

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario. Price of Subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE B. NORTHGRAVE, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels," THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey

Agents for Newfoundland, Mr. James Power of St. John.

Advertisements—Ten cents per line each insertion, advance payment.

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

When subscribers change their residence it is important that they send us the new address as well as the old.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION. Apostolic Delegation, Ottawa, June 18th, 1905.

To the Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD. London, Ont.

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.

With my blessing on your work, and best wishes for its continued success. Yours very sincerely in Christ, DONATUS, Archbishop of Ephesus, Apostolic Delegate.

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

To the Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD, London, Ont.

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.

With my blessing on your work, and best wishes for its continued success. Yours very sincerely in Christ, DONATUS, Archbishop of Ephesus, Apostolic Delegate.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAR. 3, 1906.

BRIGHT PROSPECTS FOR IRELAND.

Even those who have advanced into extreme old age cannot recall to mind a period in the history of Great Britain when the prospects for the future prosperity, the contentment and the happiness of Ireland looked so promising as at the present time.

It was not without reason that the Irish people, since the day of King Edward's accession to the throne, placed highest hopes upon his spirit of fair play, his broad-minded statesmanship, and his sincere desire to bring happiness to every class, race and creed of his broad dominions.

That Irishmen will at length be given that freedom which for centuries been denied them—that measure of freedom enjoyed by the people of every other part of the Empire—there is now abundant reason to hope.

What has for so long stood in the way of this change in the government of Ireland is called "the vested rights of the landlord," but which Mr. Gladstone more truly named "vested wrongs."

The type of the man who for generations kept the Irish people in abject misery and slavery is undoubtedly Lord Lansdowne, at one time Governor General of Canada.

When the King's speech came up for discussion in the House of Lords the same Lord Lansdowne pointed out certain dangers connected with the prospective changes in the King's speech.

It would not be unjust or uncharitable to say, considering all the circumstances, that the element of selfishness enters largely into the pronouncement of my Lord Lansdowne.

Of course Lord Lansdowne would oppose any change! This was to be expected. In the conduct of the Standard Oil Company John D. Rockefeller would likewise oppose any change.

The magnates of the Beef and Sugar trusts would oppose any change that would tend to curtail their acquirement of riches in a manner directly opposed to the lessons inculcated in the Sermon on the Mount.

There are other noble Lords, too, who would undoubtedly be very much opposed to the slightest interference with the present condition of affairs in the Emerald Isle, as there were noble lords who fought valiantly against the granting of responsible government to Canada.

If the House of Lords places itself in an attitude of hostility to the granting of Home Rule to Ireland there will be a way found to clip its wings. The following is the reference to Irish affairs in the King's speech:

"My ministers have under consideration plans for improving and effecting economies in the system of government in Ireland and for introducing into it means for associating the people with the conduct of Irish affairs. It is my desire that the government of the country in reliance upon ordinary law should be carried on, so far as existing circumstances permit, in a spirit respectful of the wishes and sentiments of the Irish people."

It seems to be taken for granted that the first instalment of Home Rule will be of very modest proportions; but a great deal will be gained if the principle is admitted. Gradually, as the English people come to a knowledge of the excellent results produced, the scope of the measure will be enlarged to something like that of the old Irish House of Parliament, the mode of the abolition of which has ever since remained as a blot upon the characters of the English statesmen of that day.

It will be unfortunate, it seems to us, if the English Parliament is given a free hand when dealing with bills that pass the Irish House. This was the bone of contention before the Act of Union, as many measures intended to promote Irish interests, and which it was feared would be detrimental to those of England, were either thrown out altogether or amended in such a way as to render them of little or no value.

This led to the agitation which prevailed at the time, the object of which was to prevent the practice of submitting Irish bills to the English Commons, and praying that they be subject only to revision by the king, lords and commons of Ireland.

In the new measure of Home Rule, which we have reason to believe will be enacted in the near future, it is to be hoped that Irish legislation will not have to pass through the English House of Commons, but will require the approval only of the Irish House of Lords and the king.

careful of the wishes and sentiments of the Irish people."

At the second Council of Macon there were present 46 Bishops and 20 authorized delegates of other Bishops.

That Council passed many wise decrees, and notwithstanding the convulsed condition of the nation, plunged into a disastrous war, it insisted strongly on the proper fulfilment of their duties by the clergy, and on the proper administration of justice by the secular judges.

From this brief statement it may be inferred that the Council was not an assemblage of ignorant fanatics, such as we would suppose them to be if we had only Professor Guerlac's account of the matter to rely on.

The authentic records of the Council in question, the second of Macon, do mention that "ONE Bishop said that woman cannot be called man: (homo) Quidam ex Episcopis dicebat; mulierem hominem non posse vocari." Mansi-Zatta edition, vol. 9.)

It is barely possible that this Bishop, being a Frank, was not a profound Latin scholar, but the whole question turned upon this matter of the meaning of a word.

It was not a question of faith but of terminology. There was no prolonged debate on the matter, and no decree or decision by the Council that, as Professor Guerlac puts it, woman is a "human being." But the historian of the Council says that, when the Bishops gave their reasons, the first mentioned Bishop was satisfied with the explanation: (Quereit.)

To state briefly the reasons given, they were:

1. That according to the old Testament God created man, male and female, and called both MAN.

2. The Lord Jesus is called the Son of Man, being the Son of a virgin, that is of a woman.

3. Other proofs were given, and the matter was dropped.

It is clear that the one Bishop who had an erroneous view of the meaning of a word was not the council, and in fact even if that local council had come to a different conclusion against the faith which had always been held, that would not have made a decision or a doctrine of the Catholic Church, as is evident from the letter of Gregory I. above referred to.

Professor Guerlac admits now that the decision of the Council was not as he announced in Montreal, but that woman is a "human being." The truth is rather grudgingly told, and the impression is left that the Council rather unwillingly granted to woman at this privilege of being part of humanity, whereas there was no question on this matter, which has always been understood as a subject of Divine Faith; and to a woman the Catholic Church has always given the highest possible place in our churches and on our altars next to Christ Himself, namely, to the Immaculate Mother of God.

The professor has apparently made his admission somewhat against the grain. He adds, however, that he only made a joking reference to the Council. We presume this is meant as an apology and as such we are willing to accept it. We must remind him, however, that it is too serious a joke to be indulged in, to attribute a ridiculous doctrinal error to "a Council of the Catholic Church."

We receive with due appreciation the professor's testimony as to the usefulness of conventional education. He adds, however, that "scholarly and free-minded lay teachers seem to me (the professor) better adapted than the most noble and self-devoted members of a religious community, to the intellectual needs of young women of our time."

With all due respect to the professor, we must say that the Catholic Church has had a more extensive and far-reaching experience than himself, and with that experience favors the teaching of members of religious communities as more likely to rear the young in morality as well as secular learning, so that they may be trained in morals as well as in secular matters. Surely, then, what seems to her to be right, is more likely to be so than what "seems to me" when these words are uttered by the professor.

The one fact which we have already mentioned, that even Protestants in great numbers recognize this by sending their children to convent schools, is sufficient to show the correctness of the church's judgment. To this we may add that in the professor's own State, namely, in New York city, the Catholic boys from the schools of the Christian Brothers have for years in succession been at the head of the list of competitors for West Point scholarships, and on many other occasions when they have through private enterprise come into competition with the pupils of the Public schools, though

the latter receive all the aid they need from the State funds.

We must here add that we could not suppose that the professor was merely joking in his reference to the "Council of the church," as we had before us only the newspaper report of his lecture, and in that the assertion he disputed was positively made.

A DISCUSSION ON THE CHURCH.

At a meeting of the Ministerial Association lately held in Hamilton, Rev. J. K. Unsworth read a paper on the contribution of the Catholic Church to the advancement of God's kingdom.

Mr. Unsworth, we are told, took a very liberal view and said, in the matter of encouraging learning as well as in the matter of democracy and the preservation of the sanctity of the marriage relations, the Catholic Church had done much for the advancement of the Kingdom of God. We are, however, told that in the discussion which followed several ministers took exception to Mr. Unsworth's views, and claimed that his presentation of the claims of the Catholic Church applied to it in the early centuries of its history, not to the present day Church.

Amongst our friends in the Protestant ministry there are to be found some gentlemen of deep thought and learning, who are at times courageous enough to say a friendly word for the Mother Church. These are men who have made a partial study of its history. It is a pity they do not go further. The deeper they delve the more the stamp of its Divine Founder will become apparent. Many a Protestant minister has been brought into the fold by studying her claims. It is a great pity, however, there are to be found so many ministers of the superficial kind. Stalwart bigotry, inherited or acquired, gives them a fear of reading Catholic works. Occasionally their sermons bristle with pert, parrot-like references to "Romanism" more becoming 12th July orations. Small claims have they for being styled ministers of the Gospel. The preaching of the Gospel is for some of them not a congenial theme. More prone they are to furnish their people Sunday after Sunday with literary chrysanthemums on current events, which have no bearing whatever on the salvation of souls.

THE SCRIPTURE IN QUEBEC.

In this issue we publish a letter having reference to the teaching of the Holy Scripture to the people of the Province of Quebec. We are glad to have an opportunity of adding some further information on this point from an Ottawa priest. It is for the special benefit of our Ontario non-Catholic friends who have been misinformed by those who desire to perpetuate the humbug styled "French Evangelization."

In 1894 an Ottawa Capuchin priest, Father Alexis, published a little book entitled "L'Evangelie, ou la vie de N. S. J. C." This book has been sold or distributed by hundreds of copies in Ottawa and Hull. It bears the approbation of the Archbishop of Ottawa, whose letter figures at the beginning of the book. "Your book," writes the archbishop, "contains the evangelical narrative; you give it completely and you reproduce the entire text of the four gospel writers; you coordinate them, relating each event in its own place and in its own time. You crown the whole work by adding to it what is essential to a prayer book; thus you have formed a first-class manual of Christian doctrine; it is worthy to be in the hands of all, and deserves an extensive and lasting circulation. I desire particularly to see it spread in the families and communities of this diocese."

In 1899 another edition of the same work was published. This second was also strongly recommended. We read these words at the beginning of the book: "I learn that, encouraged by the rapid sale of the beautiful first edition of the Gospel, you intend to publish a new one in this country, which will be accessible to all classes of the people. I sincerely desire that the parish priests and school commissioners should spread this excellent book among the families of this diocese."

It is said that the man who is his own lawyer has a fool for his client; and I think it is equally true that the man who has the sole regulation of his own spiritual interests, and recognizes no authority save his own subjective impressions, has a very foolish priest for his confessor.

The Bible has unquestionably a rightful place in the economy of human salvation, but it is the crying shame and scandal of the modern denominations of Protestants that each has found in the Bible precisely the sort of doctrine that it wanted. No doctrine was ever yet broached which was not professedly grounded upon or deduced from the Scripture; or as it has been put in verse:

"One day at least in every week The sects of every kind Their doctrines here are sure to seek And trust as sure to find."

To my mind, the man or church incurs a very grave responsibility who interferes with the faith of our Roman Catholic fellow countrymen of the French nationality. They have been brought up in that faith, pledged to it in baptism, and in many solemn ways it has entered into the fibre of their being. Why, in the name of all that is charitable, should we set them out upon

as a quest of a new religion which is never likely to have the hold upon them which the old possesses? As between ourselves and the Roman Catholic Church the points of difference have been discussed for many generations, and it is safe to presume that the issues are settled to the satisfaction of the disputants. Very often on both sides of the controversy it was extremely difficult to define what was strictly spiritual or politico-religious. Nobody with any knowledge of history would pretend to say that Henry VIII. or the Elector was moved by any interest in the cause of spiritual religion; but in their case, as in that of others, religion was a convenient stalking horse.

All this being true, would it not be better to permit the French Canadian to pursue his way undisturbed by any outside interference with his religion, which appears eminently responsive to his nature and the needs of his local environment? This I conceive would be the better way. But I would like to draw Mr. MacFaul's attention to a feature of the case which has probably escaped his notice. It has been stated over and over again, that at the present moment there is no book so little read, or to which less attention is paid in Ontario, than the Bible. To day the youth of Quebec as little about the facts of the Bible as they do about the Koran; and I assure Mr. MacFaul that I am not speaking without the fullest knowledge of that which I affirm. Further, let me illustrate the practical teaching in both provinces. On the question of obedience to parents, what do we find? Why, this: All over the province of Ontario, when the father or mother becomes aged, and a burden to themselves and others, how are they treated in this wonderful province of Ontario, which is so solicitous for the conversion of the French-Canadian? The answer is too painful, and God only knows of the fathers and mothers who have been ruthlessly kicked out of doors by their heartless offspring. Some of the cases would draw tears from a stone.

But what of Quebec? Surely Mr. MacFaul must know that the aged parents, and often grand parents, are treated with the most loving and thoughtful kindness. And here, again, I speak from what I know. Then, again, contrast the provinces in the awful crime of race suicide. I do not need to enlarge on this, but a great Authority has laid this canon down: "By their fruits ye shall know them." In Ontario, possessed of so much Bible light and knowledge, flagrantly disregards the plainest commandments of God, trusts their bibles into the ashpit, would it not be better for Mr. MacFaul to turn his energies out of Hull into Ottawa, and thence penetrate to the darkest places—which, I make no hesitation in saying, will include the city of Toronto. The school system of Ontario is without God and religion, and when you penetrate to her universities, the system has bloomed out into downright infidelity. Until we have succeeded in converting the people of Ontario it is a scandal and a shame to interfere with those whose simple lives put us to shame every day in the year. In a word—and I commend it most earnestly to Mr. MacFaul as being particularly applicable to existing conditions in Ontario—"They made me the keeper of the Vineyard; but Mine own Vineyard have I not kept." With apologies, Yours very sincerely, PHILLO. (A Protestant.)

DISGRACEFUL INVENTIONS.

We publish in this issue an article entitled "Enlightened Toronto," and addressed to the editor of the Ottawa Free Press. We ask a careful reading of the same. The extract therein printed appeared in the Presbyterian Record and the Orange Sentinel and is one of the most shameless exhibitions of insane bigotry and falsehood that could possibly be produced. No doubt there are hundreds, nay thousands, of our Protestant fellow-citizens who will be led to believe this abominable rubbish. Does the editor of the Presbyterian Record think that Catholics are idiots and that their spiritual advisers are knaves? The law against slander should most assuredly be enforced in a matter of this kind. The jail is the proper place for the man who invented these disgraceful stories about the Quebec missionaries. The editor of the Presbyterian Record has every reason to be ashamed of himself. If he is not the author he is equally guilty, by giving a place in the columns of his paper to such ridiculous nonsense. We will not say the editor of the Orange Sentinel should be ashamed of himself. Shame he knows not. The "Blue Beard" stories appearing in that paper about the Catholic Church gives it a very low place in Canadian journalism.

We deem it important to add that the graceless scamp who wrote this correspondence was very careful not to give particulars. He was evidently afraid of an indictment for criminal libel. It will be noticed that he states the mission was given "in a little country village in the Province of Quebec" by priests calling themselves the "Christian Fathers." This so-called order of priests is entirely new to us, and we have no hesitation in saying that the name is an invention.

"Unless moral training is given, whereby youth may be safe-guarded, ability to read may be a curse," says the New World. "The youth who learns to read, and by means of the printed word feeds his mind with indecent or sensational fodder, is worse off than if he had never learned to read at all."