

Catholic Record

Subscription—\$1.50 per annum... COFFEY, L. D., Editor and Publisher

LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 27, 1912

A TOUCHING ADDRESS

Shortly after the terrible accident to the Titanic His Lordship the Bishop of London, Right Rev. Dr. Fallon, in the course of an address in St. Mary's Hall, this city, made reference to the sad event.

THE HOME RULE BILL

The struggle for Home Rule for Ireland has entered upon its final stage. A thrill of exultation stirs every Irish heart at the culmination of this magnificent struggle.

Verily Peace hath her victories. What parallel in the history of the nations can be found for this unselfish, disinterested and marvellous singleness of purpose and unity of action?

On the people of Great Britain depends the fate of the measure. There was no doubt in the world that it would pass the House of Commons, and there is no doubt, either, that it will be rejected by the House of Lords.

There are two rocks ahead, however, on which the Bill and the government may founder. One is the financial provisions, the other is Ulster.

reduced by \$250,000, annually until reduced to \$1,000,000.

The actual expenditure for government services in Ireland for the year ending March 1911, was \$56,000,000, and Ireland's contribution to the general revenue was about \$50,000,000, thus leaving a deficit of about \$6,000,000.

In both of Gladstone's Home Rule bills Ireland was to contribute to the Imperial Exchequer. This is something the man in the street can understand and it is not likely to make him enthusiastic.

"The total civil government of Scotland (with practically the same population) was in 1806 £2,477,000, or \$12,385,000. The cost of similar government in the same year in Ireland was £4,547,000, or \$22,735,000.

It will only need time and full discussion to bring home to the rank and file of the British people that the present system is not only a failure but a costly failure.

Ulster, or Ulsteria, is also a serious stumbling block. No one in Ireland believes Ulster Orangemen will fight, but no one can say that they have no chance of creating the impression amongst certain classes of Englishmen that Home Rule will cause serious disturbances if not civil war.

The fact that the apprehension of serious trouble on the occasion of Winston Churchill's speech in Belfast turned out to be groundless has already discredited Carson and Carsonite tactics.

The fact that the apprehension of serious trouble on the occasion of Winston Churchill's speech in Belfast turned out to be groundless has already discredited Carson and Carsonite tactics.

The fact that the apprehension of serious trouble on the occasion of Winston Churchill's speech in Belfast turned out to be groundless has already discredited Carson and Carsonite tactics.

We may take it that Home Rule is assured. Though party feeling and party warfare are bitter enough in England as elsewhere, it is difficult to believe that any party is so bankrupt in statesmanship as to perpetrate a condition that the world condemns as an injustice to Ireland, a costly and useless drag on Great Britain, and a serious weakness to the Empire.

THE OLIVE BRANCH

An editorial in the Ottawa Citizen under the above caption has been called to our attention. Commenting on Archbishop Brocheau's plea for sinking racial differences in Canada, The Citizen says: "This country has outgrown the racial bugaboo. From being a menace it has become a bore."

"It is not surprising either. Under the British flag the Roman Catholic Church has privileges that it enjoys neither in Rome, nor in old France, nor in any other known country."

"The tone is one of top lofty tolerance quite usual with a certain type of Canadian newspaper, but 'from being a menace it has become a bore.' Catholics have just the same rights in Canada as others, with no debt of gratitude due to the Citizen type of Protestant flag-waver."

"Within the past three years there has been a racial and religious demonstration in Canada which would scarcely have been as quietly tolerated in any other known state."

"Tolerated," "tolerance," the writer does not even suspect how utterly incompatible this superior "tolerance" is with any genuine conception of liberty and respect for the rights of others.

He goes on to enumerate some of the dreadful trials to which his broad tolerance was subjected.

"We have had an acting Governor-General tendering his 'homage' to a prince of a foreign state."

The Citizen is either very ignorant or malicious. The acting Governor-General very naturally presented his respects to the papal legate. Ignorance of the French language is not a sin, but bearing false witness is. Moreover, the legate was not a prince of a foreign state.

"We have had His Majesty's ministers likewise paying homage."

His Majesty's Protestant ministers may take any part they choose in the religious ceremonies of their respective churches without a single Catholic objection. Protestant objection to Catholic ministers' taking part in a Catholic religious ceremony is indicative of regrettable religious prejudice; misrepresentation of such action for political purposes is contemptible.

And we have had "soldiers of His Majesty the King of Great Britain and of the British Empire taking part in religious processions without the authority of the State. And the people of Canada have stood for it all."

Now if it were simply a regiment of Canadian militia, or even Canadian soldiers, it would not be so bad; but "soldiers of His Majesty the King of Great Britain and of the British Empire!"

This most prominent Methodist minister acted, at best, with doubtful civil jurisdiction; as for the religious side of the question, that is the business neither of the State nor of the Citizen.

"So far as Canada is concerned no trouble actually arose at the time of the Eucharistic congress, but it is an unvoiced fact that following September last past there will never again in this country be such a subordination of State to Church."

Here we believe the Citizen does a grave injustice to the electorate of Canada. We cannot believe that any large number were influenced by a malicious or ignorant misstatement of a French word, nor by the contemptible appeal to religious bigotry on account of the presence of Catholic ministers and Catholic soldiers at a Catholic religious ceremony.

GOOD CANADIANS AND OTHERS

In the Christian Guardian, of Toronto, dated April 10th, the editor makes the following reference to a portion of a speech delivered by Senator Coffey in the Senate, on the Manitoba boundary bill. The Senator spoke in favor of amending the bill in such a way as to protect the rights of Catholics in regard to education in the territory proposed to be annexed to Manitoba:

"The following quotation from a recent speech by Hon. Senator Coffey is worth reading. He says: 'We are all Canadians. Would that a kinder spirit were abroad. Would that there were fewer rancour-mongers plying their unlovely trade in our midst. Would that we had amongst us more really good Canadians whose noble purpose is to build up a united Canada, united in heart and soul, dealing out measure for measure of kindly consideration, each for each, irrespective of race, or class, or creed. With such men Canada will become truly great. Such men are a benediction amongst us. May they be multiplied over and over again, until it may come to pass that we are as one people, under one and the same old flag, loving our country with a great love and our neighbor as ourselves.' This is the spirit which should animate all true Canadians, and our Roman Catholic friend will find that Protestants believe just as he does in this matter. For this reason we deprecate priestly interference in the home in cases of mixed marriages, and priestly interference in the state to secure special privileges for Roman Catholics."

Where, may we ask, is there any evidence of such a thing? No doubt the editor has in mind a certain case in this province which occurred about two years ago, and which was given much prominence in the press, especially of Toronto. Of the merits of this case we are absolutely convinced that the public has not received a true and complete version. But, even on the admission of the non-Catholic party, the question of religion did not in any sense enter into consideration. It was entirely a matter of personal antipathy, and on the assumption of the truth of this view, which we are very far from admitting, it is clear that the Catholic Church had absolutely no responsibility whatever. It is pitiable indeed to note how little the editor of the Christian Guardian knows of the Catholic Church in the matter of mixed marriages. Before the marriage takes place she uses every influence possible to dissuade the parties concerned from entering upon a union where so great dangers of discord must inevitably be faced. If her efforts to prevent the union fail, and the marriage takes place under her auspices, she treats the contract and the contracting parties with the same maternal kindness which characterizes her actions towards her own children. Now, however, suppose the case where a mixed marriage occurs outside the jurisdiction of the Catholic Church, and her attention is in any way drawn to the fact, it is in such a case that the vivid imagination of the non-Catholic writer is given full play. Indignant readers are furnished with the harrowing details of almost blood-thirsty priests rushing into such a home to separate husband and wife and throw helpless children upon the mercy of a cruel and careless world. Such a case has never occurred. To make such a statement is but the effort of fancy, tinged with ingrained prejudice against Catholicity. What are the facts? In every such case the unvarying method of the Catholic Church is to endeavor in the most private, personal and friendly way to regularize a condition which she cannot approve, and which does violence to the religious convictions of the Catholic party, and in ninety-nine cases out of every hundred her Christ-like methods meet with complete success. It is a crying injustice, therefore, and most unbecoming conduct on the part of a paper calling itself the Christian Guardian, to deal in generalities for which no specific case can be offered in justification.

With regard to "priestly interference in the state to secure special privileges for Roman Catholics," we shall say no more than this charge is the old calumny in the old form. That both priests and lay Catholics have a right and duty to insist upon the protection of their conscience from the possible inroads of the civil power, is a principle that no logical Christian can successfully oppose. That Catholics, as such, whether lay or

clerical, seek for more, is a statement that we most emphatically deny. Will the Christian Guardian kindly furnish us with the particular instances upon which it bases its general accusation?

THE FIGHT AGAINST VESTED WRONGS

The strenuous battle for Home Rule still goes on from day to day in the English House of Commons. The descendants of those who in the old days opposed the Reform Bill, having for object the betterment of the mass of the people, are to be found in the ranks of those who are fighting the bill inch by inch. Mr. Balfour describes it as an unsymmetrical and botched federal scheme utterly unworthy of British statesmanship. The Postmaster-General, Mr. Samuel, truly said that Mr. Balfour's arguments against the bill might with equal justice be advanced against any soberer of colonial self-government, and reminded the leader of the opposition that exactly the same opposition was offered to local self-government for South Africa. Andrew Bonar Law savagely assailed both the bill and the government. The people of Ulster, he declared, were ready, in what they believed to be the cause of liberty and justice, to lay down their lives. It is astonishing with what a light heart the English Tories give vent to expressions which, coming from Irish members a generation ago, would land them behind prison bars. Mr. T. P. O'Connor declared that in Ireland they believed that the true democratic road was through liberty to loyalty, "God save the King," he added, would be sung again in Ireland when it was not degraded into a song for party faction. Timothy Healy said that the bill, instead of repealing the union, as contended by the opposition, made it perpetual with the consent of the Irish people. One of the most gratifying features of the present conditions in Ireland is the solid united action of the Irish people, always excepting, of course, the foreign element in Ulster. There are no Irish factions now. The Nationalists, embracing, be it remembered, a very large contingent of Protestants, who place country above narrowness and bigotry, form a compact body. We have at last a united Ireland. The race of the wily politician, who promoted faction for his own selfish purposes, has become extinct. May he never be seen in the land again.

A MOMENTOUS SUBJECT

The best way to grapple with the drink evil is a subject that is old and yet ever new. Statisticians tell us that one half the drunkards contract the disease before they are twenty-one years old; 30 per cent. before they are sixteen; and 7 per cent. before they are twelve. The latter, it may be assumed, become accustomed to the taste of strong drink in the home or in the bar-room owned and operated by their fathers. Some young men, who, just emerging from their teens, with a little roll of bills in their pockets, handed them by the paymaster of the shop, stroll about the town on a Saturday afternoon as too prone to drop into the bar-rooms and invite each other to "have something." Needless to say that they, as a consequence, go to their homes, it may be early or it may be late, with a peak load of vile stuff in their stomachs. Conditions are, however, we are pleased to say, improving. This custom is not as common as it was a generation ago. The working men nowadays, taken in the aggregate, have wisely arrived at the conclusion that by partaking in the jollity promoted by the wine clerk in the white apron, they are but living in a fool's paradise. In society, save that of the lowest grade, and in the commercial and industrial world, the man who carries about with him the odor of spirits is looked upon with suspicion and with distrust, and men who have a high aim in life shun his company. An American exchange tells us that "for some years corporations that employ many men to carry on their enterprises have been careful to exclude from their payrolls those addicted to drink. All governmental departments, national, State and municipal, also make it a point to keep only sober men."

Working men who are fond of the cup might here tell us they have as much right to drink intoxicating beverages as their employers; that the poor man has as much right to his beer as the rich man to his champagne. Admitted. Our words of censure go out to the one just the same as to the other. The secret drinking of the rich is quite as reprehensible as the public drinking of the poor. Of course we do not wish it to be understood that we think the drinking of a glass of beer or a glass of champagne is sinful. We are now dealing with the influences which serve to promote the habit and which sooner or later lands both the rich and the poor in a condition which gives them a charred past and a bleared future.

Much discussion is now in vogue among the proposed legislation in our Provincial Parliament touching the regulation of the liquor traffic. Mr. Rowell, the leader of the Opposition,

has issued a manifesto declaring it to be the purpose of his party to abolish the bar. Sir James Whitney, the Premier will not go so far. He favors the enactment of a statute which will prevent treating. Politicians will view the merits of one and the other proposition from the party standpoint. Conservatives will declare it as their conviction that abolishing the bar goes too far, and Liberals will say that an anti-treating law is but a weak and spineless expedient, impossible of enforcement. The bulk of the Dominion Alliance will no doubt, at least in proportion of Mr. Rowell, but when the ballot boxes are doing business they will, as is customary, "hearken to the lash of the party whip. What is best to be done to promote temperance spells 'Perplexity.' The ideal condition is in the experimental stage. Meantime the very best work that can be done is along the line of education. The really effective way of closing the bar-rooms is to take away the customers, and if we put forth strenuous efforts in this our day to keep the rising generation far away from temptation—to impress upon the minds of our youth the horrible effect of the drink habit—we will in due time have a "dry" community and the wine clerk would be forced to look for a more reputable way of making a living. In this connection we deem it well to quote here the words of Cardinal Manning:

"As a pastor of souls I have before me the wreck of men, women and children, homes and all the sanctities of domestic life. I see prosperity turned into temptations; the wages of industry not only wasted, but as they increase making the plague more deadly. If by denying myself in this which I am free to renounce, I shall help or encourage even one soul who has fallen through intoxication, to rise up and break his bonds, then I will gladly abstain as long as I live."

WORTHY OF DOOLEY

The Most Rev. Dr. Crozier, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland, has been publishing his views upon what he thinks will result from any measure of Home Rule. He regards with horror the thought that the destiny of his native land should be handed over to the mercy of men who had marched through rapine to the dismemberment of the Empire. As an apostle of ascendancy His Grace of Dublin could not be expected to express any other view of the situation. The same sentiments were held by his fellow-churchmen—indeed we might say even more intemperate ones—when Mr. Gladstone brought in his bill to disestablish what was mis-called the Irish Church. At that time and during many generations farther back the Irish Catholic people, poverty-stricken as most of them were by oppressive English laws, were compelled to give of their scant means to support the clergymen of this alien establishment. Our friend Dooley, a few years ago, while in conversation with his mate Hennessey, related his experience while attending Rockefeller's Sunday school. "It would have done your heart good," says the humorist, "to hear young Mr. Rockefeller leading the choir, who sang 'Onward Christian Soldiers—marching for the stuff.' His Grace of Dublin must be, if sincere, a very peculiar individual, else he answers the description of Mr. Rockefeller, Jr. The non-success of the Irish Church Mission Society, to sunder the tie which binds the Irish people to St. Patrick, has made them dour-minded, and we are therefore not surprised when we read of their giving vent to such un-Christian, uncalled for and narrow-minded utterances.

The Unionist whip, Sir John Lonsdale, received a cable despatch from one Mr. Castell Hopkins, of Toronto, which reads: "Canadian loyalists are opposed to Home Rule based on the separatist disloyal agitation. Disallowance powers in colonial experience absolutely futile; we consider safeguards useless." If there were a law against sending misleading reports over the cable Mr. J. Castell Hopkins would be punished for transmitting the above despatch. On two separate occasions the House of Commons and the Senate of Canada passed with scarcely a dissentient voice resolutions praying the English Government to grant Ireland Home Rule. Are we to take it that these men and those whom they represented were disloyal? Mr. Denison, if we mistake not, boasts of being a descendant of the United Empire Loyalists, who, to show their loyalty to George of England ran away from George Washington and settled in Canada—a circumstance which proved but a sorry asset for Canada. People who are eternally boasting of their loyalty make poor soldiers in time of need. Mr. Geo. T. Denison of Toronto also sent another cable which reads: "The surrender to the Empire's enemies is an outrage to Ulster dictated by U. S. A. Fenians. Will England wound herself?" Mr. Denison when sending this despatch forgot that he was skating on very thin ice, besides stating what is not a fact. There are no Fenians now in the United States. There were such persons in

1866 and they invaded Canada. The Toronto Loyalists went out in battle array to meet them, but when the first shot was heard they turned tail and headed for the Queen's City in a manner which would have made Longboat green with envy.

A third despatch was sent by Mr. J. S. Willison, disapproving of Home Rule. Mr. Willison is editor of The News and The News is published in Toronto.

SOCIALISM

In "The Common Cause" for March Mr. Robert Larmour, the Railway Veteran of Stratford, Ont., has a clever paper giving a comparative study of Socialism and religion, disproving all the claims made by Socialists in regard to their programme of action. It would seem that the propaganda are pursuing but a policy dictated by arrant hypocrisy. In the Socialist arena we have a body of men, clever beyond doubt, at the top, who, while claiming to be Socialists and leaders of Socialists thought, eschew all forms of Christianity and outline a course of action that would lead us back to barbarism. At the same time the rank and file claim that Socialism is something entirely different—that the very fathers of the cult have gone astray and that their children will not follow them. In other words, the claim is made that the generals of the army command a body of soldiers who are not obliged to give them obedience. The whole thing is a hodge-podge of insincerity, mystification and devilry calculated to entrap the unwary by holding before them a will 'o' the wisp which has for its aims and objects the robbery of one section of the community to enrich another section. We would advise all who wish to become thoroughly acquainted with this subject to send for Mr. Larmour's little book entitled "The Impossible Vagaries of Socialism." Price 50 cents. His address is Stratford, Ont.

A BLESSED WORK

From Toronto we have received a neat little booklet, being the third annual report of the St. Elizabeth Visiting Nurses' Association. Within its covers we read a story that will, we feel assured, be the means of bringing a benediction upon all those engaged in this splendid endeavor to alleviate misery. In the darksome home, where poverty is too often known, sunshine and hope and Godliness have entered through the exertions of these noble ladies. In a world of gaiety, of frivolity, of all the waking hours spent in worse than useless rounds of pleasure, when men and women look forward to naught save the quenching a thirst for the gratification of the senses with the continuous social whirl, the visiting nurse is the bright and blessed star shining through the gloom. To her warm heart, loving the things divine, there is infinitely more gratification succoring the stricken ones. 'Tis trying to the human side; but the divine idea—the following in the footsteps of the Master—makes the burden, though heavy, light indeed, and brings the conviction that the great reward will come somewhere, sometime. The founder of the Society was the late Archbishop McEvay, the Honorary President Lady Falconbridge and the President Mrs. J. McLean French. The nurses are Miss Annie B. Long, lovingly remembered in London because of her innate nobility of soul; Miss Kelman, Miss Mary E. Kelly and Miss MacDonnell. During the past year these ladies had 921 patients and made 6,924 visits. What a splendid work, and what a noble ambition is that of each nurse as expressed in the following lines:

Let me to-day do something that shall take A little sadness from the world's vast store, And may I be so favored as to make Of joy's too scanty sum a little more.

COLD STORAGE

The Toronto Board of Trade has taken upon itself the task of finding out the cause of the high price of our foodstuffs and a special committee has been appointed to make investigation. Mr. Spence, one of the speakers at the meeting, defended the cold storage, which, he said, had been blamed for the high price of living. "The cold storage," he added, "was very necessary, as it prevented radical fluctuations in prices. Before there was cold storage produce was cheap only at certain periods in the year." In other words, the cold storages, level up prices, but do they ever level them down. As might be expected, these people will advance all sorts of excuses to defend their particular line of business. Before the advent of the cold storage a housewife could in the plentiful season take her basket to market and get chickens, butter and eggs at a low figure. The modern "Big Interest" man now scours the country and buys up everything in sight, puts it in cold storage, smiles benignly at himself, and calmly awaits the time when the corner is ripe, when he fixes the prices. There may be other reasons for the new conditions but the cold storage is certainly one that is visible to the naked eye. Some time, and that soon, there may arise the cry that cold storages must either go or be placed under strict regu-