

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum, United States and Europe—\$2.50.
 Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D., (Rev. James T. Foley, D.D., Editors) (Thomas Coffey, L.L.D., Associate Editor—H. F. Mackintosh, Manager—Robert M. Burns, Address business letters to the Manager.
 Classified Advertising 15 cents per line. Remittance must accompany the order. Where CATHOLIC RECORD Box address is required send 10 cents to prepay expense of postage upon replies.
 Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.
 The Editor cannot be held responsible for unsolicited manuscripts. Every endeavor will be made to return rejected contributions when stamped addressed envelopes are enclosed.
 The CATHOLIC RECORD has been approved and recommended by Archbishops Falconio and Sharrett, late Apostolic Delegates to 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.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JULY 26, 1924

"CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY"

The great Orange festival of "Civil and Religious Liberty," the glorious Twelfth of July, has come and gone. It calls for some reflections. Whether we like it or not the Twelfth—and what it stands for—is an institution and an influence in the national life of Canada, and especially in Ontario. Now what should be the attitude of Catholics to Orangemen and Orangeism? We think that where Catholics and Orangemen live together in what are called mixed communities—especially rural communities—they have solved the problem quite satisfactorily. They get on together as good Canadians and good neighbors, clashing not at all on religious grounds. Not only does this condition obtain generally in many places where the writer has lived but he has always found instances of intimate friendship between individual Catholics and individual Orangemen. And there is the further notable fact that in the case of these friendships between individuals the Catholic is a staunch, well-informed, outspoken Catholic, and the Orangeman thoroughly convinced of his position without the slightest "leaning towards Rome." In fact we have never seen a half-hearted, apologetic, ill-informed Catholic a warm, personal friend of an Orangeman.

These good neighborly relations and personal friendships found in so many rural communities of Ontario, we repeat, show the solution of the Orange-Catholic problem, if, indeed, problem there be. We have never had any sympathy with diatribes against "Ontario Orangemen" by ill-informed or misinformed Catholics of other provinces. They would be better advised to leave that subject to Catholics "to the manner born" in Ontario who know what they are talking or writing about.

It is all to the good that Orangemen should make "Civil and Religious Liberty" the keynote of their annual celebration. For, by the reiteration of that precious principle they cannot fail, in some measure, to inculcate it in the minds of the younger generation of Orangemen.

But there is the implication that the placing of William of Orange on the throne of Great Britain as William III. put an end to an era of Catholic tyranny and inaugurated the era of civil and religious liberty under which we now happily live. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

John Richard Green was a Protestant, an Englishman, and filled the Chair of History in Oxford University. In his History of the English People he writes:

"The history of Ireland, from its conquest by William the Third up to this time, is one which no Englishman can recall without shame. Since the surrender of Limerick every Catholic Irishman, and there were five Catholics to every Protestant, had been treated as a stranger and a foreigner in his own country. The House of Lords, the House of Commons, the right of voting for representatives in Parliament, the magistracy, all corporate offices in towns, all ranks in the army, the bench, the bar, the whole administration of government or justice were closed against Catholics. Few Catholic landowners had been left by the sweeping confiscations which had followed the successive revolts of the island, and oppressive laws forced even these few, with scant exceptions, to profess Protestantism. Necessity, indeed, had brought about a practical toleration of their religion and their worship; but in all social and political matters the native Catholics, in other words the immense majority of the people of Ireland, were simply hevers of wood and

drawers of water to their Protestant masters.

"The English Parliament, too, claimed the right of binding Ireland as well as England by its enactments. . . . England did her best to annihilate Irish commerce and to ruin Irish agriculture. Statutes passed by the jealousy of English landowners forbade the export of Irish cattle or sheep to English ports. The export of wool was forbidden, lest it might interfere with the profits of English wool-growers. Poverty was thus added to the curse of misgovernment, and poverty deepened with the rapid growth of the native population, till famine turned the country into a hell."

Evidently Irish Catholics owe no great debt of gratitude to William of Orange.

Dr. E. A. D'Alton, M. R. I. A., author of a "History of Ireland from the Earliest Times to the Present Day," thus writes of the same period:

"But even when William of Orange had triumphed, toleration of Catholicity was expected. For the Treaty of Limerick (1691) gave the Catholics 'such privileges as they enjoyed in the reign of Charles II'; and William was to obtain from the Irish Parliament a further relaxation of the penal laws in existence. The treaty was soon broken. The English Parliament, presuming to legislate for Ireland, enacted that no one should sit in the Irish Parliament without taking the Oath of Supremacy and subscribing to a declaration against Transubstantiation; and the Irish Parliament, filled with slaves and bigots, accepted this legislation. Catholics were thus excluded; and in spite of the declared wishes of King William, the Irish Parliament not only refused to relax the Penal Laws in existence but embarked on fresh penal legislation. Session after session, for nearly fifty years, new and more galling fetters were forged, until at last the Penal Code was complete, and well merited the description of Burke: 'As well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment and degradation of a feeble people and the debasement in them of human nature itself as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man.' All bishops, deans, vicars-general, and friars were to leave the country and if they returned, to be put to death. Secular priests at home could remain if they were registered; in 1709, however, they were required to take an oath of abjuration which no priest could conscientiously take, so that registration ceased to be a protection. They could not set up schools at home nor resort to Catholic schools abroad, nor could they receive legacies for Catholic charities, nor have on their churches steeples, crosses, or bells.

"The laity were no better off than the clergy in the matter of civil rights. They could not set up Catholic schools, nor teach in such, nor go abroad to Catholic schools. They were excluded from Parliament, from the corporations, from the army and navy, from the legal profession, and from all civil offices. They could not act as sheriffs, or under sheriffs, or as jurors, or even as constables. They could not have more than two Catholic apprentices in their trade; they could not carry arms, nor own a horse worth more than £5; they were excluded even from residence in the larger corporate towns. To bury their dead in an old ruined abbey or monastery involved a penalty of £10. A Catholic workman refusing to work on Catholic holy days was to be whipped; and there was the same punishment for those who made pilgrimages to holy wells. No Catholic could act as guardian to an infant, nor as director of the Bank of Ireland; nor could he marry a Protestant, and the priest who performed such a marriage ceremony was to be put to death. A Catholic could not acquire land, nor buy it, nor hold a mortgage on it; and the Catholic landlord was bound at death to leave his estate to his children in equal shares. During life, if the wife or son of such became a Protestant, she or he at once obtained separate maintenance. The law presumed every Catholic to be faithless, disloyal, and untruthful, assumed him to exist only to be punished, and the ingenuity of the Legislature was exhausted in discovering new methods of repression. Viceroys were constantly appealed to give no countenance to Popery; magistrates, to execute the penal

laws; degraded Irishmen called priest-hunters were rewarded for spying upon their priests, and degraded priests who apostatized were rewarded with a government pension. The wife was thus encouraged to disobey her husband, the child to flout his parents, the friend to turn traitor to his friend. These Protestant legislators in possession of Catholic lands wished to make all Catholics helpless and poor. Without bishops they must soon be without priests, and without schools they must necessarily go to the Protestant schools. These hopes, however, proved vain. Students went to foreign colleges, and bishops came from abroad, facing imprisonment and death. The schoolmaster taught under a sheltering hedge, and the priest said Mass by stealth, watched over by the people, and in spite of priest-hunter and penal laws. Nor were the Catholics won over by such Protestant ministers as they saw, men without zeal and often without faith, not unlike those described by Spenser in Elizabeth's day—'of fleshy incontinency, greedy avarice and disordered lives.' In other respects the Penal Laws succeeded. They made the Catholics helpless, ignorant, and poor, without the strength to rebel, the hope to redress, or even the courage to complain."

The implication, then, that the patron saint of Orangemen was the founder of civil and religious liberty is a grotesque perversion of historic truth. The rather lengthy extracts we have quoted crowd out our reflections until next issue.

THE HOME BANK

The House of Commons without demur and without debate concurred unanimously in the report of the Banking Committee with regard to the Home Bank.

Briefly, that means that though there is no legal ground for the claim of the unfortunate depositors for compensation, the moral right and justice of their claim is admitted and unquestioned.

Had Sir Thomas White, then Minister of Finance, exercised the discretionary power with which he was invested in 1916 or 1918, when the rotten condition of the Home Bank was brought to his official attention, the depositors would have suffered no loss. He failed to do so because of the War and the harm that might in his opinion be done to Canada's credit in the midst of the stupendous task of financing the War.

Sir Thomas has emphasized the fact that he was not legally obliged to take action. However, when a responsible Minister of the Crown is invested with discretionary power to be used in certain conditions, and when these conditions obtain he is bound by the dignity and responsibility of his office, bound in decency, bound in justice if not in law, to exercise this discretionary power; and the condition of the Home Bank, as revealed to him as Minister of Finance, imperatively demanded action in 1916 and in 1918.

Parliament acted wisely in referring these questions of fact to the impartial and unbiased investigation of Mr. Justice McKeon of New Brunswick.

The unambiguous action of the House of Commons removes the matter from acrimonious or partisan discussion. It is well. No one questions that Sir Thomas White in the stress of War conditions acted according to his best judgment. But since the Minister of Finance deemed it in the best interest of Canada practically to sacrifice the Home Bank depositors in order to preserve the country's financial credit at a time of crisis, the action of the House of Commons makes it clear that no one now questions the logical conclusion that the country owes them compensation.

"GIRLS A LA MODE"

By THE OBSERVER

Under this heading, there is an article in America by Ella M. E. Flick, in which the girl of today, or, as she calls her, the girl a la mode, is defended and even praised. No doubt she may be well defended and even justly praised within reasonable limits. But why not deal with all sides of the question. The lady who writes in praise of the modern girl ought to be frank enough to discuss all aspects of the question, of the manners and habits of the interesting young person she takes up the cudgels for.

Miss,—or is it Madam—Flick's theory seems to be that the free manners and customs of the girls of today are due to an economic movement having to do with ways and means of earning a living. But when an employer has to rebuke his stenographer for not wearing enough clothes in the office, a thoughtful observer will realize that there is something in the question that is not a matter of economics. For, men have been under the necessity of earning their living ever since God cursed Adam but they do not therefore expose their persons indecently in office and in workshop.

A distinction must be drawn between that degree of freedom which is necessary in order that women may earn their living, and that further degree of freedom which is sought in the manner of dress and in the laxity of social customs. The need for freedom in competing with men in the business world has nothing to do with jazz dancing, petting parties in darkened automobiles, and with the rapidly spreading custom of drinking from the flasks that are expected from the male escort. It is the sensuality of modern customs that is criticized and not the amount of freedom which is reasonably necessary in order that women may earn their living.

When women who practice this new and vicious "freedom" are pressed with criticisms of their conduct they sometimes attempt to hold men responsible. They say that the men demand that girls dress scantily, and that they dance suggestively, and that they take a drink or smoke; and good women have been heard to say that if a girl refuses to do these things she will be neglected and will not get married. But we wonder whether they are really fond of the opposite sex when they wore crinolines? Some years ago it was the fashion for women to wear a wire machine which was called a "bustle." Did the men invent that? Or, were they even consulted about it? A few years ago it was the fashion for women to wear balloon sleeves. Were those adopted to please men? Then there was that bit of rather painful contortionism called "the dip." Were the men consulted before the women began walking as though they had a severe pain in their stomach?

Then came the little-girl-skirts—only they were less modest than decent little girl had been accustomed to wear. Were the men consulted? They were not. Nor were they consulted when last year fashion decreed that the sidewalks should be swept again as they used to be twenty years ago, by women's skirts; and at a moment's notice dresses became long—but only on one side. Were men consulted when women began to wear overshoes with the buckles loose, or when they adopted that pneumonia-inviting custom of wearing a heavy fur coat with the front open to make dead sure—"dead" is good—that Jack frost would have his full chance to kill them?

Having adopted the fashion of uncovering their chests when the thermometer was below zero, the fashionable sex began to wear furs when the thermometer was eighty in the shade—summer furs they called them. Were the men consulted about that? They tell us now that the men will not love them if they do not take up and practice every silly fashion that the dancing master or the dressmaker imposes on them. But when did men come to have so much to say about all that? Next year, or whenever fashion changes its arbitrary whim, the fair sex will change to clothes that will cover them from chin to toes and sweep the dust besides, and the men will have not a word to say about it. And, strange to relate, the men will be just about as much devoted to the fair sex then as they have always been; as they were when bustles were in fashion; and when crinolines were in fashion; and when the foolish "dip" was in fashion.

Miss Flick will have it that the modern girl is to be accounted for on economic grounds. We have said enough to show that many other considerations arise; but suppose for argument's sake that economic considerations govern the phenomena which are so much commented upon. What sort of success is the economic movement—if it be an economic movement—meeting with? During the War hundreds

of business girls earned from eighty to a hundred dollars a month, and joyfully spent every cent of it on dress; girls who lived at home and paid not one cent for their board and lodging. Was that an economic success? Any young man who has considered marriage will tell you that the modern girl expects to be provided for not on the scale to which she has been accustomed, but on the scale to which she expects to become accustomed if she can get a young man to promise it to her. If this is the sort of economic question that is involved in the modern girl's entry into the world of business, there is not much in it to excite congratulations. If Miss Flick could show us an economic movement on the part of girls which gave some hope of relief from any sort of economic burden or difficulty, we should be disposed to join her in her praise of the modern girl. But if, on the other hand, this much praised young person is succeeding principally in making the high cost of living higher yet, unstinted praise may well be deferred.

And it is to be feared that this is just what she is doing. Pass as granted that thousands of girls must earn their living. The fact must be added that thousands of them are increasing their demands upon society in luxuries and pleasures, which they have begun to call the necessities of life, as fast as the thing can be done. Housekeeping ought to be getting cheaper. It is getting dearer. It is far dearer than it was when the man had to do all the earning for both while the young folks were preparing to get married. The average business girl does not put one cent into the making of a home, and never even thinks of such a thing. What sort of economic movement is it which only increases the general extravagance of society?

But, after all, as we have said above, it is not the business doings of the modern girl that are the subject of criticism, nor the slight increase in freedom of manners which may be necessary in such occupations as she may take up. There is a much more serious question about the modern girl; that is, what part is she playing in the moral advancement or retrogression of society? The earning of a living does not in any way necessitate that laxity of deportment which has been so much remarked upon in the last few years.

Swearing, smoking, drinking, voluptuous dancing, immodest dressing, are not excused by remarking that grandma never had to earn her living, and it may be remarked in passing that Grandma saved her husband's money; and the modern girl does not intend ever to do that. Grandma had an old-fashioned thing called conscience which would have told her to die sooner than earn her living by sacrificing her modesty and her innocence. But, it is not true that girls "a la mode" are under the necessity of making such a choice. They take up the customs of the age just because they are the fashion and there is no compulsion about it.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

A LEADING Anglican Church in Toronto has had erected on the wall of its interior a piece of stone from the ancient Catholic monastery on the Island of Iona with a glowing inscription to that effect. It would not surprise us to learn that the same thing had been done with a fragment from St. Ignatius cave at Manresa. Consistency has never been an Anglican virtue.

AN ANGLICAN missionary in China writes to the Guardian (the leading organ of the Establishment) deploring the difficulties Protestant missionaries have to contend with by reason of their variations of belief, and at the same time expressing admiration for what he terms the "magnificent unity and marvellous organization" of the Catholic Church in China. "Out here," he writes, "it is absurd to ignore the Roman communion. Their work extends everywhere, their numbers are at least four times those of all other Christian bodies put together, and many of their results are altogether admirable." This is really but re-echoing the testimony of every independent observer. And, it is to be borne in mind, that Catholic missions are maintained on less than one-tenth the resources of Protestant organizations. It is, after all as said and done, the Divine commission that counts.

COMMENTING ON an assertion of Dean Inge in a recent sermon in St. Paul's Cathedral to the effect that "organized Christianity has visibly lost ground," an East Indian contemporary remarks: "The most perfectly and widely organized system of religious belief and practice is represented in the Catholic Church which certainly has not lost ground. On the contrary she is ever making fresh conquests throughout the civilized world, and today as a spiritual force her influence is unrivalled." Skeptical philosophers and historians (Gibbon, as an example) have sought in various ways to account for the triumph of the Catholic Church in the early ages, but her secret of perennial youth in this later time is as much a puzzle to the unbelieving as it was then.

THIS UNDYING vitality of the Church is the theme of a Protestant writer (Dr. J. A. Faulkner in the Quarterly Review.) His tribute is somewhat reminiscent of Macaulay's famous outburst, it is true, but it has its force and value none the less. We reproduce the passage in full: "The Papacy has come down through the centuries without the same power that she had in the Middle Ages, but with large remnants of it, her spiritual vigor still almost unimpaired, assured that next Sunday whosoever pastor's parishioners do not go to church, hers will go; whatever theology is changing and vanishing, hers is still the same; and she will still have her seat on the Seven Hills in the year 2124, and her ramifications in every country where she now exists, with perhaps many new lands added to her domain. In this year of grace 1924 she is the only historic Church which faces the future calm and unafraid, because she is the only Church without schism or schisms, without everchanging religious values, which is sure of her creed because she is sure of her Lord, the only Church which is not afraid of some new philosopher Kant or new theologian Ritschl Unitarianising her, and thus eviscerating her. I speak simply historically. If you would ask Papal theologians the secret of their confidence in the future, of their assurance that in 2500 they would still be offering the body of Christ in the Mass, they would give many answers, but they would all unite in one: This is the victory that overcometh the world, even your faith."

WHAT A secular periodical terms a "feature of outstanding interest" in the Byron Centennial Celebration in Greece was the presence at Missolonghi of a direct descendant of the poet, the Hon. Anne Lytton, who is a Catholic. Because of her relationship to the Poet of Greek Independence, Miss Lytton won the hearts of the Greeks, who acclaimed her as the "adopted daughter of Athens and Missolonghi." The Prime Minister presented her with a medal, recording her great ancestor's heroic services to Greece, which on behalf of the nation she was commissioned to lay on his tomb when she returned to England.

It is noteworthy that all Lord Byron's direct descendants are Catholics, and it may be that in finding their way into the Church the inspiration was drawn from the poet himself. The Hon. Miss Lytton is a great-great-granddaughter, through her mother, Lady Wentworth, who was the only child of Lady Anne Blunt, wife of the celebrated poet and traveller (also a Catholic) Wilfred Scawen Blunt. Lady Blunt was the only daughter of the first Earl of Lovelace, her mother being the only child of Lord Byron by his wife the Baroness Wentworth. Byron certainly had his weaknesses, but had spirituality enough to recognize the Catholic as the "best religion." Thus the Faith which the "Bard of the Broken Heart" looked upon with reverence is now the cherished possession of his descendants. And this is a glory which he shares with many another English writer of name.

It is not only Italy that has shown the American Y. M. C. A. the door. News from Turkey is that that institution has made its presence so objectionable at Constantinople by reason of its underhand proselytizing methods as to have been ordered by the Government to cease its pro-

paganda. This is the burden of a decree issued by Mustafa Kemal. It is not the preaching of its peculiar tenets that are in themselves objected to, but, as in Italy and other countries, the insidious and dishonest methods employed. Evidently, thinks an exchange, the Turk, no matter how many bushels of American dollars the Y. M. C. A. has to dispose of, has made up his mind to stand no nonsense from this organization which meddlesomely worries itself about the religious ideas of every other country but its own.

FAMOUS OLD IRISH SCHOOL RESTORED

By Rev. J. Van der Heyden (Louvain Correspondent, N. C. W. C.)

Louvain, Belgium.—The piety and munificence of an American Catholic layman is to be the chief instrument in the rehabilitation of the ancient College of the Irish Franciscans here, one of the most glorious monuments to earlier Irish learning and zeal. Erected three centuries ago through the gift of a king, the college was suppressed in 1797 and has since been only a memory.

The distinguished American layman who has taken on himself this great work in the interest of Catholic learning is Marquis Martin Maloney, K. S. G., of Philadelphia. His philanthropy and deep interest in education already exemplified in large gifts to the Catholic University of America.

One hundred and twenty-seven years ago, January 8, 1797, the College of the Irish Franciscans at Louvain met the fate of all the religious institutions within the boundaries of the First French Republic; it was ruthlessly suppressed, after an existence of 191 years, and its inmates were dispersed by the newly-fledged apostles of "liberty equality, fraternity." Sold at public auction April 22 of the same year, the house was bought back again by the Guardian, the Rev. James Gowan, with scripts received from the spoilers by himself and his religious brethren for their share in the property. As the university, with which the college had been connected, had not yet reopened its doors in 1829, Father Gowan disposed of the property that year in favor of the Catholic missions of Great Britain. In 1830 it became a Brothers' school for children of the poor, and it has continued as such to this day.

MONUMENT TO IRISH NATION
 The Franciscan College was the first of those three Louvain colleges which a noted historian has called "a proud and lasting monument of the learning and zeal of the Irish nation."

Of the "Pastoral College," which trained secular priests for the Irish missions, nothing remains now but two stones set in the garden wall of one of the houses that replaced the school buildings razed in the year 1835.

Of the study house of the Irish Dominicans, founded in 1628, as was also the "Pastoral College," the sole vestige left is the name of a street—"Rue des Dominicains Irlandais"—where the institution had its last refuge. The buildings were demolished in 1799-1800.

Lovers of the past acquainted with the achievements of the Irish race can best conceive the feelings of the sons of St. Francis upon the eve of the return of some of theirs to a house linked with the most glorious annals of their order during two centuries.

A king, Philip III. of Spain, urged thereto by an Irish prelate, Florence Conry, Archbishop of Tuam, contributed the funds for the erection of that house three centuries ago; an American citizen, Marquis Maloney, of Philadelphia, under the inspiration of another Irish prelate, Monsignor J. Ryan, late President of the Seminary of Thurles, is to contribute the funds for the restoration of the hallowed premises to the legitimate successors of the noble men who made it illustrious by their faith, their learning, their unbounded zeal—all for the service of their people and of their religion.

A proof of the sympathetic esteem enjoyed by the first Franciscans from Ireland who dwell in the Louvain House of Study was the presence, May 9, 1617, at the cornerstone laying of their chapel, dedicated to St. Anthony, of the beloved rulers of the church, Archduke Albert and Archduchess Isabella. The princes were not deceived in the men who had provoked this manifestation of their good will. They furnished proofs sufficient of their superior worth and of their activity. While the teachers achieved renown through their contributions to the stores of the Sacred Sciences, of philosophy and of history, the pupils inhaled themselves with faith and zeal as well as with knowledge—to meet the persecutions and tortures that awaited them at home, to bring the strayed sheep back to the fold, and to keep the light of eternal truth, despite the fury of the English tyrants to extinguish it, shining brightly in their native land.

To Father Bonaventura O'Hussey, under whose presidency the college began its long career of usefulness, Hibernia owes the first book printed in Irish characters—a catechism of the Christian doctrine published at Louvain in 1608.