

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. Associate Editors—L. D. A. CABRE, H. F. MACRISTON.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION

Mr. Thomas Coffey: Ottawa, June 15th, 1905. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper. I have noted with satisfaction that it is distinguished by intelligence, ability, and above all, that it is imbued with a strong Catholic spirit.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 31, 1918

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AND THE SCHOOLS OF THE PEOPLE

Underlying President Falconer's demand that the High Schools take over the present first year university work, is the assumption that the University of Toronto is THE PROVINCIAL UNIVERSITY.

Sir George Ross in his letter to the Globe protesting against the exclusiveness, injustice and ingratitude of the President's proposal, says: "Besides, it should not be forgotten that the university is a Provincial institution. Its charter makes no distinction as to locality or social standing."

The Provincial University idea owes much to Sir George. Evidently he still clings to it. It is not surprising.

The Globe, apparently alarmed at the reception of President Falconer's demand, sprang to the defence of the "Provincial University." The Provincial University is the university of the people, a sacred trust, and so on in a vein so enthusiastic that it borders on the hysterical.

What is the meaning of a Minister of Education responsible to Parliament if the people may not freely and by right demand an account of his stewardship? And if the Provincial University be "the main source of those streams of scientific knowledge and intellectual culture which flow through the secondary and primary schools and enrich and vitalize the life of the Province," is that a reason why it should be above and beyond criticism?

The same spirit inspires Prof. Kylie when he says: "This type of argument recalls that so often used by politicians in the country districts of Ontario to the effect that money given to the university is money taken from the schools."

Special privilege always and everywhere shelters itself behind the sacredness of its functions, functions too high, too holy for common people to appreciate; they do their whole duty when they contribute the money.

Nevertheless, we shall examine the present stage of development of the Provincial University idea. Sir George Ross with paternal pride points out: "When I first became officially connected with the University in 1883 its staff consisted of only twenty-one persons, including professors, lecturers and demonstrators."

sity did not exceed 350, in 1912-13 the number of students registered totalled 4,186."

Notwithstanding Sir George's cavalier dismissal of personal attention as "coddling and mothering," Professor Kylie approves and emphasizes President Falconer's best argument when he says:

"University buildings are large and expensive, university lecturers must be paid higher salaries than high school teachers, university classes are large and pupils cannot receive the personal attention which they are given in the schools."

This opens up a question much larger than that of raising the standard of matriculation, a question that would still persist and become more acute and pressing as time goes on, even after the temporary relief that would be afforded by the substitution of senior for junior matriculation.

Sir George's interesting retrospect since 1883 may help us to picture the condition of things say in 1923. Then shall we meekly and gratefully accept the invitation (or the command) of President Falconer or his successor to do another year or two of university work in the High schools?

If personal attention be an important factor in university training why not print the lectures and issue them in book form? The advantages are obvious. Amongst them, the student, without "coddling or mothering" in High school or university, might find his own way with the minimum of personal attention.

If, on the other hand, personal attention is of paramount importance, there must be some limit to the number of students where effective university work can be done.

Have we not arrived at a stage in the development of the Provincial University idea when we should take this consideration into account?

Another consideration is suggested by the following statistics for University College:

Table with 3 columns: Year, From Toronto, From outside the Province. Rows for 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th years and Occasional Students.

From city of Toronto and from outside of the Province 637, from the Ontario, excluding Toronto, 469.

Now if Toronto were to pay half the \$500,000 a year that Ontario gives Toronto University, or better, if the City were to supplement the Provincial grant by another half million it might solve some problems. Toronto is growing very rapidly. It will become a great city. The University of Toronto will become in a large measure the University for Toronto. It will need greatly increased subsidies. It wants them now. Will the City of Toronto rise to its opportunities and its duties in the premises?

Well, not while the Provincial University idea can be imposed on country politicians. It would be too much to expect of human nature. And there is a whole lot of human nature in the city of Toronto and in its press. Do we blame Toronto University? Not very much. Have we any cure for the fault-finding country politician? Yes. He does not go far enough or deep enough. If we include medical students, dental students, veterinary students, summer session, and all the rest as well as those who are supposed to be getting a liberal education we have 4,186 in all. The grant, therefore, from the provincial exchequer is about \$1,200 a student. When the representative of a constituency remote from Toronto compares this with the \$1.70 a pupil for primary and secondary education combined, he might be pardoned if he left the "sacred trust" of a Provincial University to others and promised to look after the educational interests of his constituents. But he ought to go deeper into the question; it is worth studying.

In the High Schools and Collegiate Institutes of the Province there are 898 teachers, 646 of them University graduates. Of these 646, Toronto University supplies 373 or 58 per cent. 179 are graduates of Queen's, and 94 of other universities. So it would appear that those vivifying streams that vitalize our secondary schools take their rise in other sources as well as in the Provincial University. Queen's, having succeeded in pushing to the front, gets recognition and help; Western is legally permitted to live, and though it will not be killed by kindness its demise would be gratefully recorded. Have the members for western

Ontario seriously considered President Falconer's wise remark that "it would benefit Provincial cities and towns by taking the higher education into their midst?" Are we, under the guise of a Provincial University, pampering an institution which even now is well on the way to become the University for Toronto, a centre (to re-quote) "where wealth accumulates and men decay?" Are we starving elementary education and hampering secondary schools?

With the motto, apparently, of "whatever is, is best" our leaders in the educational sphere have self-complacently, even boastfully, allowed the system to pursue its hap-hazard course and Topsy-like it has "just growned;" sometimes (to change the figure) it drifted in the direction that self-assertive friends of the Provincial University, or, more rarely, energetic educators with broader outlook, might determine.

We expect to be classed as opponents of Toronto University; nevertheless we are nothing of the sort. We would have our educational system considered as a whole and we have put forward some of the considerations that we think must not be overlooked if we decide that we shall not become "old and foolish."

This much we may say for ourselves, in devotion to the best interests of education as well as in the desire to see Ontario in the van, we step aside for no man.

THE POPE AND POLITICS

The following is from the Christian Guardian of May 14th inst: "Are those Protestants in error who claim that the Pope demands a fealty which at heart is inconsistent with loyalty to the nation?"

In its April issue the Marian, a Roman Catholic quarterly published at Opelika, Ala., and enjoying the special endorsement of James Cardinal Gibbons, declares that they are. This is what it says: "Catholics do not believe that the Pope has any divine right to interfere with our country in things purely political. The Pope has no right to interfere with our politics. These Popes (who did interfere in things political) had no divine right to interfere in these things political; they had a human right, and this human right came from the people; source. The source was the right; 'was they who could take it away.' It also says: 'If, by an impossible supposition the Pope should man army and fleet to storm our coast, do you know what Catholics here would do? You would have two million Catholics in the American army ready to die to resist the Pope's invasion; you would have thirteen million Catholics in their homes praying for their sons, brothers and fathers in the field; you would have forty-five thousand Catholics upon their knees before the God of armies to strike the guns from the Roman emissaries. You would have seventeen thousand priests in the front ranks of the army fighting till they died for the Constitution of the United States.' We confess that this is different language from what our Canadian Roman Catholic editors use, and reads somewhat differently from the famous 'To hell with the U. S. Government' sermon preached by Archbishop Phelan in St. Louis. Whether the Archbishop or the Marian strikes the truer note we cannot say, but the Archbishop's attitude appears to be much the commoner one on the part of the Roman hierarchy. We fear the Marian must have backslidden."

We assure our Methodist contemporary that it has not made any startling discovery. Not only Canadian Catholic editors but Canadian Catholic school-boys could teach the Advocate a lot about Catholic belief and practice. We have no doubt that the editor of the Advocate has sufficient mental capacity to understand the Marian article, if he could get rid of his peculiar mental warp long enough to try to understand anything from Catholic point of view. Suppose, for instance, that a Supreme Court judge, or the Lord Chancellor of England, if you like, not in his official capacity but as a private individual, infringes on the civil rights or property rights of the Guardian's editor. Would the editor not feel free to assert his rights and bring that person who infringed on them, judge though he be, into the Courts? Would he not fight him there as freely and as earnestly as if he were the humblest in the land? Some prejudiced foreigner with an incomplete, biased and hazy knowledge of our law of contempt might express astonished incredulity on hearing of such a case. But no ordinarily intelligent citizen of this country would be surprised. We are accustomed to distinguish between the official character and the private individual.

If the Pope commanded army and navy he would do so as a temporal prince. Some of his predecessors were temporal princes and engaged in war. Catholics fought against them. They had no difficulty at all in distinguishing between the Pope as Head of the Church and the Pope as a temporal prince. The Pope is no longer a temporal prince, but Catholics distinguish between the man, the scholar, even the theologian who may fill St. Peter's chair, and the successor of St. Peter as Head of the Church. As a theologian the Pope's opinions are worth just that respect which his learning and capacity entitle them to receive.

Passing over the Marian's lapse from orthodoxy which escaped the vigilance of Cardinal Gibbons and the Bishop of Mobile to be discovered by the Christian Guardian, we must ask our Methodist contemporary for its authority for the last part of its article. Of course as an antidote to the Marian article for its Methodist readers it will serve without authentication. But since we do not know who Archbishop Phelan may be, whether living or dead, and as we never heard of the "famous" sermon with the startling title, we are curious to have some information with regard to both.

Will the Advocate be good enough to gratify our curiosity?

AN "EX-PRIEST"

An unfortunate individual calling himself "Patrick" Morgan has posed as an ex-priest and ex-Capuchin in various parts of the country. Our attention is again called to him and it becomes our disagreeable duty to notice him in our columns—let us hope for the last time.

Harold Morgan is an Englishman who was received into the Church when about eighteen; expressing the desire of becoming a priest he was sent to Ushaw Catholic College. After some months the President wrote to Father Leeming saying that he was wasting his money on Morgan as it was quite evident that he was incapable of ever attaining sufficient education to proceed to the study of theology. Morgan at the time was a quiet young fellow apparently of good habits, and he received a certificate of good moral character on leaving the College. He went to a Capuchin Monastery in Wales where he desired to become a lay brother. A lay brother in a religious order is merely a working man who adopts a religious rule of life but continues his manual labor. A lay brother may or may not know how to read and write. During Morgan's novitiate or period of probation, it was discovered that he was addicted to opium. He was dismissed. He was never even a lay brother.

These are the grounds on which he advertises himself as an ex-priest and ex-Capuchin. He might with equal reason call himself ex-pope or ex-premier of England.

Nevertheless he posed as an ex-priest and ex-Capuchin. In a letter over his own name in the North Hastings Review, Wood, under the date May 10th, 1911, he claimed to have been ordained by Right Rev. Thomas Wilkinson, Roman Catholic Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle, and that he afterwards "made his vows" in the Capuchin monastery at Pantisaph, Wales.

The facts of his life having been made known by the Catholic press he now writes to the Ottawa Citizen which had reported a lecture in which Morgan had talked of saying Mass and administering the sacraments. This the sensitively truthful Morgan calls "wilful misrepresentation." "I am indeed pleased to be able to say I have never been guilty of saying Mass. "From time to time I have been spoken of as an ex-priest, but whenever a favorable opportunity occurred I have always repudiated the rather dubious honor."

The date of this letter to the Ottawa Citizen is April 15th, 1913. Self-confessed liar and hypocrite though he be, he will still be heard from in country villages as an ex-priest and ex-Capuchin. There are Protestants who will provide him with halls and audiences because nothing discreditable to "Rome" can tax their easy credulity and such characters as "Patrick" Morgan while pandering to a bigoted party-spirit which passes with some for religion, also afford the opportunity to gratify a prurient craving for the obscene and salacious. Under the cover of "religion" such lecturers give this class of people an entertainment that would bring the manager of a fifth-rate theatre into the police-court.

It is well, however, to remember that decent, self-respecting Protestants give no countenance to the Morgans, Monks and Sheppards. When Margaret L. Sheppard, posing as an ex-nun, was regaling those who like that sort of thing, a Presbyterian Minister of Toronto investigated this disreputable woman's claims and placed the printed exposure at the disposal of all who cared to know the truth concerning her. This was Rev. J. A. MacDonald, now editor of the Globe. Many other instances might be given. Great as the provocation at times may be, Catholics must distinguish between that class of Protestants whose weapons are lying, obscenity and calumny and those decent Protestants who suffer more keenly from the disgrace of their own side than Catholics do from the despicable calumnies.

THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS AT GUELPH

The tenth annual convention of the Knights of Columbus of Ontario was held last week at Guelph. As usual the delegates before beginning their deliberations assisted at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. This fact was thus alluded to by Mayor Carter in his address of welcome: "When I see a large body of brilliant looking men, assembled from all parts of Ontario, business, professional, workingmen and clergy, come here and associate with some of our most reputable citizens, and begin your deliberations by asking God to bless your labors, I take my hat off to you."

In another column we give the able and appropriate sermon preached by Rev. Father Drummond, S. J., to the assembled Knights.

Our readers who are aware of the good work done by this splendid Catholic organization will be pleased to note that the order has grown in the last ten years from 4 councils in Ontario to 30 councils, with a membership of 3,500. Not the least important of the benefits which the order has conferred on the Catholics of the Province is that of bringing together in fraternal intercourse on various occasions leading and earnest laymen who otherwise would have remained strangers to each other. Such intercourse has made many realize that everywhere there are not only sincere, zealous and loyal Catholics, but that in our ranks are found the highest types of manhood and citizenship, men of light and leading who are most highly esteemed where best known. Acquaintance, therefore, begets mutual esteem and mutual confidence which make co-operation and concerted action possible and comparatively easy.

Following are the names of State Officers elected at Guelph:

- State Chaplain, Right Rev. M. F. Fallon, D. D., London. State Deputy, Thomas N. Phelan, Toronto. State Secretary, Dr. J. F. White, Ottawa. State Treasurer, L. V. O'Connor, Lindsay. State Advocate, J. A. Mulligan, Sudbury. State Warden, J. A. Hussey, Sault Ste. Marie. Representatives, Dr. J. F. White, Ottawa; L. V. O'Connor, Lindsay; Dr. Claude Brown, London.

The convention next year will be held in Ottawa.

WHY NOT YOU?

Frequently in the Epistles we find the sacred writer addressing the early Christians as "saints." Why was this? Did they have exceptional means of sanctification that made them holier than us?

This opens up a larger question. What constitutes sanctity? Does it consist of extraordinary things done for Almighty God? Does it need extraordinary graces to attain to sainthood?

St. Joseph ranks next after Mary in the court of Mary's Son. What extraordinary things did he do? He lived with Jesus. He worked for Jesus. He worked with Jesus. Was he exceptionally favored in all this?

He lived with Jesus. Do you? Somewhere near to your home Jesus dwells. How much of your leisure moments are passed in His company before the Tabernacle? Do you exchange confidences with Him as friend to friend? Is He on your visiting list?

He worked for Jesus. Do you? Or do you work for the applause of men?

He worked with Jesus. Do you? Or do you work against Him by failing to co-operate with His Church as represented by your parish?

What extraordinary grace is there in sawing wood and fashioning tables and chairs? Is your avocation any humbler than St. Joseph's? Why not try doing it with and for Jesus, and see if you, too, will not become a saint like St. Joseph? St. Paul, in his epistles, reminds you that Christian and Saint are synonymous. COLUMBA.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

SARTO is the name of a newly incorporated town in Texas, and it was so named in honor of the Holy Father. It is said to give every promise of becoming a thriving community. Certainly, if there is anything in a name, Sarto has every right to look to the future with hope and confidence.

"WE HAVE somehow lost our grip on God," said Rev. Alexander Connell, D. D., in his presidential address at the Free Church Council at Newcastle, England, a short time ago. "The churches seem to have lost the old impressiveness of their appeal. . . . The Christian testimony on great issues of morals and religion seems to lack something in breadth and gravity and authority." Substitute the term Protestant for Christian, and Dr. Connell's testimony is entirely in harmony with that of other candid and clear-sighted observers of his own order in every country where the religion of the Reformation holds sway. The principle of authority was repudiated in the very act of breaking away from the Catholic Church. How then could it be expected that any more simulation of that great principle, usurped and unwarranted as it was, could hold with the same element that had renounced the genuine? Well would it be for those who thus lament the trend of the times if to honest scrutiny of the cause they devoted a tithe of the energy now wasted upon trifling issues of the hour!

AS IT IS, those to whom the masses might be expected to look for light and guidance are too often found to prostitute their calling to the most ignoble ends. Far be it from us to question the honesty or good faith of a large section of the ministerial body. But in the absence of that authority which Dr. Connell deprecates, the weight of influence in determining the ideal is not with them but with that growing class to whom the Christian ministry is little more than a means of livelihood. Of these, the Niagara River minister who issues business cards announcing his facilities for over-the-river marriages, and those others who divide the fee with the cabman bringing a run-away couple to their door are possibly the extreme. Not far removed, however, is that other class who think it not beneath the dignity of their calling, to perform the marriage service for the delectation of the flippant multitude at amusement resorts. These we could not, if we tried, characterize more severely than have some of their own.

OF SAID CLASS, a writer in the Presbyterian had this to say a short time ago:

"The sense of decency and moral order has been shocked by what has been performed at these various places by men ordained to the Christian ministry. It is a shame and disgrace that it is tolerated in a community, and if the Church does not wake up and stop such unseemly conduct, the State must. All honor to the clergy of the English Church and the priests of the Roman Catholic Church for their high ideals. There is no fear of them transgressing and outraging the moral sense of the community by any such deplorable conduct. We heard a good deal recently about the Ne Temere decree, and properly so, but be it observed also that if any fool conduct in regard to the wedding ceremony is desired—any exploitation of a sacred ceremony in the interests of commerce or pleasure, you need not look to either the English Church or Roman Catholic for assistance—this is to be left to 'Protestant clergy.'"

NOTWITHSTANDING the bitter state of persecution through which the Church in France has been passing of late years, and the manifest apostasy of the governing authorities, it becomes increasingly evident that the heart of the French people is sound. We have recently had a striking testimony to this from no less an individual than the Anglican Bishop of Oxford. Dr. Gore has incurred much acrimonious criticism from his fellow-churchmen, because of his favourable attitude towards Welsh Disestablishment, and in con-

troverting the idea that the Church of England had succeeded to any appreciable degree in becoming the Church of the poor, he adverted to the Church in France as having by her bearing under establishment, vindicated not only her hold upon the poor, but the loyalty of the mass of the French people to her. It seems to us worth while under the circumstances to reproduce the substance of Dr. Gore's remarks.

"I CANNOT," said Dr. Gore, "help looking across the sea to the French Church in this connection. There is hardly anything in Europe which interests me at this moment so much as the great spiritual revival which we see taking place in the French Church. The French Church is in many ways vindicating its claim to be the Church of the country in directions which surprise us. The French Church has passed through a great crisis of Disestablishment and Disendowment. I think what attracted our attention at that time was the magnificent loyalty with which it asserted its principles and made its spiritual claims, and at the same time betrayed an extraordinary degree of indifference as regards its secular position, and as regards its financial resources. I think that was extraordinary. I watched that process with admiration. As a result, though doubtless the French Church has lost influence in many ways, there has been, and I believe there will increasingly be, a great revival. Whatever their spiritual claim was—and, of course, I cannot but regret that that spiritual claim bound the Church in France in such complete subjection to Rome—but whatever their spiritual claim was they asserted it. They put their spiritual principles first, and their secular position and their finances last. They did wisely."

SUCH ATTITUDE on the part of an English churchman is not new. It finds its parallel in the longing gaze with which John Henry Newman, as Anglican Vicar of St. Mary's, and leader of the Oxford Tractarians, looked back to the age before the Reformation, and to the joyous swing, as he termed it, of the Church's advance always, in face of secular opposition or State persecution. It was of course the Divine life within which made this possible, but this was not then fully appreciated by the Oxford Vicar of eighty years ago, any more than by the Oxford Bishop of to-day. That the issue may be as happy in the later instance as in the former, Catholics who look on interestedly might well pray.

THAT DR. GORE is not less conscious of the dissolving tendency of the Anglican Establishment than of the vigorous rejuvenation of the Church in France, is evident from his further reflections upon the situation brought so conspicuously into view by the agitation for Welsh disestablishment. Having quoted his sentiments as to the one we cannot do less as to the other. "I regret profoundly," he said in his speech in the House of Lords, "that in our day when, if anything is true, it is true that there is going on now in our Church a doctrinal disintegration unparalleled in our history, such that if things go on as they are going on now it will not be possible in a generation's time to say what the Church of England's real position is even in fundamental matters of doctrine—that in such a period as this the Establishment is running away from principles and taking refuge in historical institutions; for that is what we are doing. We are trying to keep the Church of England together by flying for refuge to Establishment, when we ought to be taking the trouble to assert what our principles are and saying whether we intend to stand by them. I believe generally that to run away from principles to institutions is a grave disaster. I believe that the Church of England would have been far, far wiser in this crisis if it had sought to make the Welsh people understand what it stands to, and had shown far less zeal on behalf of its secular position or its endowments." It must at least be counted a gain to the Church of England that she has one prelate who has the wide vision and the courage to declare what these remarks imply. In that she has an immeasurable advantage over other organizations of Protestantism.

Lend your better self to all. God will not suffer you to be taken advantage of if you are prompted by the spirit of charity.

The settlement in favor of Catholic schools is growing. Judge Gemmill of Chicago says that the Catholic schools are far superior to the Public schools, because they teach the young the principles of honor, morals and industry.