The Catholic Record

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

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

Advertisement for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.

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

Messrs. Lake King, P. J. Neven, E. J. Broderick, M. J. Hagarty and Miss Sara Hanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the Catholic Record. Agent for district of Nipissing Mrs. M. Reynolds, New Liskeard.

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

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

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

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION.

Apostolic Delegation.
Ottawa, June 15th, 1905.

Mr. Thomas Coffey

My Dear Sir,—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper. I have noted with satisfaction that it is directed with intelligence and ability, and, above all, that it is imbued with a strong Catholic spirit. It strenuously defends Catholic principles and rights, and stands firmly by the teachings and authority of the Church, at the same time promoting the best interests of the country. Following these lines it has done a great deal of good for the welfare of religion and country, and I will do more and more, as its wholesome influence reaches more Catholic homes. I therefore, earnestly recommend it to Catholic families. With my blessing on your work, and best wishes for its continued success, I remain,

Yours sincerely in Christ,
DONATUS, Archbishop of Ephesus,
Apostolic Delegate.

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

Mr. Thomas Coffey

Dear Sir,—For some time past I have read your estimable paper, the Catholic Record, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published. Its matter and form are both good, and a true Catholic spirit permeates the whole. Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful. Blessing you and wishing you success, believe me to remain,

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,
†D. FALCONIO, Arch. of Larissa,
Apost. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 8, 1911

GOOD FRIDAY

Upon this day the great tide of time was at its highest flood. All history had led up to it through the highways and bye-paths of wandering mankind. All subsequent events have been colored by its dreadful tragedy. So vast is the sweep of Good Friday's memories that no human creature has been, or will be, a stranger to its invitation. Nor is the Cross of Calvary a mere blessed souvenir coming down through the ages—a story of devotion and a mystery of love whose recollection may cause wonder and admiration, praise and thanksgiving, fear and hope. The Cross is yesterday, to-day and forever. It is ours just as much as it was when first its pierced and bleeding Victim hung upon its hard wood, giving Himself up to death for us. It is nearer to us than any past event stored in memory can be. It sweeps down to us not so much from a distant past as from the Majestic height of God's eternal. Its crimson tide of Blood and Suffering is not the far-off mountain stream described to us by some traveller. Nearer to our soul must be its waters of eternal life than our own blood to the soul which animates it. The Cross of Christ does not so much come down to us as we go back to it. We were agents in its bitter action rather than spectators now. Our sins scourged our Blessed Lord at the pillar, crowned Him more heavily with thorns, were a weight superadded to the material Cross which He was made to carry, and imposed a special pain and sorrow upon Him in the agony of His dying hours. We cannot get away from the Cross. We were with it when it was first put up. We shall be with it in its final taking down, on that dreadful day when its mystery will be clearly read and its justice eternally established. There is no school like that of Good Friday. Its lurid light and its dim shadow, its blasphemous yells from the priests and the populace, the silence of our Blessed Lord and His still more silent death are wisdom's lessons about so many things which so deeply concern us. On earth we can get no higher idea of God than that which the Passion gives us. The Passion, as nothing else does, opens to our eye of faith God's justice and holiness, His love of mankind and His mercy to sinners. It teaches us so much about Our Lord Himself; for nowhere is He so much Jesus, nowhere is He so prodigal of suffering or so excessive in His Redemption. The Cross teaches deep things about ourselves and much more about sin. Then the Church comes out of the Cross as the first woman was taken from Adam's side. So much doctrine lies hidden in the Passion of the Word-made Flesh that the Cross is the book of the learned doctors of the Church as well as of the contemplative saints. The sacraments come out of the Cross in their unfailing streams of grace. The daily Mass is a wonderful continuation of it, unlimitedly magnified by its multiplicity and softened by our Lord's own institution and the Church's reverential rite and ceremony. The Passion is more than a lesson. It is a gift. Jesus Himself was a gift, the gift by excellence; for God so loved the world as to give His only beloved Son for it. But nowhere is He so much Redeemer as in His Sacred Passion and Death. Jesus in Gethsemani, bleeding and sad, Jesus in Pilate's court-yard bruised for our sins, crowned with thorns and clothed with mock royalty, Jesus nailed to the Cross in dereliction and death is God's unutterable gift to man and man's priceless offering to God in praise and love and copious atonement. What is the end of all but God's glory? It is the end of creation and that natural movement which the creative act impresses upon every being. It is the primary and sovereign end of the Incarnation whose hymn was sung by angel choirs above the manger. God's glory is the end of the Redemption through which God's truth, God's justice, His right and order are returned and restored to Him. But God's glory is our happiness. What rest, what refuge for the storm-tossed bark in the clefts and wounds of Calvary's Divine Victim. He made Himself sin for us. O divine Captive, Thou dost lead us out of prison; Thou dost restore us to the sun, to God's light, and Thou dost give us back the air of His grace and mercy. By Thy Passion, O Blessed Jesus, Thou hast loosened our chains and torn down the handwriting upon the wall against us. Our dear Lord not only paid our overwhelming debt but enriched us. Not satisfied with closing hell He opened heaven. Not only did He blot out sin, he restored grace. The royal crown is again placed upon our brow, and our baptized soul clothed with innocence. The Heavenly Father accepts us as His adopted children; the Son vivifies us, and the Holy Ghost replenishes with the highest gifts and His own presence our re-born soul. What praise and gratitude are due to our Blessed Lord upon the mournful day of His Passion. Sympathy must go out to Him the live-long day. Reparation should be made Him for own multitudinous crucifixion of Him in sin as well as for those of the world. Gethsemani, Pilate's hall, Herod's palace, Calvary's cross, are the door posts at which we must watch the uncreated Wisdom in His deepest love and countless sufferings. Sinners must keep vigil there, for their only Friend is paying their debt to God's offended majesty. Fervent disciples must be there; for all holiness, high and low, is imitation of the Passion. The Cross is always the magnet which attracts noble souls striving for advancement in virtue. All Christians should be at the foot of the Cross, to mourn, to hope, to love. It is not a day for joy and distraction but rather a day of universal compunction, prayer and separation.

WHY THE REV. MR. PEARSON IS A PROTESTANT

The Hamilton Times, of the 20th ult., reports a peculiar sermon, by the Rev. Mr. Pearson, to the Irish Protestant Benevolent Society, giving reasons why he himself is a Protestant. So far as the argumentative part was concerned it was merely an accumulation of misleading pleas why he was not a Catholic. To try to explain why a man is a Protestant is to stop half way. Protestantism is really without form and void. What Mr. Pearson ought to have done is to have told the Irish Protestant Society why he was a Methodist and not Anglican or Presbyterian. Nor do we see any propriety, much less charity, in the gentleman preaching upon the subject. The bar before which he will have to give reasons why he is not a Catholic is altogether different from an earthly congregation, mutely accepting the most unreliable statements of history and the most unwarrantable notions of Catholic theology. St. Paul counted it nothing at all to be judged by man's day. So must every preacher deem it folly to stand up and with gloved hand strike the Old Church under the nominal pretence of giving reasons why he does not belong to it. His hearers never mistook him for a priest in disguise. Unless the preacher's aim was merely to strike the Church under the belt he was beating the air and classifying the Society as a set of ignorant and bigoted fellows who would smack their cheeks at the pabulum he fed to them. There was no call for the Rev. Mr. Pearson to make an apology against the Church. It was badly made and should have been badly received. How different is that reading from the workings of a mind like Cardinal Newman who trod the path from darkness into light. Here was an apology for a life whose greater part was spent in unselfish search for truth and the solution of a question which shook the foundations of Oxford and Littlemore. Here was one of the noblest sons Anglicanism ever had, not charging Rome with blood and falsehood, nor charging any one—but going forth alone in prayer and silence that he might be guided on. We have no thought of comparing a canting minister with the saintly Newman. In the former we find not a single solid reason he alleges against the Church. He knows nothing of its history and spirit, and less, if that be possible, of its teaching. On the other hand we find in Cardinal Newman the man of single purpose and high ideal, bringing all the virtue of a saint and the learning of genius to the one problem of life, the grasp and hold of eternal truth. We have no intention of examining the Rev. Mr. Pearson's reasons for not being Catholic. The same hash is served up so often by ministers of that class that it is a waste of time to contradict them. We give just one as a sample. He says: "We protest against the powerful political influence the Church of Rome wields to coerce the souls of men." Nothing could be more puerile or more unfounded. That the Church has had tremendous influence in nations need not astonish or scandalize any one. This power was never employed for the coercion of men. When European civilization was threatened, and when the old Roman Empire was broken to pieces, and when the Roman Emperors were rotting in Constantinople the only breakwater to the tide of barbarism was the Catholic Church. When under her fostering care a new order issued from this chaos, and nations began to be formed, the influence of the Church stood for liberty against the tyranny of kings and emperors who had no regard for their oath and no respect for their vassals. As for modern times we have not a little of evidence of this pretended coercion. A protest of this kind, made under the circumstances under which the Rev. Mr. Pearson made it, is less a protest than a challenge and threat. The gentleman would have shown much better taste if he had left the Catholic Church out of his sermon. It may be popular to do so and might satisfy a few. On the whole protests are weak, unconvincing and pregnant with discord. Prejudice against the Church is uppermost in the feeblest minds where it sometimes manifests symptoms of fever, sometimes of frenzy and sometimes of failing sickness. It is a direful, piteous phenomenon which preachers and people who profess freedom of worship and union of charity too often display to the credit of their own ignorance and the loss of their own reputation.

ECCLESIASTICAL AND CIVIL LAW

There is no little confusion in modern times concerning the relations of Church and State. Mutual independence is the favorite theory. But however strictly each of these institutions may keep its own side of the road, certain questions and certain circumstances arise from time to time showing that mutual independence is neither mutual or independent. It too often means exaggerated caesarism. One of these border questions is matrimony, concerning which we are hearing a good deal just now from press and pulpit. Our zealous friend, Father Minehan, of St. Peter's Church, Toronto, did good in his eloquent and forcible sermon upon the subject, on Sunday, March 26. It does not do to let prejudiced and ignorant ministers have all the say upon Catholic subjects. Not only has Father Minehan dealt with the subject from the pulpit, but he has come out with earnest, clear letters. One of these was addressed to the Toronto Star. Taking an extract from this letter the Toronto Globe undertakes to read Father Minehan and all other Catholics of the country a lesson upon obedience to the civil law. The article is peculiarly subtle and insinuatingly offensive. Catholics obey the civil law as well as their neighbors, nor does their conduct defy the civil law. Why must a contract tone be assumed just because a Papal decree—three years old, is misread, misunderstood and misapplied? By what authority does the Toronto Globe tell the Catholic Church what is its duty? "The Catholic Church," says the Globe, "must comply with the civil law not merely, 'as far as she can,' but her priests and people must comply absolutely with the law as all other good citizens do." It will not be the first time in history, nor is it likely to be the last, when in this very province of Ontario the Catholic Church, represented by its bishops, may have to refuse the burthen threatened. We leave the responsibility with the bishops; for in case of a conflict between ecclesiastical and civil law a priest would naturally leave the decision with his ordinary. The question of matrimony may be, and is, of a mixed character, pertaining in its validity and indissolubility to the Church and in the temporal matters of registration and property responsible to the State. The sources of the two laws, ecclesiastical and civil, are not directly the same. All power is from God. The civil power is not from God directly, otherwise Church and State would be identical. On the other hand the Church received in the matter of the sacraments her power directly from her Divine Founder. Matrimony is one of these sacred treasures of which the Church is guardian and administratrix. It belongs to her to legislate upon matrimony, to decide when marriages are valid or not, licit or illicit. The Catholic Church has always shown an earnest willingness to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's; but she has also been courageous enough to insist upon rendering to God the things that are God's. The Globe says that: "It is beyond all peradventure that the Catholic Church in the Province of Ontario must accept as valid every marriage declared so to be by the civil law." We can console the Globe by assuring it that such a thing is not at all beyond peradventure, that it is an assumed premise whose conclusion, if it should ever be drawn, will be negative. Civil law cannot in this matter claim absolute and universal obedience from Catholic prelate, priest or people. All the power the Globe will grant the Church in case of disobedience is the expulsion from the membership of the Church. That is serious enough and reaches farther than the journal will admit. The invalidity of the sacrament cannot be rectified by civil magistrate or Protestant minister. If this argument of the Globe were sound it would destroy the sacredness of matrimony more than in the ordinary civil marriage. Again, the Globe tells us that there is nothing in the civil law requiring Catholics to be married by their clergy. Admitted: what does it prove? There is nothing in the civil law requiring Catholics to fast in Lent or to contribute to the support of their pastors. In this matter of clandestine marriages the power of the Church is well founded and definite, and has made in its exercise for the sanctity and union of man and wife. There need be no quarrel upon the subject. If the civil law were as careful and as carefully administered as the ecclesiastical law there would not be so many homes unhappy. Matrimony is, in the eyes of the Catholic Church, a sacred rite with which she alone is entrusted, the civil law to the contrary notwithstanding.

SPAIN AND THE HOLY SEE

Nation after nation in these times presents the same attitude of hostility to the Church and its Supreme Ruler. It is unnecessary to mention France, which, only a few years ago, tore up the Concordat between itself and the Holy See and conducted the Papal Nuncio at Paris to the Italian frontier. Germany, if not absolutely renewing its May laws, is continually finding fault and objecting to every Papal decree issued. Spain thinks it is its turn to join in the attack. The example set by France is to be followed throughout the Iberian Peninsula. When we examine the different plans of campaign in this almost universal warfare we find a striking similarity which implies a central organization directing the whole. Its dominant characteristic seems to be the aggressiveness of a small minority whose power is obtained through the apathy and disunion of the Catholic majority. Spain is the latest power dragged into the fight against the wishes of its truest and most numerous citizens. The present Spanish government is radical. Its Premier, Senor Canalejas, whilst professing Catholicity, is, for the sake of political power, anti-clerical. No sooner did he receive his present honor than he made a bid for the support of the Republican Left by pledging himself to introduce several anti-clerical measures. A concordat between the Vatican and Spain was then, and is still in existence. According to some of its clauses certain matters were required to be dealt with by mutual agreements between Spain and Rome. Instead of respecting this point Canalejas issued two decrees without any reference to Rome's wishes. One of these decrees professed to modify the legal standing of religious orders and congregations. The other introduced a new interpretation of the Spanish constitution which determines the amount of freedom to be allowed non-Catholics in the matter of religious manifestations. Thereupon the Vatican sent a dignified protest expressed in moderate language. The King's speech followed, not merely anti-clerical in substance but aggressively so in form and expression. It was a decided call to war rather than a message of peace, designed to enlist the sympathies of the anti-Catholic supporters of Premier Canalejas. The next law was along the same line. This was a law preventing any addition to the number of religious houses for the space of two years. No consultation this time with Rome either. Once more the Spanish government was making clear what stand it was taking with the Concordat it had with Rome. The Papal Secretary of State again protested. On all these occasions the Vatican defended its rights with firmness, without infringing upon existing agreements or offending the delicate rules of diplomatic intercourse. What was Canalejas' reply to this last protest? Without a word of warning he recalled the Spanish Ambassador from Rome. In spite of this insulting measure the Vatican kept its Nuncio at Madrid. Still further the Holy See expressed its views upon the conditions under which the law could be admitted. These are not the only instances in which the Vatican has just causes of complaint against the Spanish government, its supporters and its press. Two acts are general in these dramas: the first a break with the Holy See: the second consists in throwing the blame upon the Vatican. The inspired Ministerial Press is busy trying to mislead public opinion into the belief that it is the Vatican which, throughout the dispute, has behaved with intolerance. If a rupture should occur, which is not at all unlikely, the fault will not lie with the Holy Father, for he has borne much for peace. All that he demands in answer to the enquiry from Madrid as to whether the Vatican would renew negotiations, was that these negotiations should be conducted upon the basis of the existing Concordat and in view of Canon Law as recognized by that treaty. The Spanish Government, during the negotiations, must abstain from introducing measures or issuing decrees which are calculated to anticipate or prejudice the negotiations. This is quite reasonable. Two parties treating together in order to arrive at an agreement upon a point cannot fairly anticipate the result by an independent action. Should a rupture take place the only forecast likely is the fall of the Canalejas Cabinet.

THE NEW FRENCH MINISTRY

To diagnose a French ministry is too dangerous for self-respecting journals. Before the journal reaches its clients the ministry is changed and the appreciation has to be revised. We must not delay, for M. Monis, the Premier who succeeds Briand, is now in power nearly average time. The Saturday Review, of London, Eng., considers the composition of the government "as bad as bad can be." That implies much more than positive terms could express. The only consolation a country can derive from having a ministry of that character is that this badness will lead more quickly to a change. Governments which succeed one another several times during the life of a single parliament naturally show weakness in the composition of their members. They are recruited from the residue, not of parties but of factions, whose policy is suggested, not by the majority of suffragans through the country, but by the exigencies of the moment within the halls of the legislature. So is it with the cabinet of M. Monis. Its strength lies in only three members—the Premier himself, Delcasse and Berteaux, whose most lasting bond of union is hatred of the Church. Monis, the Premier, assures the world that the government is homogeneous and explicitly radical. "It is," he declares, "authentic Radicalism, the Radicalism of the Left which is in power." The position is, therefore, anomalous even according to French Republicanism. The policy of moderation and conciliation, under which M. Briand was successfully holding the chamber and which was confessedly accepted by the country, was thrown aside by the President of France when he called an Extremist to form a combination. This consists of the creatures of Combes to whom they paid a that of respect as soon as constituted. French politics are always in unstable equilibrium. They tend more and more to disturbance. When moderation was expelled from office by the resignation of Briand a policy of aggressiveness might be expected. Accordingly Monis, when called to office, said: "We shall apply without feebleness and without violence the laws on the congregations and on the separation of Church and State. We shall maintain the secular school against attacks." He made a bid for all classes of the Republicans and promised on his own behalf and that of his colleagues that the new government would practice all virtues, prudence, justice and moderation, and most of all, secularism. Setting out to please everybody the new Premier has pleased nobody. Deputies within the chamber greeted his statement with laughter, whilst they voted for its approval in order to give the ministry. It is the same with the country and the press. The probability is that the government will not last long. Its lease may be long enough for evil. The anti-clerical threat in M. Monis' statement gives rise amongst Catholics to grave uneasiness. Professed unbelievers in schools and in the chamber of Deputies, anti-religious books in classes, and an aggressive declaration of office, are the prospects of the immediate future for the Catholics of France. With these factors neutrality means war and persecution.

CLUB, SCHOOL AND NOVEL

We were gratified to see that these subjects are attracting the attention of at least a few thoughtful women. The surprise is that these evil influences did not long before cause criticism. There should not have been the lax silence and the blindfolded oversight for so many years. It is inexcusable for society to shut its eyes against the faults of the three or close its ears to the complaints which sound moralists have been uninterruptedly making upon them. Society sees no faults in any of its pets. And judging by the popularity of clubs, schools and novels these are three most favored evolutions of modern civilization. That clubs serve to weaken home life is not perhaps the harm they do. There are other dangers far more subtle and deadly in the club life. Temperance gets the slip and habits of gambling are formed to the loss of honor and integrity. What is to be said of the heir of all the ages, the public school? No one would dare to complain of the great system which styles itself non-sectarian, but which is so irreligious it cannot be sectarian. People would be considered unpatriotic if they said a word against the schools. Now we find Christian mothers blaming the schools for the want of reverence, modesty, and many other passive virtues which are despised by youth. These good women are right. They see the wound without being able to apply the remedy. Want of discipline, co-education and absence of religious training are to blame. An evil tree cannot produce good fruit. In a young country, more than in older lands, is it necessary to walk by God's law; for the schools in a new land are the main associations for the acquisition of knowledge, taste and virtue. In too many districts of our Province coarseness is mistaken for courage, and humility regarded as meanness. Politeness is a lost art and respect for age was buried a generation ago. When education limits itself to the same materialistic search for means to be selfish and to advance in wealth no high ideal can be held out to the growing youth or sacrifice be asked of him in the higher calls of life. He is only one and counts for no more, so that it is his advantage to elbow others out of the way and push himself to the front by all the means in his power. The novel is the third evil the women are beginning to complain of. English novels are not so universally bad that even an inquisition would burn them all. It is the excess of novel reading which is the most objectionable feature. Too much of this reading has a very injurious effect upon the mind and character. We are not discussing suggestive books or passages, which are forbidden to all. But fiction begets an unreal idea of life and fosters a frivolous habit of mind.

What are the remedies for these evils? The only suggestion we read of these associations making was that the government should do something. That is always the way—and a poor way it is. Non-Catholic moralists rush to the politicians as if they could, or ever did, make the world. For the novels we think there ought to be an *Index Expurgatorius*. For the schools religion must be the basis and the copestone. For the club wives and mothers must control husbands and sons. Home has much to do with moderating the first of these evils. Home can supplement the imperfect school training. Lastly, home has much to say, and should have much to say upon the kind of reading indulged in by the fireside.

A CATHOLIC INTERNATIONAL UNION

The Rev. P. J. Dowling, C. M., of Cork, Ireland, has been sponsor for many a good cause ere this, but we doubt if, in our time at least, any Catholic, be he priest or layman, has initiated a work of such far-reaching importance as that suggested by him at the English Catholic Congress held at Leeds. At this congress Father Dowling advocated the formation of an International Catholic Defence Union to combat the organized attacks of Freemasonry throughout the world. Since the Bishops of Ireland have approved of the object of the proposed union, and since in all probability the English hierarchy will likewise set its seal upon it, it may be taken for granted that the Association is well on the way to success. It may, therefore, interest readers of the RECORD to learn a little about its proposed constitution and plan of action. It is not proposed to establish an entirely new organization. The new union is to be made up of a number of bodies already existing, drawn together in a common league for the following purpose: 1st. To watch the press and utilize it in exposing the plots and calumnies that are employed in the warfare against the Church. 2nd. To provide an International Trusteeship registered as a commercial company, which in case of need will undertake the guardianship of threatened church property. 3rd. To make common cause and concerted action with regard to the commerce of a country that engaged in a warfare against the Church, and to use every means to ban all products of that country everywhere the union exists so long as that hostility continues. 4th. To supply funds to fight the cause of priests and religion when attacked before local tribunals. 5th. To use any other means the council may adopt as legitimate defence against the attacks of the enemies of the Church.

From this it is evident that the Union intends to labor in a wide field. Of course its first object, the apostleship of the press, is far and away the most important. It is that which will appeal most to the people at large, as it is from it the Union will reap the greatest fruit. In the newspaper age men take their opinions cut and dry from the press. The world is too busy to think—it thinks by deputy. Society is like a huge gramaphone; it assimilates the thoughts and the words of others as recorded in the newspapers, and then gives them out as its own. Think, then, of the evil wrought by a wicked and unscrupulous press! Think of the lies it retails, the slanders it gives utterance to, the ignorance it fosters, the bigotry it develops! And think of what an untold amount of good could be achieved by such an agency as the proposed Union, which would see to it that these lying statements were contradicted, that these calumnies were refuted, at their fountain and source! In America recently appeared a very interesting account of the work accomplished by the German Central Information Bureau for the Catholic press along the lines referred to. Therein we read that during a single year, 1910, the Bureau handled in all 1,329 cases. Now if a single society can achieve that splendid result what could not the proposed International Society not do? Here, then, is work for the Church. This is modernism of a kind not condemned by the Holy Father.

Membership of the Union will be within the reach of all as the annual fee is fixed at a shilling (twenty-five cents). If twenty million Catholics join the Union, and who will say that this is an impossible number, it will mean that a war chest of five million dollars will be at the disposal of the Union. In the article in America, already alluded to the writer laments that we have few Catholic millionaires willing to finance Church work? But the pennies of the poor, represented by this five million fund, will do the work without the assistance of the millionaire, and in a way more pleasing to the Sacred Heart of our Divine Lord, Who values the widow's mite more than the princely gifts of the few.

The governing body of the Union will consist of Bishops, priests, and laymen in equal numbers, presided over by a Cardinal to be nominated by the Pope. They will constitute the International Council. There will also be a National Council for each country similarly constituted. The International Council will direct the general policy of the Union; the National that of its particular country. In giving their approval to the objects of the proposed Union the Irish Bishops refused to sanction section three, namely, to introduce concerted action in regard to commercial business, feeling no doubt that it savored of "boy-cotting."

"COLUMBA."

NOTES AND COMMENTS

WE HAVE received the report of the Archdiocesan Union of the Holy Name Society, of Toronto, covering the period from June 1st of last year (the date of organization) to the present time. The report is very comprehensive as to the work accomplished and the financial position of the Society, and fairly augurs a continued career of usefulness along the lines marked out for it by its founders. We have referred repeatedly in these columns to the aims of the Holy Name Society, and its adaptability to the needs of the hour. In this age of relaxing faith and increasing irreverence it is meet that Catholic laymen should assume an aggressive attitude in opposition thereto, and by themselves setting an example of clean lives and reverent speech, show forth to the world the essential beauty of holiness on the one hand, and, as contrasted therewith, the hideous deformity of blasphemy and obscenity on the other. To this end there is no more effective means at hand than the Society of the Holy Name, for it carries with it the blessing and encouragement of the Church, and all that these imply—frequentation of the Sacraments on the part of its members, and that consciousness of strength and inviolability which membership in the One True Church alone can bestow. Every sincere Catholic, therefore, will wish well to the Holy Name Society and pray for its world-wide extension. And the success of the Toronto Archdiocesan Union should stimulate and encourage the movement in every section of Canada.

THE NOISE and bluster over the Papal decree, "Ne Temere," has been growing space and resounding throughout all Canada. It will probably continue to increase in volume for a few weeks, swell to abnormal proportions, and then, bursting, disappear into thin air as have so many similar agitations in the past. It will be profitable at this juncture to recall the Jesuits' Estates Act of some years ago, or the outcry against our Separate Schools which precipitated something of a split in one of the great political parties. The latter received its quietus from Archbishop Cleary, who, in a series of letters to the then Leader of the Opposition in the Ontario Legislature, effectually exposed its iniquitous origin in the brains of a few scheming politicians hungry for the spoils of office, while at the same time demonstrating to Canadians how to conduct a controversy in a vein worthy of the best traditions of the old world.

THE ANTI-JESUIT agitation seemed perhaps more formidable. The present turmoil is at any rate a tempest in a teapot compared to it. Then, as now, we were treated to wild talk about "Papal Aggression," "Religious Liberty," and the like, and, in addition, a group of men hitherto regarded as moderate and judicial in their attitude towards public questions, formed themselves into an association for the defence of "rights" which nobody had assailed. Then, too, as now, but in an even more violent manner, Catholics were treated to a daily bill of fare of calumny and abuse, through the medium of the daily press, the Protestant pulpit and the religious