

# The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 181 and 183 Richmond street, London, Ontario.  
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

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

Agents: Luke King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and Joseph S. King are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.  
Agent for Newfoundland, Mr. T. J. Wall, St. John's.  
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, admeasurement.  
Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.  
Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London, not later than Tuesday morning. When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.  
Agent or collectors have no authority to stop your paper unless the amount due is paid.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION.  
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA,  
Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1902.  
To the Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD,  
London, Ont.:  
Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published and the good and true Catholic spirit pervades 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,  
T. D. FALCONIO, Arch. of Ottawa,  
Apost. Deleg.

London, Saturday, May 10, 1902.

## SPURIOUS PRAYERS.

We have on several occasions from time to time warned Catholic readers against the use of spurious prayers which make promises of extraordinary graces or favors from heaven to those who make use of them or recite them under certain conditions.

Our attention was recently called to one of these prayers which has been circulated somewhat widely among Catholics of this and other dioceses in Ontario under the designation of "The Most Efficacious Prayer to St. Joseph."

It is not the prayer itself, as we do not reprint the prayer itself, and we do not wish to assist in propagating it by giving it the benefit of our circulation. This prayer promises many favors to those who recite it and fulfil the condition under which it is to be promulgated. One of these is the release within a certain number of days of any soul in Purgatory whom the person using this prayer may designate, the condition being annexed that five copies of the prayer shall be written out and distributed by the user, or that five printed copies be procured and circulated.

It appears evident on the face of the case that the purpose of this condition is to promote the sale of the leaflet for the profit of the person who had it printed. The leaflet is sold at a small price, but if by means of these false promises a large number can be sold a considerable profit may accrue to the benefit of the interested promoter of this spurious devotion; and the same thing is to be said of some similar spurious prayers, of which one of the conditions is that it should be propagated in a similar manner. It cannot be doubted that the principal aim of the propagators of this devotion is to make some profit out of the transaction, though we cannot imagine that the amount derivable from such a traffic can be large.

A similar deception has been attempted by the circulation of a prayer entitled "In the Tomb," which is falsely asserted to have been discovered in the Tomb of our Lord in the eighty-third year of the Christian era. Other dates have also been given for the discovery of this prayer, the propagation of which is also a condition for the obtaining of the favors promised by it, one of which is that those who circulate it "shall not die a sudden death."

We cannot readily understand why Catholics should allow themselves to be imposed upon by these shallow deceptions. These bogus prayers have always in them some indication by which it can be known that they are spurious, for they make lavish promises of heavenly favors for which there is no authorization in reason or religion.

There are many prayer-books within reach of Catholics, which contain excellent devotions which are calculated to promote love for God, and to nourish piety, without having recourse to these unauthorized or condemned prayers which make ridiculous promises of graces or divine benefits for which there is no authority, as there is no authenticity to the statements that Almighty God has made any revelation that such benefits shall be conferred upon those who use the prayers.

While treating of this subject we feel it incumbent on us also to warn our readers generally to pay no attention to circulars sent from a distance asking for contributions to charities or benevolent works for the truth of which it is impossible to have any guarantee or certainty. We do not assert that in every case these circulars are fraudulent; but there have been many frauds perpetrated in this manner, and in the case when copious promises are made that hundreds of Masses will be cele-

brated for the donors towards the charities indicated, there is good reason for a suspicion that a fraud is intended, for the Church is very particular in condemning every attempt to make the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass the basis of traffic.

In most parishes there are local good works to be promoted, and it is all that can be expected of most people, if they contribute toward the good works of their own parish or diocese, without looking abroad for objects of charity the authenticity of which is, to say the least, often very dubious. Nevertheless it will occur from time to time that sudden emergencies arise at a distance to contribute toward which will be a real charity, and it would then be a good deed for those who are blessed with considerable means to aid in relieving the sufferings of those who are far away. The best recommendation we can give for the guidance of our readers in such cases is that they should consult their confessors in regard to what aid it is prudent or desirable for them to assist distant charities.

It is a meritorious deed to assist the distressed in whatever part of the world they may be, but for the great majority of people there is certainly no obligation to look far away from home for objects of charity, whereas there are near at hand so many worthy ones as to require all the help which most people have the means to extend; for our Lord reminds us that we have the poor always with us. At all events, distant objects of charity which are made known by circular only are usually not sufficiently authenticated to justify the generosity of people to send money for such purposes.

The following is a list of bogus prayers which have been condemned by the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences as unauthentic:

1. A litany of the Blessed Virgin of Sorrows, said to have been composed by Pius VII.
2. A salutation to Mary the mother of Sorrows, written in imitation of the Hail Mary.
3. The heads called the "Crown of Thorns," the grains of which resemble the heads of certain animals to represent the birth of Christ between an ox and an ass.
4. A revelation said to have been made to St. Bernard regarding the wound in our Lord's shoulder.
5. The history of the merits of the Passion and Death of Jesus Christ our Lord.
6. Words said to have been uttered by the Blessed Virgin Mary when she received Jesus into her arms.
7. A certain prayer addressed to the Saviour of the World.
8. A prayer of Pope St. Gregory said to have been written to St. John at Rome in letters of Gold.
9. A prayer to the Holy Cross with a promise of the delivery of five souls from purgatory if it be recited five times on successive Fridays.
10. A letter of Jesus said to have been found in His Tomb, and treating of the drops of blood which He shed on His journey to Calvary.
11. A spurious document said to have been issued by St. Anthony of Padua.
12. A book named "Crown of the Saviour."
13. A prayer to the Blessed Virgin beginning with the words "Hail, O Sovereign Virgin."
14. A prayer in remembrance of "the glorious death of St. Benedict," with the promise of many ineffable graces.

## A GREAT BENEFIT SOCIETY.

It is now nearly a quarter of a century since the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association was established in Canada, the first branch being formed in Windsor, Ont. It was then, and for many years afterwards, affiliated with the American Association, Canada having a Grand Council the same as different States of the American union. Those who, like the writer, joined the Association on its introduction into Canada, are at this day agreeably surprised at what may be fairly termed its phenomenal growth. The Society first took a firm hold in the Province of Ontario, and from Montreal spread throughout every part of the Province of Quebec. Only a short time elapsed before the great benefits to be derived from membership in the Association were recognized throughout the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, where it soon became established on a solid basis. By leaps and bounds it progressed all over the Dominion, until now it covers the whole country, many branches having been formed in Manitoba and throughout the North-West Territories, all of which are in a flourishing condition. The splendid success of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association became more marked after the Canadian membership separated from the United States. The course of events during the past eight or ten years proves that the step taken by the Canadians at that time was a wise one. The Canadian membership is now nearly seventeen thousand, and is steadily increasing. The death benefits are paid promptly and the Association has a Reserve Fund of about \$130,000. It is only justice to

remark that the builder of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association is its present worthy Grand Secretary, Samuel R. Brown. From time to time he was ably assisted by some of the best minds in the country; but the active, earnest and constant work of Mr. Brown was the prime factor in establishing the Association upon a solid and enduring foundation.

There has not been for many years any excuse whatever for a Catholic joining benefit societies other than those recommended by the Church authorities. So far as security is concerned, we feel perfectly safe in stating that the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association stands on a firm basis. That the Catholic people of Canada may have full confidence in it we have put to print herewith the names of those gentlemen who have the direction of its affairs. The positions occupied by these gentlemen, and the reputation which they enjoy amongst the people of Canada, is enough of itself to inspire confidence in the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association.

Spiritual Adviser—Archbishop O'Brien, Halifax, Nova Scotia.  
Chancellor—D. K. Fraser, Brockville, Ont.  
President—Hon. M. F. Hackett, Stanstead, Que.  
First Vice-President—Dr. L. J. Belliveau, Shediac, N. B.  
Second Vice-President—Bernard O'Connell, Dublin, Ont.  
Secretary—Samuel R. Brown, London, Ont.  
Treasurer—W. J. McKee, M. L. A., Windsor, Ont.  
Marshal—J. D. Colquhoun, Arthur, Ont.  
Guard—Jacob J. Weimer, Neustadt, Ont.

TRUSTEES:  
Rev. J. E. Crinion, Dunnville, Ont.; J. A. Chisholm, Halifax, N. S.; Charles Dupont Hebert, Three Rivers, Que.; P. J. O'Keefe, St. John, N. B.; J. J. Behan, Kingston, Ont.

## COMMITTEE ON LAWS.

W. J. Boland, Toronto, Ont.; John A. Murphy, Cayuga, Ont.; J. A. Ramsay, Joliette, Que.

## FINANCE COMMITTEE.

John Roman, Hamilton, Ont.; J. T. Halliday, Toronto, N. S.; Hon. A. D. Richard, Dorchester, N. B.

## APPOINTED OFFICERS.

Supervising Medical Examiner—Edward Ryan, M. D., Kingston, Ont.  
Solicitor—Hon. F. R. Latchford, Ottawa, Ont.  
Assistant Secretary—J. E. H. Howison, London, Ont.

## ANGLICAN ORDERS.

In the Woodstock Herald of April 26th we find a report of a sermon by the Rev. J. C. Farthing, the rector of the new St. Paul's Anglican church, in which that rev. gentleman undertakes to defend the sermon of Bishop Baldwin on which we made some remarks in our issue of 12th ult.

The Rev. Mr. Farthing's is professedly a reply to a sermon delivered by the Rev. Father Cook in St. Mary's church on the previous Sunday.

We have not before us any report of Father Cook's sermon, and it is not our purpose to deal here with any personal issue between the two gentlemen, but as Rev. Mr. Farthing makes a great flourish of trumpets we propose to show that he has failed completely to prove that the Bishops and clergy of the Church of England have valid priestly orders, and that this same Church is identical with the original Church of England established in that country, say in 183, in the reign of King Lucius, and later under the Saxon domination by St. Augustine in 597.

In our issue of three weeks ago we proved already at some length by the testimony of Venerable Bede, William of Malmesbury, and other ancient British historians and historical monuments, that the British Church of the second century and the Anglo-Saxon Church of the sixth were both established by missionaries from the Popes of their respective periods, namely, Eleutherius and Gregory the Great.

Both these Churches constantly recognized the authority of the Pope. We showed in our former article that British Bishops signed the acts of the Council of Arles in 314 which acknowledged the Pope's universal authority, and again British Bishops attended at and signed the acts of the Council of Sardica in 343, and of other Councils, showing that they belonged to the universal Church which was never made up of independent national Churches, as the Rev. Mr. Farthing asserts, but was from the beginning one Church under one visible head, the Pope, whose jurisdiction extended throughout all nations.

Bishop Baldwin himself admitted that the British Bishops assisted frequently at the Councils of the Church from that of Arles downward. This fact of itself proves that they belonged, not to an independent English Church, but to the universal Church over which Rev. Mr. Farthing himself says in his sermon:

"It is undoubtedly true that a primacy of honor was conceded to the Bishops of Rome."

We shall see from the quotations and references which will be given below that the primacy of the Popes was no empty honor, but consisted in a real authority which extended over the whole Church of God on earth.

At the Council of Sardica, the Pope's legate, Bishop Osius of Cordova, presided. This itself was an admission that the Pope's authority was real; and it is to be remarked that at this Council the proceedings were of a very different character from the modern

abortive Pan-Anglican Councils which always have admitted that they had no authority to settle disputes which are tearing the very vitals of Anglicanism. The Presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury over these assemblies was indeed merely honorary, and no one dared even to propose to settle the controversy which is still raging between Ritualists and Kenites.

Precisely because Pan-Anglicanism is an agglomeration of independent national and provincial churches, its Councils have no authority to settle disputes whether on faith or discipline. But it was a very different matter with the one Church which Christ established and the Apostles governed.

From Acts xv we find that the Council of Jerusalem held by the Apostles had power to settle disputes, and did so, declaring that what they did was done by the authority of the Holy Ghost, for "it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay no further burden upon you than these necessary things," (verse 28.)

But the Council of Sardica, at which, be it remembered, British Bishops assisted, anathematized the Arians, and maintained the faith as it had been already propounded by that Council of Nice. At this Council, also, Osius, the Pope's legate, spoke as one whose authority was real, and not honorarily fictitious. It was Osius who declared to the Arians who brought false accusations against St. Athanasius, that if Athanasius were proved guilty of the crimes alleged against him

"You may rest assured of the vigor of his condemnation . . . and I will willingly decide to dismiss him from his See, and to bring him with me into Spain."

By what right could a Bishop of Spain thus speak of exercising such authority over the patriarch of Alexandria? According to Rev. Mr. Farthing's theory that national Churches are independent, Osius must have greatly exceeded his authority. Could we imagine the Archbishop of Canterbury at a Pan-Anglican Council speaking thus in regard to Bishop Potter of New York? If he were to do so, he would make himself a laughing-stock to the world. But Osius could do this for the reason that as delegate of the Pope he had a real and universal authority, and not the delegated empty "primacy of honor" of which the Rev. Mr. Farthing speaks.

With such facts before us, what are we to think of the Rev. Mr. Farthing's statements "that in early days the rights of national churches were recognized, and they were independent?"

We do not deny that in every country, so long as matters went smoothly, not only every national Church, but every provincial, and even every diocesan Church proceeded calmly in the conducting of its own affairs, just as they all do in the Catholic Church at the present day, but it is seen that in subjects of importance the authority of the Pope was always appealed to as the final tribunal to which all matters of great moment were referred.

In the face of numerous authorities of this kind, the Rev. Mr. Farthing states that the supreme authority of the Pope dates from after the year 850, and was based upon sixty forged documents which were made public at this time. This is a gross misrepresentation of the case. It is true that some person, usually called Isidore Mercator, but whose identity is not known for a certainty, issued forged documents, which were supposed by many to be authentic. But the Pope's authority was fully recognized before these documents were issued, and therefore the Primacy of the Pope in no way depended upon them. These false decretals were not the work of any Pope, nor were they issued by Papal authority; but their author was able to pass them off for a time as genuine, because they upheld the Pope's authority which existed already and was universally recognized, and thus it was comparatively easy to pass off as authentic forged documents which were quite in accord with the received and true teaching of the Church. The false decretals were not, however, all forgeries. Many of them were authentic decrees of Popes and Councils, but ante-dated; but the Pope's authority over the whole Church neither began with these decretals nor did it depend upon them in any way. (See Encyclopedia Britannica: Canon Law.) In fact, these forged decretals were issued not in the interest of the Popes, but as a protection to Bishops against persecution by the civil authorities.

The Lutheran historian, Mosheim, in his Church history, admits that in the third century the chief authority in the Church was universal given to the Pope. (Mosheim's Church History, 3rd century.) Even the most extreme Protestants admit that in this period the Church possessed the pure and primitive faith as handed down from the Apostles. It was within the period of persecution when many millions of martyrs laid down their lives to attest their firm adhesion to the faith originally delivered to the saints—

a period when any teaching contrary to the faith was universally regarded as a sacrilege, and would have been indignantly rejected by these martyrs and confessors of the faith.

The following decree of the Council of Nice held in A. D. 325 will show the care with which the Christian Church preserved the unity of faith at this period:

Speaking of ordinations performed by certain African schismatics (the Miletians) the Council says:

"They shall have no authority to designate those persons that please them . . . or to do anything at all apart from the decision of those Bishops of the Catholic and Apostolic Church who are living under Alexander. But the authority to designate and nominate those worthy of the clerical office, and to do all things according to the law and custom of the Church, shall belong to those who are not in schism, but who are spotless in the Catholic and Apostolic Church." (Synodal Epistle of Nicene Council.)

Alexander here mentioned was the patriarch of Alexandria, and it is declared by the Council that only those in communion with him had the right to ordain priests, that is to say, in his province.

That Alexander was himself in communion with the whole Church, and therefore subject to the Pope, its supreme Head, is evident from own his words:

"The body of the Church is one, and it is a precept of the divine writings that we should keep the bond of unanimity and peace, and in accordance with this that we should write and make known to each other what has been done by each."

It is clear that the great general Council and Alexander himself would not approve the Schismatical ordinations and episcopal consecrations whereby an Anglican hierarchy was established in 1559, namely, that hierarchy which Rev. Mr. Farthing takes so much pains to prove to be possessed of valid orders. Bishops consecrated for the purpose of beginning a schismatical and heretical Church would be spurned as schismatics by the Fathers of the Church who met at Nice, scores of whom bore upon their bodies the wounds they had received for bearing testimony to the true faith which had been handed down to them from Apostolic times. These Fathers would as soon have acknowledged Julian the Apostate, who lived but a few years after them, as head of the Church of Christ, and have adored at his dictation the gods of heathenism as true gods, as to have accepted the supremacy of Henry VIII. or Queen Elizabeth, or to have recognized Elizabeth's batch of Bishops as pastors in the Church of God.

We already quoted the testimony of Irenaeus in regard to the Headship of the Church as belonging to the Pope. Let us now hear St. Cyprian, who flourished in the third century, namely, in A. D. 230 and 240:

"A pseudo-Bishop having been set up for themselves by heretics, they dare to sail and to carry letters from schismatics and profane persons to the Chair of Peter and the chief Church (ecclesiam principalem) whence the unity of the priesthood took its rise."

This refers to the false Bishop Fortunatus who had the presumption to go to Rome to plead before the Pope that he might be confirmed in his episcopacy, surreptitiously obtained in this manner as Rev. Mr. Farthing pretends and argues that Matthew Parker and others became true Bishops in the year 1559.

The testimonies of the early ages to the supreme authority of the Pope over the Church of God are so numerous that we must limit our quotations to but a very small number. We shall quote now only one more Father, whom we select because he sat at the same council of Sardica at which, as we have stated above, the Bishops of Britain were present. St. Hilary of Poitiers states that the Council wrote to Pope Julius:

"You (Julius) most dearly loved brother, though absent from us in body were present in mind, concordant and will . . . For this will be seen to be best, and by far the most befitting thing, if to the head, that is to the see of the Apostle Peter, the priests of the Lord refer (or report) from every one of the provinces."

We have already made this article so long that we are obliged to defer to the further consideration of Rev. Mr. Farthing's sermon. But we shall add that even if that gentleman could establish the valid consecration or ordination of pseudo-Bishop Matthew Parker and his colleagues, as he endeavors to do, the case of the Church of England would not be much improved, for it is evident from what we have already shown that these Bishops and the clergy ordained by them in schism would be in the position of schismatical, suspended, or excommunicated Bishops and priests, having no authority in the Church of God, because they are cut off from Catholic unity.

We shall examine in a future article the detailed proofs adduced by Rev. Mr. Farthing to show that the Anglican hierarchy has Apostolic succession

through the Catholic Church, and we undertake to show that Rev. Mr. Farthing's proofs are defective at every point.

The Church of England under Henry VIII. was at least schismatical, but under Edward VI. and Elizabeth it became heretical. In each case it was utterly cut off from the universal or Catholic Church, and from the ancient Church of England, which was part of the universal Church.

There is no authority either by Scripture or Tradition for the establishment of a new Church apart from the one Church which Christ established, commanding His Apostles to teach all nations, (St. Matt. xxviii, 19,) and against those who create schisms or teach heresies the Apostle St. Paul pronounces the terrible anathema:

"But though we or an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you beside that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema." (Gal. i, 8, 9.)

The Church of England cannot shake off its responsibility for this crime.

## CATHOLIC SOCIETIES' FEDERATION.

Many of the Catholic papers in England are out in advocacy of a federation of Catholic Societies similar to that which has been formed in the United States for the protection of Catholic interests in general. It is argued, not unreasonably, that such an Association as the Protestant Alliance is a constant danger to Catholics politically, and that fire is most effectively fought with fire. The resuscitation recently of an old penal law against the Jesuits, which was not repealed even at the time of Catholic Emancipation, has shown that there are swords in their scabbards which only await some one bold enough to draw them against Catholics, and the Catholics should be on the alert to meet their enemies at the first appearance of danger. This can be done only by union and association. One paper said not long since that "such an insult to the Catholics of England as the King's accession oath would not remain twenty-four hours on the statute books if there were an earnest federation of Catholic societies ever ready to battle for Catholic rights."

## FOR THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

### WAKE UP, CATHOLICS!

Speak Your Mind on the Subject of the Oath of Accession.

The above heading does not seem inappropriate, in view of the apathy which seems to prevail in too many quarters on the subject of the horrible anti-Catholic oath which our liege lord, King Edward, has been forced to take on his accession to the imperial throne. His majesty has been already obliged to make a sworn declaration to the effect that the belief held by twelve millions of his subjects in the sacrifice of the Mass is idolatrous and superstitious and that their veneration of the Mother of God is the same. "Is it," we ask, "in the power of human language to describe the lengths and the breadth and the depth of the outrage on Catholic feeling contained in this diabolic declaration?"—a declaration made not by a mere politician soliciting the votes of ignorant bigots, but by the very head of the State!—made, too, not on an ordinary occasion, but on his very coming to the throne, and that in Russia or China, but in the very heart of an Empire which depends largely for its freedom and its success in peace and war on these twelve millions of "superstitious" and "idolatrous" Catholics! Mark you, Catholic readers, you have been expressly singled out for this royal compliment! Glory in the thought! Turks, Jews and Kafirs, Hottentots and Red men, black men, brown men and yellow men, fire worshippers, sun worshippers and serpent worshippers, all have been passed over in silence. You vile Catholics have been made lower than the lowest, for you alone have been formally proclaimed as superstitious idolaters, and that by no lesser authority than your Sovereign! Of course it is our strong belief that King Edward's private sentiments are utterly averse to such a declaration. We believe that, and we know it; but that does not change the position. The declaration in all its revolting form has actually been made. The taking of such an oath two hundred years ago was comparatively little moment, because when Catholics were exiled, imprisoned and gibbeted for their religion, it was only consistent that the Sovereign should declare them "superstitious idolaters." But we are now in the twentieth century, and for the past seventy-four years we have been deluding ourselves with the thought that Catholics in this Empire were at least equal before the law to the followers of Mohammed or to the men who worship wooden gods in the jungles of India. If we, poor benighted twelve millions of Catholics, in our "superstition" and "idolatry," did cherish such a delusion, the "Accession Oath" has set us right. We now know our position. Seriously, what oath were he to live to-day? Would that we had an O'Connell to raise a protesting voice!—to cry out, and cease not, until the Empire rang with the enormity of this official survival of penal days—this deep, dark cloud which comes over the sky to shade off and well nigh eclipse the glory of our beloved Sovereign's coronation. Let politicians say what they may about "tampering with the oath" and "securing Protestant succession," we have too much faith in our Sovereign to think that on his coronation day it will give him pleasure to remember that he has mounted the

throne by tampering with honor and dignity. Viewed from the "Accession Oath." At one fortune. At one that and toleration the happy reign is a horrible persecuting gulf between twelve millions of that oath the Catholic man amongst the vilest slave earth was not the Sovereign's the "Accession Oath" of Catholics would the world in do after the oath—next from "supremacy" where is "idolatry"? Possibility? Passed on only a minority thing to the twelve millions are only white, then, too, out he as sensitive to Indian, African subjects (black, brown, red) that it may be so than at them? Having been crucified to-day have the races as those a mayhap, the Emperor friends just no Frenchmen, Anglo-Boers that it is twelve millions, and possibly, as we have its merriest laughing stock the world, and extension of native Canadian, English, African, Indian and These Catholic! Atkins, all right "on the tide" River has to be word comes to be bold is good even African soil, but it is only right when a royal army see will idolatry British black to have been the a- ians who refuse Surely they co- other reasoning clusion! Why can the following "It is my royal belief as a Prote- and every one of Catholic subjects Catholic peers in and truly horseless my coronation."

We would Chamberlain add they added that would have re- of much of its gain, there would deem it whipped or do day. It would, tinction. How Catholics or a feel that they few strokes of mainly got their cession. Oath! scoured, not w- pions. Think Twelve millions reared within the Dominions, paying its taxes formally and so- Sovereign to be and then God truth of this we ask: "ubini rempublicum ho- virtuous? Well, we Canadian Ca- stated from the sp- this monstrous and bay the Roman." If in- parted from the men fou- then will it con- on, stolid in apathy, our name amongst the God Catholic shall a wagging of Bersabee: to the go- and forbid, say- should be "N- gauge as indic- decadence of ing off of co- Catholics. Th- faith for nine- Catacombs, on- on Irish hills- in days like o- strongly in or- is that Cathol- zeal if they w- reproach left the silent ac- accession wou- Let such sile- Speech! prote- dignant, are n- found pol- some one vo- voke opposit- the Protestan- we reply, "M- simply delica- man even? "But," says 'extremists' if we protest they will tak- cruel outrag- later day el- them to turn playful crea- "Well, then we must be exquisite sen- it be to ma- rather than ful "bigots" ber of twelv-