and the leader of the other party has not given any opinion on the point. A perusal of the discussion in the Senate shows that there was no

intention of ratifying the Treaty; and in fact it was never ratified by anybody; not by England nor by Turkey; without whom there could be no treaty in which Canada could possibly be interested.

The whole discussion and the whole of the recent events affecting Turkey show very plainly that if we are going to hold ourselves bound to go to war whenever the Balkans blaze up, we had better make up our minds to take a little more interest in what sort of treaties are being made for us in Downing Street, London, and in the terms and provisions of whatever treaties Canada is in great need of having some defined policy in respect to her part and her liability in regard to European affairs. I have been trying in this column, from time to time for the last three years, to draw attention to the unsatisfactory position into which we were drifting. I do not suppose there was much interest felt in the matter anywhere. The fact is, the average, ordinary view in this country was, that once the War was over, all that should follow was a matter for Mr. Lloyd George and his associates to attend to and that Canada had nothing to do with it one way or another.

The menace of a new war has come at a time when public opinion in Canada is in a responsive state and there will be no undue rush to take on the burden of a new participation in the troubled affairs of Europe without more proof of the need of it than has yet appeared. But the events of the past few weeks should set Canadians thinking. We must realize now that always in the future whenever England thinks of going to war anywhere, Canada will be asked to go in. It is all very well for Mr. Lloyd George to say that he did not ask us to go in, but only let us know that there might be a chance for us to go in if we felt like it; but that is not the way that a great many people in this country looked at it when the message came; and that is not the way in which the people of Canada are likely to look at such messages. For, if that were all, we might as well be left to send the first message. We were to all intents and purposes asked to go in; and unless we make an attempt to define our position, and to put some limitations of a definite character upon our liability in regard to European wars, we may expect to get a similar message in the future in every case where England thinks of fighting, whether or not the Empire, including Canada, is in danger; whether or not the interests involved are common to us all; or are only the particular interests of England or of some other part of the Empire.

I think we had better abandon once and for all the notion that whenever England is at war Canada is also at war. To commit ourselves to any such principle as that, while we remain without the power to elect even one member of the Parliament to which alone the makers of war or peace are responsible, would be an act of sheer political madness; one which could hardly commend itself to any large number of Canadians when they are free from excitement. But the trouble is that a time when war is threatened, and when a people with whom we are in close and friendly relations are asking, reasonably or unreasonably, for our aid, is not a time when the clearest and coolest thinking can be looked for.

Therefore it will be well to have some definite principles laid down, for our future guidance, in regard to the liability of this country to take part in wars outside her own boundaries. The reason for having a political constitution is, that it gives a rule to go by in national matters, and serves as a common ground on which all the people of a country can meet; and must meet; thus avoiding the dangers of a sudden wholesale change of national policy under sudden excitement or great provocation. Also a constitution keeps foolish demagogues from doing as much damage to old and well-tried institutions as they could and would do in the brief spells in which they exercise power.

Now, if there is one thing that calls clearly for constitutional definition in Canada, it is the matter of our liability to be called on to take part in wars abroad. Perhaps such a matter cannot be defined with a legal or mathematical exactness; but at least some of the main principles of the matter can be

laid down; some of the necessary limitations can be stated.

But there will be some one who will fear that Canada will lose by doing this some part of the colonial servility that is so dear to the heart of the Loyalist who spells that word with a capital "L." And it will be said,—Why worry? We have the right, of course, to decide in any given case whether we shall go in or not. That may or may not be true. Suppose that instead of the so-called Treaty of Sevres being mere waste paper, it had been fully ratified by all the parties concerned, what then? Should we have had, in that case, the full right to decide on peace or war? Yes, if we had had as full opportunities as anybody else to play a part in the making of that treaty; no, if we merely followed a hint given us from London when we signed it.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE REV. DYSON HAGUE, that prolific exponent of "evangelical" Anglicanism, quotes the well-known text: "In the midst of life we are in death," as from the Anglican burial service. It would not be surprising if the reverend gentleman further assured us that St. Paul got it from that source.

LITTLE BY little the scientific world, or rather a certain section of it, which would have us believe the Church to be the irreconcilable foe of scientific investigation, pauses by the way to admit its indebtedness to men who were no less conspicuous for their attachment to the Faith than for their eminence as devotees of science. A recent instance of this was the celebration of the centenary of Champollion's discovery of the Key to Egyptian hieroglyphics.

UNTIL THIS celebrated Frenchman's elucidation of the mystery in 1822, these hieroglyphics, carved or painted on the tombs and temples of ancient Egypt, were a sealed book to the modern world. For centuries archaeologists had striven in vain to decipher their meaning, lacking which the history, the manners and customs of that wonderful people remained purely conjectural. It remained for the Catholic Champollion to unravel the mystery, and the discovery of the Key on his part was due to the finding of what is known as the Rosetta stone in the ruins of the ancient town of that name (or Rashid, in Arabic) at the mouth of the Nile. This stone was discovered by a French officer, Bousard, engaged in repairing the Fort St. Julien, on the same site, then under French control. Under the treaty of Alexandria the stone became the property of Great Britain and is now one of the most treasured possessions of the British Museum.

THE ROSETTA stone is thus described: It is a large slab of black basalt, bearing an inscription relative to the coronation of Ptolemy V. This inscription is trilingual, or in three languages—hieroglyphics, the sacred writing of the ruling class; in demotic, or the popular language of Egypt, and in Greek. It was thus possible to compare the hieroglyphic characters with the Greek, and the way to their decipherment was thus opened. The difficulties in the way, however, were very great, and were complicated by the condition of the stone when found, as a part was broken off, or so badly mutilated as to render portions of the inscriptions indecipherable. Patient study, however, and Champollion's penetrative genius gradually overcame these difficulties, and in the event, the mystery which had so long enveloped the history of ancient Egypt was effectually swept away.

THOSE INTERESTED in this fascinating event may find the story told in full in Cardinal Wiseman's celebrated lectures, "The Connexion between Science and Revealed Religion." These lectures though long superseded by later narratives, and by the marvellous developments in physical science since their delivery, still retain a certain value, and as literature will always have an attraction for the studious. Champollion is therein seen to have been not only one of the first scientists of his age, but a devout Christian into the bargain, and while in the rush of modern scholarship his name has been forgotten except by the few, the celebration of his centennial has served to remind the world of

its indebtedness to him, and to restore him to the place which his achievements in science have earned. Above all, he proves in his own person that Faith and true science are perfectly reconcilable.

THE TORONTO GLOBE has editorially called attention to the disgraceful condition in which one of Ontario's most interesting historical monuments, "The Priory," Guelph, is allowed to remain. This was the first house built in Guelph after its foundation by John Galt in 1847—or it is at least the oldest now standing. Temporary structures were no doubt first erected in the new settlement but they have long since disappeared. "The Priory" remains, dilapidated and neglected as it is, a monument not only to the romantic beginnings of a now flourishing community, but to a distinguished man, John Galt, its founder, who by his literary attainments shed lustre upon it.

THE GLOBE briefly reviews the history of the structure and reproduces William Lyon Mackenzie's description of nearly ninety years ago. It says nothing, however, of the fact that it narrowly missed becoming the residence of a future Roman Cardinal. The story has often been told, and it is not necessary to reproduce it here, beyond recalling that when Bishop Macdonell sought for assistance in the government of his then vast diocese it was given to him by the appointment of a coadjutor, in the person of the Rev. Thomas Weld. Bishop Weld did not in the event, however, come to Canada, although retaining for three years his office in the Canadian Church. It was his unlooked-for elevation to the Sacred College that put an end to the prospect. Evidently it was the intention when his purpose of coming out to Canada was effected that he should take up his residence in Guelph, and from that point oversee the western half of the diocese, which then covered the entire Province. Referring to "The Priory," in a letter written from Guelph in 1827, and published in Fraser's Magazine in 1880, Mr. Galt says: "We have some expectation that Mr. Bishop Weld of Lulworth Castle is coming here." Should the people of Guelph develop sufficient regard for their past, as to take adequate steps to preserve this interesting monument, it might fittingly have inscribed in its portals that it was the intended residence of the first Canadian Prince of the Church, Cardinal Weld.

BOY LIFE

"Talks to Boys" By Rev. J. P. Centoy, S. J.
 Published by permission of the Queen's Work Press

THE MISFITS

When a door is locked that leads into a room we wish to enter, what do we do? We do not at once take down the door nor remove the lock. We try to get a key that will fit the lock; and if the key does not fit we file the wards until it does fit.

When we are using a new baseball glove for the first time, breaking it in, we find that it does not hold the ball well. What do we do? We do not take a bat and pound the ball into a jelly, but we keep at the glove till we have worn a little pocket in it to receive the ball.

When we are dealing with a limb dislocated through some accident, we do not push the body around to make it adjust itself to the limb. We pull the limb back to the body and make it fall into place again.

"What is all this about?" you ask.

Well, if we view it at a certain angle, it is all about ourselves. We come into this world with but one great business to attend to—namely, to fit ourselves into life, rightly to adjust ourselves to things as we find them. And sometimes we are like the key, active, aggressive, starting things; sometimes like the glove, passive, enduring severe blows; and, again, we are like the dislocated limb, which first suffers a strong pull to get it into place, and, after that, is energetic in the use of its full power.

But no matter which one of the three we happen to be imitating, we are always supposed to be doing our best to fit in with the situation. The sooner we learn this fundamental idea, and get to work to put it into practice, the more sense we reveal and the greater the amount of good we finally accomplish. One of the hardest criticisms we pass on a man in any line of work is, "He is