

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum. United States and Europe—\$2.50. Publisher & Proprietor: Thomas Coffey, L.L.D. Editors: J. H. James, T. Foley, B.A. Associate Editor—H. F. Mackintosh. Manager—Robert M. Burns.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 12, 1921

WHERE "ULSTER" LEADS

We have seen that the Ulster Legend so assiduously fostered is refuted by official facts so far as education is concerned. With regard to grants of money for University scholarships, on similar principles to those awarded by the County Councils in England, Ulster's contribution per 1,000 of population is £1 14s, whereas Connaught heads the list with 27 18s 2d, and the average for all Ireland is 24 10s 11d.

"Ulster," therefore, lags behind the rest of Ireland in the important matter of education. We have further shown that it is below the average in taxable wealth.

There is one line, however, in which "Ulster" has an unquestionable lead over the rest of Ireland. The Police define "Habitual Criminals" as persons who engage habitually in crimes as their means or part of their means of livelihood.

They describe "Houses of Bad Character" as houses where Habitual Criminals regularly resort and meet; also Houses of Receivers of stolen goods.

Now the statistics in these matters follow. "Habitual criminals at large" enumerated by the police in April of each year: Yearly average for the five years 1908-1912:

Table with 2 columns: County, Population, Habitual Criminals. Rows: Leitner, Munster, Connaught, Ulster, All Ireland.

Ulster in this matter not only leads; it has a practical monopoly of crime.

Houses classified by the police as the Resorts of Habitual Criminals: Yearly average 1908-1912:

Table with 2 columns: County, Ratio per 100,000. Rows: Leitner, Munster, Connaught, Ulster, All Ireland.

Not only does Ulster lead all Ireland in these unenviable records, but Belfast heads the list for all the cities of the United Kingdom.

Habitual Criminals Ratio per 100,000: Belfast, Sheffield, London, Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, Dublin Metrop., London Metrop., City Police Det.

Mr. Knight gives tables more comprehensive, but the result is always the same: Belfast heads the list. No city in all Great Britain, large or small, can depose the Ulster metropolis from its bad eminence. It is a sad and saddening task to analyze conditions in Belfast. It is made necessary by the blatant boasting of the superiority of "Ulster" over the rest of Ireland. Mr. Knight in "Ireland and the Ulster Legend" traces the prevalence of crime in Belfast to the appalling conditions of wretched labor prevailing amongst Belfast women, to the consequent forced neglect of

children by their mothers, the ignorance of the children due to the lack of public spirit in the matter of providing facilities for education, and to the over-working of immature children who should be at school.

Here we may subjoin a paragraph from the Report of the Home Office Committee of Investigation, appointed by Winston Churchill in 1911, to enquire into and report on the statements made in 1910 by Dr. H. W. Baillie, Medical Officer of Health for Belfast, in his Report on the sweating of women and out-workers in the linen trade in Belfast and district.

After giving the incredible conditions under which women worked—in the majority of cases investigated the wages were one penny and under per hour—the Report thus refers to the point:

"A painful feature incidental to out-work in the making-up trades in many towns is the extent to which children are employed at home. . . . The evidence of two school teachers (Qs. 2,443, etc., and 4,934, etc.) as well as that of Dr. Agnew, medical superintendent officer of health for Lurgan, should be carefully read in this connection. . . . We have an abundance of evidence that young children are often kept working for long hours even until very late at night. (Qs. 1,168, 1,376, etc.)"

SIR PHILIP GIBBS AND FATHER DUFFY

Few there are throughout the English-speaking world who, during the dark and uncertain days of the world War, did not thrill to Philip Gibbs' account of heroic struggle. His letters never stated, for he was not only the greatest of war correspondents, but the most human of writers, master of those touches of nature that make the whole world kin. He has written books that are read in every language; and the readers must be few who are not the better for the reading.

Sir Philip Gibbs is something more and better than a great war correspondent and a great author; he is an honest man, true to his convictions and principles; fearless as the gallant lads whose heroic service he so graphically depicted in the expression and defence of those honestly held convictions and principles, and of truth and justice and good-will.

Sir Philip was one of a dozen or more of distinguished English literary men who signed a vigorous and forceful protest against the policy of repression in Ireland shortly after the present brutal policy was inaugurated.

His present lectures in the United States may be British propaganda. Suppose they are. Propaganda has almost come to connote something discreditable; but its origin—Secra congregatio de propaganda fide, the Congregation for the propagation of the faith—is surely respectable enough. Propaganda, as a matter of fact, may be good, bad or indifferent. And Englishmen have precisely the same right to carry on propaganda in the United States as Irishmen have.

An honest and fearless Englishman like Sir Philip Gibbs is entitled to the same courtesy from those who go to hear him as Eamon de Valera, Donal O'Callaghan or Dr. Irwin. They are not the friends of free speech, fair discussion, of liberty and justice, who deny to Sir Philip Gibbs what they freely accord to, claim as a right for, de Valera and Dr. Irwin.

And above all they are not friends of Ireland or the cause of Irish liberty who by ruffianism, organized or spontaneous, prevent Sir Philip Gibbs from speaking, and prevent those who so desire from hearing him speak on the Irish or any other question.

That sort of thing is not a whit more respectable when indulged in by Irish sympathizers in the United States than it is when practised by Orange hoodlums in Canada.

The New York Times thus reports the intervention of Father Duffy:

"In the first moments of the attack upon him came one of the most dramatic incidents of the evening. A slim, tall man in clerical garb climbed up on the stage and walked over to within a few feet of Sir Philip, who looked at him amazed a moment, and then walked over to him and cordially shook his hand. The house was silent for a minute, even the Sinn Fein enthusiasts ceasing their noise, before this unexpected interruption, and then most of those present, recognizing the clergyman, broke into wild applause. 'I would like to introduce myself to this audience,' said the priest. 'My name is Father . . .'"

The rest was lost in a burst of hand-clapping in welcome of the priest of the fighting Sixty-ninth, the Irish regiment which as the 16th fought its way so gallantly to the Marne.

"I see that my friends have done their best to make Sir Philip Gibbs write more about another war," he said. "I am here to hear him, to hear what he has to say with the intention of taking him up at some other meeting. I am an Irish Republican."

The shouts of Irishmen in the balcony broke in on his remarks. "I want to say that Sir Philip Gibbs has done more to restore truth to the world than any other man," he continued. "I introduce myself as a convinced Sinn Feiner. I am an Irish Republican. I want to hear him. But I want to warn Sir Philip Gibbs that this presentation of facts will likely produce the conclusion in the minds of this audience, a Republican audience, that he is a British propagandist."

Cries of "No, no," and "You're not the speaker," arose from the floor of the hall, which in a moment had turned on the war chaplain. It was a symptom of the divided feeling of the house, which made itself known again and again during the evening. "But I want to say that if he were a British propagandist the best thing he could do would be to hire a number of crazy persons such as are up there," resumed Father Duffy, instantly regaining the good feeling of the audience. "For the present we want order so that we can hear what he says."

But "the crazy people" did not heed Father Duffy's reasonable request. It is difficult to think that any intelligent Irish American could fail to see that the effect of such ruffianism is precisely what Father Duffy implied when he said: "If he were a British propagandist the best thing he could do would be to hire a number of crazy persons such as are up there."

Father Duffy represents and expresses intelligent Irish American opinion; the interrupters and obstructionists at Sir Philip Gibbs' meeting—a handful of even New York Irishmen—are an unreasoning mob who very seriously damage the cause they pretend to have at heart.

CANADA'S NAVY

The following dispatch is of interest to the Canadians especially in view of the Imperial Conference to be held a few months hence:

London, March 8.—Canadian Associated Press.—Urging that the Imperial Government make an immediate statement of its naval intentions, Admiral Adair, speaking in the Commons last evening, declared that, with the exception of Australia and New Zealand, no dominion was making an adequate contribution to the naval defence of the Empire. The dominions, he said, ought to contribute 25 per cent of the cost of the Empire's navies, but India contributed, and it is, and always has been, that. But it has, and always has been, much more than that.

To understand the full extent and the full viciousness of the Ascendancy in Ireland, it is necessary to understand the alliance formed in the 17th century between the land-kings of Ireland and the money-lenders and money-leaders. London has always been the world centre of the money-lending business.

Over in Ireland a few hundred political adventurers had come into possession of nine-tenths of the land of that country by means of military confiscation, and gift from kings who did not, morally, own what they thus gave away. In a generation or two, this small class of land-kings plunged their vast estates into debt; which was altogether to be expected, and was consistent with the course followed in other countries by such a class. The Irish estates were mortgaged to London money-lenders. The same money-lenders financed English industries; and thus the natural thing was, an alliance between English business interests and Anglo-Irish landlordism.

Our American friends call this "log-rolling," and Ireland has had about two hundred and twenty years of continuous log-rolling. I pass from that to the political aspect. Irish democracy could never find a foothold in the politics of the so-called "Union;" because the undemocratic land-kings of Ireland were in close alliance with the undemocratic moneyed interests of England. A great deal might be said about this in detail; but my present purpose is served by this passing reference. Let me now refer to the other forces forming part of the long, and still existing, resistance to the progress of democracy in Ireland.

There has been, and still is, the class sympathy between the aristocrats of Ireland and those of England. The English peer and the Irish peer have always felt that they were brothers. There has always been a very close union between them. Then, there is the solid

cement of religious prejudice, which has filled up all chinks, and has united all the parties interested directly in the Ascendancy; and has joined to them millions of voting Englishmen who had no direct financial interest in it, but who have had the idea that in maintaining it, they were somehow playing the puck on the Protestant side.

Religious clashes in Ireland did not originate in the Ascendancy; but religious peace would long ago have descended on that unhappy land, had not the parties to the Ascendancy deliberately, and of settled policy maintained discord; renewed the fires of religious hatred whenever they were dying down; and cast at all times a veil of sanctimonious religious hypocrisy over their sordid and selfish interests and schemes.

The Penal Laws were the most dreadful code of religious persecution ever devised in Europe; and I think it is the true reading of Anglo-Irish history that the motives for the making of them were financial and political rather than religious. I do not doubt that such public opinion as then existed in England; such Englishmen as knew there was such a country as Ireland; approved of the Penal Laws, if they had ever heard of them. And in such approval I have no doubt they were honest enough; as honest as bitter religious hatred ever is, or can be; for it can never be wholly honest.

But I do not believe, have never seen any reason to believe, that those who actually made and enforced the Penal Laws, believed in their religious necessity. The five hundred years of warfare for the conquest of Ireland had just ended. The class wars were finally gone. The clan lands were finally confiscated; and the Penal Laws were passed to confirm and preserve that confiscation.

Being passed by bitter bigots, their bigotry gave them, of course, a better (or worse) heart for the work; but their main idea was to hold on to what they had robbed or got from robbers.

Nothing could be further from the modern idea of democracy than such an ascendancy, such an alliance, such predominance of selfish interests; disfranchisement of a whole people; monopoly of the land, the power, the money, and the trade of a nation.

This is what Ireland has been struggling with since 1690. And this is 1921. And in December 1920 English politicians, who, a few years ago, held Home Rule and treason to be synonymous terms, passed an act which they call a Home Rule Act.

And in this Act, and all across the face of it, is written the continuation of the Ascendancy, and the consequent denial of democracy.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE PRESENT wave of anti-Catholic feeling passing over the country, and the dreadful things Catholics are liable to do towards subverting liberty and progress, recall to mind certain words of the late R. W. Phipps, so long and favorably known as a publicist, and latterly as Commissioner of Forestry for Ontario, in which latter capacity he produced a series of Reports which have permanent literary value. Discussing the Janitis Estates Act of 1880, Mr. Phipps said:

"I have been here over fifty years and never knew a year but what somebody, who could make a figure on any other way, was raising an outcry against something terrible he thought some Roman Catholic intended to do. I have never observed them do anything of the sort"—words which might be weighed with profit by certain individuals of today.

THE FIGHT against Divorce is not confined to Canada. In England some are disposed to think that because the proposed Divorce bill is not coming forward this session, the danger has passed away. Not so!—there is greater reason than ever for vigilance and adequate preparation on the part of those who prize the sanctity of the home. Several Catholic organizations are fighting the insidious efforts being made to wreck the very foundations of the Christian family, and one means adopted for this purpose, which might very well be duplicated in this country, is that Catholic women throughout the length and breadth of England have been asked to send a postcard to their local Member of Parliament protesting against the proposed legislation.

PREACHING at the opening of a new church on a recent Sunday

Cardinal Bourne urged that this opposition be carried to the very limits of the law. He said that if the world set aside the teaching of Jesus Christ in this matter it would inevitably grow corrupt and approach dissolution. The Master had laid down laws governing the social relations between individuals and among these He directed that marriage was to be dissolved only by death. If further facilities for divorce were tolerated in England the country would quickly descend once more to the level of paganism.

THE THOROUGHNESS of the preparations made by the Catholic Women's League to see that the protest of Catholic women against the bill is fully recorded show with what anxiety the matter is regarded. A "station" has been opened in each parish where signatures can be affixed to a monster petition which it is proposed to present to Parliament, and on a chosen Sunday special efforts are made to see that every woman in attendance signs. In this way it is hoped to give expression to the uniform conviction of Catholics on the subject, and at the same time to arouse public sentiment to a sense of the peril which the proposed legislation holds to that much-prized, and perhaps much-boasted institution, the English home.

In ITALY, too, the hydra-headed monster has raised its head. A decision has just been given by the Court of Appeal, Milan, which actually introduces divorce for the first time into Italy. France, which has been so much in the eyes of the world as the scene of Gabriel D'Annunzio's exploits, produced this first divorce. The case came before the Milan Court through the fact that while the parties concerned had obtained citizenship of France, the decree of the court of that city would not hold good outside of it. In Milan the decree was sustained notwithstanding learned arguments against it, and in the name of the King of Italy it was directed to be entered on the Register of Civil Statutes.

THIS IS all the more extraordinary seeing that no Divorce Law exists in Italy, and the decree therefore forestalls proposed introduction of such legislation. This has aroused the Catholic conscience and vigorous measures of opposition have already been set on foot. Such legislation is repugnant to the great body of the Italian people, whose family affections are strongly developed, and sacred as the result of their saturation for countless generations with the teachings of the Church. The anti-clerical element which is behind the proposal is not to be confounded with the people as a whole.

ATTITUDE OF NON CONFORMISTS

Thus far, then, both the Catholics and the representative Anglicans are united in their opposition to divorce on the same basis of Christian morality. How far that opposition can extend on the support of the Non-conformist or Non-episcopal churches is a matter of doubt. The Protestant Dissenters are not notoriously enthusiastic supporters of easier divorce; but at the same time their loosely-constructed religious formulae do not appear to forbid divorce, which the official teachings of the Catholic Church and the Church of England do. Indeed, it was a Non-conformist lady preacher, a Miss Miss Maud Roydon, who by some extraordinary process found herself a member of the National Assembly of the Church of England, who put in a kind word for the Buckmaster divorce bill on the plea that "all marriages made in churches were not made by God."

But the point is: Are the Catholics, the sound Anglicans, and the other people in the country who believe in the Christian teaching of marriage, strongly enough organized to withstand and ultimately defeat an obnoxious measure that finds among the members of the present parliament? Six years ago the Irish members could have defeated the measure at Westminster, but today the opposition will have to come from a Christian element outside of Parliament.

EASIER DIVORCE IN ENGLAND

By N. C. W. C. News Service

London, February 18.—The Lenten Pastoral of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster has just been read in all the churches of the diocese. With the greatest seriousness Cardinal Bourne calls on all the Catholics under his jurisdiction to consider "the danger of the ever-widening disintegration of family life."

The Cardinal's warning is opportune, because in the new session of Parliament, which begins within the next few days, there most certainly will be another attempt made to push through the bill introduced by Lord Buckmaster for extending the facilities for divorce. It is true that this bill was defeated in the last session, but nothing save an overwhelming pressure of other parliamentary business can prevent the bill being once more brought up for discussion, and unless the same opposition is as well, or even more effectively organized, there is no reason why this particular bill should not receive a majority vote, and become law.

EVILS OF EASIER DIVORCE

Cardinal Bourne does not shrink the issue, and he sets fairly and squarely before the Catholic people of Westminster, and through the press the whole reading public of London, some of the inevitable results that must flow from this making easier of divorce. "The marriage contract," the Cardinal continues, "is itself likewise endangered, and the authority of Holy Writ is called in question, and the traditional teaching of Christianity on those moral questions upon which the very foundations of true civilization ultimately rest, is gradually being abandoned."

By a curious coincidence, at the very time when the Cardinal Archbishop's Pastoral was being placed in the hands of the clergy for communication to their parishes, the Church of England was discussing the very same measure of extended facilities for divorce. The National Assembly of the Established Church, a moderate self-determining

active body set up recently by the consent of Parliament, in its sessions at Westminster discussed the Buckmaster Bill, and the general assent of that assembly appears to have been in decisive opposition to the bill. The Anglican approach to the question was thoroughly sound, being from the religious and Christian standpoint, which, as Lord Farmer informed the assembly, was the only true standpoint of moral teaching. The purity of family life, the speaker continued, was at the bottom of the whole question of social advance.

For all their boasted appeals to "sound learning" and their reliance on the teachings of the Apostolic Fathers, the Anglican divines are, when they venture into the realm of definite dogmatic teaching, extremely shaky, indeed highly unreliable; and only appear to be on sure ground as they approach nearer to the definite teachings of the Roman Church. This sort of attitude is very well exemplified by the Bishop of Durham, who, as it is himself to oppose the Buckmaster bill and the idea of divorce, and yet counsel a church assembly to refrain from expressing an opinion on this matter because "there was on some points a serious conflict of theories by eminent critical scholars."

ANGELICANS ALSO OPPOSED

But fortunately the Bishop of Durham, whose liberalism in religion as well as in politics somewhat discounts the orthodoxy of his theological sentiments, did not win the day, and the sentiment and expressed opinion of the Anglican assembly was that the present involved situation in the national life is not going to be met by lowering the ideals of Christian marriage. The whole issue was very well summed up by Lord Hugh Cecil, who reminded the assembled prelates and laymen that if the State was of opinion that the Christian law of marriage was too hard for a world that had ceased to be Christian, then let the State allow licensed unions to which the legal consequences of marriage would attach, but don't expect the Church to recognize them. His objection was that what was being sought was that all sorts of union, which under the teaching of Christ are nothing more than adultery, should be recognized as marriages by Christian people and the Christian Church. And if the moral law is weakened in this manner, it would only prepare the way for that general moral apostasy of which there are too many signs in public opinion at the present time.

REPUTATION OF JUDICIARY

The Rawson Maistry is deserving of commendation for its outspoken condemnation of those responsible for the holding in that town recently of a big public meeting at which a paid agitator discoursed on religious topics in a manner calculated to set ablaze the ever smouldering embers of religious prejudice and intolerance and arouse in the community a spirit of religious antagonism which cannot but be detrimental to its general welfare and harmful in many respects. The Mercury's rebuke was timely and well merited and will have the endorsement and approval of all right thinking men. On the other hand one cannot but be amazed at the fact that in the neighboring town of Perth, where the same agitator held forth, there should be found presiding as chairman at his meeting a member of His Majesty's judiciary, in the person of County Judge Scott. That in this country, where people of all creeds and nationalities look upon the judiciary as exemplars of tolerance and dispensers of even handed justice, one of their number should by his words and his actions give support and encouragement to a man who is going about the country indulging in calumnies and gross misrepresentations against those of