

# The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum.  
United States & Europe—\$2.00.  
THOS. COFFEY, L.L.D., Editor and Publisher.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., at 5 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.  
Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Meas. Luke King, P. J. Neven, E. Roderick, M. J. Haggerty, Mrs. W. E. Smith and Miss Sara Haggerty are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the Catholic Record. Agents for district of Winnipeg Mrs. M. Reynolds, New Liskeard.  
Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 10 cents.  
When subscribers ask for their paper at the post office it would be well were they to tell the clerk to give them their Catholic Record. We have information of carelessness in a few places on the part of railway clerks who will sometimes look for letters only.

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

## LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION.

**APOTOLIC DELEGATION.**  
Ottawa, June 13th, 1911.  
Mr. Thomas Coffey  
My Dear Sir:—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper. I have noted with satisfaction that it is directed, with intelligence and ability, and shows that it is imbued with a strong Catholic spirit. It strenuously defends Catholic principles and rights and stands firmly by the teachings and authority of the Church, at the same time promoting the best interests of the country. Following these lines it has done a great deal of good for the welfare of religion and country, and it will do more and more, as its influence increases among Catholic homes. I therefore, earnestly recommend it to Catholic readers. With best wishes for its continued success, yours very sincerely in Christ,  
Domenico, Archbishop of Ephesus,  
Apostolic Delegate

**UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA.**  
Ottawa, Canada, March 27th, 1910.  
Mr. Thomas Coffey  
Dear Sir:—For some time past I have read your valuable paper, the Catholic Record, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published. Its matter and form are both good, and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the public. Blessings upon you and wishing you success, believe me to remain,  
Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,  
T. D. Falconer, Arch. of Laraine,  
Apost. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1911

## HON. S. H. BLAKE AND THE NE TEMERE

"Not all the protests which have been hurled against the Ne Temere decree can outweigh in force and effectiveness the argument and denunciation which Hon. S. H. Blake, K. C., used last night before the Wyllie Association to condemn the position of the Roman Catholic Church on the sacredness of marriage."

Thus the Globe introduces the summary of Hon. S. H. Blake's recent delivery on this much-discussed and ill-understood question. That the denunciation was very forceful and effective we have no reason to doubt: that Mr. Blake out-denounced all others is indeed very high praise of the kind. That his argument "outweighs in force and effectiveness" all previous protests may not be considered very high praise at all by those who have followed the discussion with intelligent interest.

We shall pass over the denunciation and take up his argument, making due allowance for the incompleteness of the summary which, doubtless, is sufficiently comprehensive to indicate his position pretty clearly, and to justify the eulogistic introduction.

"Such children were not illegitimate when the marriage was enacted according to the legal enactments of the land."

Whether this is a premise or a conclusion from Mr. Blake's forceful and effective argument matters little; it is the one clear and unequivocal statement of position which to the unthinking, at least, would justify all the vehement denunciation and persistent agitation occasioned by the Papal decree on marriage.

But what Catholic questions the legal status of parents or children in the case of a marriage which conforms to the "legal enactments of the land"? Not the Pope, no Canadian Bishop, no Catholic, priest or layman, calls into question the legal standing of such married persons or their children. Does Mr. Blake want a law compelling Catholics to believe that all legal marriages are also valid before God and His Church? He would hardly go so far. Then does he wish to allow liberty of conscience but restrict freedom of speech? He would scarcely like to admit the principle involved, though apparently he and others would not strenuously object to its being applied to the particular case of the Catholic view of marriage.

But, it will be objected, in the Province of Quebec the civil law recognizes the Church impediments to marriage, witness the Hebert case. Aye, there's the rub. The Ne Temere decree, which came into force only in 1908, had no bearing on this case, though we grant that it may affect civil decisions in the future. So we may in a measure grant also the relevancy of the Hebert case. This is probably one of the "recent events well known to all" to which Mr. Blake refers when he demands that "so far as possible, one uniform marriage law for the whole Dominion should be passed."

That might be a very good thing, but Mr. Blake's opinion of what the law should be and ours might differ. One uniform educational law might be a good and desirable thing also, and still we might not agree with Mr. Blake as to what it should be. One license law for the whole Dominion would please many, but there would be a diversity of opinion as to what that one law should enact. The trouble with all such proposed solutions of difficulties is that the wisdom of our fathers decided in favor of a Federal Union and against a Legis-

lative Union. One is free to hold that they made a mistake, and point out the advantages of a Legislative Union; but it is well to count the cost of this new building to consider the wisdom and propriety of sewing this piece of new cloth on the old garment. "Legislation that would empower the Exchequer Court of Canada to deal exclusively with all questions throughout the Dominion relating to the validity of marriage," would be a strange patch on provincial autonomy; and passing strange that the patchers should be the erstwhile ardent champions of provincial rights!

One thing we have learned from this discussion, and that is that there is a painful need of reiterating certain elementary truths with regard to marriage.

Marriage is a sacrament in the eyes of the Church; it is also a civil contract. Every sacrament must have a minister. Any one, Protestant or Catholic, Jew or infidel, may be the minister of baptism, provided only he has the intention of administering this sacrament. Only a Bishop can be the minister of Holy Order. A priest with jurisdiction is the minister of the sacrament of penance. But the ministers of the sacrament of matrimony are the man and woman themselves. This is clearly indicated in the Ne Temere decree itself, which gives permission to the parties desiring to marry, in the event of the impossibility of coming before a priest for a month or more, to marry themselves before two witnesses.

The civil power has nothing to do, and can have nothing to do, with marriage as a sacrament; but the civil power has an undoubted and unquestioned right, and a corresponding duty to deal with marriage as a civil contract. The civil power recognizes, necessarily, that the man and woman desiring to marry are the contracting parties. And yet, the civil power nowhere in the world gives absolute liberty to the parties to contract a valid civil marriage when, where and how they please. Even in Great Britain there had to be a witness. Common sense and experience have impelled the civil power, everywhere, to restrict to, comparatively, a few individuals the right to act as competent official civil witnesses to the marriage contract. Usually all ministers of religion are authorized to act as civil officers in the performance of the marriage ceremony. If married people wish to enjoy all the rights that the civil law guarantees to them and to their children, they must conform to the provisions of the civil law which restricts to these few individuals the right to receive and register their mutual consent to marriage. If the civil law did not impose any such restrictions, "public morality" (so Mr. Blake's expression) would suffer enormously, and the civil rights of married people and of their children would be hard to determine in the confusion, the chaos that would ensue.

Now what the State does to safe-guard marriage as a civil contract is precisely, in principle, what the Church, in the Ne Temere decree, does within her own sphere, with regard to marriage as a sacrament. This decree restricts the competent official witness to the sacramental contract to the parish priest of the parties (or one of them) the ordinary of the diocese, or a priest delegated by either of these. Any other priest is no more competent to receive the consent to marriage of two Catholics than is a Protestant minister or a justice of the peace. But the Church imposes no penalty on Catholics who disregard her marriage laws, other than her refusal to recognize their marriage as a sacramental marriage. If they marry according to the civil law they enjoy all the rights and privileges, and all the protection that the civil law affords, without let or hindrance from the Church, from which they freely cut themselves off.

It must be remembered that the decree affects Catholics and Catholics only. Protestants are free not only to contract civil marriage, but, if they are baptized, the Church recognizes such unions as sacramental and indissoluble. The decree affects Protestants only incidentally, in the infinitesimal number of marriages (compared with the total number of marriages throughout the world), in which one of the parties is a Catholic and the other a Protestant. But the Catholic is bound by the law of the Church even if he has fallen away or joined some Protestant communion. It is to this provision that Mr. Blake referred when he "scored the doctrine which denied the right of spiritual freedom to an infant baptized by a priest of Rome." Now this soundly formidable; it is not easy, however, to separate the argument from the denunciation. The grievance seems to be this: Since the Pope includes within the provisions of the decree those Catholics who may have severed their connection with the Church, he thereby denies them "the right of spiritual freedom" and reduces them to a "state of bondage" not permissible in a free land. This is specious reasoning which could be considered as "forceful and effective" only where religious preju-

dice and passion largely influence the judgment.

Persons baptized into the Church come under the laws of the Church; but they are as free as it is possible for free men to be, to leave the Church and affiliate with any sect or with none. But in the name of liberty and common sense, why shall not we Catholics be free to regard them as unfortunate brethren who have forfeited their rights as members of the Catholic Church? So long as they are satisfied with their position outside of the Church Catholics will in no way interfere with their freedom, spiritual or temporal. But if they wish to return to the Church they must conform to what the Church imposes as a condition of receiving them again into her membership. And that will never involve the breaking of the tie by which civil marriage legally binds them, but that tie will be implemented and sanctified.

It is mere ranting, then, to talk of denying "the right to spiritual freedom," and of a "state of bondage that should not be permitted in this free land."

When Mr. Blake says that the Ne Temere decree "is used as a means of virtually coercing persons desirous of marrying to enter the Roman Church," he shows that he is unacquainted with the teaching and practice of the Church in the province in which he lives.

Now let us consider the reason for attempting the dangerous and difficult task of amending the marriage laws by infringing on provincial autonomy, and giving the federal government rights in the premises which it has never hitherto exercised or even claimed.

The civil law in the Province of Quebec does not meet with Mr. Blake's approval. So it is not now the Church that is at fault, but "the regulations set forth in the legal enactments of the land!" What pitiful inconsistency!

The Province of Quebec does precisely what the Province of Ontario does, restricts to certain civil officials the right to celebrate the marriage ceremony. Every Catholic priest, with jurisdiction, is recognized as competent to receive the consent to marriage of Catholics. Every Protestant minister in the Province of Quebec is recognized to receive the consent to marriage of his own people. No Protestant minister may legally marry two Catholics. Now in the famous Hebert case, both of the parties were Catholics, and they were married by a Protestant minister, a highly improper, illegal and unwarranted thing for that Protestant minister to do, since he knew, or should have known, that he was doing something contrary to the interests of "public morality," and something which he had no legal right to do. There is not a Catholic priest in the whole Province of Quebec who would, for any consideration, marry two Protestants. Some of the overflowing indignation and denunciation of Ontario might be reserved for this indiscreet and meddlesome minister whose only excuse could be invincible ignorance of the law of the province in which he was officiating as a civil officer as well as a minister of religion.

It is the business of the civil courts of Quebec to interpret the laws of Quebec, and that is all they did in the Hebert case. If the civil laws of Quebec need change or amendment that is the business of the Quebec legislature. If the Protestants of Quebec feel that they have a grievance against the marriage laws of the province, then it is their business through their representatives (and Protestants always have full and fair representation in Quebec) to endeavor to have those laws changed or amended. Ontario people are guilty of impertinent, meddlesome and unwarranted interference with Quebec's provincial autonomy in agitating to deprive the Quebec legislature of the power to make the laws which shall govern the marriage contract in that province, and in seeking to deprive the Quebec courts of their undoubted right to interpret those laws.

As for the Church "usurping authority never conceded by treaty or statute," Mr. Blake goes far afield in history to prove nothing. The Province of Quebec has the same legal and constitutional right as Ontario to make her own marriage laws. And in exercising that right she gives no special privileges to the Catholic Church.

There is another Ontario lawyer, Mr. Walter Mills, K. C., like Mr. S. H. Blake, K. C., a Protestant, who has studied this question deeply, and, without allowing religious prejudice or predilection to warp his views or bias his judgment, gives us the following as his conclusion from his study of this very same question of the marriage laws of Quebec:

"In the Province of Quebec according to the Civil Code there is this provision under section 127. After enumerating in previous sections the various impediments, according to law, this section comes in as the only provision in the law of any State in this continent which shows respect for religious institutions. It reads, 'Other impediments recognized according to the different relig-

ious persuasions as results from relationship or affinity or from other causes, remain subject to the rules hitherto followed in the different Churches and religious communities.' It is not applicable to any individual Church. It does not single out the Church of Rome, but it says to all the religious persuasions of the Christian community that 'the law-makers of this Province have assumed that you have a sincere regard for your religious affiliation and that you are not a hypocrite but are sincere in the faith which you profess to adopt in preference to all others. It says to the law-makers of this Province that 'Methodists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Baptists and Anglicans and all others of the various Christian denominations: if there are any impediments which exist according to the rites of your Church the law of this Province respects them, for Christianity is recognized as part of the common law of the land. The law of this Province not only tolerates your faith but it so far respects it as to require that its conditions shall be observed before the validity of the marriage can be asserted.'"

We commend its perusal to Hon. S. H. Blake, Mr. Matthew Wilson and others who favor "continual protest."

From the chief analyst of the Department of Inland Revenue, Ottawa, Mr. A. McGill, comes the official announcement that the pepper used throughout Canada has been adulterated to the extent of forty per cent. during the past thirty-three years. The principal adulterants are found to be wheat husks, ground coconut shells, maize, foreign starches and ground olive stones. For some years the chief analyst has reported that other foods have been to a greater or less extent adulterated by the manufacturer. And all the while that imperious dignity inflates his chest and says to the law officers of the Crown, "What are you going to do about it?" And the law officers of the crown sit in their easy chairs, enjoying a good cigar, and continue to practise masterly inaction. Would it not be a good plan were Mr. McGill to undertake the task of analysing the law officers of the crown. There must be some adulteration there, otherwise they would long since have taken steps to stop the rascally methods of some of the manufacturers. A small fine would be like using barley water for a case of cancer. Bread and water diet and hard labor in the prison yard is the only radical cure. We would also like to have a report from Mr. McGill on the adulteration of bread. Some bakers give us an article that keeps fresh for weeks.

## AT HOME AND ABROAD

Our separated brethren of the sects have for long been spending millions of money every year in the foreign fields of missions. The have embarked in it with an earnestness which is most remarkable and they give of their means with prodigal liberality. Men and women are despatched with goodly filled purses to the furthestmost parts of the earth with the object of promoting the spread of Christianity. The man on the street, looking at the matter without prejudice, will wonder why all these millions of money are spent to bring the heathen into the fold, while so little is done to counteract the baneful influences at home which are tending to take people's minds away from God and the things belonging to God. In almost every centre of population in the country it would be no easy task to enumerate the number of people who, while supposed to be Christians, are agnostics, scoffers and modernists. There is, too, that class, and a very large one, which, while bearing the Christian name, have become so indifferent to Christian practices and Christian precepts as to be merely withered branches. What the missionaries may be gaining abroad is lost at home. For proof of this we have but to turn to a report in the Toronto Globe of last Saturday, referring to the Methodist General Board of Missions which took place in that city. The Globe reporter tells us that "some earnest heart searching was done as the members listened to the reports of the superintendents of missions in the various provinces. These told of an indifference to the church on the part of many people, especially in the West, where they seem absorbed by the passion of the pursuit of wealth; while at the other extreme of the Dominion rises the lament for the draining of much of its best blood to supply material and often leadership in the different spheres of activity for the West. The apparent great decrease in the rate of growth of membership in the church as a whole was strikingly set forth in figures presented by the committee on membership." Our Methodist friends in the West would have shown better results, perhaps, had they copied the methods of the Presbyterian missionaries, who made a dead set upon the foreign Catholics who had moved into the new country. They procured one or two renegade priests, set up altars in some improvised wooden structures, and held a service which they called the celebration of the Mass. It was hoped that in this way they would gradually wean these simple people from the faith of their fathers. They would give them a bogus "Mass" at first, with the hope that in the coming years, with a

new generation, they would be transformed into Presbyterians of the orthodox type—cold and barren Presbyterianism. As the years go by our separated friends will, we think, find it more and more difficult to keep their churches filled. Attractions of one kind or another, having no semblance of religious service, will have to be introduced, so that attendance may be maintained. Nor can it be well otherwise for, as Father Vaughan said, "Protestantism has no soul,"—has no lamp of the sanctuary to denote the loving Saviour of Mankind in their churches.

FATHER VAUGHAN, who has arrived in the United States, will prolong his visit to that country and Canada until after Easter. During November he is to preach a series of sermons in the Jesuit church in Boston. He will also, the press dispatch tells us, deliver a series of Advent conferences in Toronto. He told a press interviewer that he "does not want to be listed as an advocate of the new woman. As to woman suffrage his objection is not to woman voting, but to other things that might follow. A woman may be all right in matching ribbons and looking after details, but she is not mentally fitted to grasp and solve the problems of the day. She should not hold office, he thinks. A woman in office might do well enough in dealing with side issues of minor importance, but could she grasp and deal with great issues? Father Vaughan doubts that she could. There have been a few exceptional women, but the ordinary woman is the weaker vessel, and not suited to masculine roles."

## A METHODIST "ECUMENICAL."

The gathering of our Methodist friends from the different parts of the Methodist world in the city of Toronto, while in great measure a love feast becoming that body, is yet strangely inharmonious. It has not been called together, we are told, with the view of discussing doctrinal standards, but merely to give the delegates an opportunity of reading papers on almost every other conceivable subject, including prize fighting. This they have of course a perfect right to do, and it is to be hoped, when all is over, what fell from the lips of some of the reverend gentlemen will, in the conduct of human affairs, prove to be a little healthily mustard seed. A gentleman named Carroll is secretary of the western section of the conference. The name and the conference are ill-mated. "Methodism is still Christianity in earnest," Mr. Carroll said, "but with less emphasis on earnest. It seems to have lost in sympathy and directness and enthusiasm. We are living in times of great activity, intellectual, moral, political, commercial and industrial. New things were never so warmly welcomed. Old things never so continually questioned. Appeals to the past are little heeded. Creeds are old and therefore suspected. The Bible comes from the dim distance and must be reconstructed. The matchless character of Christ must pass under the critical X-ray. Almighty God Himself is curiously questioned, and not a thing He has made nor a word He has said escapes even. Shall all its whims be recognized and the Church adjust herself to its demand? Or shall it continue its God-given mission to shine." Truly this is a gruesome picture of the world given to us by this Methodist gentleman as a result of the reformation. One can be an excellent Methodist, highly respected in the pew and in the community, and yet have opinions of his own in regard to the credibility of the Bible and the divine character of Christ. Surely this cannot be the Church which our divine Redeemer built upon a rock. Outside the true fold of Christ the sects are cast about by every wind of doctrine.

Our Methodist friends are wont to send missionaries to every part of the inhabited globe, with the intention of bringing into their fold the white, the black, the red, all manner of people, teaching them that Christ died for all, that all are equally dear to Him. The converts, however, will, in many cases, as at the present conference, find that practice has made bad worse with preaching. The newspapers inform us that some of the negro delegates found difficulty in getting rooms at the Toronto hotels, Bishop Gains, of Georgia, was turned away from one of the leading hostels with the answer that there was no room. Later he found accommodation in another place, but several other African delegates had quite a hard time to get a room. Some of them do not want to discuss the incident at all, but others are quite outspoken in their surprise at their reception. Bishop Derrick, of New York, who has a room himself, said "he resented the way he and his friends were treated. 'God is no respecter of persons,' is a motto not lived up to here apparently, he said. What difference does it make if your blood is blue or black or red or green?" Upon being asked if such treatment were accorded the colored delegates ten years ago in London, England, he replied, "O no, that is a civilized country." Some

of the negro delegates also have a grievance in that the word "colored" had been placed opposite their name in brackets on the programme of preaching appointments. "We don't like that at all," was the statement of several negroes. And all this in "Toronto the Good," the most evangelical city in the world. If some one were to tell us that this was an age of hypocrites and humbugs, at least in large part, we would find it a very difficult task to disprove the assertion.

A NOTABLE pronouncement was made recently at Dundee by Mr. Churchill in regard to Home Rule. He said the benefits of that system of Government were exemplified in the cases of South Africa and Canada, where freedom had bred loyalty. The opposition to Home Rule in Ireland is carried on by a miserable faction because the present conditions give them a monopoly of privileges which bear heavily upon the mass of the people. Such was the case in Canada, too, before responsible government was wrested from the privileged class. In this connection we might also mention that a notable conversion to Home Rule within the past few weeks is Sir Conan Doyle, the versatile writer of stories that will live.

## OF PRIME IMPORTANCE

We desire once more to refer to the urgent necessity of promoting the circulation of literature of a high class amongst our people. Our Catholic societies could do much towards forwarding this beneficent work. We are pleased to notice that the C. M. B. A. has already taken action. At a meeting of Branch 472, Windsor, N. S., the question was interestingly discussed, two members, Rev. J. W. Brown, and Mr. Richard Soy.

"The advantages to be derived from the use of good reading matter was taken up by Mr. Soy. He mentioned many of the great men of the world who had derived the inspiration which made them great from the reading of good books. The value of good fiction such as that of Dickens, Mrs. Stowe and Anna Sewall, which had come to make the world kinder and better, was shown. The philosophy of Marcus Aurelius, the Christian teaching of St. Augustine, and the sublime imaginative writings of Dante were dwelt upon as books capable of raising men up to higher planes of thought and nobler character. All these and many other gems were within our reach. They were not so rare or costly as Robinson Crusoe, but infinitely more value to the human race. Books are pouring from the presses at the rate of many thousands per year. The vast majority of these are very poor and a large percentage are but trash. Why then should we waste time and money on the latest book, only to find that it is useless when so many treasures, which have stood the test of time are within our easy reach. Good books are a cure for loneliness, a source of wisdom which will increase our common sense and aid us in every walk of life."

Father Brown dwelt with much force upon the great mistake made by parents in allowing the young to peruse trashy novels, the mere love story and the sensational "yellow" journals. From bad books and yellow journals men were taught the ways of crime, and from the trashy novels young girls became filled with romantic dreams, from which they awakened later in life only to find how sadly they had been disappointed. Even many of the works pronounced classical by scholars contained much that was objectionable, and unfit to be put into the hands of the young. This was true in the case of Shakespeare and more particularly so in regard to Byron.

This subject is also receiving serious attention from our separated brethren. A prominent Protestant publication entitled "Christian Work and Evangelist" criticizes unsparingly, yet most justly, as follows, the objectionable literature which meets us at every hand:

"We are being flooded with a lot of fiction that attacks everything, and the world has called morality, and holds up a frantic individualism as the only dominant life-principle worth considering. Marriage is a conventionalism of old-fashioned people, and must not stand in the way of 'love.' If a man suddenly conceives a terrific passion for a woman, neither marriage, nor the welfare of the community, nor the great foundation of moral law, which keeps society from becoming a chaos, should stand in the way of this great love. It is a law unto itself. The individual must live his life, follow his nature, break down everything that stands between himself and his one seeming high happiness. The favorite gospel of these novelists is 'the rights of the soul.' Under this gospel divorce, adultery, any crimes against the social order are all glossed over, and even held up as the true way of life. And men and women who are guilty of the most heinous crimes are excused on the basis of fate and destiny or entanglements which they are powerless to break. Or the man and woman who violate their vows are so glossed over by other fair qualities or so surrounded with a sentimental halo of sympathy that the readers' sympathies are won for the sinners. In three modern novels out of five of those one buys at the news-stands or on the train the reader wonders (or would if the average book that these books had any moral perception) if the writers of these books have any sense of right or wrong left. Or do many of them go just as far as they dare in ignoring all moral restraints simply to write a shocking book that may sell to the great host of the morally perverted? But several of the writers who have literary standing are as culpable in these regards as those who write the rubbish to be hawked in trains. They do not take one into severer nor are their pages quite as odorous

as is garbage, but in their perfumed pages the same danger lurks. All moral vigor is absent. There is nothing but sensuousness as atmosphere, and there is absolute relaxation of will to passion, and law is unknown, and the rights of others unheeded—ignored."

ANOTHER ITEM, which will serve to lessen the talk of bigots in regard to the Ne Temere decree, comes to us from Toronto. A despatch from that city, dated Oct. 3rd, informs us that John Denman, a builder of Chicago, has entered action at Osgoode Hall for a High Court order declaring that no valid marriage was entered into by his daughter Grace Christina Denman, with Otto Frederick Werner of Georgetown, Ont. It seems to be another clandestine marriage case, for the young lady was visiting a relative at Georgetown and went off to Stratford with her lover. She was married there by Rev. Mr. Green, Methodist minister. It is stated that the young lady is between seventeen and eighteen years of age. It is a pity that some ministers of the Gospel take so little trouble to find out if young people who come to them with a license are fit to be married. We humbly submit this case for the consideration of Mr. S. H. Blake, K. C., of Toronto.

## IN TWO YEARS

In Dublin, on the 1st of October, a bronze statue of Parnell, one of the finest achievements of the great sculptor St. Gandens, was unveiled by Mr. John E. Redmond. We are told there was enthusiasm equal to that which prevailed at the unveiling of the O'Connell statue thirty years ago. The parade, starting from St. Stephen's Green, was a monster one—perhaps the largest that has been seen in Dublin in a generation. Mr. Redmond was the only speaker. He paid a glowing tribute to Parnell.

"Twenty years," he said, "seemed a long time to wait to erect a monument. But was it not the inevitable hour? A chosen hand guides us in the sequence of events." He declared that there would be an Irish parliament within two years and he advised his hearers to remember the Chief of words, that "We cannot spare a single Irishman." He made a plea also for a conciliatory attitude towards Ulster. These are noble words. Everything possible should be done to bring the people of that province to a sane realization of what will take place when local government is secured. The leaders of the Orange or ultra Protestant faction in Ulster are a miserable clique of disturbers who, that their personal interests may be served, endeavor to keep alive the old spirit of faction and hatred between Irishmen. They are the lineal descendants of that rascally collection of bigots who composed the Dublin corporation in 1603. A letter issued by that body in that year made declaration of the way they wished Ireland to be governed. They wanted "a Protestant king, a Protestant House of Commons, a Protestant hierarchy, the Courts of Justice, the army, the navy, the revenue in all its branches Protestant, and this system fortified and maintained by a connection with the Protestant State of Great Britain." The document went on to declare that "Protestants of Ireland will never relinquish their political position which their fathers won with their swords and they therefore regard as their birthright." There is in this declaration a remarkable coincidence with the 12th of July orations in our day both in Ireland and Canada.

Their professions to the contrary notwithstanding, many of the Orangemen would, if they could, in our day, deprive Catholics of their civil rights. When Home Rule comes, bringing with it a new era of equal rights to the people of Ireland of every class and creed, the misled bigots of the rank and file of Orangemen will have reason to be ashamed of themselves, and, as for their leaders, Ireland will be all the better without them.

## CONFUSION WORSE CONFOUNDED

Yet another and a very striking illustration of the deplorable effects of private interpretation comes to us from Halifax. A Canadian press despatch tells us that a heresy case in the presbytery of that city promises to become exciting. Rev. Mr. Nicholson, a Presbyterian clergyman, has, it seems, been propounding some entirely new and very extraordinary doctrines, which have given something in the nature of an electric shock to those of his denomination who cling to the old standards. He has, it seems, "denied the Virgin birth and brands our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ with a foul stigma," so the report informs us. And we must confess that we too, were somewhat shocked to read that anyone bearing the Christian name would have given utterance to such a blasphemous declaration. We are not surprised, however, that Mr. Nicholson has been excommunicated by a majority of the members of the presbytery. In giving this decision the gentlemen composing that body are at least consistent, because nowadays the almost universal rule amongst the sects is that one may believe whatever he pleases and yet remain in good standing in the