

## The Catholic Record

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

THOS. COFFEY, L.L.D., Editor and Publisher.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., at one cent per insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Meas. Luke King, P. J. Neven, E. J. Broderick, M. J. Haggerty and Miss Sara Hanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the Catholic Record. Agents for the district of Niagara, Mr. M. Reynolds, New Liskard, Ontario, and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.

When subscribers ask for their paper at the post office it will be well for them to tell the clerk to give them their Catholic Record. We have information of carelessness in a few places on the part of delivery clerks who will sometimes look for letters only.

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

## LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION.

Apostolic Delegation.  
Ottawa, June 13th, 1905.

Mr. Thomas Coffey

My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper. I have noted with satisfaction that it is directed with intelligence and ability, and, above all, that it is imbued with a strong Catholic spirit. It is a paper which I can recommend to all Catholics, and I am sure that it will be read with interest and pleasure by all who are interested in the welfare of the Church and the world.

Yours very sincerely in Christ,  
DOROTHY, Archbishop of Ephesus.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA,  
Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1906.

Mr. Thomas Coffey

Dear Sir—For some time past I have read your estimable paper, the Catholic Record, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published. Its matter and form are both good, and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful. Blessing you and wishing you success, believe me to remain,  
Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,  
T. FALCONE, Arch. Episcopus,  
Apost. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 22, 1911

## ORGANIC CHURCH UNION

The Rev. Dr. Milligan, a retired or emeritus Presbyterian Minister of Toronto, having time on his hands, seems to be devoting himself to what he calls Organic Church Union. What he means by it is less definite and more loud sounding than we ourselves would desire if we were directly concerned in seeking the union. To our mind Protestantism is too individualistic to admit of organicism, to display the essential qualities of a Church or to attain unity. We may, and do, deplore the divisions of Christianity—that saddening spectacle to men and angels. We think that as Protestantism is what it is through individualism and the devotion practised by individuals, so union can come only through the return of these units to the one true fold. Organic Church Union cannot be the end aimed at by those who sincerely seek that One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church which Christ our Lord founded and against which He promised that the gates of hell should never prevail. The motto which men like Dr. Milligan should adopt is that which our Holy Father proposed as the policy of his Pontificate: "To restore all things in Christ." We feel certain that Dr. Milligan is not so anti-Protestant that he cannot recognize the suitability of that motto for his own purpose. "The true function and end of Church organization," says this emeritus minister, "is the readiness to adopt organic changes in religious enterprise." Surely not. To adopt organic changes is not the problem before these gentlemen. The real question is to restore their divided house to the unity in which our Divine Lord established and promised to maintain His Church. Men may organize a Church union from now till the crack of doom. That will not mend matters. It will make confusion worse confounded by its increased magnitude. It will not be Christ's Church. The pearl is lost, and these men must borrow a light and call in their neighbors and search the house thoroughly. Union is not unity still less is any union constituted by self-appointed committees apostolic. Dr. Milligan gives himself away in saying that distinction must be made between "pearl and shell." Who is to be the judge between the spiritual pearl and the spiritual shell? Unless such a judge can show that he possesses jurisdiction by divine right and by the authorization of Christ, we cannot receive him. If any angel from heaven were to preach another gospel than that proposed by the Apostles we should reject it. Primary and secondary interests, essentials and non-essentials, are terms which Dr. Milligan handles drolly, but always with the foregone supposition that private judgment must remain the highest court of appeal. Dr. Milligan's suggested Church Union limits itself to a national Church whose "organic principle" is to be "Christ and Him Crucified." This the Dr. holds to be "centrally" essential, a kind of bull's-eye in the target. Is there nothing else essential? By what principle do these Unionists take upon themselves the responsibility of discriminating between the revelations made by "Christ and Him Crucified," accepting some and rejecting others, regarding certain truths as essential and discarding the rest as unessential? Is not the Church itself essential? Our Lord clearly taught that the man who would not eat His flesh and drink His blood would not have life. Dr. Milligan con-

soles himself with the idea that in the "organic principle, Christ and Him Crucified ought to find an adequate solution." So they would, and so they did, under the pen and thought of St. Thomas of Aquin. The Presbyterian of the twentieth century overlooks a number of chapters of doctrine, truth and worship which undoubtedly come out of Christ and Him Crucified. He has forgotten the church, he is silent about the sacraments, nor does he say a word about grace, that supernatural fruit of Calvary's Tree. Dr. Milligan's organic principle is not to be despised. Nor is it to be minimized. It extends to all the courtards of the Church. At the altar it is the worship of the Most High. In the pulpit it is the preacher's universal theme. At the baptismal fountain it is the laver of regeneration, and in the tribunal the word of pardon. To the pontiff it is jurisdiction and sacred union.

Of these and many more important and essential points Dr. Milligan has kept ominous silence. The foundations are unsound and what little superstructure he has erected is wofully weak. He is prepared to admit that Arminian and Calvinist can "organize around Christ and Him Crucified, agreeing for all practical purposes that the elect are those who will be saved and the non-elect are those who will not." That is profound; the elect are those who will be saved and the non-elect are those who will not. What is the purpose of inane truisms? If this be the strength of an organic principle in the proposed Church Union it is weaker than straw and as light as a feather. Salvation is the crucial point between the Arminian and the Calvinist. For Dr. Milligan to suggest what he does is to insult ordinary intelligence. These people may talk as they please about Church Union, Organic or Federated. It makes little difference. As long as they bring to it their primary Protestant principle of private judgment it is sure to fail. They are not seeking the lost pearl. They are striving to manufacture one of their own. An eclectic Church, with material chosen by different members of different sects cannot claim to be Christ's Church. It is to our Blessed Lord's Church that men, if they be sincere in their desire for united Christianity, must come. All the good we see in this talk about Church Union is the admission that division is wrong and something is needed. Human considerations and national prejudices play so far the larger part in the attempts at reconstruction. God has his designs in all these movements. May He lead them on, not to the worldly formation of man, not to the worldly increase and strength of that One Church where alone unity is to be found, and to which in the beginning it was duly guaranteed.

## BAPTIST OR CONGREGATIONALIST

A prominent minister of a prominent New York Baptist Church has shaken the dust not only of the city but of the Baptists from his feet and proceeds to San Francisco to take charge of the First Congregational Church in that city. Whether the western Congregationalist is as far from the eastern Baptist belief as the two cities are in material distance, we do not comprehend how a minister can so lightly step from one denomination to the other. It signifies that differences of churches are nominal, or at any rate that Baptist is synonymous with Congregational. This Rev. Dr. Ake, who came from England four years ago to the Fifth Avenue Baptist Church, New York, feels hurt on account of some criticisms of his beliefs and methods. His sensitiveness is stung so keenly that if his critics represent American Baptists he is not an American Baptist. To this he adds: "I am in harmony with the American spirit." What twaddle! In regard to the supernatural it is to be regretted that the gentleman did not define more fully this American spirit. We hear the boast that "Britons never, never shall be slaves;" still we do not know that that is the same as belonging to the English Free Church. This Rev. Dr. Ake has for some time taken the stand that "all may be one." It would be all right if it were in the meaning in which these words were first used. But the Rev. Dr. seems to want that others shall be the "all" and that he himself shall be the "one." Hardly. What is the idea of associating unity with private judgment? They never harmonized; for if private judgment is a right then orthodoxy is scattered to the winds and unity is smashed to pieces. Dr. Ake is bidding farewell to his New York Baptist congregation turned to the question of Baptist orthodoxy. This he did when he had a sermon ready for his San Francisco Congregationalists. The whole thing must be a sham, beginning in pride and ending in self. Dr. Ake's idea of a great Church—not, it must be noted, his idea of the Church which our Blessed Lord founded—but his idea of a great Church, "a temple that would not be Christian or Jewish, Protestant or Catholic, but should embody the both

in each." As church-builders and organizers our non-Catholic architects are peculiar. They do not look well to the foundations or seek material from the right quarry. This blistering boast of the union on the one hand and the fellowship of the Church with science on the other, is nothing but the unsprinkled selfishness of materialism. "The one," says this Rev. Dr. Ake with profound self-complacency, "and only hope of saving the twentieth century is the ability of the church to restate its dogmas in harmony with the revelation to the world which science has made. Let the church fail to do this and the future generations will wander in agnosticism." A church which has to restate its dogmas is self-condemned. Private judgment may have to revise its opinions from time to time; but the dogmas of Christ's Church once formulated "stand four square to all the winds that blow." False science, materialistic philosophy, agnosticism, pantheism, caesarism may all rush in together or pour their tidal waves one after another: the dogma remains the power and resurrection of God. But dogma, to be dogma and not a mere collocation of words, requires authority. Not every one can say: Thus saith the Lord. It is only Peter who can authoritatively state: "It seemeth good to the Holy Ghost." We are not surprised that the Rev. Dr. Ake finds it opportune for a revision of Baptist teaching, seeing that he is leaving the Baptists to try the Congregationalist creed. Perhaps in another four years the gentleman may find that the dogmas—so-called—of the Congregationalists will demand correction and emendation. It was an old Greek philosopher who held that all was flux and change. So is it with Protestantism.

## THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

These pets of modern irreligion are just now in the limelight. A pitiful figure they display, without the redeeming excuse that they are doing something for the intellectual outfit of the province. They should show a small return for all that is lavished upon them and for what is expected from them. Neither in refinement, morals or intellectual culture do the Public schools of Ontario deserve aught but obloquy and condemnation. Mrs. Thornley's charge against the local cases of our city of London is not only corroborated, but letters to the Toronto Globe show that the worst festering sores are eating out the life of the whole system. The writers of these letters speak from experience. Their voice comes from various quarters, all testifying "to the prevalent state of affairs along moral lines." One teacher from Kingston finds "more immorality and profanity, more obscene stories and pictures, more disgusting and suggestive actions among scholars in towns and cities than in the rural districts." He finds that neither rural schools nor public buildings are free from the same filth. Where is the blame to be placed or what remedy is to be applied? A Professor of McMaster University, Toronto, who spent the summer of 1909 in a lecturing tour through western Ontario concluded from the writing he saw on the walls of outhouses in connection with the schools that their moral tone was anything but elevating, and that the neglect of teachers and trustees was most culpable. What is the cure of such widespread evil? Catholic moralists have held this charge, amongst others, against the public schools from their inception. Evidence upon evidence has been forced upon their notice not only about the lack of religious training of these schools, but also concerning the immorality learned through the bad example and wickedness of evil companions. What surprises Catholic moralists is, that notwithstanding their warnings, the supporters of these public schools ridiculed them, and held that the schools were far superior in every way to the parochial schools. Now when the teachers and ministers are out, acknowledging the fault, the country pays attention. What is, we ask again, the remedy? In the case of a pest or epidemic it is always segregation. There is no use for the Catholic Record offering remedy, for it will be too Catholic. Separate your boys and girls. Get religious communities to teach the latter as well as the younger boys. Send all the children who have attained the use of reason to confession regularly. By adopting these measures a generation will grow up not knowing evil, with purity in soul and God in heart. As long as co-education endures so long are the young doubly exposed to the temptations and snares of bad companions. Unless the strings of the heart be taken when moral life is in its start, and unless the supervision extend to the interior, all external precautions are of little purpose. There is no virtue which the Catholic Church values so highly or fosters with such care as the virtue of purity. Without the sacraments her children could not nourish it and without religious teachers or without prayer our poor children would not be protected. They would be corrupted and their innocence lost before their parents would

know it. In the angelic virtue an ounce of prevention is worth a ton of cure. Although the Public schools will not accept our suggestions, they are the only ones likely to prove efficacious, and they are well intended.

## MARRIAGE CASES

As advice to the Rev. Mr. Hincks, of the Methodist Broadway Tabernacle, Toronto, we think he ought to devote one of his Sunday evenings to the celebrated Fraser case of Midland, a town on the Georgian Bay. The trial is now before three judges of our higher courts, and is fully reported in the Toronto journals. It is more than usually romantic, in that the groom is of the super-mature age of four score and something and possessed of wealth. Whether he is possessed of his wits, or was possessed of them at the time of his marriage, about two years ago, is the point to be decided. The bride or wife is only thirty-two years of age, discreet enough in other circumstances but strikingly peculiar when she was wooed and won by a man fifty years her senior. Now it would be most interesting for the Rev. Mr. Hincks to discuss this case, all the more because he holds it a crime to pronounce invalid a marriage which has been held valid. How can it be doubted? The wife is the daughter of a minister from Dundas. Her father performed the ceremony. It was no mixed marriage. No priest had a hand in it. We hope that the Prophet of Broadway Tabernacle will not confine himself to the betrothal and marriage of Catholics, or of Catholics with Protestants. The Fraser case should not be overlooked.

Here is another for the same gentleman, taken from The London Tablet of the 1st inst.:

"Those who now declaim against the Pope may well be reminded of an incident like the following, which is described in a Bill in Chancery filed October 21, 1867, for an account from which we are indebted to the kindness of Mr. John Hobson Matthews: "And in support of the objection made by said William Dolby and Mary his wife, Ann Blewitt, to the legitimacy of the Orator, they pretend that Orator's mother (formerly Mary Courcy) was born of Popish parents and educated in the Popish religion, and that she was a Papist at the time of her marriage with said Edward Blewitt, Orator's father; and that Orator's father was then a Protestant, and therefore the marriage was void by the laws of Ireland, where same was solemnized, and particularly by Stat. (Ireland) 19 Geo. IV, which enacted that from and after 1 May 1746 every marriage celebrated between a Papist and every person who hath professed himself a Protestant within twelve months before such marriage, or between two Protestants, if celebrated by a Popish priest, should be absolutely null and void, without any judgment of law whatsoever. "They therefore pretend that said Edward Blewitt was not lawfully married to your Orator's mother, and that your Orator is not the lawful son of said Edward Blewitt and hath no right to the estates."

It may be added that the estates in question were Llantarnam, the manor of Magna Porta and other extensive lands in Monmouthshire, which had descended to the Blewitts from the old Catholic family of Morgan of Llantarnam. They were saved by evidence that Edward Blewitt's marriage with Mary Courcy was solemnized in the Church of England at Kinsale, Co. Cork, in 1763.

## BISHOP EVANS AND BELLARMINI

We referred not long ago to a lengthy and peculiar sermon by Bishop Evans upon The Reformation. It was less devoted to the development of the title than to an attack upon, and vilification of, the Catholic Church. The gentleman seems to have gathered material without stint or discretion. He never paused to ask himself whether a certain quotation proved what he wished it to prove. Much less did he compare his extracts with their original sources. As long as he had a mass of material which, with a semblance of truth and a pretence of learning, he could hurl against the Church, he cared for nothing else. A congregation listening to a preacher with a purple gown, though borrowed, is not apt to question the authorities cited. We can imagine that when Bishop Evans went down from his pulpit after finishing his sermon he was perfectly satisfied with himself, whilst the people on their way home wagged their heads with the conviction of Rome's iniquity and the righteousness of Protestantism. Protestantism has always an erroneous apology for itself in the abuse of the old Church. Let us not forget Bishop Evans. We select one extract to show how unscrupulous and careless this gentleman can be when attacking Catholicism or quoting Catholic theologians. He undertakes to quote Bellarmine: "Cardinal Bellarmine says: 'If the Pope should err by enjoining vices or forbidding virtues, the Church would be obliged to believe the vices to be good and the virtues bad, unless it would sin against its own conscience.'" The Bishop refers this to Cardinal Bellarmine De Pontif. Lib. IV, Ch. 5. He did not take it from the original, but from the Rev. Strong, in "Our Country" p. 52. The great theologian Cardinal

Bellarmino never wrote such disgusting trash as that. Either Bishop Evans himself or Rev. Strong did not translate the Cardinal properly, misconstrued his sentences and distorted his argument in order to deal a blow at the Church. Malice and ignorance are weak auxiliaries. Let us see what the Cardinal really did say. We shall find it the contrary of that attributed to him by Bishop Evans. Bellarmine states his third proposition: "Not only in decrees of Faith the Supreme Pontiff cannot err but he cannot err in precepts of morals which are prescribed to the whole Church, and which, in things necessary for salvation, or in those things which per se are good or evil." Two strong precautionary conditions are here laid down: that the precepts in question are necessary for salvation and that the prescription is to the whole Church; and that the Pope cannot err in things moral which per se are good or bad. It cannot be that the Pope could err by commanding some vice, e.g., usury; or by forbidding some virtue, as restitution. That the Pope may command something which is useless and which is not per se good or bad it may be. But it does not belong to subjects to judge of the usefulness. If the Pope could err in these matters which are mentioned by Bellarmine, viz., things necessary for salvation and matters per se good or bad, a serious injury would befall the Church and the promise of our Lord would fail: "When the Spirit of truth shall come He shall teach you all truth." The truth which is necessary for salvation and which concerns things good or bad in themselves must be the least lesson of the Holy Spirit to the Church. The Cardinal's argument is a very simple and logical one, based upon the principle that the Church must be holy, and the equally irrefutable principle that we are obliged to obey the Church. So far from Bellarmine holding the damnable doctrine attributed to him by Bishop Evans, he maintains the opposite. Almighty God Himself cannot make a vice to be good or a virtue to be bad. We cannot judge whether Bishop Evans himself believed what he was saying. If he did he must be credulous. If he did not he must be malicious, because he shows himself quite prepared to belie three hundred millions of his fellowmen and that through three hundred years, the time of Cardinal Bellarmine. In either case Bishop Evans' position is untenable; for a man who is so easily gulled is a blind guide leading the blind. The Bishop should not forget that Bellarmine is only one theologian amongst thousands, so that even through this illiterate and careless Bishop's quotation happened to be correct, it would not be Catholic doctrine. It would be an opinion. But in justice to the great Cardinal Bellarmine we draw the line between his real opinion and that in which Bishop Evans has mendaciously falsified him.

## CAESAR OR CHRIST

"He must be slow of comprehension and void of imagination who cannot conceive of circumstances arising in this country, where the State should assert it to be its duty to violate whatever Protestants believe to be the moral law of God." The foregoing looks like a quotation from a Papal Encyclical, but in reality it is an extract from "Obiter Dicta," by Mr. Augustine Birrell, a non-Conformist, and Chief Secretary for Ireland. We commend it to the gentlemen who have worked themselves up to such a white heat over the Ne Temere decree on mixed marriages. A little reflection thereon would be most profitable. If they are honest, and it may be that many of them are sincere according to their lights, they must admit that it warns them against a very present danger, and they will think twice before they take on Erastianism to their strange confession of faith. We have heard much loose talk from pulpits and from the rights of the State and its jurisdiction in things spiritual. Blind prejudice against Rome is at the root of it. But if the civil power is once enthroned in the sanctuary, who can see the end? Will it be for a divided church to say: thus far but no farther? Our friends should beware of sowing the dragon's teeth. More than curses come home to roost. It may gratify their childish spleen to see the State infringe upon the liberties of the Catholic Church, but what if it should come to be their own turn some day? The Catholic Church has always to bear the first brunt of attack, because it is most obnoxious to the State, but if the civil authority can interfere with impunity with a Church that even her enemies admit is great and powerful, who will foolishly say it would fear to infringe on the rights of a smaller and weaker body? If our friends would only endeavor to see things as they are, and not as they appear to be through the distorted perspective of a heated imagination, they cannot but realize that their present road will lead them right up against a formidable stone wall, which, if they succeed in surmounting, will unhook them in the process. Recent history has demonstrated the truth of Mr. Birrell's statement. In

England the State has violated "what Protestants believe to be the moral law of God." Parliament has legalized marriage with a deceased wife's sister, although the Church regards it as unlawful. What do our indignant champions of civil authority think of that? Would they punish an English High Church minister who refused to do what the State authorized him to do? Reader to Caesar the things that are of Caesar, but to God what is His. Did you never hear it? Or was Christ, too, a reactionary?

How absurd is this theory of the rights of the State in things spiritual is amply proved by this very controversy. For if the State is the judge of the validity of the marriage bond, then, since each State has its own code of morals, and some of them very dissimilar, God must approve of all. Thus God approves of the Turkish code of morality equally with the Christian. Hence if a Bible-loving citizen of Toronto were to migrate to Constantinople he might lawfully take unto himself several wives! Take another example: The French civil law allows Frenchmen married in London to disavow their English wives on French soil. Would Rev. Mr. Hincks aid Monsieur in contracting a bigamous marriage? The Ne Temere decree is denounced as tending to break up the home. If a second wife tired of his wife he can take refuge behind the decree. Of course this is rank nonsense, but we would make bold to remind our friends that the great patron saint of civil control of marriage Henry VIII. didn't need to fall back on the decree. He preferred to see the heads of his wives fall on the block. Hatred of Rome has led to many an absurdity, but never before to anything like this. Can it be that some people would prefer Caesar to Christ if it meant siding against the Pope? A little more and we will be shouting, as on the first Good Friday, "We have no king but Caesar." "COLUMBA."

## LOW JOURNALISM

Last summer a person was arrested in England for stating that our beloved king had contracted a morganatic marriage in Gibraltar. At the trial it was found that there was no justification whatever for such a statement and the culprit is now serving out a term in prison. A report somewhat similar has been published in regard to the present king of Spain. It is said that the Queen is seeking a separation from her husband because of ill-treatment and bad conduct generally. This statement appears in a press despatch from Madrid via France published in The Guardian, Bay Roberts, Nfld. It is dated 27th Jan. As we have not seen this report in any other paper in America it would be worth while were the publisher of The Guardian to state where and how he received it. It looks very much like that fictitious literature which makes Orange publications occupy such a low grade in journalism. It may be that the manufacturer of this rumor felt he was safe from prosecution from the fact that the King of Spain would not take any notice of him. But sometimes kings do notice such things and perhaps the King of Spain would take measures to discover the author of this ridiculous canard. All accounts from Spain go to show that the King and Queen live a very happy married life and are beloved by their subjects.

## FOND OF THE LIMELIGHT

Our Methodist neighbors have become unduly perturbed because of the Ne Temere decree. Grave and learned divines of that sect have sat in solemn conclave in the Queen City and have resolved to take militant steps to stay its operation. How they can effect this will bring them some anxious hours. They threaten to have recourse to legislative bodies, but this has been tried many times without avail. Bismark went to Canossa, Dr. Carman and his brother divines will find that such will be the case also in Canada if they succeed in having placed in the statutes legislation which has for object the curtailment of the rights of God's Church to legislate for the temporal, and more especially the eternal, welfare of its members. It is lamentable to notice ministers of the gospel so coarse, so offensive, and so un-Christian in their utterances about the Catholic Church. They opened proceedings in Toronto by denouncing the Ne Temere decree, and in order to have this denouncement well spiced, Rev. Dr. Graham proclaimed it as a fact for which he can vouch that the Jesuits were directly responsible for the Franco-Prussian war, and that the dogmas of Jesuitism authorized wickedness, trickery and theft. He might also have added that they were responsible for the lateness of the spring season, Dr. Graham should remember the fate of the man who recently libelled the King, and take warning. Were any member of the Jesuit order to bring him into court on a charge of libel, his usefulness as a minister of the gospel would come to an end.

Decrees coming from the Father of Christendom are hearken! to and obeyed by every Catholic. Enactments

of the chief men of the sects are as a rule received with the utmost indifference. In matters of doctrine and discipline every member cherishes his right to private interpretation, and he may or may not give heed to the enactments of the yearly parliament of the particular church to which he belongs. He may hold, with one Methodist divine in this city, that Christ is "more than man and less than God," and yet retain his card of good membership. As to personal conduct, too, he is quite free, Methodist discipline to the contrary notwithstanding. He may attend the races, he may go to the opera house on an evening, he may play cards and he may dance, and the money he tenders for his pew and the change he places in the collection envelope will still be received. He will continue to be addressed as "brother," and get the kiss of peace. We would advise our separated friends in Toronto to leave the old church alone. It is fighting to preserve the sacred ordinance of matrimony from the pollution of modernism—to promote the sanctity of family life—and it will become men who wish to be known as Christians to seek to place obstructions in the way.

## NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE DAILY press has been giving much publicity to the celebration in Rome of the fortieth anniversary of the unification of Italy. This, it has been declared, was one of the great events of the nineteenth century, and signaled not only the birth of Italy as a nation and a world power, but the emancipation of the people from the tyranny of a clique of oligarchs and the oppression of the tax-gatherer under which for a long course of years they had lain helpless and bound.

WE HAVE NO intention of discussing here the question of Italian unity as a political measure or the effect it may ultimately have upon the fortunes of the race. That it has given Italy a place in the world's affairs, and created a new type of Italian patriotism, it would be idle to deny. But it may be said once and for all that a unity built upon spoliation and rapine has within it, ere yet the summit of the ambition of the house of Savoy has been attained, elements that can scarcely be said to make for permanence. This is a feature of "Italy's Jubilee" that has been kept carefully in the background by those who have descended so effusively upon the glories of the Revolution. To such it was nothing that the pillage of the Church and the practical imprisonment in perpetuity of the Holy Father was the price of a United Italy.

A MORE concrete proposition is the effect this revolution has had upon the finances of Italy and their bearing upon the pockets of the people. An English paper, the Southern Daily Echo of Southampton, in an article on the "Jubilee," has laid much stress upon the "reactionary spirit that pervaded the Papal States," and upon the "iniquitous taxation under which its subjects groaned." This has drawn from a correspondent of the Tablet some reflections upon the contrast afforded between then and now. "I have always," he says, "understood that taxes were very light in the Papal States and also in Tuscany, where the Grand Duke, being very wealthy, there was not a great call made on the people. If I recollect rightly, the Grand Duke kept up his army out of his own resources." This is fully in accord with the testimony of contemporary writers and it would be difficult for any theorist to go behind the mass of documentary evidence (not mere hearsay) assembled by John Francis Maguire in his book "Rome: its ruler, institutions and people." How far the dicta of the Southampton paper is true, viz., that "progress of any kind was resisted, science and mechanical invention utterly repudiated, and education deliberately checked," a perusal of Mr. Maguire's book will show. It would not be pleasant reading for theorists of the Echo school, for it constitutes an unanswerable vindication of the wisdom and beneficence of government under the administration of the Popes. And we can imagine that those who now pay so dearly for the privileges of Italian unity cast many a wistful glance back to the days that were.

As to the days that are, it is all sweetness and felicity, and unbounded prosperity that rests upon the people of Rome and of Italy, as we are asked to believe? One of the leading organs of English public opinion, The Daily Chronicle, has spoken out the truth bluntly and without thought of the consequences. In January last, with the great jubilee immediately in prospect, it had this to say upon the authority of its Florence correspondent: "Mass meetings were held in all the principal Italian cities to-day to protest against dear food and big rents, and to urge universal suffrage as a remedy. In Florence there was a procession of sixty thousand citizens through the streets. They marched with banners flying and under the auspices of the

APRIL 22  
National League  
Flery orations  
lusions were  
pathy of the  
refused hither  
lighten the cr  
people's beca  
And the cor  
"Cities of I  
Italians protes

AGAIN, COMM  
tax levied on  
property to re  
caused in Sic  
which destroy  
the Chronicle  
thus:

"Already th  
Italy is taxed  
of confiscatio  
where the fert  
harvests a year  
ample—is in th  
priors, one lea  
vulation, and o  
food. And this  
Alliance and t  
of ornaments."

Nor is this

commenting de

ancholy facts,

"Our note

Italy, and the

coast people

Mediterranean

explain the des

blood-money.

is that a

gather taxes

are these: T

The huge exp

Armaments ar

Alliance; and

quired by th

of Italy as a

good and happ

goal of pol

been one of t

dents in her

tory."

WELL MAY IT

such facts as

is a woful ju

glorious event

Globe would

does it typify

which under t

masonry, the

drag the Natio

ism.

THAT NO

the tenor of

perhaps not

many Catholi

visions. It is

considerable

not read their

are so utterly

of the Church

in a fog. It

the present t

from the whea

(however well

timation) is

knewed Catho

his feet by ev

misunderstand

He reads the

of the daily p

ified by a sou

at once falls

dismay. To

take an intere

date to these

intolerance a

The Rev.

great Doctor

are fond of

opinions on

of the Globe

some years

able for the

worship color

upon by the