

FOUR

## The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.00 per annum.  
United States & Europe—\$2.00.Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.  
Editor—Rev. JAMES T. FOLEY, B.A.  
Associate Editor—Rev. A. A. CASHH. F. MacIntyre  
Advertisement for readers, situations wanted, etc.  
Send such insertion. Remittance to accompany.Approved and recommended by the Archbishops  
of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface,  
and Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and  
Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the  
Diocese.Mons. P. J. Neve, E. J. Broderick, M. J. Hegarty,  
Mrs. W. E. Smith, Miss Sara Hanley, Miss O. Her-  
inger, and Miss B. Saunders are fully authorized  
to receive subscriptions and transmit all other  
business for the Catholic Record.Ordinary and marriage notices cannot be inserted  
except in the usual continued form. Each insertion  
costs 10 cents.Subscribers changing residence will please give old  
as well as new address.In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased  
from Mrs. M. A. McNamee, 54 Main street.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION

Apostolic Delegation  
Ottawa, June 13th, 1905.My Dear Sir:—Since coming to Canada I have  
been a reader of your paper. I have noted with satis-  
faction that it is directed with intelligence and  
ability, and above all, it is imbued with a  
Catholic spirit. It strenuously defends Cath-  
olic 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 it goes on. I therefore, ear-  
nestly recommend it to the Catholic families. With  
kind regards to your work, and best wishes for its con-  
tinued success.Yours very sincerely in Christ,  
Thomas Coffey, Archbishop of Ottawa,  
Apostolic DelegateUNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA,  
Ottawa, Canada, March 27th, 1900.My Dear Sir:—For some time past I have read your  
Catholic Record, and I am glad to say that I find it  
to be a paper of the highest quality, and a truly  
Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore, with  
pleasure, I can recommend it to the Catholic fam-  
ily, and wish you success in your noble work.Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,  
D. Falcovich, Arch. of Lening, Apost. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1918

## "BE STRONG AND QUIT YOUR-SELVES LIKE MEN"

Plato thus enumerates the chief virtues:

"Wisdom is the chief and leader; next follows temperance; and from the union of these two with courage springs justice."

Thus we may trace the recognition of the familiar cardinal virtues back to pre-Christian times. The Latin word *cardo* designated the pivot and socket on which the doors of the ancients revolved, equivalent to our hinge; hence figuratively the chief circumstance or consideration on which many others depend.

Courage in man has always been admired by pagan as well as by Christian: physical courage ever did and ever will command admiration in-stant and universal. Nevertheless, moral courage is of a higher order and has been so considered by thoughtful men of all ages. Unlike physical courage, however, moral courage is not instantly and universally recognized. The cardinal virtue of fortitude included moral courage and moral strength; it is what the scholastics call a habit, and is the chief characteristic of what the civilized world regards and admires as manliness. Christian fortitude pre-supposes the natural virtue, but inspired by higher than natural motives and directed to nobler ends.

This brief analysis has been suggested by an incident which admirably illustrates Christian fortitude, and illustrates also the instinctive admiration for the moral courage and fidelity to principle implied in that characteristic virtue of the strong man. Long before the days of Pestalozzi and Froebel, Christ used illustration, example and object lesson; and the Church throughout her liturgy and ceremonial has ever followed His example. Hence, without unnecessary comment or apology, we give the object-lesson.

Our readers are aware that a Catholic, a staunch, active, uncompromising Catholic, was recently elected Lord Mayor of Manchester, a great city where Catholics are overwhelm-ingly outnumbered by Protestants. An immemorial custom imposes on the Lord Mayor elect the obligation, as it were, of attending with the Corporation a special service of the Estab-lished Church of England. What more natural for the Catholic Lord Mayor to conform to this cus-tom and discharge this semi-obliga-tion, attending merely in his official capacity? Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, Senators, Representatives, Diplomats, and even the President, have attended the Pan-American Mass in Washington for the past seven years. It was Secretary Knox who requested that the Mass be celebrated annually. The late King Edward was present at Cardinal Manning's Requiem Mass. No end of instances could be quoted of Protestants being present at Mass; why, then, should the Catholic Lord Mayor not be present at a special, almost an official, service of the Anglican Church as by law es-tablished? Well, Mr. McCabe had the good and sufficient reason that he belongs to the Church established by Christ, sustained by His living presence and guided according to

His promise by the Holy Spirit of God. Nothing that could be inter-pretated as disloyalty to that Church is unimportant. The early Christian martyrs might have purchased free-dom from torture and death by the simple act of casting a bit of incense into the urn before the statue of the Emperor.

That happy day has come when the democracy of England recognizes and admires the qualities of that fighting race, the dashing bravery of whose soldiers in battle is eclipsed by the heroic fortitude of the obscure and often despised soldiers of the Cross in whose ranks the majority of the Irish race have been ever en-listed. The Catholic Lord-Mayor was absent from the service attended by the Corporation at Manchester Cathedral, and the preacher of the occasion, Bishop Weldon, the Dean of Manchester, thus referred to the fact:

"They regretted," said the Dean, this absence, and still more they re-gretted the reason of it. The spirit of religious exclusiveness was so far from their own hearts that they could scarcely realize that at this time of day, in the twentieth century of the Christian era, it could linger anywhere else. But it was no part of their duty to criticise the motives and actions of others. They who were members of a more Catholic Church might rejoice that they were not debarred by any ecclesiastical authority from the privilege of associ-ating themselves in public worship with the great majority of their fel-low-Christians."

We shall be on the lookout for G. K. Chesterton's comments on the "more Catholic" Right Rev. Dean. However his "fellow-Christians" have signified unmistakably that Dean Weldon's "Catholicity" like Uriah Heap's "humility" is not in their opinion the genuine article. Nor is the Christian and gentlemanly charity with which he disclaims the duty of criticising the motives and actions of others while in the very act of such criticism, considered really impressive.

"Anglican" in the Manchester Guardian, after speaking of "the keen sense of humiliation" with which he read the Dean's sermon, says:

"In these days of religious in-definiteness, it is a matter of devout thankfulness to find a public man acting according to his religious con-victions, and the Lord Mayor de-serves the respect of the whole com-munity for so doing. The mere accident of the Establishment is no justification to any man for swallowing his religious principles and practically playing the hypocrite, just because he happens for the time being to hold an important civic position. The Lord Mayor has set Manchester a noble example of religious consistency in the straight-forward, manly way in which he has acted all along, and I for one say, 'All honor to him.'"

"Artifex," a regular contributor to the great Manchester paper, above mentioned, in an article on "Broad-mindedness" puts the matter thus:

"I am quite clear in my own mind as to the entire correctness of the Lord Mayor's action. The Church of Rome teaches that attendance by her members at services other than her own is sinful. Whether she is right or wrong to teach this is, of course, open to question. That such is, as a matter of fact, her official teaching, is quite beyond dispute. It comes, therefore, to this: Is a lay-man justified, in order to avoid giving offence to others or in order to promote the amenities of life or for any other reason, in committing what the Church of which he is a loyal member teaches to be a sin? When the question is worded thus there seems to be but one answer. That so few people have worded it in this way is a proof of the regret-table fact that the Church of Eng-land is not to be almost wholly with-out discipline. The offence of Roman Catholics is that they are severely logical. And the fault of the average Englishman is that he is totally il-logical and wholly ruled by senti-ment and a desire for practical com-promise."

The Church Times, an Anglican organ, after giving Bishop Weldon's remarks as quoted above, thus com-ments:

"What his lordship meant by Catholic was 'heterogeneous,' or 'miscellaneous,' or 'omnium gatherum,' which would have been perfectly in-telligible and adequate, without de-privating an ancient word of a definite meaning of its own. We should like to learn from Bishop Weldon what is the ecclesiastical authority that has dispensed churchmen on 'special and solemn occasions' from their or-dinary objections as Catholics to the established sense of that ill-treated word."

The Manchester correspondent of the Church Times says:

"Needless to say the Dean has been very severely criticized. Members of the City Council are very angry at what they describe as an attack on the Lord Mayor; Roman Catholics are naturally indignant; the man-in-the-street resents what he regards as an unfair use of the pulpit, and few

are found to champion the Dean's cause. It must be confessed that these attacks on Roman Catholics never do any good. It enables them to represent churchmen as utterly indifferent to their own beliefs, and ready to surrender them on the least provocation. And certainly the eagerness with which many Church mem-bers of the City Council are profess-ing their willingness to go next Sun-day to High Mass at the Church of the Holy Name with the Lord Mayor gives point to their sneers."

AFTERMATH

The Manchester Courier:

"For the first time in history, the Lord Mayor of Manchester paid an official visit to a Catholic Church. It was, as the Bishop of Salford subse-quently remarked, an epoch making event for the Catholics of Manches-ter, and the occasion was marked by a great display of pomp and cere-monial. The Holy Name, large as it is, was quite unable to accommodate all those desirous of taking part in the service. Special seats were reserved for the members of the City Council, of whom there were a large number present, as well as of other public bodies, in-cluding representatives of the Con-sultative. The Chief Constable (Mr. R. Peacock) was also present, and Sir Charles Beltrams and Sir Alexander Porter occupied seats near to the sanctuary. Several of the Town Hall officials were also present decorated with plants and flowers, backed by tall palms, while the altar was adorned with yellow and white chrysanthemums, the papal colors. On the sanc-tuary were representatives of all the religious orders in the Salford diocese, including Franciscans, Dominicans, Benedictines, and Norbertines, while nearly the whole of the Diocesan Chapter were present. A fanfare of trumpets outside the building an-nounced the arrival of the Lord Mayor, who was received at the west door by the Bishop of Salford. A procession, headed by the Bishop and his attendants, followed the mace-bearer, the Town Clerk (Mr. T. Hud-son), and the Lord Mayor and Lady Mayoress (Mrs. Charles O'Neill)."

"The Lord Mayor was conducted to a priedieu near the sanctuary, where seats had also been provided for the Lady Mayoress and the Town Clerk. The mace was placed on a table in-side the sanctuary. "Fortified High Mass was sung by the Bishop of Teos (Right Rev. Dr. Hanlon), a native of Manchester, and an old personal friend of Alderman McCabe."

The italics are merely to show the accuracy of the Manchester corre-spondent of the Church Times in forecasting the effect of Bishop Wel-don's ill-advised reference. There are still some people—even in Canada—who will call this fidelity to prin-ciple and loyalty to the Church by the ugly name of bigotry. Well, amongst people where half education is somewhat general we cannot ex-pect precision in the use of common words. In this loose acceptance of the term Tennyson was quite right when he said, "you must choose in religion between bigotry and flabbiness." There are those who glory in their shame; but they should aban-don the euphemism "broadmind-ness," learn a lesson in English from Tennyson, and call the thing by its right name—flabbiness.

A SUGGESTION

Every Canadian knows or should know that "the spelling in official documents in all branches of the public service of the Dominion of Canada is regulated by a minute of the Privy Council signed by the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, dated May 30, 1890." The rest of this important document we shall merely summarize: Such words as "honour," "favour," "labour," "hon-ourable," and the like are spelt with the 'u' in England; "such forms as "labor," "favor," "honor," "honor-able," etc., are apparently confined to the United States with the exception of some few instances where they have been adopted in Canada." The English practice should be uniformly followed.

Whether it is due to latent annexa-tionist sentiment, or a defective sense of "form," or merely to a juvenile spirit of insubordination where no serious penalty is incurred, it must be admitted that this valiant effort to stem the tide of Americani-zation of the King's English in Canada has not met with such success as would allay the suspicions of a British-born visitor to this over-sea Dominion.

The Parliamentary Guide (to which useful manual we are indebted) while sternly holding the Spelling Class as of first importance, makes room for a lesson from the Geographic Board. Amongst the rules of nomenclature we find:

"The term 'brook' is to be pre-ferred to 'creek' for designating small streams, and will be adopted in cases where the latter has not be-come too firmly fixed."

And there is an institution of learn-ing where they refer to an important part of this country as "Up-the-

Creek!" Probably in consideration for the older members of the House "up salt brook" will not be insisted upon.

"The form 'canyon' may be used instead of 'cañon.'"

This serves the Spaniards right for saying *aca nada* and betaking them-selves to South America. But—

"French names in Canada are to be spelt according to the rules of the French language."

That is why 'the Soo' is spelt 'Sault'—on the map. And this, again, accounts for the American stranger within our gates who, seeking some information about Sault Ste Marie, inquired about Salt Stee Mari. Mutual enlightenment elicited the remark in broad United States, "Well if that isn't the dumbest way to spell 'Soo'!" "Well, how would you spell it?" asked the Canadian, slightly nettled and prepared to demonstrate the utility of bilingualism. "Why, S-i-o-u-x of course."

But we have been carried far afield from our original purpose in consulting the Parliamentary Guide. That was to get some authoritative pronouncement on the question indi-cated by the following despatch:

The word "creek," when used politically, cannot be considered as defamatory, was the novel plea of Julian Robillard to-day in the slander suit of \$2,000 damages brought against him by J. K. Boileau, a notary. The term was applied to Boileau by Robillard during the re-vision by the plaintiff of the voters' lists at Cheneville recently.

We shall probably have to await the decision of the Courts. But how much simpler and cheaper it would be if there were inserted in the interesting volume to which we owe so much useful information, a chapter on "political nomenclature," indicating precisely the degree of good taste in such terms as "ruined gamester," "broggerize," and "slippery bill." A lawsuit might have been averted if it had been gently suggested that the term "creek" is to be preferred to "heeler" for designating trusty political ser-vants, or those who do not stay "firmly fixed" such terms as "black-mailer" and "perjurer" are of course sanctioned by parliamentary usage.

We are making progress, and en-larging the Canadian vocabulary. Very appropriately the Toronto City Council leads the way in giving tone to adjectives and epithets free, forcible and picturesque—and perhaps truthful. Already there is reputable (Toronto) journalistic precedent for intimating that a rival editor is "a fat-headed sophist." In another century or two certain foreign-look-ing papers—not regular visitors—that have made their way to our sanctum during the past few weeks may be cited as examples of sweet reasonableness in journalistic dis-cussion.

"GRANNY'S APRON-STRINGS"

That a grateful English democracy whole-heartedly support the Nation-alist demand for Irish self govern-ment is well-known. That the party of class and wealth and privilege half heartedly allowed its stop-gap leader, Bonar Law, to give a bluster-ous approval to Carson's gigantic bluff, is likewise well-known. The seriousness with which some of our "over-sea" papers have treated the melo-dramatic development of Car-sonism, with its half-hearted, half-ashamed condemnation by Unionists, reminds one of the unsophisticated veteran who was so impressed by the realism of a moving picture show that he leaped on the stage to assist his Southern comrades and fought all his battles o'er amid the wreckage of the screen and other stage accesso-ries, which were soon reinforced by frantic manager, assistants and policemen.

Despite the serious pre occupation of a portion of the Canadian press the average Englishman was quite unmoved by the dread spectre of im-pending civil war. The aforesaid section of our press forthwith elab-orated theories to explain British apathy. The real explanation is sufficiently indicated in David Harum's sage remark: "There's a lot of holes in a ten foot ladder." And even an Orange preacher can see through that if the rungs are far enough apart.

The ulterior motives of Unionist politicians are not far to seek. Any-thing to defeat the government, any-thing to bring on a general election, with its possibilities before plural voting is abolished, before Home Rule and Welsh Disestablishment have lost their campaign uses and become accomplished facts; above all, before the House of Lords is re-formed. For a hundred years the

Tories had their own way when in power: when in opposition the Tory House of Lords saw to it that no really disagreeable Liberal legisla-tion passed that august chamber. Parliament Act for the first time makes it possible for the House of Commons to enact such legislation as the vast majority of the people of the United Kingdom desire, in the teeth of aristocratic opposition. And the Prime Minister is pledged to reform the House of Lords, leaving not a vestige of hereditary privilege in the second chamber. Then where will that inefable demagogue Lloyd George stop? Anything, any-thing, anything to have the reform-ing of the House of Lords in good Tory hands, so that "The Constitu-tion" may be saved. Rebellion in Ulster? Good, the fear of civil war ought to influence a lot of steady-going Englishmen. Then surely the schoolmaster has not been so long abroad that we cannot confidently appeal to ingrained British fear of "Rome." It seemed too good a bet for desperate aristocratic sports to over-look.

Alas! Only Belfast Orangemen and Canadian anglers for the Orange vote were at all impressed. Worse, the aristocratic sowing of the loyal Ulster wind produced the unfore-seen whirlwind of democratic defiance of the irksome re-straints of authority. Carsonism gave birth to Larkism. Before this Frankenstein monster Tory politi-cians recoil. The Ulster pawn is unhesitatingly sacrificed. The Tories stipulate only for a chance to "save their faces." Asquith agrees. The farce is over. Bonar Law may never get the leading role in another play; but "there'll be many a dhray eye" in the Tory ranks over that.

Now, the spoiled child of Toryism needs correction. This is how the English imperialistic organ, the London New Age, uses the Imperial shingle on Little Ulster:

"There are, however, two good reasons, and both permanent reasons, why Home Rule is necessary to Eng-land and necessary now. One is that we have had enough of the Irish party as a party in Parliament and cannot endure their presence any longer. The other is that Ireland blocks the way to the creation of an Imperial Commonwealth. But neither of these reasons, each sufficient in itself to justify Home Rule, does it appear that Ulster appreciates; and thereby she shows herself more Irish than even the rest of Ireland. For it is incredible that if Ulster were, as Sir Edward Carson would have us believe, more English than the Eng-lish, she would not realize that the acceptance of Home Rule would be the best proof of it. The sacrifices demanded of Ulster in accepting Home Rule are such, moreover, as seem to native English opinion trifling; and her reasons for refusing to appear to us preposterously flimsy when even they appear at all. The status of an autonomous member of the Commonwealth is not so degraded that Ulster need sneeze at it; and the safeguards against her oppres-sion by the rest of Ireland are exactly as numerous and as effective as she cares to define and ask for. What burglar alarms, spring guns and life-preservers Ulster needs in the new constitution to enable her to sleep in peace under Home Rule she can have ad lib. from the catalog. Against in-substantial terrors, we fear, there is no political remedy; psycho analy-sis has not yet penetrated politics; but against any nameable and sub-stantial apprehensions many defences are necessary. But no. Ulster cares for none of these things. Ulster is a strong man armed who is afraid of nothing but fear. Ulster will feel safe only if tied in the old fashioned way to her grand mother's apron-strings. Ulster will not play dirty with the rest of Ireland, the naughty, dirty Catholic boys. Ulster wants to be with mother. But the love idyll here presupposed is not exactly the setting for Ulster's bloody history. In short, mother is only too well as-sured that Ulster can look after her-self."

So!

Little Ulster must let grandmother untie the apron strings! Listen to the good old lady whose patience is near the breaking point: "Run on out and play, Ulster dear.—Yes, yes, I'll keep the army and navy within call; don't be so frantically frightened of the little Catholics.—You want to be with mother? No! I say, go on, and don't be a milkop.—Even so, they have forgiven you and will heap coals of fire on—Don't whine, you little simpleton; that is a figure of speech and is taken from the Bible, it means,—stop that shrieking! I mean the Protest-ant Bible.—Now clear out; mother and I have a big job of Imperial house-cleaning and we can't be bothered with you, (aside.) You savage little coward!"

Let us hope that in this as in other cases the spoiled child under happier conditions may grow into decent and self respecting manhood.

## "PRIEST-RIDDEN"

The following is an extract from a letter of Mr. W. J. Bennet, an ex-official of the Wesleyan Church, in the London Morning Post, November 20th. Failing to enlist the co-opera-tion of English Nonconformists in saving Ulster he tells the brethren what he knows about them:

"If this outrage is perpetrated, (throwing Ulster over), it will split Nonconformity from top to bottom, and in the opinion of a large and growing body of Free Churchmen it would be a good thing, too, if there is no other way of arresting that parasite, the political parson. We may then regain for our 'Free' Churches that freedom and real reli-gion which are at present a mon-strous pretence and nauseating hy-po-crisy. . . . Nonconformity is struggling in the grip of a Radical caucus, and for my part I would prefer the domination of the Roman Catholic clergy, which at least has the respect of its congrega-tion, to the sniggering, underhand tyranny of the 'Radical agent' in minister's clothes. I for one think there are things worth fighting for, and one of them is to free a church from political tyranny greater and more sinister than any Church under Rome."

Comment would spoil it; unless, indeed, we subjoin as such another extract from the same letter:

"Let us be frank about it, if you want unanimity amongst Free Churches, hostility to the teachings of Rome is the only factor under the sun that can secure it."

But that does not exhaust the com-ments that suggest themselves. We shall allow our readers to make their own.

## ET TU BRUTE

London, Dec. 10.—Eloquent Ulster divines did their best in the Wick bye-election. Tariff reform speakers were officially selected to give them a free field, yet the Government won easily. The result seems to indicate that the "No Popery" cry has lost its old electoral power, even in an aggressive Protestant division.

In the words of The Daily News, "Wick represents Scotland as a whole in repudiating the insult Toryism is paying a great people by selecting them to be the subject for a miserable experiment in a 'Titus Oates revival.'"

Thus cabled Windermere to the Montreal Star. Those who have read this hysterical correspondent's shrieks of alarm all summer over the impending Ulster "crisis" and the consequent fear, trembling hesi-tation, and dissension in the Asquith Cabinet, will readily recognize the significance of his recovered mental balance and of the sane, matter of fact tone of the foregoing despatch. What is the use of trying to work Canadians into a panic over Ulster when the British electorate treat it with cold contempt? Windermere's returning sanity is an evidence that Ulsteria and Carsonism have been re-legat-ed with many a round Tory malediction to the *alibi diorum* of discarded and discredited political tactics.

## A CHRISTMAS THOUGHT FOR THE PEOPLE

Unrest is the characteristic of the age. It makes itself felt in every rank and condition of society, in every sphere of human activity, but amongst the rank and file of the industrial world it is especially pronounced. We have travelled a long way from the old feudal times when the de-spised serfs were numbered with the baron's goods and chattels, rated if anything, a little less than his beasts of burden. It may not be so long a call to the days of the old aristocratic regime, when, if it began to be whis-pered abroad that the common people had rights, it was proclaimed from the housetops that the lords of the soil had privileges. But now democracy has found itself, and the privileges of the aristocrat have gone into the limbo of discarded things as surely and irrevocably as the rights of the feudal baron.

This is the day of the people's reign—and would that we could altogether rejoice that it is so. But we cannot forget that the voice of the multi-tude is not always the voice of God, and there are not wanting signs that the rule of the people will lay itself open to criticism. Democracy has its rights—but it has also its duties and responsibilities, and whilst we recognize the one it will not do to ignore the other. Christian prin-ciples must mould and direct the democratic movement if the last state of society is not to be worse than the first.

From what source are the people to draw the inspiration that is to give life to the new regime? From the lips of the iconoclasts, who would pull down before they build up? From the Socialist soap-box orator who would erect the democratic commonwealth on the ruins of the

supernatural? Who will be fool-hardy enough to deny that the ten-dency is not in this direction?

And yet if men would but look deep down into the history of huma-nity they cannot fail to see that their ideal is to be reached by an entirely different path. Christianity, in the minds of the ignorant, is the great enemy of Democracy, and yet it was the Church that first proclaimed the inherent equality of man. This is the people's day, and it is easy to achieve a little cheap notoriety by championing their cause. But it was not so fashionable when the Church first proclaimed it to a pagan world. We need not labour the point. History is our eloquent wit-ness.

Prior to Christianity the world refused to admit that the common people had any rights. They were cast aside as worthless, their whole history summed up in the two stern words to work and to die. They were debarred from the pleasures the world loved, from the dignities it honored, from the interests it valued. What could they know of politics and power, of philosophy and statesman-ship, of trade and commerce? These were the things the world valued, of these it made great parade, and for these it made many a sacrifice. And because these things did not come within the reach of the poor, the world hated and despised poverty. But Christianity had a different mes-sage for the toiling masses. The message of Bethlehem opened up a view of life which the world had never been in the habit of taking. By calling attention to the eternal future it dwarfed the present. The life was more than the meat, and the body more than the raiment. It pro-claimed to the world that the poor had a very real business in life; that the things upon which men had hitherto set their hearts were not of so much importance after all; that the thing that mattered was the soul; that the poor had souls as well as the rich, and that it was their business, equally with the rich, to save them. Here, then, was equality. Here was fraternity. Here in the Cave of Bethlehem was written the Charter of Democracy. And after that things could never be again as they were before.

Bethlehem witnessed the birth-throes of Democracy. The Church watched by its cradle. For nearly two thousand years it has given to the world the living example of a so-ciety democratic in its every fibre. Would that our present day democ-rats might read history? Then they would see that their new-found gospel is not so new after all—that, on the contrary, it is as old as the Church that was founded by the Carpenter's Son, the Church of the Fisherman's Throne, that to day is filled by the barefoot boy who once herded a few goats and sheep on the Italian hills.

COLUMBA.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE SALVATION Army in Toronto is coming in for considerable criticism because of its so-called "salvage department." It is charged that of the vast quantity of cast off clothing, furniture, cooking utensils, etc., given to it gratis for distribution among the poor, the greater part is sold, and that at prices which compete with the licensed dealers in second-hand goods. Certain it is that regular commercial establishments are maintained by the Army for that purpose, and that a large force of uniformed employees find their living thereby.

ON BEHALF of the Army it is main-tained that this is the only method of distributing relief consistent with self respect and a sense of independ-ence on the part of the recipient. The distribution of the necessities of life, free from all obligation on the part of the receivers, it is stated, demoralizing in the extreme, and an incen-tive to pauperism. Therefore the Army puts the thing on a commercial basis, and makes it a part of the vast industrial machine which it now maintains all over the English speak-ing world.

THERE IS SOMETHING to be said in behalf of this view, but the trouble is with a semi-religious organization such as the Salvation Army, that despite its boast as a Bible religion, it is apt to lose sight of those other considerations which stand forth so pre-eminently in the Gospels. We hear much of thrift and self-de-pendence in these days—most de-sirable qualities in themselves, and very necessary to the propriety and integrity of a nation. But are they not very often permitted to obscure