

**The Catholic Record**

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum.  
 United States & Europe—\$2.00  
 Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.  
 (Rev. James T. Foley, B.A.,  
 Editors) [Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.]

Associate Editors (Rev. D. A. Casey,  
 H. F. Mackintosh,  
 Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted,  
 etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.

Approved and recommended by Archbishops  
 Falconio and Sbarretti, late Apostolic Delegates to  
 Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston,  
 Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London,  
 Hamilton, Peterborough, and Ogdensburg, N. Y.,  
 Messrs. J. J. Neven, E. J. Broderick, M. J. Hagarty,  
 J. Ray Chaney, D. J. Murray, Mrs. W. E. Smith, Miss  
 Sara Hanley, Miss L. Heisinger and Miss Bride  
 Saunders are authorized to receive subscriptions  
 and transact all other business for THE CATHOLIC  
 RECORD.

Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted  
 except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion  
 50 cents.

Subscribers changing residence will please give  
 old as well as new address.  
 In St. John N. B., single copies may be purchased  
 from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 249 Main Street, John J.  
 Dwyer and The O'Neill Co., Pharmacy, 109 Brussels  
 Street.  
 Montreal single copies may be purchased from  
 Mr. E. O'Grady Newsdealer, 106 St. Viateur street  
 west, and J. Milloy, 24 St. Catherine street, west.

LONDON, SATURDAY, AUGUST 8, 1914

**MAKING HISTORY**

Perhaps there was never a period in the history of England more interesting, or involving more momentous issues than the present. Ulster and Home Rule itself are but incidents in the great struggle of the people to free themselves from the domination of class and wealth and privilege. Britain as well as Ireland is in the birth-throes of a new order. Often as this has been said it is difficult at this distance to realize that it is anything more than a particularly bitter and desperate phase of party strife. But it is infinitely more. To realize how much is involved it is necessary to glance at the history and evolution of English aristocratic and plutocratic government now passing into the hands of the people.

The Magna Charta was not the beginning of the struggle for democratic freedom. It was the assertion and recognition of liberties even then referred to as ancient, but which were often infringed upon and as often resolutely asserted. After the demoralizing effects of the wars of the Roses Tudor sovereigns were able to make Parliament the subservient creature of their will. Of the Long Parliament in the reign of Henry VIII, called also the Reformation Parliament, Dr. Gairdner says:

"This Parliament was simply filled with the King's nominees. The writs of the different constituencies went out, each accompanied with a private letter from some of the Council to the returning officer naming the persons whom they were to elect, and the result was manifest in the composition of the House of Commons as soon as it assembled. For, as a well-informed writer of the next generation had ascertained, 'where in times past the Common House was usually furnished with brave and discreet townsmen, apparessed in comely and sage-furred gowns, now might you have seen in this Parliament few others than roystering courtiers, serving-men, parasites and flatterers of all sorts, lightly apparessed in short cloaks and swords, and as lightly furnished either with learning or honesty; so that when anything was moved against the spirituality or the liberty of the Church, to that they hearkened diligently, giving straight their assents in anything the King would require.'"

And elsewhere, after stating that the main work of this "Reformation Parliament" was entirely dictated by the King himself, he says:

"Subserviency to this extent is not what we look for in an English House of Commons. Perhaps the historical student, however, may have greater difficulty in realizing the subserviency of the House of Lords in an age when the Commons were only a growing power. But the independence of the Lords had been lost almost from the accession of the House of Tudor."

Henry had at his disposal not only the practically unlimited power of "a very able despot" to punish ruthlessly but also to reward handsomely.

Cromwell's revolution curbed the power of the King but by no means transferred it to the people. "The efforts of the Tudor sovereigns," says Professor Green, "to establish a court party in the House by profuse creation of boroughs, most of which were mere villages in the hands of the Crown, had ended in the appropriation of these seats by the neighboring land-owners, who bought and sold them as they sold their own estates. Even in towns which had a real claim to representation, the narrowing of municipal privileges ever since the fourteenth century to a small part of the inhabitants, and in many cases the restriction of electoral rights to the members of the governing corpora-

tion, rendered their representation a mere name. Some were the King's boroughs, others obediently returned nominees of the Ministry of the day, others were 'close boroughs' in the hands of jobbers like the Duke of Newcastle, who at one time returned a third of all the borough members in the House. The counties and the great commercial towns could alone be said to exercise any real right of suffrage, though the enormous expense of contesting such constituencies practically left their representation in the hands of the great local families. But even in the counties the suffrage was ridiculously limited and unequal. Out of a population, in fact, of eight millions of English people only a hundred and sixty thousand were electors at all."

That is the picture two hundred years after the Reformation, and a hundred years after Cromwell. The great Reform Bill of 1832 was a great reform only if we bear in mind preceding conditions. The ruling oligarchy fought it as desperately as their political successors and heirs are fighting to-day. In 1867 another great step was made in the direction of popular self-government. But while class and privilege and wealth were securely entrenched behind the impregnable and unassailable hereditary House of Lords popular self-government was limited to what the oligarchy deemed prudent to concede.

Nothing that has happened in centuries is comparable in its far-reaching consequences to the assault on this hitherto impregnable and unassailable stronghold. The very citadel of the old order passed by the Parliament Act into the hands of the representatives of the people. But their tenure is precarious and uncertain. It may be recaptured by the aristocracy. It would be modified even by them, but so as still to prove an effective barrier for some generations to come to the rising tide of democracy.

That is the meaning of the struggle that is now going on. Home Rule is inextricably woven into the very warp and woof of the politics of the democratic party. To Home Rulers they owe the ground gained in the past century. But apart from gratitude, they realize that the defeat of Home Rule involves the defeat of democracy. To the reactionaries Irish self-government is but a pawn in the game. They would grant a larger measure tomorrow if by so doing they could advance a single step toward the real object of their desperate and unscrupulous struggle to save what they may of their old class privileges and age-long pre-eminence in the control of public affairs.

The prejudice which dates British free liberties from the Reformation is grotesquely ignorant. What did arise at that date was the undue power of the new nobility enriched with the spoils of the Church. It was they who financed the industrial revolution out of which has grown the monster of modern capitalism with its concomitant degradation of labor. "The great issue was joined," says Lindsey Crawford describing a recent historic debate,—"Peers, Privilege, Church, Army, Landlordism arrayed against Democracy. There was no concealing the joy of the die-hards as the real object of the Opposition, of the Carson campaign in Ulster, of all the attacks on the Government, was revealed in all its brazen nudity."

**BLOODSHED IN IRELAND—WAR IN EUROPE**

The thrill of horror with which the world heard of the brutal massacre by armed soldiers of women and children in the streets of Dublin had scarcely found expression when the horizon was darkened by the impending catastrophe of a general European war. This new development of the Irish question on which the attention of the world was hitherto focussed will naturally be overshadowed by the portentous events which threaten not alone the peace but the very civilization of Europe. And yet the situation in Ireland doubtless had its grave influence in determining the question of European peace or war; and the reckless and intolerant policy of Unionist England which found its fitting, even if accidental, culmination in the Dublin tragedy may have its serious effect on the outcome of the Titanic struggle.

Throughout the time that Ulster with the open approval and active encouragement of Unionist England was arming with the avowed purpose of rebellion against lawfully constituted and constitutional authority, throughout all this time

the Irish people exercised a self-control that compelled the admiration of English men, and maintained an attitude of calm and dignified confidence in the ability and willingness of the Crown to enforce respect for lawful authority and assert the majesty of the law. Only when they saw an exceptionally powerful British Government apparently overawed by Ulster's armed force, did they too show their determination, stern and unflinching, to meet, if need be, with force. Gun-running had been condoned not only by the desperate political gamesters who looked upon the Irish question as a mere pawn in their political game, but by the Government and the War office which calmly looked on while the arms and ammunition imported in defiance of the Government embargo were openly used in parades and military manoeuvres by the prospective Ulster rebels. No attempt was made to seize these arms. Almost at the very moment that an irresponsible official in Dublin ordered out a regiment of soldiers with loaded rifles to disarm the Nationalist Volunteers, the Ulster Volunteers were defiantly parading with smuggled rifles under the eyes of General Macready. Then came the crowning brutality that would put to shame a regiment of Cossacks in Russia. The Irish men with rifles, but without ammunition, had successfully eluded the military, but their wives and sisters and children should not flout these soldiers of the King. Russian soldiers have fired on unarmed men, but even Russian soldiers do not shoot down women and children.

The demoralizing effects of the ascendancy spirit are well illustrated by an editorial in the Toronto Telegram. It gloats over the dastardly massacre; "the borderers maintained the tradition of British soldiers; they did not run." The tradition of British soldiers is the history of the Irish soldier. The Irish did not run in South Africa; but there were other British soldiers who "unfortunately mistook their orders." The military history of England has been largely written by the Irish Catholic soldier. This the Iron Duke of Wellington, no mean authority, has left on record. The habit of hypocritically pretending to reconcile the great principles of liberty and equality with the practice of narrow intolerance and ascendancy has sapped the very manhood of the ascendancy class in Ireland and their cowardly imitators and apologists here.

There can be no doubt of the immediate deplorable effect of the Dublin tragedy on the high-spirited and martial people of Ireland. We can, however, hope that the effect will be but transient.

The Prime Minister has touched the sore spot of Irish administration that makes it possible for unsympathetic and intolerant alien officials to vent their party spirit and party spite by odious discrimination in the government of Ireland. Said Asquith in the House of Commons:

"I confess that I look upon the matter of importation of arms as of minor importance. What is far more important is the general attitude of the Government and Opposition to the maintenance of the authority of the law. That is where the real crux of the question comes in. Our difficulties, I agree, in governing Ireland under existing conditions are very great. They are due partly and as I believe mainly to the inherent viciousness of the system under which you seek to govern a people whom you do not understand by a Parliament which is imperfectly equipped to deal with their special problems and necessities."

It must be remembered that the Irish government is distinct from the British Government. Ireland is governed largely by irresponsible Boards. The Lord Lieutenant has greater powers than the Prime Minister. What Chief Secretary Birrell calls the "astonishing lack of discretion" of Deputy Commissioner Harrell and the flagrant partisanship of Commissioner Ross, illustrate once more why Castle rule, even under the loose control of a friendly British Parliament, is distasteful and intolerable to the Irish people.

It is "the inherent viciousness of the system" that makes the government of Ireland's law abiding people a difficulty; a difficulty that would become an impossibility were it not "soon to be removed." Asquith continued:

"That difficulty, of long standing, if we hope, soon to be removed. That difficulty in these later years has been immeasurably enhanced and exaggerated by the language and attitude of the Opposition, those who claim that violation of the law is a cardinal virtue, but are yet perpetu-

ally claiming a better title than ourselves to govern the country and empire. It is there that one of the roots of our difficulties in Ireland lies."

John Redmond in demanding an inquiry drove home some truths that will touch a responsive chord in the heart of the great and sympathetic democracy of Great Britain:

"Mr. Redmond compared 'this monstrous business' with the parades of armed volunteers in Belfast. 'To such a state of impotence has the British Government been reduced in Ireland,' he said, 'that a subordinate official is able to call in soldiers without consulting the executive of the country.'"

"He expressed the hope that the Irish people would not blame the troops too much, and concluded amid great cheers: 'Four-fifths of the Irish people will not submit any longer to be bullied and punished for conduct which is allowed to go scot free in Ulster by another section of their fellow countrymen.'"

That reckless partisan strife should not only have prevented a statesmanlike settlement of the Irish question, but engendered distrust and racial bitterness within the United Kingdom at the very moment when without untold dangers threatened, will be the task of the future historian to record. May he also have to write down that the indignant patriotism of the people forced an arrogant and decadent aristocracy to a belated effort to conciliate the race that fought and won so many of the historic battles of the past. At any rate before the menace of European war the voice of intolerance provocation will now, let us hope, be hushed. And let us hope, also, that the Irish people in their indignant grief for their slaughtered women and children, and in the ranking sense of injustice with which they see Belfast stand out in such odious contrast with Dublin, will not forget that democratic England, the England of the future, is with them heart and soul in their unconquerable cause; that cause whose triumph will not only redress age-long grievances and satisfy unquenchable national aspirations; but will, also, knit together the peoples of the two islands in such an intimate union that in such trying and uncertain times as the present Saxon and Celt with common interest and common determination will make good the poet's patriotic boast:

"Come the three corners of the world in arms,  
 And we shall shock them."

**ONE ON THE GRIM BRETHREN**

The Manchester Guardian tells this story:

A gunboat arrived in Belfast Lough not long ago. The nearest Ulster Volunteers heliographed a message to her commander on a Sunday morning, asking if any men were coming ashore to Church, as, if so, they wanted to form a guard of honor. The commander signalled back that fifty men were going ashore to Church. The guard of honor was formed and lined up to receive the men as they came ashore. And then it turned out that the whole fifty were going to Mass. The guard of honor disbanded at once.

If the deadly earnest grimness did not relax on that occasion we accept the fact as good and sufficient proof that the "Scotch" Irish are not yet extinct.

**HOW PORTUGAL TREATS THE PRESS**

"I have been anxious during the last three years to learn what was happening in Portugal, and I wanted to get Conservative as well as Republican views. With that object I subscribed to one Royalist paper after another, I marvelled at their rapid increase in size and quality. Then one after another, they suddenly disappeared. The government had wiped them out of existence. Its principal, in fact its only, charge against them was that they unsettled the minds of the people. But, as a matter of fact, they were suppressed because, without using violent language, they bent the government organs in argument, they contrasted the promises with the performance of their opponents; they exposed the wholesale speculation and corruption of the new regime."

Another reason for their suppression was this: they kept the outside world informed of the true state of things in Portugal. I was myself indebted to them for much valuable information, and, after their suppression, I continued to correspond with members of their staff who remained in Portugal. But our letters were opened, presumably, and my correspondents were in all cases banished from Portugal. The republic did not want any publicity. It wished the country to be hermetical. I scaled so far as independent news was concerned. The only news which was allowed to get out was that which appeared in the optimistic, utterly untrustworthy semi-official press."

Thus writes Francis McCullagh in The Dublin Review for April.

Before the revolution there were a great many conservative newspapers in Portugal, some of them very valuable commercial properties. At present there remains but one little Conservative organ and it is periodically harassed by fines, suppressions and censorial delays. The method adopted in driving out the Conservative organs is simplicity itself. A gang of Republican hoodlums appeared on the scene, "sacked the editorial offices, wrecked the printing works, threw the type into the gutter and smashed the machinery." The editor on appealing for police protection found himself lodged in gaol. The Civil Governor advised the owners to cease publication as they were exciting the anger of the "patriots." Finally a decree was issued suppressing the paper.

English, French, German and Italian journalists resident in Portugal who send out true accounts of doings in Portugal are not wanted, and the Republic is giving them the alternative of writing only what is acceptable to Dr. Afonso Costa, or leaving the country.

**LLOYD GEORGE AND THE LAND QUESTION**

"There is more land in this country capable of cultivation, and yet not cultivated, than in any country in Europe, except perhaps Russia. . . . We have land in Wales windridden and rainswept. You cannot grow anything there. No cattle can live. But in the old days in those areas, hundreds of feet above the level of the sea, we kept a population that held the Normans at bay for two centuries, and the highlands grew men that very nearly conquered England and put their own king on the throne. A rugged lot of muscular men were bred in those valleys. They gave us the best regiments. They did more to arrest the might of Napoleon, the greatest warrior the world had ever seen. And these men from the glens who did it have been swept away, their crops destroyed, the whole place trodden with deer."

Thus spoke Lloyd George in the course of his speech at Swinton last fall, the second on the land question of England.

"We want to repopulate these glens," he went on, "and you can do it by reforestation hillsides, protecting glens, getting back the population, who will have winter employment looking after the forests and summer employment in cultivating the valleys."

Referring to the transportation facilities of England, Lloyd George contrasted them with conditions in Belgium. In the great manufacturing town of Liege, out of forty thousand workmen, ten thousand live in the country. They do it because they have cheap transit that takes them into the country. How do they get that? They have nationalized the railways. They have not allowed great monopolies to strangle towns. The result is they are able to get the most extraordinary fares. In Belgium you have thirty miles of railway for every twenty miles here; they have twenty-three miles of light railway for every one-third of a mile here; and they have seventy miles of tramway for every mile you have here. In Belgium a workman can travel six miles each way every day for a shilling a week; he can travel twelve and a half miles every day for 1s. 2d. a week; he can travel twenty five miles for 1s. 7d.; and if he likes to live sixty-two miles from his work he can do it for 2s. 6d. a week.

The problem Lloyd George has set himself of revolutionizing conditions in England and of restoring to the mass of the peasantry their legitimate place in the life of the nation, is one that might well daunt a less fearless statesman. And yet the principles of political economy and philosophy on which the great Welsh reformer bases his plea for the great mass of the English people in nowise clash with the principles laid down in the great letters of Leo XIII. on the Labor Question and Christian Democracy.

In the days when the voice of the Church of God was heard in England the laborer was a freeholder on the land; he had his commons; there he could graze a cow and grow corn, and

his title was as ancient as that of the lord of the manor. But the voice of the Church was stilled and Landlord Parliaments enclosed Nabob's vineyard and the laborer was thrust out of the commons his father owned. Lloyd George conceives it his mission to restore the comfort and contentment and plenty of the days when England was known as "Merrie England."

**THEORY AND PRACTICE**

Whilst the orthodox Ulster Orangemen were protesting against Roman supremacy and mouthing their ancient hypocrisy about "equal rights" on the recent Twelfth, the Rev. W. J. Calvin was delivering a remarkable sermon to a large congregation of the Independent Loyal Orange Institution in the Exhibition Hall, Belfast. The unpardonable sin in Belfast, he said, was that for the sake of earning a weekly wage the ordinary workman was not allowed to think or speak his own thought; he must think and speak as an unscrupulous employer or a conscienceless foreman directed. "If we don't stand and fight against this practice," said the preacher, "we will lose the strongest plank of our Protestant faith. No one seriously questions the fact that we have lost the right of free speech in Ulster for three years. If you wear a certain label you can go anywhere, talk on any subject, use the most insulting language about your opponents, without risk of molestation. But, if you do not wear the badge, then to speak your mind is to court insult, persecution, and boycott. Clergymen are silent simply to save their people an experience as trying and cruel as that which Daniel went through."

The opponents of Irish self-government, deficient in logic and bankrupt in argument, parade the bogey of Catholic intolerance to stampede the British electorate and overawe the Cabinet. The liberty won at the Boyne will be filched from Protestant Ulster under an Irish Parliament. No man who does not bend the knee to Rome dare call his soul his own when the representatives of Catholic Ireland make laws for the people of Ireland in College Green. If, by any stretch of the imagination, it were possible to imagine the most tolerant people under the sun being suddenly transformed into very demons of intolerance, it would take them long years to reduce the persecution of opponents to the fine art of the Ulster Covenanters. Let us for the thousandth time affirm what has been asserted by divers impartial witnesses other than the Rev. W. J. Calvin, that the only people in Ireland who will not concede to others the same liberty they claim for themselves are the Orangemen. Not to see eye to eye with the brethren is, in Mr. Calvin's expressive language, "the unpardonable sin" in the Orange temple of liberty.

Does this pretended fear of Catholic intolerance spring from an accusing conscience? Do these people really fear that a Catholic Parliament will mete out to them their own measure? Or is it not the explanation of their frenzied opposition to Home Rule rather explained by this other portion of Mr. Calvin's address: "If only the teaching of Christ were applied the whole scene would be immediately changed. Man would not treat each other as they do if they only believed what Christ taught. If Christ's teaching were operative no man could pile up a large fortune whilst he paid workmen, with families depending upon them, from 14 to 16 shillings weekly." Home Rulers have been taunted because the business men are not on their side. Mr. Calvin has supplied the answer. The Belfast captains of industry are playing a shrewd game. They have lined up the poor deluded workers to fight an imaginary enemy, the better to withdraw their attention from the real evil that menaces them, namely, the unjust and inhuman conditions under which they are forced to live. So long as the Orange workmen blindly answer the whip of the bosses, so long will these same bosses condemn them to work for a starvation wage, and to live under conditions that reduce them to the level of beasts of burden. When once they realize that this cry of Catholic intolerance is a fraud and a sham they will band themselves together, not to war upon their fellow workmen, but upon the cruel taskmasters who have long used them for their own selfish ends. All Ireland needs Home Rule, but the Belfast Orangeman most of all.

**NOTES AND COMMENTS**

WE REFERRED casually last week to a tale communicated to the Canadian Churchman by the Rev. Dr. Griffith Thomas of Wycliffe College, Toronto, to the effect that only the vigilance of the police had prevented a massacre of inoffending Christian Endeavorers in Barcelona, Spain, in May last. The story was too ridiculous on the face of it to call for serious refutation, and we referred to it merely as evidence of the illimitable credulity, or malice, or both, of the Wycliffe professor. The reference to Portugal was one of those curious slips from which none of us are wholly exempt.

It so happens, however, that the latest mail from Europe unceremoniously disturbs this mare's nest. It originated (as do so many of these idle tales intended to arouse ignorant prejudice against Catholics) in the columns of a Methodist paper, the Recorder. A Barcelona correspondent to whom the matter had been communicated from England, proceeded to investigate. So sure such gathering, it appears, was held in that city in May, under the name "Evangelical Congress," but, as we are assured, 90 per cent. of the inhabitants had no knowledge whatever of the fact. The authorities, however, were apprised of it, and, as the customary precaution against disorder of any kind, sent the usual detachment of police to the place of meeting. No meeting, political or otherwise, takes place in that country (or, for that matter, in any country) without such supervision, but to the disordered imagination of one of the delegates to the Congress, the presence of a policeman unfolded the "terrible plot" which through the columns of the English Methodist Recorder has played such havoc with the sanity of Dr. Griffith Thomas. There was absolutely no other foundation for the senseless canard.

THE CANADIAN Churchman thinks it "exceedingly unfortunate" that most Anglicans are in the habit of speaking of Catholics as Catholics, not as "Roman Catholics," and proceeds to read its subscribers a very homely lecture on the essential identity of the terms "Protestant" and "Catholic." This need surprise no one acquainted with Anglican ways, or with even a moderate knowledge of the history of the Church of England. It began by profanely damning (see the Thirty Nine Articles) every primitive Catholic practice and putting out of court the hitherto unbroken traditions of the Christian Church. The old Faith was thrown away, lock, stock and barrel, and replaced by a new creed of purely human invention, which has swaggered through three centuries under the treasured name of Protestant. Then, when the uncovering of the past vindicated the attribute "Catholic" as essential to apostolic Christianity, a certain school of Anglican divines, realizing their own isolation, and, ostrich-like, mistaking the shadow for the substance, proceeded to appropriate the title Catholic, and now, judging from the Canadian Churchman, they lay claim to it as almost exclusively theirs. That to impress this upon the ordinary, hard headed man of the world, they have a huge task ahead, is but to state the self-evident. The pretence, however, accentuates the necessity of Catholics adhering unequivocally and always to their birthright.

PREACHING RECENTLY in Wales, Mgr. Bickerstaffe-Drew, better known, perhaps, as "John Ayscough," the writer of several of the most notable novels of the generation, made some opportune reflections upon the distinction to be drawn between the essentials and the accidents of worship which have a bearing upon what has just been said. Mgr. Bickerstaffe-Drew said that the Holy Eucharist was the sign of spiritual life, and the test and criterion of all Christ's followers. Those who were opposed to it were, like the Jews of old, striving among themselves and it was this which lay at the bottom of much of the unbelief of the present day. In England and Wales during these later generations there was a growing desire for the Holy Eucharist, a desire so great and so strong that those who felt it seemed to be possessed with envy for the mere trappings and externals—vestments, incense, and candles—and, having no difficulty in buying these, appeared to think they were in possession of the real thing which they had lost.

COLUMBA