

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum.
 United States & Europe—\$2.00.
 Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.B.
 Editors—REV. JAMES T. FOLEY, B.A.
 THOMAS COFFEY, L.L.B.
 Associate Editor—REV. D. A. CASEY
 H. F. MACKINTOSH
 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,
 Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and
 Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the
 Dominion.
 Messrs. P. J. Neven, E. J. Broderick, M. J. Harty,
 W. J. Millin, M. W. E. Smith, Miss Sara Hanley
 and Miss O. Harrington are fully authorized to receive
 subscriptions and transmit all other matters for
 the CATHOLIC RECORD.
 Ordinary and marriage notices cannot be inserted
 except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion
 50 cents.
 Subscribers changing residence will please give old
 as well as new address.
 In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased
 from Mrs. M. A. McLaughlin, 240 Marine Street.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION

Mr. Thomas Coffey
 My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have
 been a reader of your paper. I have noted with satis-
 faction that it is directed with a view to the
 ability, and, above all, it is imbued with a
 strong Catholic spirit. It strenuously defends Cath-
 olic principles and rights, and stands firmly by the
 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 it
 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 con-
 tinued success.

Yours very sincerely in Christ,
 DOMINICUS, Archbishop of Ephesus,
 Apostolic Delegate
 Ottawa, June 13th, 1918.

Mr. Thomas Coffey
 Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your
 paper with interest and pleasure. I am glad to
 note that you are not only a Catholic paper, but
 that you are also a paper of the people. Therefore,
 I can recommend it to the faithful. Bless-
 ings on your work, and best wishes for its con-
 tinued success.
 D. FALCOSTO, Arch. of Larissa, Apoc. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 14, 1918

ECCLIASTICAL FOLLY AND INSUBORDINATION

Under this heading the Rev. Canon Ker deals in a letter to the Globe with the movement within the Anglican Church in Canada to throw down all barriers between that Church and those Christian denominations which deny every claim that gives, or perhaps we should say used to give, the Anglican Church a reason for existence. A large number of prominent clergymen are identified with this movement, indeed it was initiated by the Anglican clergy and is carried on largely if not exclusively by them.

The Anglican bishops of Canada in a joint letter disapproved of the whole movement as a peril to the Church; they "admonished the brethren, clergy and laity alike, not to act precipitately, lest in their anxiety to come closer to non-episcopal communions, they weaken the bonds by which the Church of England in Canada is united to the Anglican communion throughout the world." They also expressed the belief "that such unauthorized action will inevitably hinder rather than promote the cause of real and lasting unity."

Needless to say that the precipitate clergymen profess to act for the furtherance of the cause of Christian Unity. They want some outward and visible sign of unity in the comprehensive but invisible "Christian Church." The bishops seem to fear that in an invisible Church visible signs of any kind may soon be esteemed very lightly. And for our part we can not see why invisible membership should not be the ideal towards which the unified invisible Christian Church should strive.

The Anglican bishops, however, unanimously disapproved of the unauthorized movement. Did it kill the movement? Oh no. The Bishops' letter apparently gave it an added impetus. The newspapers in their broad-minded cavalier fashion approved of the broad-minded Anglican clergymen, the readers approved their favorite newspapers, and both editors and readers proceeded forthwith to give their attention to more important, because more practical, matters. If the Bishops had been more popular, or more numerous, or more influential, they might have secured the all-important support of the press. And people would have forgotten all about it just the same.

It is quite true that the Bishops did not begin with anything so uncompromising as "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." They did not speak in that authoritative way that one might expect from those whom the Holy Ghost had appointed Bishops to rule the Church of God. No, their pronouncement was mild, timid, even apologetic. They recognized "the right of every churchman to hold and maintain his own views on things non-essential" and they carefully maintained the historic, "comprehensive" attitude of their Church by "not defining the limits between essential and non-essential. They say nothing of Apostolic Succession, they never do now-a-days; "historic episcopate" even seemed too self-assertive; but they declared that the specific proposals of the circular

(were) calculated to disturb the Church's historic order." Surely Anglican bishops might be pardoned for intimating that they were, if not necessary for the order of the Church, at least historically connected with the scheme of order in the Church which had hitherto prevailed; and were justified in asking their clergy and laity not to be precipitate. No; the clergymen plainly told them they did not understand the question; the press sided with the clergymen and it begins to look as if episcopal authority is one of the non-essential things on which every churchman is free to hold and maintain his own views. Indeed, the other day on opening the Advertiser the glaring headlines boldly stated the following interesting fact: "The Circular of the Bishops was Unauthorized, says Canon Tucker." And the first sentence begins with, "Rev. Canon Tucker of St. Paul's Cathedral."

The Rev. Canon Ker is then not guilty of great exaggeration nor indulging in a little pleasantry when he says that the first article of the new faith is "To Jericho with the Bishops."

And inasmuch as Anglicans used to find in the Scriptures the institution by Jesus Christ Himself of episcopate, priesthood, sacrifice and sacraments, and this historic position is swept away by the simple assertion that "The Christian Church has largely re-stated its position with regard to Holy Scripture," we believe that our friend Canon Ker intends no exaggerated pleasantry when he says the second article is like unto the first. "It is: 'To the dust-heap with Holy Scripture.'"

It must be consoling for the Anglican Bishops to be told by their clergymen who signed the circular of the Church Unity League, that, "There is no intention of alienating the Bishops who have disapproved of the movement. They are within their rights, but the priests and laity have their responsibilities also which they feel they must meet."

But the worthy Canon makes a remark on which we should like to comment very seriously.

"Is it any wonder that our Catholic neighbors laugh us to scorn and confidently predict that the disintegration of Protestantism has almost reached its last stage?"

No one with a sense of humor, can help laughing at a ludicrous association of incongruous ideas. Our Anglican friends, obsessed with the idea of Christian unity, are unconsciously and no doubt honestly performing a very pantomime of the most incongruous situations and positions that ever appealed to men blessed with the saving sense of humor. We laugh, it is true; but "laugh to scorn," God forbid. No one sees with keener feelings of disappointment than the Catholic that much of the apparent success of the Protestant movement towards Christian Unity is due to indifference in matters of faith, to the abandonment of old positions that safeguarded Christian truths. No one more than the Catholic deplors division. If the present movement amongst Protestants should, without impairing their hold on Christian truth, increase their influence on the public life of the country and over the souls of individuals it would bring joy to the heart of every enlightened Catholic. Half a loaf is better than no bread. But we fear there is only too much evidence that in the "lust for talk" about Unity there is a slackening of the hold on Christian truth, and that in the near future the Catholic Church will alone have to safeguard Christian ideals and Christian morality without the powerful aid of convinced Protestant Christians.

Whether the Anglican Church helps or hinders conversions to Catholicity is a question on which opinion is divided. We believe that though she has given us thousands, she has kept away from us tens of thousands. Be that as it may, it is with genuine sorrow that Catholics see the disintegration in the Anglican Church as revealed by the Church Unity League; unless it be that the fulness of God's time has come to show earnest Christian souls that Unity and Peace and Safety are found only in the Church founded by Christ who prayed: "That they all may be one, as Thou Father in Me and I in Thee, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me."

That unity for which Christ prayed is dear to every Catholic heart. A visible unity, surely; a unity so strikingly visible that it will be world-conquering. With that unity we should bring the whole world to the foot of the Cross,

believing and adoring; acknowledging, without explaining away His claims, Him Whom the Father sent, the one Redeemer and Mediator, Jesus the Divine Son of the Eternal God; rendering willing and loyal obedience to the visible Church which He founded, with which He remains to the consummation of the world, guaranteeing the promised guidance of the ever-abiding Holy Spirit, and against which the gates of hell shall not prevail.

AN ORGANLESS ORGANISM

In the civil order every one who fills an office whether great or small is vested with a certain official authority which is and ought to be recognized, respected and obeyed. It is not the personality of the officer that commands this recognition, respect or obedience; it is the official position without respect to the person who fills it. The judge on the bench may be a man so deeply learned in the law that his legal opinion commands instant respect, or he may be only a very mediocre lawyer; he may be of an engaging personality, or he may be a man who in private life would attract few friends, perhaps one who would neither get nor deserve much respect. Nevertheless in his official capacity as judge he deserves and receives deference, respect and obedience. It is not the physical prowess of the policeman that inspires respect, nor his uniform that overawes the would-be transgressor of the law. Nor is it that his own life is so blameless that we blush to do wrong in his august presence. Nevertheless, gentle and simple, learned and ignorant, all bow to the authority with which he is vested. All recognize his official position. So with the king; so with the president; so with the legislators; so with the executives; so with everyone in every official position. While we keep to the civil order all this seems eminently reasonable as well as vitally necessary. True, there are those who rail at it all as tyranny; but reasonable men know that it is the necessary safeguard of liberty. Rational beings will not forego the order which reconciles the exercise of just and necessary authority with the largest measure possible of individual liberty for the fantastic dreams of unbalanced anarchists. They know that anarchy while promising liberty would destroy at once both authority and liberty and usher in the reign of the most odious tyranny.

In the ecclesiastical order we might expect the same sweet reasonableness; surely something analogous to the king or president as head and centre of unity; a governing body certainly; officers exercising legislative, executive and judicial functions; in short an organization similar in all respects to that of the civil society. When we proclaim that the civil order must have its organization, its head, its officers discharging the legislative, executive and judicial functions; its minor officials; when we proclaim this evident truth all agree with us; no rational human being dissents. But when we claim as much for the ecclesiastical order, when we say the successor of St. Peter is the lawful head of Christ's Church, that the Pope and Bishops are the governing body, that priests alone may exercise the sacerdotal function; when, in short, the common sense rational conception of things accepted by all necessary in the civil order is applied to the ecclesiastical order we are met with a babel of tongues protesting against ecclesiastical tyranny. Anarchy in the civil order may be impossible; but anarchy in the ecclesiastical order is desirable, is the ideal. Protestantism is religious anarchy.

Nay more, the study of biology has familiarized us with the structure of living organisms. The lower organisms have only rudimentary organs, are masses of cells that adapt themselves to different functions. In the higher organisms the cells become specialized for special functions. In the social organism we find the same elementary functions discharged by a single chief of the tribe, later by the lawgiver, the leader in war, the prudent counsellor, the medicine man. Finally, we have the highly organized national societies of modern civilization.

The social organism is something more than a mere organization. Man is essentially and of his very nature social; he must live his normal life in society with his fellows. The social organism develops its organs, therefore, from the necessity of the inherent life within it.

The Church is an organism, not an organization. This is not a mere analogy suggested by the wide-spread modern study of biology. St. Paul indicates very clearly what biology has made familiar in our day. "For the body is one and hath many members; and all the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body. . . . If the whole body were the eye, where would be the hearing? . . . And the eye cannot say to the hand I have no need of you." Indeed, its Divine Founder himself compared the Church to a grain of mustard seed containing in itself the germ of life which was to germinate and develop those organs by which it was to live and grow and become a tree.

Protestantism resembles the very lowest living organisms, which propagate themselves by mere division. Its history is full of abortive attempts to develop organs by which it might live and grow; but it has failed even to achieve cohesion. The Protestant minister may be highly esteemed; but it is for his learning his earnestness, his eloquence, his personality; never for his official position.

Nowadays it is the fashion to close one's eyes to the endless divisions, to proclaim cohesion, even unity, in some elusive, invisible, ecclesiastical organism which is euphemistically and optimistically called "The Church" or "The Christian Church." Anyone may be the head, or rather no one must presume to be the head. The body may be all eye, St. Paul to the contrary notwithstanding. In fact it is an organless organism in spite of the modern apotheosis of biology. It is also the fashion to regard this verbal legerdemain as the great advance of our age towards Unity.

In honest bewilderment we should like to join our old-fashioned but sane and sensible Anglican friend, the Rev. Canon Ker, in his pertinent query:

"There is just one other question I would take the liberty of asking: When these gentlemen say 'the Christian Church has largely re-stated its position in regard to the Holy Scriptures,' where shall we find this truly remarkable Church? That is easy, is it not?"

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

As we write the Presbyterian General Assembly is in session in Toronto. From childhood we have had a very real respect for the sturdy Scotch Presbyterian with his rugged honesty and his uncompromising grip of certain fundamental Christian truths including the inspiration of the Scriptures. It was a Scotch grip, a little hard even for an Irishman, who is willing to suffer and die for his religion, to understand; but narrow and peculiar though it was it was the grip of a man and a Christian. We speak of the Scotch Presbyterian of our early days; it was good to come into contact with him in neighborly intercourse. We are not prepared to say, but we fear very much that the type is passing; candidates for the ministry who denied the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection would fare badly with an examining board in those days. Higher Criticism and pseudo-scholarship would not easily excuse the attempt to destroy the scriptural foundation on which those simple men believed the Kirk firmly rested.

The paper before us tells of Presbyterian concern for our "non-Saxon" immigrants. The prayer of the Scotch Presbyterian of other days: "Lord gie us a guid conceit o' oor sels" is either not forgotten or has been so fully answered as to be unnecessary to-day.

Mr. Berlis, who is working among the Ruthenians of New Ontario and is a Ruthenian himself, stated that there were twenty Ruthenians who were going to seek admission into the ranks of the Church at the Assembly. Dr. MacKay asked the Ruthenians to stand up so that the audience might see them, and a few stood up, but the rest were probably proved the situation by asking the President if it would not be better to sing the hymn, "Blest Be the Tie That Binds," which was done with a vigor and abandon that was refreshing.

Still, the vigorous, refreshing and abandoned singing of the "Tie That Binds" did not seem to dispel the shyness of the twenty-minus-a-few Ruthenian candidates for the Presbyterian ministry. Perhaps they were afraid of an examination on the Ruthenian Presbyterian Mass with incense, or had forgotten the Presbyterian-Ruthenian prayers for the Pope, or the invocation of the Virgin and the saints that was in keeping with the Westminster Confession. All we know is that only a few of the

twenty stood up "that the audience might see them."

Mr. Berlis himself had the manly courage to stand up and say this for his countrymen even in the face of the General Assembly:

"Little or no danger comes from the sturdy, Protestant non-Anglo-Saxons of the evangelical type. These liberal, broad conception of Christianity that fosters intellectual development as well as spiritual growth. They are capable of grasping at once the tremendous possibilities of becoming part of a new nation and of contributing their share toward the make-up of that nation. Now, note the difference in the masses of other non-Anglo-Saxon immigrants who come to Canada from countries where for many centuries ecclesiastical despotism and abject religious slavery have been dominant; countries such as Russia and Austria. There the people have been under the nurture and influence of the Greek-Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches. Untrammelled, unhindered for many centuries, these ecclesiastical systems have had complete sway over the lives of the people, and now these people—the finished product of these systems are here— are with us; to live, to stay, to impress their stamp upon the Canadian national complexion.

What kind of a stamp is it? And in how far is it serious enough for consideration? The quality of that stamp can easily be recalled by a mere glance at the localities where these people segregate and the Police Court reports. There is the baffling all-description overcrowding, men and women thrown promiscuously together in filth and without privacy; the drunkenness with inevitable bloody fights as results; the prevailing illiteracy and ignorance of English, fostered in many instances by rabid nationalism and ecclesiastical agitators who declare that all Protestant attempts for enlightenment are only so many attempts to de-nationalize them. This, of course, is also strongly upheld by the Roman Catholics, who are anxious to retain these, simple as they are, for then they are more likely to be blind adherents of Rome.

And so many of them do remain; poor tools in the hands of unscrupulous leaders; they remain as they were on arrival—religiously stunted—satisfied with mere formalism in religion, bowing to the ground, kissing images, burning candles, confessing sins and receiving absolution from priests at so much per head, morally seared—with either no outstanding ideal of purity, honesty, unselfishness, or rather of gross self-indulgence, or else with perverted ideas along the lines of social and political anarchism; intellectually fettered—reading, learning, studying or not—according as to how sinister priestcraft permits; politically helpless—banded about at election times by priests or politicians for party purposes by means of bribes and intimidations—such are some of the peculiarities marking the Slavic immigrants, and surely serious enough when considered how strong numerically they are."

That sort of talk goes better in Toronto than it would in Winnipeg. This is what Mr. Vincent, a writer of a series of articles on Cosmopolitan Winnipeg, in the Free Press of that city, says:

"Educationally, the Ruthenian is rather surprising us. He is discovering a remarkably active brain. The writer once taught elementary English to six of these 'Galicians,' as we then called them. They worked hard all day, but were eager to learn at night. He never had to repeat the same thing twice, so retentive were their memories. To-day twenty young men are in St. Boniface college and eight in Manitoba college, taking the arts course; ten are taking the matriculation course; five are in Normal school; two are articled as law students, and two are studying in the engineering course; many are in the collegiates. There would be many more in college if they had funds."

Again he says:

"The two Greek Catholic churches and the one Orthodox Greek or Russian church have parochial schools. The St. Nicholas school has a large building on Flora avenue with ten class rooms."

These gross libels the Rev. Mr. Berlis, without "shyness" and without shame, poured out on his absent countrymen. According to him his people are a drunken, murderous and incestuous people.

That Mr. Berlis has the alert native wit of the race he maligns is shown by his quickness to gauge Presbyterian credulity. He did not hesitate to tell the Presbyterian General Assembly that Catholics confess and receive absolution at so much per head!

And amongst the well-informed, broad-minded gentlemen of the General Assembly was there not one honest man to rise and protest against this insult to their intelligence?

Yes, to the credit of Christian manhood, Rev. Mr. Kinsale, though he did not refer specifically to the worn-out slander about paying for absolution, challenged the accuracy of the cubist picture of his countrymen that Berlis had painted. Mr. Berlis has

doubtless come to the conclusion that there are Presbyterians and Presbyterians. Those who would hire him to travesty the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass are not the only kind.

"Rev. M. C. A. Kinsale, who is a worker among the foreign element at Sydney, said that the foreigner was not nearly so bad as depicted; he is not such a murderer and drunkard as he is supposed to be, and one statement of Mr. Kinsale that among the fifteen thousand foreigners there was not a single case of prostitution staggered the audience. 'We treat the foreigner in the worst possible way,' said Mr. Kinsale, 'and he seems scandalized when he is turned back. Conditions are such at present that some of the European countries are seriously thinking of stopping immigration to this country.'"

Yes sir, it "staggered the audience" when the Rev. Mr. Kinsale pointed out that the foreign lamb couldn't have muddied the waters on the native Anglo-Saxon English speaking Protestant wolf, since we had white slavery, irreligion, drunkenness, political debauchery and other things before the foreign lamb came to drink farther down the stream. Moreover the lamb was accustomed to drink cleaner waters and preferred them!

While the General Assembly was listening to Berlis, Parliament was listening to this:

"The brief discussion arose when Mr. Andrew Broder urged that steps should be taken by the Government to prevent the operations of white slavers on the trains and among young girls who came into the court try under the auspices of the Immigration Department.

"Dr. Michael Clark of Red Deer and Mr. J. H. Burnham, Peterborough, strongly supported the stand taken by Mr. Broder. 'I have made some personal investigations' said Mr. Burnham, 'and was appalled to find the amount of crime of this character.' He had been informed that a number of young girls from the old country had been actually assaulted by the 'red caps' in the Union Station at Toronto, and that this kind of thing went on with appalling frequency."

Another case in point. Many of our readers will have heard of Canal street, Buffalo; it was one of the vilest quarters in America—when it was inhabited by native Americans. Prostitution, robbery and murder were at home on Canal street. Nothing respectable disturbed them; unless, indeed, that pitiable confession of Protestant failure—the slum mission. Now Canal street is an Italian quarter and its name is changed to Mount Carmel. There is not a single house of ill-fame, no not one loose woman in the neighborhood. A decent girl, unescorted, may pass safely through it night or day; much more safely, indeed, than the type of man who used to frequent Canal street. So much for the "finished (Italian) product of those systems of ecclesiastical tyranny, etc."

But the veracious Mr. Berlis tells us that the Slavs are politically helpless, bribed and intimidated at election times. In one of the series of articles in the Winnipeg Free Press to which we have already referred, Mr. Vincent dealt with the Slav. After speaking of the patriotic aspirations of the Slav at home the Free Press writer caustically adds:

"The selling of himself to a party he must learn in Canada, the land of liberty and (party) slaves. Here is an actual conversation: 'What did you get for your vote?' 'Ten dollars.' 'Don't you know it is wrong to sell your vote?' 'It is all I get out of it.' 'Would you sell it at home?' 'No,' with disgust. He is told here that a certain party gives him his 'government paper' and is threatened with loss if he does not vote for said party. Is it any wonder that it takes time for him to appreciate the franchise? Said one, 'To go through an election campaign with these people makes one ashamed to wave the British constitution for the benefit of British subjects did not imagine that such vile travesties would be made of its privileges by the creatures of political organizations.'"

Mr. Vincent's intercourse with those ignorant, murderous, drunken, incestuous compatriots of the Rev. Mr. Berlis is evidently corrupting his patriotism. It is the privilege of Anglo-Saxon Canadians to degrade the flag for party purposes; but the ignorant foreigner must be taught to worship it. If he thinks of another bit of bunting that symbolizes more for him, perhaps because he never saw it used in such a way, he is a dangerous character. Then the Free Press writer does not make sufficient allowance; these ignorant foreigners and sic like fok are an awful temptation to evangelical politicians!

The Rev. Mr. Gordon (Ralph Connor) gives us a fair double-barrelled warning: If the Roman Catholic Church does not look after her own immigrants—and he is not prepared

to admit that they are her own—then others will. As the Rev. Mr. Gordon is also responsible for the statement that there are half a million Presbyterians in Canada not within the Church we respectfully suggest that he assist first in setting his own house in order, and stemming the tide of irreligion and impurity amongst the "Anglo-Saxon" people.

By the way, if we remember right, Ralph Connor did stand manfully for purer political methods in his own community and was roundly abused for it—not by ignorant Catholic foreigners either.

TO STAGGER HUMANITY

A special correspondent of the London Times, who is writing up the present position in Ulster, warns his readers not to suppose that because Ulster was not nowadays "much in the papers" that, therefore, opposition to Home Rule is dead. Those who think so, says the correspondent, are destined to have a rude awakening, for, he continues, "if Home Rule comes, I may apply the words of Paul Kruger—'Ulster will stagger humanity.' That is rather a tall order for the comic King Carson and his regiments of wooden guns. To stagger humanity he must begin by staggering Ulster, and when we remember that Ulster has a Catholic and Nationalist majority we confess we are unequal to the task of figuring out the precise time Sir Edward will find himself in a position to march on Cork and begin to stagger humanity.

Anyone conversant with the facts of the situation is completely staggered at the audacity of the claim that Carson can speak for Ulster. As a matter of fact, out of the 83 Ulster constituencies 17 are at this moment held by Home Rule, and only 16 by the followers of King Carson. Fourteen of the 83 have always been held by Home Rule whereas the Unionists cannot point to more than 10 which have been consistently Unionist, the other 9 having been held at times by either party. So much for the political complexion of Ulster. The religious figures are: Methodists, 48,490, Episcopalians, 366,171, Presbyterians, 421,566, Catholics, 690,134. Four of the nine Ulster counties, Donegal, Tyrone, Monaghan, and Cavan, are preponderantly Catholic. Only two, Down and Antrim, are preponderantly Protestant. Leaving out Belfast, which is one-third Catholic, Ulster has a Catholic majority over combined Protestantism of 71,528, and even with Belfast included the Catholic Church is nearly as strong as all the other sects put together. It follows from all this that Sir Edward Carson has about as much right to speak for the people of Ulster as the Three Tailors of Tooley Street had to call themselves "We, the People of England."

The Times correspondent accuses the Government of criminal stupidity "in not recognizing that the will of Ulster must prevail." But we have seen that "the will of Ulster" is for Home Rule. Minorities have their rights, it is true, but to submit that they are to set the pace for the majority would be an intolerable claim. Sir Edward Carson will indeed succeed in staggering humanity if he advocates such a patent absurdity. COLUMBA.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

LIKE ALL his utterances the appeal of Archbishop McNeil to the Holy Name Societies to blacklist the term "dago" was timely and to the point. As His Grace pointed out, it is a term of opprobrium, and entirely out of tune with Catholic courtesy and charity. It is widely used, unfortunately, but should have no place in the current phraseology of those who, less than a generation ago, were themselves vulgarly caricatured under a not dissimilar term. It is to be hoped that the Archbishop's counsel has not fallen on unheeding ears.

TORONTO last week saw a great gathering of Presbyterians from all parts of Canada. They filled the streets and the street cars, the departmental stores and the show places, the soda-water counters and the motion picture theatres, and even the court room, where the case against a theatrical company for producing a doubtful play was being heard had, according to the daily papers, its quota of red-badged visitors of both sexes. They had, so to speak, the run of the town, and, if appearances count for anything, took every advantage of the privilege. That, undoubtedly, was their right, and no one called it in question.