

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum.
United States & Europe—\$2.00
Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.
Editor, Rev. James T. Foley, R. A.
Associate Editor, Rev. D. A. Casey.
Associate Editor, J. F. Mackintosh.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., so cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.
Approved and recommended by Archbishops of Canada, 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.
Messrs. J. J. Neven, E. J. Broderick, M. J. Haggarty, J. Ray Clancy, J. Murray, Mrs. W. E. Smith, Miss Mary Hanley, Miss L. Heinger and Miss Bridget Haggarty 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 25 cents.
Subscribers changing residence will please give old as well as new address.
In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mr. W. A. McNamee, 240 Main Street, John J. Dwyer and The O'Neill Co. Pharmacy, 109 Brussels Street.
In Montreal single copies may be purchased from Mr. E. O'Gady, Newsdealer, 106 St. Viateur street west, and J. Milloy, 24 St. Catherine street, west.

LONDON, SATURDAY, AUGUST 1, 1914

PARENTAL RIGHTS AND DUTIES

It is refreshing to find in a convention of school-teachers recognition of parental rights and refusal to assume parental duties. The National Education Association of America to which we have already referred discussed as a matter of course the inevitable subject of sex-hygiene. What a term it is! Hygiene is defined as a system of principles or rules designed for the promotion of health. Sex hygiene, therefore, concerns itself about health, not about morality. Christian modesty in that case has no right to protest. Though religion is excluded from state schools, the health of its citizens is a matter that falls within the province of the state. Hygiene had already a place on the public school curriculum; by coining a new compound word the ever-watchful opponents of religion in the schools would open the door to the insidious teaching of a morality whose ultimate standards must be fixed by the state and interpreted by the state teacher.

It is a hopeful sign of a sane and Christian reaction against the hideous proposal to find teacher after teacher denouncing sex-hygiene as a class subject. And still more encouraging to read that such denunciation was greeted with ringing applause.

"We should have but the strongest condemnation for the wealthy, club-going woman who has not time to teach her child the fundamental truths of life and would throw the responsibility upon a teacher or a football coach," shouted Dr. Charles H. Keene, of Minneapolis, supervisor of hygiene and physical training. "Such a shiftless and outrageous!"

When the tumultuous cheering had subsided, he went on:

"Sex instruction placed on the same plane with spelling and arithmetic will rob it of all its sacredness."

"If we take up sex hygiene in our schools, the homes of America will continue to lose ground, and will give up the few privileges they now have to train the children."

Evidently Dr. Keene and his cheering audience had a glimmering of that truth which the wise old Church of nineteen centuries emphasizes. Morality must be based on religion. There is no other means of giving to sex instruction the element of sacredness.

Another truth they seem to have grasped also. This subject of sex-hygiene has been loudly, ignorantly and shamelessly discussed, not by the healthy mothers of healthy and moral boys and girls, but by the shiftless and selfish and sensual "club-going women" too busy about social uplift and woman's rights to serve society by fulfilling woman's duties.

Best of all is the recognition by school teachers of the opportunities and privileges, the rights and the duties of "the homes of America" as opposed to the state-worshippers' extravagant claims for the schools in the matter of training the children. The home is God's school system. There are learned those vital lessons which far outweigh anything learned in schools. On the family, not on the individual, Christian civilization rests. "It is not an ideal condition when the home surrenders easily to the school its God-given rights and duties. Dr. Keene says:

"If we take up sex hygiene in our schools, the homes of America will continue to lose ground, and will give up the few privileges they now have to train the children."

More deeply significant than the occasion and the subject which called them forth are these remarks. Both in matter and form they emphasize the necessity of insistence on parental rights in the matter of edu-

cation. The home, the school, and the Church must be co-ordinated, must work in harmony and mutual help. To speak of the sacred home rights and duties as privileges fast disappearing, and to acknowledge that the home is losing ground is to indicate a serious condition of things. However it is hopeful and encouraging to find attention drawn to this serious condition by the representatives of the teachers of America. Hopeful and encouraging, also, are the sanity and sobriety of the Education Association with regard to the shameful agitation which at one time threatened to stampede press and public in favor of the paganism of sex hygiene. The unanimous and strenuous opposition of the Catholic Church has had no small share in defeating this determined assault on Christian modesty and Christian decency.

True, amongst those who are deprived of the holy influence of the sacred tribunal of the confessional in the matter of conserving personal purity and imparting instruction when necessary, there may be those who honestly believe that such a class subject as sex-hygiene might be useful. For them we can have only sympathy; but apart from religion altogether, scientific opinion condemns sex-instruction in the schools as certain to defeat the very object intended by those who honestly advocate it.

Dr. Lezynsky, an eminent neurologist of New York, in an address delivered before different medical societies of that city, and finally published in the Medical Journal, warns his brother physicians that the instruction even of adults on such matters "should be undertaken only in the most tactful and discriminating manner;" and still speaking of adults he says: "more knowledge on the subject of sex than is required tends to a morbidity of imagination."

Then he adds:

"In the case of children, however, individualization is absolutely essential as a precautionary measure against psychosexual curiosity and its baneful results. Hence, such teaching is impracticable and inexpedient in the public class-room, and cannot be safely relegated to pedagogical routine. Furthermore, the imparting of such knowledge to children should be the prerogative of instructed parents whenever possible."

A QUESTION OF LOGIC

"The Roman Catholic Church has been fighting so bitterly and desperately against the acceptance of Nathan as Italy's representative at the Panama Exhibition that many Protestants have wondered what Nathan said or done to provoke all this fury."—The Christian Guardian.

The wild exaggeration of the American Catholic protest is characteristic; characteristic also is the ignorance, real or pretended, of Nathan's record which makes his appointment as official representative of Italy distasteful to Catholics. It is amusing but it is also instructive. It illustrates a type of Canadian Protestantism. Not the best type, but still one that is real. To the warped vision of these short-sighted Christians any one who is anti-papal is a hero. Ferrer, Viviani, Nathan and their congeners are sure to find admirers and defenders among them. They are forthwith placed on the unofficial Protestant calendar of saints. We doubt very much if even Nathan's friend, Podrecca, publisher of the foulest paper on earth, could escape their admiring adulation. For Podrecca is the bitterest anti-papist of them all as well as the filthiest journalist alive.

As Mayor of Rome Nathan in express and gross contravention of the Law of Guarantees repeatedly insulted and vilified the Pope. The Holy Father two years ago pointedly referred to the then mayor's notorious twelfth of September diatribe. Nathan in his rejoinder declared that if he overstepped his duty as Syndic the people of Rome were his judges. The people of Rome have since then passed that judgment to which the braggart mayor appealed. Though the party opposing Nathan and his bloc were triumphantly elected there is a provision by which the defeated minority secures one-fifth of the municipal representation. Nathan was so far down amongst the alorans of the motley anti-clericals that even this provision failed to save him from ignominious rejection as a representative in any capacity in the municipality of Rome. This election took place after Nathan had received the Panama appointment.

Nathan is a Jew of English birth. No Catholic objects to him as such.

Solely on his record is he declared *persona non grata* to Catholics. The American Israelite has intelligence enough to understand and sufficient regard for the amenities of civilization to respect the Catholic protest against Nathan; it does not hesitate to admit that the sending of Nathan was indiscreet. The Israelite evidently does not share the bewilderment of the Guardian on this question.

Pacific coast journals not obfuscated by medieval superstition but enjoying the clear vision of Protestant America are also speaking out plainly. Among them *Town Talk* after telling of Nathan's rejection by Rome goes on to say:

"Nathan has disgusted Catholics by his systematic and coarse assaults on the Vatican. His intimate friend is the editor of the *Asino*. . . . The *Asino* has the distinction of being the foulest paper published in the world. . . . Now the *Asino* is the fiercest of all anti-clerical papers. . . . Shortly after his election to office Nathan announced that the exterior of the churches of Rome belonged to the municipality, and that they might therefore be let out for advertising purposes. In a few days the exteriors of some of the finest churches were bedaubed with showy and glaring theatrical posters, representing nude, or semi-nude ladies drinking champagne. It was this sort of vandalism that caused the name of Nathan to be execrated throughout Italy, and that brought upon the vulgar Syndic the censures of the leading newspapers of Europe."

The Guardian, then, does not speak for all, or even for many Protestants when it "wonders what Nathan has done or said." Most Protestants are better informed.

In the light of the "vulgar syndic's" coarse and scurrilous attacks on the Pope and Catholicity he had the effrontery to say in a recent speech:

"I am not an enemy of religion. I am not fighting anything sacred to any man, but I have fought, and will fight to the best of my ability sham religions which are political organizations."

It should not require a course of logic to see that the Catholic Union and Times fittingly characterized this as "Nathan's crowning insult." The Guardian's logic, however, leads it to infer that Nathan could never have said anything very offensive if this is the "crowning insult!"

"We may be pardoned if we fail to see why a Protestant Government should notice such things. But the RECORD gives an instance where the Italian Government objected to receiving the United States Minister to Italy, a Mr. Keiley, because he had sharply criticised the Italian Government for taking Rome. And so, because the Italian Government objected to receiving an American Minister one who had criticized it sharply, our Roman Catholic friends think the United States ought not to receive the Italian representative because, forsooth, he criticized the Pope. Such logic is beyond our comprehension, unless our Roman Catholic friends deem that any criticism of the Pope of Rome is criticism of the United States Government, which, we think, United States citizens will be slow to admit."

"Such logic" as the above is beyond our comprehension also. But "such logic" is not ours. "A Protestant Government" is very good; quite logical, too, when you understand the Guardian's logic.

The case for the Catholic protest is this: Nathan's offensive record makes him *persona non grata* to 16,000,000 of Americans. The Government of the United States represents these millions, and would be simply stating a fact if it intimated through the ordinary diplomatic channels that Nathan's appointment is distasteful to the largest religious body in America. That we assume is the object which the American Catholic press has in view when voicing the feeling of Catholic Americans in the premises. The responsibility of acting or refusing to act rests entirely on the government. That is a matter of discretion, political wisdom, good taste, what you will. Whether or not the government of the United States sees fit to heed the protest, Catholics are surely within their right as free American citizens in making the protest. They haven't yet discovered that their Government is a "Protestant Government." They cling to the old superstition that in America all men are free and equal, and that the Government of their country is neither Protestant nor Catholic nor agnostic, but representative of the people.

Now a word with regard to the Guardian's charge that the RECORD "characterizes Protestants and their faith" in offensive terms. Will the Christian Guardian be good enough to specify a single article that would justify such a charge?

A QUESTION OF VERACITY

Several weeks ago we received a copy of the Berlin Telegraph containing a report of the Library Board proceedings.

We at once wrote the Rev. J. W. J. Andrew the following letter:

London, Ont., June 17, 1914
The Rev. Mr. Andrew,
Berlin, Ont.

Dear Sir—The Daily Telegraph (Berlin) reporting the proceedings of the Library Board attributes to you this statement: "He had taken extracts from THE CATHOLIC RECORD which hit Protestants as hard as any thing The Sentinel has published regarding Catholics."

Would you kindly indicate any of our articles that you consider offensive and inform us in what number or numbers of the RECORD such statements appeared?

Sincerely yours,
(Sd.) J. T. FOLEY, pt.

The Rev. gentleman who was so reckless in his charges has not vouchsafed a reply. Before the Library Board he stated that "he had taken extracts from THE CATHOLIC RECORD" which justified his charge. Now it appears to be not incompatible with the Rev. Mr. Andrew's code of ethics to refuse to notice a courteous inquiry from us to specify such extracts. We have often been complimented by Protestants, even by Protestant clergymen, on the tone of the CATHOLIC RECORD which they admit is distinctively and often aggressively Catholic without being offensive to Protestants. The acknowledgment is gratifying as such has been our constant aim. We should also be grateful if it were pointed out to us that at any time we had failed in our endeavor to be fair and courteous even, when most aggressive. A general charge such as the Rev. Mr. Andrew made should be susceptible of proof. If made in anger or ignorance and found incapable of substantiation it should be withdrawn. Happily there are many things on which Protestants and Catholics agree. Among them are the natural virtues of veracity and moral courage and the divine commandment, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

We do not think the Rev. Mr. Andrew's silence in the circumstance in keeping with the generally received ethical standards common to Catholics and Protestants.

THE NEW ENGLAND

The failure of the conference of political leaders to reach an agreement involves the immediate fate of Home Rule in the uncertainties of party politics. There are, however, some considerations which point to the inevitable triumph of the great struggle for Irish self-government. The Unionists whether of Ulster or England do not even pretend to defend the outlandish bureaucracy which now governs Ireland. No one discusses, much less defends, the anomalous and incongruous agglomeration of forty-five irresponsible boards which in this democratic age administer the government of Ireland. The chief opposition to the measure of justice which the Bill of the Better Government of Ireland extends to the sister island is based on religious grounds. There are other and honest objections to Home Rule as at present proposed. But it remains true that its opponents have based their hopes chiefly on an appeal to religious prejudice. The great journalist and veteran political campaigner in England, T. P. O'Connor, bears testimony to the fact that religious prejudice is dying or dead in the great British democracy which henceforth will control the destinies of Parliament. The Orange appeal to sectarianism has fallen on deaf ears so far as the British democracy is concerned.

"This in turn has led to an extraordinary decay in the religious bigotry which once was so powerful an element in British life. I do not know any political phenomenon more remarkable in history than the steadiness of the English and the Scottish nonconformists during this Irish struggle."

"It is not that they have ceased to be Protestants; in some senses they are more Protestant than ever. It is that they have reached the conviction that religion is a thing so exclusively of the soul and of the free will of the individual that they cannot tolerate, they find it difficult even to understand, that any plea should be made to deny political liberties on the ground of religious views."

There is a self-respecting consciousness of power and freedom in the whole mass of British workingmen since the aristocracy lost prestige as well as power on the passage of the Parliament Act.

The Carragh incident disclosed the fact that the army was aristocratic and might be used as the instrument of aristocracy. When this was realized there was "the fiercest outburst of popular feeling ever seen in England for generations."

"In a second it raised a modest and almost obscure member of the House of Commons into a popular hero. John Ward, as everybody knows, did not come from aristocratic origin. He was a navy and a private soldier, but when this ex-private soldier declared that the masses of England would not take dictation from king or army there arose that prolonged bellow of assent which reverberated through all England and which will reverberate in English politics for many a day to come."

"It was an object lesson which can never be forgotten; it was one of the many signs and portents of the new England that stands on the threshold of new and strange developments."

This is the new democratic England which gratefully recognizes its debt to the Irish Nationalists and remembers that Ulster Unionists have been the implacable foes of every measure of social amelioration, and of every step in democratic progress. The "grim" and "deadly earnest" argument of Ulster armed and financed by Tory aristocrats is answered by the spontaneous organization, marvellous growth and joyous enthusiasm of the Irish National Volunteers.

Be the vicissitudes of politics what they may the greatest constitutional and parliamentary struggle in history is fought and won. Nothing can for long prevent the Irish nation from enjoying the fruits of its magnificent victory.

A CORRECTION

Last week when comparing the Public and Separate schools in the light of the Entrance results the number of Public school pupils enrolled should have read 7,699 instead of 6,970. It will be seen that the corrected figures give the Separate schools an average attendance proportionally higher than that of the Public schools.

LITTLE THINGS

He sat opposite us in a Greet Southern railway carriage on the journey from Limerick to Dublin. He was a Scotchman and an atheist. As is usual with those outside the One True Church he led the conversation round to religion. The inconsistencies of the sects had shattered his belief in revealed religion of every description, but he confessed he saw much to admire in the Catholic faith. "But," he objected, "I don't think even you Catholics believe in Jesus Christ. I know a young fellow, a fellow boarder of mine, and he invariably attends church on Sunday, but it is always the early Mass. Once when I asked him why he did not take a longer rest in the morning and go to the midday Mass instead he answered me 'oh, there is a sermon at that Mass.' Now, if he really believed in his church I do not think he would mind the service being a little longer." It is a good many years ago since my Scotch friend and myself made the journey to Dublin together, but his criticism of the young man is still fresh in my mind. It was only a little thing, but it gave scandal to this man of no belief. The poor atheist was looking for the light, but the lamp was extinguished.

He was a monthly communicant, and in every other respect a model young man, but he missed the sermon three Sundays out of every four. The last note of the "Ite Missa Est" found him hurrying for the door. Once, when we remonstrated with a rather careless member of the congregation and suggested his receiving the sacraments more regularly he answered us, "I am just as good as so and so. He skips out before the sermon every Sunday, and he goes to Communion every month."

It is very commendable indeed to invite our Protestant friends to attend our church services, but sometimes our so doing has an entirely opposite effect from that intended. For example, we sat in the back of a certain church during Vespers, and noticed a non-Catholic occupying the pew with a member of the congregation. Several times during the service the Catholic party talked and laughed with her friend. It was hardly the way to impress the non-Catholic with an idea of the Real Presence.

Let us be careful of the little things for they are of vast importance. We Catholics are under the observation of a curious, and often

well disposed, world. Let us show forth our belief in practice.

COLUMBA.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE REPLY made by the celebrated Friedrich von Stolberg, poet and statesman, to Frederick William III. of Prussia when reproached by that monarch for becoming a Catholic is worthy of remembrance. "I do not like men who change their religion," said the King. "Neither do I, Sire," answered Stolberg, "and for that reason, when I found my forefathers changed theirs two or three centuries ago, I felt bound to go back to the old Faith."

A CERTAIN gentleman of good position but rather irascible temperament was repairing his motor car on the road after a breakdown, and using language during the process scarcely becoming a Christian. A lady acquaintance who was passing stopped to exchange greetings with the irate motorist's wife, and during the conversation that ensued took occasion to ask "can you tell me how much it costs your husband to run his car?" "Indeed, I can," said the wife, who is a Catholic, "it is going to cost him his immortal soul if he doesn't improve his language."

THE REV. Prof. Griffith Thomas, D. D., of Wycliffe College, Toronto, has earned a degree of notoriety in Canada by his espousal of certain grim calumnies against the Catholics of Spain. Somewhat more than a year ago he sprung upon the reading public a silly fable about the sale of indulgences in that country—a matter upon which, had truth been his object, he might easily have been set right upon enquiry at the only proper quarter. But he too evidently relished the piquancy of the tale to give a thought to the proposition that possibly he had got things up-side-down or was the all too willing victim of a stupid hoax.

NOW, IN a letter from abroad to the Canadian Churchman, he essays to perform a similar office for the Catholics of Portugal. It seems that in May a gathering of Christian Endeavorers took place in Barcelona. Dr. Thomas' story is to the effect that but for the vigilance of the city governor this might have terminated in a massacre, for, as he goes on, the Catholics of the city had plotted to "inflict chastisement which would serve as a warning such as neither the authorities, Protestants, or anyone else would forget for years to come." Blood was to flow freely and a gang of "savages, hired ruffians, armed to the teeth" were to occupy a gallery at the place of meeting, and, upon a given signal, were to fire a volley upon the unarmed crowd below, neither women or children being spared. At the same time they were to shout "Long live the Catholic Religion." Further, as the terrified crowd would emerge from the building, the same gang were to open fire upon them from the street, and, in short, the streets of Barcelona were to run red with heretic blood.

THIS is not an extract from a dime novel as our readers may suppose, but the serious statement of a Professor of Divinity in a Canadian college. It is a pity Dr. Thomas should have disposed of the matter in a single paragraph. And it is a pity also, for the sake of his own reputation, that he did not give some account of the indignities, the merciless grinding tyranny and persecution that the Catholics of Portugal have had to submit to since the advent of the so-called Republic. So far from being in a position to inaugurate a reign of terror such as Dr. Thomas has described (even had his misguided spirits among them been capable of conceiving such a thing) it is the common knowledge of Europe that while they have had to practise their religion in fear and trembling they have given to the world an admirable example of self-restraint and of patient waiting for the dawning of a better day.

BUT IT is not Catholics only who are the victims of Dr. Thomas' disregard for truth or (let us say) almost boundless capacity for self-deception. In the same issue of the Churchman in which the aforesaid clumsy calumny appears, a correspondent writing from England takes him to task for a serious misrepresentation of the Anglican Bishop of Zanzibar's part in an incident arising out of the celebrated Kikuyu controversy. A member of his flock in East Africa,

a lady who had distinguished herself by her charity and devotion to good works, recognizing in the issue presented by the controversy the fallacy of the Anglican claim to Catholicity, followed her principles to their legitimate issue and became a Catholic. Dr. Thomas insinuates that this lady travelled with the Bishop from Zanzibar to Naples, and there parting company with him, proceeded to Rome and was received into the Catholic Church—leaving it to be assumed that she had done so with the Bishop's approval and consent. Dr. Thomas is responsible for other incidental misstatements in the same connection, but the above forms the kernel of his complaint.

THE CHURCHMAN's correspondent writing over his own name and with full knowledge of the facts, raps the Wycliffe Professor over the knuckles for his "gross misstatements." The lady, it is true, travelled on the same steamer as the Bishop and just as truly proceeded to Rome and was received into the Church. But as it is pointed out by the correspondent, they were in the same ship by the mere chance, for her passage had been booked to avoid such a contingency, and the Bishop's, which was to have been a month earlier, was delayed by circumstances beyond anyone's control. Further, so far from the Bishop having anything to say to the lady in favor of Rome, his influence was strongly the other way. "When the subject of Rome was mentioned between them," it is added, "the Bishop's part was to urge her against a decision to which she had come at least two months before sailing from Zanzibar."

WE GIVE space to the incident only as exhibiting the reckless and unscrupulous character of Prof. Thomas' polemic where the Catholic Church or anything seeming to approximate to her is concerned. The ultimate effect is of course directly the reverse of his calculations. This is how it impresses his Anglican opponents: "This manner of presentation of 'truth' when it comes from one who ranks as a spiritual leader of men, is to discourage and dishearten many of us younger men who find the road to truth less plainly and clearly blazed by Protestant axes than Professor Griffith Thomas doubtless believes it to be." And: "Since curious incidents in connection with Catholicism are so common in the circle in which Dr. Griffith Thomas moves, you could perhaps ask him to sift the evidence in future with the care which is expected from a man of his profession." That is a very mild and polite way of putting it. That there is no limit to the rev. gentleman's credulity is apparent. We are sorry that we cannot say as much for his honor or his common sense.

WHILE THE world is standing patiently by and awaiting developments in Unionist Ulster, all concerned have still an opportunity to weigh in the balance the insolent pretensions to a monopoly of tolerance and enlightenment by Sir Edward Carson's myrmidons. The well-informed have long ago made up their minds, and the issue itself has passed out of the region of the debatable. As evidence that even the clergy of the Anglican Establishment (certainly, at least, a considerable section of them) have emancipated themselves from hereditary prejudices, we may be permitted to reproduce the letter of an English Vicar in reply to a circular from the Dublin Unionist headquarters, soliciting votes for Unionist candidates in England at the next general election. Ere that transpires the issue will, we trust, have been finally disposed of, and it may be predicted with confidence, that within a decade the Unionist cause will have ceased to have other than an antiquarian interest.

MR. S. O. BURKE, "Hon. Secretary, Dublin Southern Eastern District," (who posts his mail at Canterbury in South Eastern England) appealed for the support of the Vicar of Bideford on the absurd and cowardly plea that the Dublin Corporation had "created the slums for the purpose of obtaining votes civic and Parliamentary." The Vicar's reply is the voice of reason and humanity:

The Vicarage, Buckland Brewer, Bideford, June 8th, 1914.

Dear Sir—I beg to thank you for your letter, with enclosures (posted at Canterbury), which reached me this morning.

Your appeal might have made some impression on me twenty years ago, before I knew anything of Ireland.

Since that time I have spent nearly fourteen years in rural Ireland, and